HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, May 28, 1992*

The House met at 10 a.m.

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

We pray, O God, that our actions will reflect our good words and our deeds will relate to our intentions. Teach us always, gracious God, to begin each day with the language of prayer, praise, and thanksgiving and to remember those noble words when we go about our daily tasks and accept the responsibilities of public service. Give us the gifts of eyes with vision, hearts of integrity, and hands eager to work for justice in our land and in the world. In Your name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] if she would kindly come forward and lead the membership in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. LOWEY of New York 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.

INTRODUCTION OF THE FOREIGN TAX RATIONALIZATION AND SIMPLIFICATION ACT OF 1992

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

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Ways and Means Chairman ROSTENKOWSKI introduced the Foreign Tax Rationalization and Simplification Act of 1992. A portion of this bill deals with the taxation of foreign-controlled companies operating in the United States. There are 46,000 foreign firms operating in the United States and more than 70 percent of these companies do not pay any Federal income tax.

In 1990, the Subcommittee on Oversight, which I chair, reviewed 200 tax returns for 36 foreign-owned companies and found that more than half of the returns showed little or no taxes paid. Last month, the subcommittee conducted a followup hearing to review the most recent tax returns and tax data of the same companies. The subcommittee found that tax compliance has worsened.

The bill introduced yesterday is responsive to concerns that have been raised at the subcommittee's hearings. Under the Foreign Tax Rationalization and Simplification Act, IRS would have an additional mechanism to measure how much income, at a minimum, should be shown on the return as taxable income. The taxable income formula would be based on amounts reported by domestic companies in the same industry. For example, if U.S.-owned electronics companies had taxable incomes equaling 3 percent of total receipts, foreign-owned companies operating in the United States would have to show similar taxable incomes. Of course, if a foreign-owned company believes this figure is too high, the company could use IRS' advance pricing agreement procedure to arrive at a more appropriate taxable income level.

I believe this provision is straightforward, workable, and fair. It will help ensure that most foreign firms operating in the United States pay their taxes.

AUTHORIZING USE OF EAST FRONT PARKING LOT OF CAPITOL FOR EXHIBIT BY NASA, JUNE 1 THROUGH JUNE 5, 1992

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 123) authorizing the use of the east front parking lot of the Capitol for an exhibit by NASA during the period beginning on June 1, 1992 and ending June 5, 1992, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

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

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, under the reservation, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois for an explanation of the resolution.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding and also for his valuable assistance and contribution in this matter.

Mr. Speaker, Senate Concurrent Resolution 123 simply authorizes use of the east plaza of the Capitol Grounds for a space station exhibit sponsored by NASA.

The display consists of a full-scale replica of two modules of the space station known by the name *Freedom* showing the living environment of a large space station. Also, visitors will be able to view the station's advanced laboratory and the complex research activities which will be conducted aboard it.

Moreover, this exhibit, providing a valuable learning opportunity, will be open to the public free of charge, to be set up the afternoon of June 1. It will be open June 2, 3, and 4 from 9:30 a.m. to 6 p.m., and dismantled the morning of June 5.

Security will be provided by NASA, and no food or beverages will be sold.

Mr. Speaker, may I conclude that information about the science and technology of space exploration should generate more interest in our frontiers of knowledge and lead to a greater national commitment to further investment in this critical area, and, mind you, this could prove essential to our Nation's ability to compete successfully in the global economy of the 21st century.

Mr. Speaker, I now urge adoption of this resolution.

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

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the previous speakers. Senate Concurrent Resolution 123 which will allow NASA to have an exhibit on the east plaza of the Capitol, deserves the support of this body. The proposed exhibit consists of two trailers and represents a full-scale mockup of the habitation and laboratory modules of the space station *Freedom*.

The *Endeavour* crew recently captured the admiration of the entire Nation when they were able to first secure a nonworking communications satellite and then repair it and set it back into orbit. While this operation provides further evidence of the high level of expertise that exists for working and living in space, it also translates into increased momentum for the space program. However, given our severe budget constraints, each program—including the space program—must be closely scrutinized prior to continued or increased funding. The proposed NASA exhibit on the Capitol Grounds will, in my estimation, provide Members and the general public

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

with a rare opportunity to see first hand how tax dollars are being spent.

Increasing our understanding of the space station project will result in better decisions during future budget deliberations on the program and thus, I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 123 which will allow NASA to have an exhibit on the east plaza of the Capitol June 2 through June 4. The exhibit consists of two trailers and represents a full-scale mock-up of the habitation and laboratory modules of the space station *Freedom*. This exhibit will allow Members of Congress, staff, and the public to see firsthand the facilities our astronauts will use on the space station.

The spectacular success of the *Endeavour* crew in retrieving and repairing an errant communications satellite highlighted once again the feasibility of working and living in space. In addition, the *Endeavour* mission illustrated the fascination the American public has with space. The proposed NASA exhibit on the Capitol Grounds will provide an up-close view of life in space.

I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 123

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is authorized to use the East Front parking lot of the Capitol for an exhibit during the period beginning on June 1, 1992 and ending June 5, 1992. The Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board shall take such action as may be necessary with respect to the physical preparations and security for the exhibit.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on Senate Concurrent Resolution 123, the Senate concurrent resolution just concurred in.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman form Illinois?

There was no objection.

SUPPORT THE NIH REAUTHORIZATION

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

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Madam Speaker, when it comes to health care, women have been forgotten for far too long. Forgotten in clinical trials, forgotten in preventive care, and forgotten in the health professions.

That is about to change. The NIH reauthorization bill contains important provisions to ensure that women are forgotten no longer.

It provides $225 million for basic research on breast cancer, a disease that will take the lives of 45,000 American women this year.

It redesignates the National Center for Nursing Research as an Institute so that the nursing profession and nursing research are given the status they clearly deserve. It establishes three contraceptive and two infertility research centers which are desperately needed to help women with family planning and to prevent unwanted pregnancies.

H.R. 2507 remembers women. I urge my colleagues to support the NIH reauthorization.

□ 1010

IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 5229, THE FUNDAMENTAL COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 1992

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

Mr. ZIMMER. Madam Speaker, I am proud to be an original cosponsor of H.R. 5229, the Fundamental Competitiveness Act of 1992, which has been introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] and the other Republican members of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

I think there can be no starker demonstration of the difference in philosophy between our two political parties than the two bills on competitiveness that have been introduced recently. Whereas the Democrats ask, "What can we—the Government—do for you?"—generally with your own tax dollars, the Republicans ask, "What can we stop doing to you? How can we relieve you of the burden of taxes, regulation and litigation, the debt and the deficit?"

I believe that American industry can compete quite effectively internationally if we can only remove the shackles that have been put on it by Federal policy.

I think that one of the most impressive and imaginative elements of this legislation is the public debt reduction title. This provision would allow individual taxpayers to dedicate up to 10 percent of their tax bill to reduce the Federal debt and simultaneously to cut Federal spending by the same amount.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5229.

WHAT IS WRONG WITH CONGRESS AND THE WHITE HOUSE?

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Madam Speaker, last month's trade deficit is no great surprise. It shot up to nearly $6 billion, with a "b", $4 billion of it to Japan alone.

Now, is it any wonder that Japan continues to dump products in our markets, keeps our products out; and our Government, the Congress, and the President turn their backs and allow illegal trade, with American jobs going overseas and American investment going overseas.

What is wrong with Congress? What is wrong with the White House?

In another 5 years of this business, American workers will be buying Mao suits and riding on bicycles and rickshaws. Maybe then the Congress will wise up. There will not be a job left in our country, Madam Speaker.

WOMEN AND MINORITIES IN MEDICAL RESEARCH

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

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Madam Speaker, while it may not be clear to some, it is to me: Men and women are not alike. Although this seems obvious, it was not at one time for the medical research community. Landmark studies using only white men to determine the response of a treatment for heart disease is proof of that.

Thankfully, health researchers are now noticing the differences between white males, females, and ethnic minorities—and learning that they must study each separately before developing useful conclusions.

Congress, too, has stressed the importance of using women and minorities in medical research, and established the Office of Research on Women's Health last year. I am very pleased to note that the NIH reauthorization conference report, which will come before us today, includes provisions to strengthen women and ethnic medical research. We must continue this commitment this year and in the future.

As a breast cancer survivor, I know the importance of medical research. I also know the many questions that run through your head—why, how, and why me? We need diverse research to provide us with these essential answers.

Madam Speaker, I thank you for this opportunity to offer my support to women and ethnic medical research.

AMERICA'S SMALL TOWNS, RURAL AREAS HAVE PROBLEMS TOO

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VOLKMER. Madam Speaker, the urban problems of America's largest cities, like Los Angeles and Chicago, have been highlighted recently by the national press and brought to the attention of Congress and President Bush.

But what about the problems of America's smaller, but certainly not less important, towns? These cities and towns, located in America's rural areas, are not exempt from the problems that are currently plaguing our larger inner-cities. I have witnessed substandard housing, deteriorating and nonexisting water and sewer systems, and many more problems that most Americans associate as being exclusive to large inner-cities.

Madam Speaker, I contend we must address the needs of America's inner-cities, but at the same time we cannot afford to ignore the rural regions of our country.

Hard decisions must be made. In our zest to restore and improve our inner cities, let us not forget the plight of rural America. We, in Congress, must work together in taking an active interest in renovating and reinvigorating our rural and inner-city communities.

FETAL TISSUE RESEARCH

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

Mr. ZELIFF. Madam Speaker, we have another example today of why the American people hold this Congress in utter disrespect.

The American people want Congress to be accountable. They want to know where their Members stand on the vital issues of the day.

Millions of Americans want us to allow fetal tissue research, to help find a cure for the debilitating diseases of diabetes, Parkinson's, Alzheimer's, as well as blood disorders and spinal cord injuries. I strongly support the vitally needed fetal tissue research. What kind of leadership makes us cast one vote on these two diametrically opposed issues? Congressional reform should start today, Madam Speaker, by dividing these two important issues. Let us run this place with a little common sense. It is no wonder that the American people are disgusted with Congress.

The American people want to know where we stand on this vital, but emotion ridden, question. Will the House leadership let us have a simple "yes" or "no" vote on this potentially life-saving issue? Of course not. Congress' archaic rules, procedures, and leadership insist that the vote on fetal tissue research be combined with a $3.1 billion increase in Federal spending for the National Health Institutes.

I am strongly against this $3.1 billion spending increase.

SUPPORT THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, today we will take up the NIH conference report.

This bill commits us to improving Americans' health. It supports our biomedical research community in the search for new treatments and cures for a host of illnesses. It recognizes the long-neglected health needs of women. And it lifts the ban on fetal tissue research, which has shown such promise for treatment of Parkinson's, Alzheimer's, diabetes, and other diseases.

I am appalled at the way health care has become such a political football in this country. I hope today we will tell millions of people, who suffer from hundreds of illnesses, that we care more about them than about election-year politics.

This bill is based on the highest ethical standards of the medical profession. It maintains the integrity of the National Institutes of Health. And it allows the research community to do what it is supposed to do—to ease suffering and save lives.

I urge my colleagues to support good science, good health, and good public policy, and vote for this bill.

SUPPORT OUR VETERANS

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

Mr. APPLEGATE. Madam Speaker, once again the Ways and Means Committee is exercising its arbitrary and dictatorial authority. The Ways and Means Committee is taking $339 million away from America's veterans, when we are short on moneys to provide all the services that are required: Health benefits, compensation benefits, and particularly this money was going to be used for DIC, to create an equitable program for widows and surviving orphans.

Where is the money going to go? Well, the Ways and Means Committee said they are going to use it to pay for minimum tax relief for oil and gas companies.

What the hell are they going to do for Americans and American veterans and their survivors?

Madam Speaker, I think this is a shame, and I think that the Congress should be riled up about it.

I am asking that the veterans of this country write to the Ways and Means Committee and let them know how they feel about this.

COMMEMORATING 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF SOUTHERN COLLEGE OF SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS

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

Mrs. LLOYD. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to introduce legislation today to commemorate the 100th anniversary of Southern College of Seventh-day Adventists. Southern College is located just east of Chattanooga, TN, in the foothills of the Great Smoky Mountains. Southern College was founded in 1892 with only 23 students. Since that time, it has flourished and grown into a 4-year accredited institution, with an administration, faculty, and student body committed to academic excellence.

Southern College has distinguished itself by providing a challenging educational experience and valuable community service programs. It can well be described by the centennial slogan: "A tribute to the past. A commitment to the future."

Southern College's strong sense of community involvement is a model for the Nation. I urge my colleagues to join with me in recognizing the school's legacy of excellence in education by congratulating Southern College of Seventh-day Adventists on their 100th anniversary.

□ 1020

RTC: A GLIMMER OF LIGHT AT THE END OF THE TUNNEL

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

Mr. DREIER of California. Madam Speaker, the Resolution Trust Corporation is not the most heralded of Government agencies, but it seems to me that as we look at the issue of funding, which has been controversial, there appears to be a little glimmer of light at the end of the tunnel. By that I mean we have an opportunity to bring an end to that agency by allowing it to successfully complete the job of closing down insolvent financial institutions and, in fact, meeting our Government commitment to insure all deposits up to $100,000.

Over the past several months we have been battling over whether or not to provide that influx of capital to close down those institutions. The job is nearly complete. We need to work out a compromise on, what could be, the last funding bill, so that all those depositors who know that the full faith and credit of the U.S. Government is behind them are not in fact ignored.

IT'S TIME FOR SUNSHINE AND ACCOUNTABILITY IN THE BOARDROOMS OF AMERICA

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

Mr. AUCOIN. Madam Speaker, everyone knows our economy in this country is in trouble. Over 8 million Americans are currently unemployed, and that includes over 115,000 people in my own State of Oregon.

Madam Speaker, meanwhile the profits of American corporations fell by 18 percent last year. Now, you would think that the pay of this country's top executives would reflect in some way this sorry economic performance. But, no, in 1991 the pay of senior corporate executives shot up by 26 percent while unemployment skyrocketed.

The average annual—that is annual—compensation of top executives in America today is about $2.4 million per year. It may sound incredible, but one look at the newspaper will tell you that it's so. For example, I read recently that MNC Financial, Inc. has just given its chairman stock options worth $4.8 million while the company lost $510 million over the last 2 years.

Madam Speaker, whatever happened to making money the old-fashioned way: By earning it? It is not happening in corporate America. I think it is time to put some sunshine and accountability in the boardrooms of this country. Let's let shareholders hold the top brass accountable for the companies' performance.

Madam Speaker, the Securities and Exchange Commission should require full disclosure of compensation packages to the shareholders of these companies. I urge my colleagues to join me in writing to the chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission urging him to do this without delay.

AMERICA'S WOMEN HAVE BEEN SUBJECTED TO SECOND-CLASS MEDICAL CARE

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Madam Speaker, the American magazines of the past few weeks have been filled with articles about how women have been subjected to, really, second-class medical care in America. I think we have seen them all over the newsstands.

Today there is very good news: This House will have a chance to say that we are going to close the gap and insure that women get the same first-class type of medical treatment men have.

Those magazine articles have pointed out that women have been neglected in gender-specific illnesses, such as cancer, osteoporosis, menopause, and a whole range of things, and they have also been left out of all the studies on diseases that affect both men and women.

Madam Speaker, I am very pleased that in the NIH reauthorization we can close that gap. People will say that we should not specifically mandate women be included, that they are going to do it anyway. Well, if they are going to do it anyway, then why are they fighting it?

Believe me, we have been trying to get them to do it for 12 years, and they have not.

Madam Speaker, today let us make sure we never see them roll back on the promises again and vote the NIH bill out of here with a terrific mandate.

PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE—AUTHORIZING SERGEANT AT ARMS TO PROVIDE CERTAIN RECORDS TO SPECIAL COUNSEL RELATIVE TO OPERATION OF HOUSE BANK

Mr. GEPHARDT. Madam Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House, and I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 471) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. UNSOELD). The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 471

Whereas on April 29, 1992 the House of Representatives adopted House Resolution 441 directing the release of certain materials relating to the inquiry of the operation of the Bank of the Sergeant at Arms pursuant to House Resolution 236 as a "cooperative response" to requests for those materials from the Honorable Malcolm R. Wilkey, Special Counsel to the Attorney General of the United States;

Whereas pursuant to House Resolution 441 the 41 microfilm rolls provided to the Special Counsel were furnished without prejudice to any future consideration by the House or the Judiciary of requests for documentary or testimonial evidence from Members, Officers of employees of the House, but only upon assurances of the Special Counsel that he will take such steps as are necessary to provide for protection of the confidentiality of the records provided;

Whereas pursuant to House Resolution 441 the House expressed its will to maintain such communication and cooperation with the Special Counsel as will promote the ends of justice consistent with the privileges and rights of the House and consistent with the constitutional or legal rights applicable or available to any Member, Officer or employee of the House or any other individual;

Whereas the Special Counsel has requested the production of further documentary evidence in addition to that furnished pursuant to House Resolution 441;

Whereas, by the privileges of the House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in the possession of the House can, either by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice or pursuant to requests by appropriate Federal or State authorities, be taken from such control or possession except by the permission of the House; Now therefore be it

Resolved, That the material requested by the Special Counsel consisting of: for the period July 1, 1988 through October 1991 the general ledgers of the bank; the "throwout books"; lists or other compilations of persons whose check privileges had been suspended or otherwise restricted; for accounts in which there were one or more "overdrafts" any list or other compilation of individuals who had been granted signature authority by account holders and any list or other compilation of individuals who had been designated by Members as a staff contact person; information relating to overdrawn accounts and general bank administration maintained in the computers of the bank; in addition, and without respect to the time limitation referenced above, any list or other compilation relating to promissory notes made by the National Bank of Washington, shall be collected by the Sergeant at Arms and he shall commence production thereof to the Special Counsel not later than five p.m. on Monday June 1, 1992; Be it further

Resolved, That upon receipt of further requests for documentary or testimonial evidence from the Special Counsel addressed to any Member, officer, or employee of the House, the Leadership Legal Advisory Group (consisting of the Speaker, the majority leader, the minority leader, the majority whip and the minority whip), is hereby authorized to respond to and to take appropriate action with respect to such requests from the Special Counsel in a manner consistent with the privileges and precedents of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution states a question of privilege of the House.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Madam Speaker, the Republican leader and I have this morning introduced a privileged resolution which provides an appropriate response to a request made by Special Counsel Malcolm Wilkey with respect to his ongoing inquiry of the operation of the House Bank. This resolution is a result of bipartisan discussions in the Speaker's Legal Advisory Committee and direct discussions with Judge Wilkey's staff.

The resolution not only authorizes the Sergeant at Arms to provide certain records, such as the general ledgers, relating to the general operation of the bank but also puts in place a mechanism that will permit bipartisan consideration and response by the Legal Advisory Committee to any future request made by Special Counsel Wilkey.

In addition both the Speaker and the Republican Leader plan to consult with a wide range of Members on both sides of the aisle with respect to any such future requests.

The resolution authorizes and directs the Sergeant at Arms to collect and promptly provide, beginning no later than the close of business Monday—and with every expectation of completion in a matter of days, given the requirements of the search and reproduction

process—the following categories of records:

First, the bank's general ledgers—in effect the bank's overall running balances;

Second, the bank's throwout books—which are the daily settlement sheets;

Third, any list maintained by the bank of persons, Members, or others, whose check privileges had been suspended or restricted;

Fourth, for accounts with overdrafts lists of individuals, other than the Member, who had been granted signature authority or who were designated as staff contact persons;

Fifth, certain information contained in computer files relating to accounts with overdrafts;

Sixth, records relating to certain promissory notes which prior to the early or mid 1980's had been made by Members to the National Bank of Washington.

With respect to all but the last of these categories the request for records is limited to the same 39-month period which framed the House's earlier resolutions relating to the bank.

As Members will appreciate from this description these records are documents collateral to those previously provided by the House. It is my understanding, and that of the Legal Advisory Committee, confirmed in communications with the special counsel's office, that this resolution authorizes a complete response to all aspects of the special counsel's current request.

Care has been taken to limit, wherever possible, this request to only those general bank records which relate to the accounts in which there were overdrafts and to the time period previously specified.

There may, of course, be future requests submitted to the House by Counsel Wilkey. The resolution provides an orderly bipartisan procedure to expeditiously address, with full consideration of the privileges and precedents of the House, any such future request.

□ 1030

Madam Speaker, for purposes of this debate only, I yield such time as he may consume to my friend, the minority whip, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH].

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution.

Let me state first that this is the natural progression from the original House Resolution where we agreed to turn over the House Bank records on microfilm. Those records are currently being copied and entered into a database at FBI headquarters.

Judge Wilkey has now submitted an additional request as outlined by the majority leader. The Republican leader, myself, and others on the legal advisory group concur that this information should be released to Special Counsel Wilkey.

This resolution also sets up a procedure so that the House does not have to formally vote on each additional request when the legal advisory group is in agreement.

I should add that if the legal advisory group does not agree, the House will be informed of that disagreement. Additionally, if the legal advisory group decides not to provide information requested, Judge Wilkey can subpoena the information and such subpoena will be handled in a manner consistent with the rules of the House.

Finally, the leader and I will counsel with legal experts to advise us on the constitutional questions involved as well as other points of relevant law.

I urge Members on my side of the aisle to support the resolution so that we can continue our cooperation with Judge Wilkey and set up procedures to expedite such further requests.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of our time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 396, nays 5, answered "present" 1, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 145]

YEAS—396

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Allen
Anderson
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Annunzio
Applegate
Armey
Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Bacchus
Baker
Ballenger
Barnard
Barrett
Barton
Bateman
Beilenson
Bennett
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blackwell
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Broomfield
Browder
Brown
Bryant
Bunning
Burton
Bustamante
Byron
Callahan
Camp
Cardin
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Clay
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Coughlin
Cox (CA)
Cox (IL)
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Cunningham
Darden
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Derrick
Dickinson
Dicks
Dingell
Dooley
Doolittle
Dorgan (ND)
Dornan (CA)
Downey
Dreier
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Early
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (OK)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English
Erdreich
Espy
Evans
Ewing
Fascell
Fawell
Fazio
Feighan
Fields
Fish
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Frost
Gallegly
Gallo
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Gradison
Grandy
Green
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hancock
Hansen
Harris
Hastert
Hayes (IL)
Hayes (LA)
Hefley
Henry
Herger
Hertel
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Holloway
Horn
Horton
Houghton
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Inhofe
Ireland
Jacobs
James
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Johnston
Jones (GA)
Jones (NC)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klug
Kolbe
Kolter
Kopetski
Kostmayer
Kyl
LaFalce
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Leach
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Levin (MI)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowery (CA)
Lowey (NY)
Luken
Machtley
Markey
Marlenee
Martin
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCollum
McCurdy
McDermott
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McMillan (NC)
McMillen (MD)
McNulty
Meyers
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Morrison
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nagle
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nichols
Nowak
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens (NY)
Owens (UT)
Oxley
Pallone
Panetta
Parker
Pastor
Patterson
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pease
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Porter
Poshard
Price
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Ray
Reed
Regula
Rhodes
Richardson
Ridge
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Savage
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Scheuer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schulze
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solarz
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Staggers
Stallings
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stump
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Thomas (WY)
Thornton
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Waters
Waxman
Weber
Weiss
Weldon
Wheat
Williams
Wilson
Wise

Wolf	Wylie	Young (FL)
Wolpe	Yatron	Zeliff
Wyden	Young (AK)	Zimmer

NAYS—5

Dymally	McCloskey	Yates
Gonzalez	Washington	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Flake

NOT VOTING—32

Alexander	Dixon	McDade
Anthony	Donnelly	Michel
Archer	Hatcher	Oakar
Boxer	Hefner	Packard
Bruce	Hopkins	Perkins
Campbell (CA)	Lagomarsino	Riggs
Campbell (CO)	Lent	Roe
Chapman	Levine (CA)	Torres
Collins (IL)	Livingston	Traxler
Dannemeyer	Manton	Whitten
Davis	McCrery	

□ 1058

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1790

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1790.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1100

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2507, NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH REVITALIZATION AMENDMENTS OF 1992

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 466 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 466

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2507) to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the programs of the National Institutes of Health, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are hereby waived. Debate on the conference report shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. UNSOELD). The gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Madam Speaker, House Resolution 466 provides for the consideration of the conference report on H.R. 2507, the National Institutes of Health Revitalization Amendments of 1992.

The rule waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration. The conference report specifically requires waivers of House rules on the scope of conference reports.

Further, the rule provides 1 hour of debate on the conference report to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Madam Speaker, the conference report on H.R. 2507, the bill for which the committee has recommended this rule, authorizes through fiscal year 1996 the National Cancer Institute, the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, and the National Institute of Aging.

As Congress struggles to reduce the budget deficit and to address the skyrocketing costs of health care, the medical research undertaken by the NIH provides an average for accomplishing both. Medical research is a sound investment in the reduction of future medical costs and in the future of America's health care.

Investing in medical research promises not only a healthier future for the American people, but also for the American economy. Until we bring skyrocketing health care costs under control, the price of medical care and health insurance premiums will continue to rise beyond the reach of more and more middle-class American families. If NIH researchers were to uncover a cure for the 3 million Americans who suffer from Alzheimer's disease, the United States would annually save more than $10 billion in long-term care costs. Finding a cure for diabetes would save $14 billion.

These budgetary projections make a solid economic argument in favor of increased Federal funding for medical research, but say nothing for the more important, more compelling reason our Government must actively support medical research: human suffering.

Madam Speaker, this bill is, in large part, a women's health bill. It seeks to narrow a decades-old gap in federally funded health research which, until now, left female diseases and disorders grossly understudied.

Breast cancer is running rampant through American families, striking one woman in nine. The NIH Revitalization Act offers our best hope for finding a cure for this killer by authorizing an increase in appropriations for breast cancer research of $325 million.

Today, we don't know how to detect ovarian cancer early enough to treat it successfully but the bill we consider today provides just the boost in ovarian cancer research which may lead to a method for early detection, treatment, and cure of this deadly cancer.

Osteoporosis cripples millions of older women each year and costs our health care system more than $10 billion annually in treatment. A $40 million increase for research on osteoporosis and related bone disorders—as authorized in this bill—is a sound investment, not only in the productivity and quality of life of affected women, but also in reducing at least a portion of our skyrocketing health care costs.

Finally, Madam Speaker, the bill would make permanent the authorization for the Office of Research on Women's Health at NIH. This Office which is new, is critical to the success of the ambitious women's health agenda begun in the 101st Congress and continued in this Congress through the NIH reauthorization and the budget resolution, which also contained a package of important women's health provisions. The Office of Research on Women's Health is charged with identifying women's health research needs, making sure that women are appropriately included in clinical trials, and increasing the representation of women senior scientists and physicians at NIH.

Madam Speaker, America's families, America's mothers, America's daughters, and America's sisters can look to this bill for reassurance that our health research dollars are being equitably distributed and that every possible step is being taken to ensure their good health and well being.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support this rule so that we may proceed with consideration of the merits of this important conference report.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

We are here today to debate the rule for consideration of the conference report to H.R. 2507, the National Institutes of Health Revitalization Amendments of 1992.

As the gentlewoman from New York explained, the rule would waive all points of order against the conference report, and against its consideration.

While the conference report is highly controversial, the rule itself is not controversial at all. In fact, the rule was necessary only because of scope problems in the conference report. While I do believe conference committees should not, and I say "not," become accustomed to legislating beyond what the House and Senate have already approved, in this particular case the scope problems seem to be minor in my view anyway. The scope problems involve a noncontroversial provision added by the Senate that requires the Arthritis Institute to do research on juvenile arthritis, and to set up a center for that purpose.

A provision was also added to establish a commission to study scientific fraud and financial conflicts of interest among scientists. Since this is an authorization bill and is not scored in the budget, the conference report does not violate the budget authorization.

However, I would also point out to my colleagues that the conference report does increase authorization levels $3.1 billion over the President's request.

For this reason alone, I will be voting against the bill. But I urge all Members to join me in supporting the rule.

□ 1110

I will refrain from debating the contents of the conference report at this time and leave that to the bill managers, but I would urge my colleagues to pass this rule so we can debate the legislation promptly.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri [Ms. HORN].

Ms. HORN. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 466, the rule for the reauthorization of the National Institutes of Health.

The conference report on reauthorization of the National Institutes of Health contains much needed provisions for women's health, for wonderful programs for research, treatment, education, and prevention of diseases that afflict all Americans. But I rise to speak on one provision that touches me in a personal and emotional way.

But, Madam Speaker, I rise today as a mother.

Madam Speaker, I have a diabetic son. Steve has had juvenile type diabetes since he was 15. He is now 29, married, and the father of two wonderful little boys. Diabetes is an incurable disease. It causes the blood sugar to fluctuate wildly, with terrible long-term effects on the limbs because of circulation problems, on the eyes, leading to blindness. It attacks nearly every biological system of the human body.

Other Members of this body have spoken of personal and family situations—of being affected by Alzheimer's, cancer, spinal cord injuries, Parkinson's and Huntington's diseases. All of these afflictions may benefit from the research that will be made possible by the availability of fetal tissue.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues: Think of the human benefits, the lives that may be lengthened and enriched by treatments and cures for this wide range of diseases.

As many true and committed supporters of the pro-life position have agreed—this is not an issue of abortion. It is an issue of the quality and the length of life for many Americans and of hope and prayer for their families. Of mothers and fathers everywhere. Remember all of us as you vote—remember my son. Support the rule and support the NIH reauthorization.

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA].

Mrs. MORELLA. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2507, the conference report for the NIH reauthorization bill.

This vote is critical to women's health—it includes a number of provisions which will go a long way toward filling the enormous gaps in research on women's health. Many provisions of the Women's Health Equity Act are part of the bill, including the requirement that women and minorities are represented in clinical trails. Funding for breast and ovarian cancer, osteoporosis, and other women's diseases is increased, and the Office of Research on Women's Health is permanently authorized. Legislation to establish a National Cancer Registry is part of the conference report.

The bill also overruns the ban on the use of Federal funds for fetal tissue transplant research. Fetal tissue research has already led to a number of medical advances and is very promising in fighting diseases ranging from Alzheimer's and Parkinson's disease to juvenile diabetes, and leukemia.

The legislation includes important safeguards to ensure that any future research is conducted in an ethical manner. For example, fetal tissue could not be sold nor could donations be targeted to any particular individual. As a result of these protections, ethical concerns have been addressed. A fetal tissue bank, as proposed by the administration, is simply not adequate. Countless researchers and other experts have expressed their view that ectopic pregnancies and spontaneous abortions will not produce enough transplantable tissue to meet the needs of researchers.

Indeed, former HHS Secretary, Otis Bowen, has stated that:

> A bank of tissue from miscarriages and ectopic pregnancies is medically unworkable and will be unable to provide tissue free from infections and genetic defects. Such tissue has always been unaffected by the ban, but the problems of quality and availability are so insurmountable that research has come to a halt. This political compromise will produce no scientific results.

Madam Speaker, the NIH conference report is critical to the health of millions of Americans. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 2507 and thereby pave the way for vital scientific progress.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and this morning's bill.

Madam Speaker, this bill is more than legislation that reauthorizes the National Institutes of Health. It has the potential for saving tens of thousands of people's lives: men, women, and children. It contains money for AIDS, for childhood vaccines, for research on osteoporosis, and other diseases. It is a bill that will help us accomplish that most cherished mission—alleviating suffering and saving human lives.

The provisions for women's health research are an important and integral part of this bill. For years, women's health concerns have been systematically ignored by the Federal Government. Often overlooked by researchers and left out of clinical trials, women are suffering and dying because not enough has been done to find cures or treatments for the diseases that afflict them.

I know, because I have experienced this neglect first hand. By chance, I was diagnosed with ovarian cancer, and by luck I survived a disease that kills 13,000 women each year. Since then, other women with similar experiences have sought me out, wanting to tell their stories and asking me to do something to make women's health concerns central to our national health care debate.

This bill takes an important step in making up for past neglect. It authorizes $75 million for basic and clinical research on ovarian and other reproductive cancers affecting women, as well as $375 million for breast cancer.

We cannot continue to ignore the diseases that affect our women, our daughters, our mothers. We must encourage the understanding that the diseases affecting women must be understood, analyzed, and treated with the same care and diligence with which we fight all other diseases. This bill helps to do that. It puts some balance into medical research, and provides millions of American women with the hope that their medical needs may be met.

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH].

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Madam Speaker, I rise in sorrow today because of provisions in this conference report which taint the authorization of the National Institutes of Health. I have always been supportive of NIH and have great respect for the goals and efforts of each institute, especially the National Cancer Institute. I was pleased that this measure authorizes $2.2 billion in fiscal year 1993 for NCI and includes an additional $400 million for research on breast, ovarian, and other important cancers.

I was also very happy that this legislation stresses the importance of the participation of women in medical research and believe that this action can only further our commitment in find-

ing a cure for such devastating diseases. As a breast cancer survivor, I understand the special problems of women when faced with such illnesses.

But, Madam Speaker, I also have a responsibility to my constituents and to human life. As such, I am appalled that the conferees have tainted this important legislation by permitting federally funded transplantation research involving human subjects to use fetal tissue from induced abortions. I cannot and will not support legislation which would likely create a demand for aborted babies.

Instead, we have an alternative—a fetal tissue research bank. I am extremely supportive of the establishment of a fetal tissue research bank which would use tissue from ectopic pregnancies and spontaneous abortions for the development of research and treatments for various diseases. We have already seen promising results in treating Hurlers syndrome with such tissues. We must continue to use this untapped source of normal viable fetal tissue.

Also, I cannot support legislation which would take the authority from the Secretary of Health and Human Services and put it in the hands of an advisory board, whose decision may not be overturned. Recalling our history lessons, we know that this mandate is an unconstitutional encroachment on the President's appointment power, and I will not vote for it.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote no on the conference report, which will be vetoed, and demand deletion of these provisions. Give us all a chance to vote on a NIH reauthorization bill we can be proud of.

□ 1120

Mrs. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER]

Mr. SCHEUER. Madam Speaker, I rise strongly in support of this rule. The rule is a pro-life rule, and I am proud to take a pro-life position on this pro-life rule.

The rule provides for research that will help us attack the scourge of diabetes, Parkinson's disease, Alzheimer's disease, and of spinal cord injuries.

The fetal tissue research helped Dr. Sabin produce the polio vaccine in the early 1950's. It was not early enough for me. My problem came in the late 1940's, but it came in time to save hundreds, if not millions of kids from a life of crippling and disabling disease.

The research this time around covers all Americans, a major impact on women's diseases, on cancer.

In Long Island where I am currently serving, the rate of breast cancer for women is many times that of the surrounding areas and representative areas across the country. We must know the hows and the whys and the wherefores of why breast cancer on Long Island is prevalent at such a high incidence level.

We also attack not only breast cancer but prostate cancer which afflicts so many of the men among us.

Madam Speaker, I could go on and on and on, but truly this is a pro-life bill, and I am happy to support it. I urge my colleagues to do likewise.

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. PORTER. Madam Speaker, I support the conference report on the NIH reauthorization, which overturns the administration ban on fetal tissue transplantation.

Opponents of this bill have gone out of their way to make this vote another referendum on abortion. How sad for our country. Once again, pro-life and pro-choice come down to this floor to shout past each other without listening to each other. In so doing today, caught up in our obsession with extremist politics, we may deprive all Americans of potential cures for diabetes, Parkinson's, Alzheimer's, and perhaps hundreds of other dreaded diseases.

Madam Speaker, we spend nearly $10 billion every year on biomedical research. We are constantly frustrated by the pace of progress in that research. We still cannot cure cancer and hundreds of other diseases that afflict our people. But we are making spectacular progress on some very common and debilitating and life threatening diseases. The recent revolution in molecular biology gives hope to millions of Americans that they will be treated or cured of disease within their lifetimes. Researchers are very near a cure for juvenile diabetes. They are nearing an effective treatment for Parkinson's. And they are making great progress on Alzheimer's.

But now, on the brink of almost unbelievable success, after billions of dollars and years of research, those who oppose the legislation would have us throw away our investment because these breakthrough treatments involve the use of human fetal tissue from induced abortions—tissue that would otherwise be consigned to the medical waste heaps of our Nation's hospitals and clinics.

Pancreatic tissue from a first trimester fetus, when infused into an insulin-dependent diabetic, differentiates, replaces damaged islet cells, and helps regenerate the host tissue. As such, this treatment may provide, within a few short years, a cure for millions of Americans with diabetes. In addition, fetal tissue is nonimmuno genic and poses no risk of rejection by the recipient, thereby overcoming one of the major obstacles to any kind of transplant.

Fetal brain tissue from a first trimester fetus can be transplanted into Parkinson's suffers. This tissue regenerates brain tissue in the recipient, increases dopamine production, and alleviates many of the worst symptoms of the debilitating Parkinson's disease which robs young people as well as old of dignity, ability, and quality of life.

Our Nation's preeminent biomedical researchers attest to the value of this research and the opportunities we are missing. The Director of the National Institutes of Health [NIH], Dr. Raub, told Congress in 1990 that the fetal tissue moratorium shut down promising research on Parkinson's treatment. Dr. Gorden, the Director of the Diabetes Institute told us that efforts to develop substitutes for fetal tissue transplants were unsuccessful. Dr. Goldstein, Director of the National Institute on Neurological Disorder and Stroke told us that the administration's moratorium slowed progress on Parkinson's and prohibited further promising studies.

Madam Speaker, I am the first to acknowledge the ethical implications of transplanting tissue from one individual to another, and the particular difficulties involved with fetal tissue. On the Labor, HHS, and Education Subcommittee of Appropriations, we deal with these and the myriad other ethical dilemmas of biomedical research every day.

This bill contains comprehensive safeguards to prevent researchers from encouraging abortions for any reason. The decision to donate fetal tissue for research must be made after, and completely separate from, the decision to have an abortion. Neither the woman nor the physician may alter any condition of the abortion, including timing, as a result of their decision to donate tissue. The specter raised by opponents of fetus-farms is wholesale invention and fantasy.

Women cannot direct the tissue to a specific donor or even know the identity of the eventual recipient. No one may sell or purchase fetal tissue, researchers and physicians must disclose any potential financial interest—such as the development of marketable cell lines—to the donor, and researchers must acknowledge in writing that donated tissue may result from an induced abortion. At no point may the decision to donate tissue intrude upon, or mingle with, in any way, the decision to abort.

Some critics have suggested that this legislation may encourage women to seek second or third trimester abortions. But researchers universally acknowledge that fetal tissue is not useful for transplantation beyond the first trimester. Undifferentiated tissue from the 8th through the 12th week of pregnancy is usable. Beyond that, the tissue matures, losing the properties that benefit recipients.

The administration makes much of its recent decision to establish a fetal tissue bank to receive donations from spontaneous abortions, stillbirths, and ectopic pregnancies. But every serious researcher knows the bank is a nonstarter. Spontaneous abortions, by their nature, do not occur in health care settings where the tissue may be adequately preserved for research purposes. Ectopic pregnancies are, by their nature, abnormal occurrences and rarely yield tissue that may be used for research purposes, let alone for transplantation into humans. Stillbirths occur late in pregnancy, after tissue has differentiated and is therefore of little use to researchers.

President Reagan's Secretary of HHS, the Honorable Otis Bowen, M.D., recently emerged from private life to denounce the establishment of the fetal tissue bank as a "political compromise [that] will produce no scientific results." Dr. Bowen is just one prominent example of the many pro-life and pro-research individuals who support this legislation.

Madam Speaker, the use of human fetal tissue in research is obviously an issue that involves abortion. But it is not about abortion. This bill includes safeguards that clearly separate the decision to abort from the decision to donate. It forthrightly addresses the myriad ethical implications raised by fetal tissue transplantation and ensure that this legislation will in no way encourage abortion.

I believe that there is room for pro-life, pro-choice, and pro-research within this bill. By defeating this bill, you will not reduce abortions. You will not limit access to or availability of abortions. You will ensure that tissue that might otherwise be used to benefit society will be tossed on the medical waste heap. And in so doing, you will destroy the hope of millions of Americans who suffer from potentially curable and treatable disease.

Madam Speaker, I ask every Member of this House to vote for this bill.

□ 1130

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE].

Ms. SNOWE. Madam Speaker, today there is a great deal at stake with the NIH conference report. That is why I rise in support of the rule. This bill represents no less than the Federal Government's long overdue realization that women's health and women's lives matter. Your vote today on this legislation will determine whether or not you think women's health issues are important enough to be an integral part of the NIH research agenda, whether or not women's health issues are important enough to be part of permanent statute so that it reflects an ongoing commitment, or that it is not important enough and it is relegated to a future of uncertainty, subject to change, depending on the priorities and the inclination of whoever might be the Director of NIH, and currently we have an outstanding Director, but that always can change sometime in the future, or the discretion of those who are in charge of research at NIH, or subject obviously to the annual appropriations process as well.

If you think that is not so, then why is it that the NIH ignored its own policy, its own internal policy that require women to be part of the clinical study trials? It is because it had the flexibility and the option to do so.

Now, I know the administration has described this legislation as being micromanagement and unnecessary with respect to women's health issues, but let us take a look at some of the provisions as to why they are included in this legislation.

This legislation includes a permanent Office of Research on Women's Health, as well as mandating the policy that women be included in the clinical study trials.

Why? Because if we do not do so, sometime down the road that office and that policy can be removed if it is not part of permanent statute.

The legislation also would require information available to women about women's health and about what clinical trials exist for women. No such clinical trials data bank or clearinghouse exists at the NIH.

In addition, there are provisions in this legislation that expand significantly the research on breast, cervical and ovarian cancer, as well as osteoporosis.

Why? Because we are attempting to make up for an egregious past.

I think we all know about the history of the NIH apathy and neglect with respect to these issues in the past and we are trying to make up for decades of that neglect and inattention to these issues.

The NIH bill establishes an OB-GYN research program at NIH. No separate gynecological research program exists at NIH, although they have expanded the number of gynecologists who are doing research there. Up until a couple years ago, there were only three gynecologists at NIH.

The NIH bill requires the establishment of a national program of cancer registries in the Centers for Disease Control and a study to determine factors contributing to the elevated breast cancer rates in some States.

Why? Because there is currently no such study.

The NIH bill requires the establishment of a study on adolescent health, an area identified by the Office of Technology Assessment as one which needs more research. There is currently no such study.

Madam Speaker, I hope today that we will not make women's health issues a medical afterthought and to make sure that it is no longer a missing page in America's medical textbook.

Madam Speaker, there is a great deal at stake in the NIH conference report. This bill represents no less than the Federal Government's long overdue realization that women's health and women's lives matter. And your vote today will determine whether women will, in fact, become an integral part of the NIH research agenda.

Up until this point, American women have had to rely on the short-term appropriations process and the discretion of an appointed Director of the National Institutes of Health for research on diseases primarily affecting them. But we have only to look at the alarming rates of breast cancer, osteoporosis, and other reproductive diseases to determine that this policy—or lack of policy—has failed.

NIH's infamous history of apathy and neglect with respect to women's health tells us unequivocally that a section in the NIH reauthorization on women's health is not only justified, but absolutely necessary. Women's health must be a permanent component of NIH's research agenda.

Madam Speaker, today we have the opportunity to make this long-term commitment to improving women's health by supporting the NIH reauthorization bill. This conference report contains numerous provisions that have been a top priority of the congressional caucus for women's issues, which I cochair along with the gentlelady from Colorado. H.R. 2507 permanently authorizes the Office of Research on Women's Health that was established by NIH in 1990. The main purpose of this office is to oversee and coordinate efforts to improve the previous overlooked women's health research at NIH.

In addition, the office will work with the Secretary of Health and Human Services to evaluate and increase the representation of women among senior physicians and scientists. The lack of women in high ranking positions at NIH has been one of the root causes of NIH's historic myopia toward women's health. As a result of this history, this essential office must be permanent, and not subject to erratic, unpredictable appropriations funding.

The conference report also codifies NIH's policy that requires the inclusion of women and minorities in clinical research trials, where appropriate.

By now, I am sure that most of you are familiar with the past egregious omissions of women in research trials at NIH. You may recall that the breakthrough finding of the Physician's Health Study that established the connection between aspirin and coronary disease prevention couldn't be applied to women—because the study looked at 22,071 men and no women. That is in spite of the fact that heart disease is the leading cause of death for women over age 60. The result is that aspirin might be effective for women also, but the lack of data keeps it as speculation.

Finally, the authorized funding levels in the conference report for research on devastating diseases like breast cancer, ovarian cancer, and osteoporosis will begin to temper the enormous legacy of neglect that women's health has confronted.

Madam Speaker, policy changes are the only lasting way to maintain the pace of progress we have recently established on women's health. The NIH reauthorization gives us a vehicle to revise our priorities and once and for all place women on equal footing with men in our health research system. I urge you to vote in favor of the conference report.

Madam Speaker, I include the following material from the congressional caucus for women's issues:

CONGRESSIONAL CAUCUS FOR WOMEN'S ISSUES

The National Institutes of Health Reauthorization Bill, H.R. 2507, includes a number of provisions from the Women's Health Equity Act. These provisions are not unnecessary as claimed by NIH Director Bernadine Healy.

The NIH bill permanently established the Office of Women's Health Research and the requirement which mandates the inclusion of women in clinical trials.

The NIH established this office and the clinical trials policy only in response to the introduction of the Women's Health Equity Act (which is now part of H.R. 2507). These changes at NIH can disappear as quickly as they appeared.

The NIH bill would make information available to women about women's health and about what clinical trials exist for women to enroll in. Women need access to information and research.

No such clinical trials data ban and clearinghouse exist at NIH.

The NIH bill would allow for guidance by an outside advisory committee made up of non-government scientists and physicians who specialize in women's health.

The administration considers such public input and oversight "micromanagement".

The NIH bill establishes an ob-gyn research at NIH.

No separate gynecological research program exists at NIH, although they have expanded the number of gynecologists working at NIH in response to the Women's Health Equity Act.

The NIH bill requires the establishment of a national program of cancer registries through the Centers for Disease Control, and a study to determine factors contributing to the elevated breast cancer rate in some states.

There is currently no such study.

The NIH bill requires the establishment of a study on adolescent health, an area identified by the Office of Technology Assessment as one which needs more research.

There is currently no such study.

The NIH bill establishes 5 contraceptive and infertility research centers in the extramural program of NIH to compensate for the lack of research at NIH on contraception and infertility.

The NIH established 4 of these centers in response to the Women's Health Equity Act. These centers and this area of research could disappear as quickly as they appeared.

Other provisions in the bill expand ongoing research areas in such critical areas as breast cancer, ovarian cancer, and osteoporosis. These areas have not received a high enough priority at NIH in the past and need increased research to make up for lost time and effort.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

Mr. SANDERS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding this time to me.

Madam Speaker, the headline in this New York Times ad for an article in this month's Reader's Digest says it all. "The Cancer Weapon America Needs Most," and that is exactly what we are voting upon today when we approve the Cancer Registries Amendment Act of 1992, which is included in this NIH authorization. This is a bill which I introduced in the House several months ago and Senator PATRICK LEAHY of Vermont introduced in the Senate.

Madam Speaker, this NIH legislation, in addition to putting some $300 million into breast cancer research, research which is long overdue, will also establish, for the first time, a national system of statewide cancer registries. These registries collect data, presently lacking in over half our States, including my own State of Vermont, which is used to track cancer clusters and identify environmental causes of cancer. This bill would also establish a study of the alarmingly high rate of breast cancer mortality in New England and the mid-Atlantic States.

Madam Speaker, Dr. John Healey, chief of orthopedic surgery at the Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center in New York, describes in his Reader's Digest article how an effective cancer registry in California saved thousands of women there when their registry picked up on a 50-percent increase in uterine cancer in the San Francisco area in the early 1970's—an increase which was later found to be caused by the use of too high doses of estrogen to treat symptoms of menopause. Dr. Healy writes:

Why does the United States lag behind many other Western nations in gathering cancer data that could save thousands of lives and billions of dollars?

Well. I do not know why, but today I hope we are going to end that lag, and we are going to go forward and develop the best national system of cancer registries that exists in this world. And when we do, we are going to have much needed information that we do not have today as to who gets cancer, where they live, where they work, what drugs they take, the effectiveness of their treatment. And when we have all that information we are going to know a lot more about cancer, we are going to strike a real blow for cancer prevention, and we are going to save a whole lot of suffering.

Lastly, Madam Speaker, I want to thank thousands of my fellow Vermonters, led by JoAnna Rathgeb and Virginia Soffa, whose concern about the lack of strong Federal action in the area of cancer prevention is largely responsible for the creation of this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I include the article from the Reader's Digest, "The Cancer Weapon America Needs Most."

THE CANCER WEAPON AMERICA NEEDS MOST

(By John H. Healey, M.D.)

Donald Austin was astonished by what he saw that day in 1975. As chief of the California cancer registry, Austin directed one of the largest storehouses of local cancer statistics in the world, and researchers frequently consulted him about the incidence of the disease in the San Francisco area.

On this afternoon, Austin had been asked for a tally of all cases of breast, uterine and ovarian cancer. As his eyes skimmed the computer printout, he was startled by a disturbing trend: year by year, cases of uterine cancer were climbing dramatically.

Austin found that since 1969, uterine cancer in the Bay Area had risen by 50 percent. Worse, the incidence among women age 50 and over from affluent Marin County had doubled. Why were these well-off women at greater risk?

It didn't take long to finger a possible culprit. Between 1965 and 1975, prescriptions of estrogen—the hormone used to treat symptoms of menopause—had tripled nationwide. Large doses (far larger than are prescribed today) were being given, mostly to affluent women over 50.

Many in the medical profession doubted the link. To them, estrogen was a wonder drug. But to be safe, the Food and Drug Administration advised that women receive only the smallest possible dose and the doctors balance its effects with the hormone progesterone. Within three years, the rate of uterine cancer returned to normal. Thanks to a good cancer registry, at least 3000 women a year—in California alone—are spared.

With no cancer registry at their disposal, Massachusetts health officials were baffled by a sudden epidemic of cancer in Woburn, a Boston suburb. Only days after Anne Anderson's 3½-year-old son, Jimmy, was found to have leukemia, she learned that two other neighborhood children also had the disease. Then a fourth case cropped up. And when Anderson brought Jimmy to Boston's Massachusetts General Hospital for treatment, she was amazed to see a number of familiar Woburn faces in the waiting room. Could there be something in Woburn that's giving leukemia to our children? she wondered.

By October 1979, Anderson and her pastor, the Rev. Bruce A. Young, had tracked down 12 leukemia cases in Woburn—double the normal incidence. That same year, state environmental engineer Richard Chalpin suspected that toxic chemicals illegally dumped in Woburn had made their way into the water supply. He checked two municipal wells and discovered dangerously high levels of an industrial solvent. Then Harvard professors Marvin Zelen and Steve Lagakos found that, on average, the children with leukemia had consumed twice as much contaminated water as other Woburn youngsters had.

Jimmy Anderson died in 1981, but his mother was determined to help other kids. That's when she and Bruce Young helped persuade the Massachusetts legislature to create a cancer registry. Clusters of the disease are now detected long before they become as widespread as the tragic Woburn cases.

These two battles in the war against cancer illustrate how vital statistics can be. Ideally, researchers should be able to gather intelligence on all forms of cancer, not only because the disease is so widespread (one in three Americans are expected to contract some type of it in their lifetime) but also because it is infinitely complicated. It comes in dozens of different forms, and each cancer can have many causes—some inborn, others environmental. There are also dozens of ways to treat the disease. To battle such a beast, researchers need an exact statistical profile.

But many parts of the United States lack such information. Ten states have no cancer registries. Most of the others do not record all cases within their borders. And more than a third fail to record how patients are treated or whether they have been cured.

Back in the 1930s and 1940s, many states passed laws requiring health officials to keep track of cancer. But in almost every case, these laws went unfunded. (The notable exception was Connecticut, which has operated a model registry since 1935.)

Then, in the early 1970s, the National Cancer Institute began keeping accurate records for cancer patients in five states (Hawaii, Utah, New Mexico, Iowa and Connecticut) and four metropolitan areas (Detroit, Atlanta, San Francisco and Seattle). These SEER (Surveillance, Epidemiology and End Results) registries cover roughly ten percent of the nation's population. They are useful for making broad estimates of cancer rates. But because the registries ignore 90 percent of the population, they miss smaller trends such as the leukemia outbreak in Woburn.

Three years ago, the American College of Surgeons, with the help of the American Cancer Society, started a second national registry, the National Cancer Data Base, to track how well different treatments work. The data base covers only 30 percent of all cancer patients and misses victims cared for outside hospitals or in hospitals without registries.

Gilbert H. Friedell, director of Kentucky's state registry, uncovered exactly the kind of problem that neither SEER nor the National Cancer Data Base would have picked up. While reviewing state statistics, he noticed that women in Kentucky's poverty-stricken Appalachian areas were dying of cervical cancer at twice the national rate. Friedell found that many women there were unaware of the importance of regular pap smears, which can detect cervical cancer when it is still curable. Kentucky officials have established a community outreach program to correct the problem.

Even if SEER and the National Cancer Data Base kept track of more cancer patients, they are not geared to spot local trends. By contrast, a good state registry can identify dozens of cancer clusters every year. Even when a cluster cannot be linked to some special circumstance, it is important that the public understand the situation.

Consider the 1990 scare in Taylorville, Ill., where neuroblastoma, a rare cancer of the nervous system, had stricken three infants. Such a rate was several times the expected incidence, and parents suspected the children had been harmed before birth by contaminants their mothers inhaled from a toxic-waste site. After extensive interviews, however, the Illinois State Cancer Registry determined none of the mothers had been at the site, and careful monitoring showed that no contaminants had made their way to the outside air. The town of Taylorville heaved a sigh of relief.

As important as the need for good registries is the need for uniform statistics. Unless data from all 50 states can be tallied, we cannot get detailed pictures of rare cancers.

Consider osteogenic sarcoma, or bone cancer. Even at major facilities like New York City's Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center, we cannot collect enough data to detect broad trends in the disease. But in Sweden, which operates an excellent cancer data base, orthopedists recently discovered that the mean age of people afflicted with bone cancer—generally considered a disease of growing bones—has gradually been increasing. Perhaps, then, we should be watching for a second variety of osteogenic sarcoma, caused by different genetic mechanisms than in the younger person's form of the disease. If we could track the cancer's path through the entire U.S. population, who knows what we might learn?

I would also be useful to track the rare side effects people experience from cancer therapies. Some reactions, such as the minor brain damage that can develop in leukemia patients who have received whole brain radiation, occur many years after the patient is treated. So unless all cancer victims are followed for their entire lives, we cannot study these debilitating side effects and develop alternative therapies.

Why does the United States lag behind many other Western nations in gathering cancer data that could save thousands of lives and billions of dollars? Perhaps policy makers have always assumed that money is best spent on research and patient care. Record-keeping pays off only well into the future, after data have been collected long enough to reveal trends. Thus we tend to gamble it won't be necessary.

Treating an advanced case of breast cancer, for example, may cost $60,000 more than treating a case detected early. Good registries could save these costs by pinpointing areas where women are not getting mammograms or performing self-examinations.

Although not as glamorous, cancer tabulation can be more important in the fight against cancer than performing an intricate operation or an elegant experiment. A network of cancer registries can be our most potent new weapon against the disease.

The Cancer Registries Amendment Act of 1992 could solve this problem by enabling each state to have a registry operating under uniform standards. Cost to federal taxpayers would run about $30 million.

The Cancer Registries Act—and funding to support it—is needed now. Please write your Senators and your Representative to urge creation of uniform registries.

People do not naturally rally round a cause like cancer recordkeeping because no one can point to victims who will suffer without it. Rather, it is our larger understanding of cancer that suffers. And thus, we are all victims.

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Madam Speaker, I have heard this called a pro-life bill. Whose life? The one life always overlooked is that of the unborn. That life does not seem to count.

Nobody opposes fetal research, and to list all the diseases that are subject to research is interesting and instructive, but it does not advance this debate.

The question is, do we need to use fetal tissue from induced—that is intentional abortions—to conduct our fetal research?

Well, the President has created a fetal tissue bank and registry.

Now, I have heard from very well-meaning people quotations that denigrate the existence of that fetal bank and registry.

May I simply say that I guess as in any controverted issue, you pay your money and you take your choice. There are experts on both sides, but I think you ought to know there are some pretty good people who think the fetal tissue bank ought to be given a chance to work. For example, Bernadine Healy, M.D., the Director of the National Institutes of Health says this:

> In terms of the Fetal Tissue Bank I can state unequivocally as a physician and scientist that this approach is feasible and should be given a chance to prove its efficacy. I believe such a Bank with an established and NIH funded tissue procurement effort will provide a means to continue the transplantation research effort.

Now, here are some doctors from the UCLA School of Medicine:

> Your Executive Order to the President would allow fetal tissue transplantation research to proceed without engaging in the abortion debate.
>
> Substantial evidence exists that spontaneous abortions are an acceptable source of fetal tissue for transplantation because the tissue will be cryo-preserved and bank safeguards can be established to screen for infection, which is necessary regardless of the source of the tissue.

And on and on and on.

□ 1140

Distinguished doctors, teachers in medical schools, and professors and writers; so please do not say it will not work, do not say it is a nonstarter. Give it a chance.

You know, if you think abortion is a good thing, then you ought to support this bill. But if you think abortion is a bad thing, that it is taking an innocent, inconvenient life for whatever reason, then you should think twice about harvesting babies, taking involuntarily their organs for research.

Now, the reason this bill is offered today is to reverse the historical abuses by science of fetal research.

What would you think of an experiment such as severing the heads from recently aborted, but still living, late-term children and keeping their brains alive in aquariums? Does that sound Frankensteinish, ghoulish, and grisly? Well, it is documented; it was done.

Madam Speaker, the American Association of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, which once gave its foundation prize to an experiment in which eight living, aborted children, one as old as 6½ months, were hooked up to an artificial placenta in tanks of saltwater and eventually allowed to suffocate while under observation.

Now, those are the kinds of things that brought about the moratorium on induced abortions for fetal research. And if you want to go back to those things, if you think scientists are not above that, then you go ahead and do it.

Look, we can have the research; at the same time we can respect the value and the dignity of our children waiting to be born, by not treating them as things to be harvested and cannibalized for their parts.

When you donate an organ, you do it knowingly. When you are fetally re-

searched, you have no voice in what is going on. No one with a conscience should lend support for such an abusive process.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. UNSOELD). The Chair will remind visitors in the gallery that displays of emotion are not acceptable under the House rules.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, for purposes of debate, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ROWLAND].

Mr. ROWLAND. Madam Speaker, I want to speak to the practicality of the proposed bank using spontaneous abortion products of conception and ectopic pregnancies for that purpose. I do not know who thought up this idea, but I can tell you as a person who practiced medicine for over 30 years and who attended many patients with abortion and ectopic pregnancies, it is not practical. It simply will not work.

Up to 60 percent of spontaneous abortions come about because of chromosomal abnormalities. It is the natural rejection of that pregnancy by the body because it is abnormally formed.

The tissue is not viable in these instances. The fetus may even be absent. The fetus may be infected. It is simply not usable under those circumstances.

There would not be the kind of tissue available that is needed for this type of research.

With reference to ectopic pregnancy, the person is bleeding internally. All efforts are made to stop that bleeding. It usually takes place in the first 4 weeks of pregnancy. No attempt can be made to try to extract the small amount of tissue for future use. All attempts have to be applied to trying to save the life of that individual who is bleeding to death.

So, it is not practical to try to have a tissue bank using the products of conception from spontaneous abortions or from ectopic pregnancies. I can tell you from experience it just will not work.

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. CHRIS SMITH.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, earlier in today's debate, the gentlelady from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] suggested that there wouldn't be enough fetal brains, livers, and other organs available for research if the Bush moratorium on using baby parts obtained from induced abortion remained in place.

Madam Speaker, that assertion simply doesn't stand up to serious scrutiny.

Dr. Bernadine Healy stated in a letter that "unequivocally as a physician and a scientist" the President's tissue bank is "highly feasible."

In a letter dated May 27, Dr. Healy wrote:

NIH has been charged through the President's executive order with the establishment of a fetal tissue bank. An aggressive approach to identifying and collecting fetal tissue from ectopic and spontaneous miscarriages has never been tried. NIH scientists have vast experience with cryopreservation (freezing) of a wide variety of human adult and fetal tissues with the subsequent use of that tissue in a viable and functional state. Methods of culture and expansion of human cells and tissues are constantly improving and this combined with now standard cryopreservation make an effective fetal tissue bank highly feasible. NIH is committed to establishing the bank and will name a team of scientists to closely monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the bank.

Although fetal tissue transplantation is but one of many research options for patients suffering with Parkinson's disease and diabetes, it should be pursued. We should give the bank a chance to succeed and perhaps usher in a new collaborative spirit among all of those who would like to see this research move forward.

Sincerely yours,

BERNADINE HEALY, M.D.,
Director.

According to Dr. Louis Sullivan, Secretary of Health and Human Services, "the tissue that would be available from a bank of this sort can meet the current estimated research needs."

Dr. Sullivan wrote on May 19, that the "total number of transplants over the last 30 years is around 60, while suitable tissue from ectopic pregnancies and spontaneous abortions is estimated at 2,000 per year."

Moreover, the Secretary pointed out, this is "a conservative estimate based on a total of 750,000 spontaneous abortions and 100,000 ectopic pregnancies" per year.

Thus, Madam Speaker, the medical efficacy of transplantation of fetal cells can and will be ethically explored.

My good friend from Illinois, Mr. PORTER, suggested that somehow associating the abortion issue with this conference report is "extreme."

But, I say to my colleague, that is exactly what this debate is all about.

No one in this House is arguing against fetal tissue research providing the brains and other organs and tissue are obtained in an absolutely ethical manner.

President Bush deserves high praise for his moral courage in insisting that medical research be done in a way that is least likely to encourage more abortions or in any way put unborn children at risk. In establishing the tissue bank, he is acting on the advice of the top health officials in our Nation—Dr. Sullivan, Dr. Healy, Assistant Secretary for Health Dr. James Mason—as well as the expertise of numerous researchers and professors in medicine.

Before the President issued his Executive order, Dr. R.C. Cefalo—a member of the 1988 NIH panel who voted to recommend lifting the moratorium—and Dr. Watson Bowes of the University of North Carolina School of Medicine wrote to the President encouraging him to create by Executive order "a human tissue registry, fetal tissue bank and fetal cell lines using tissue obtained from spontaneous abortions and ectopic pregnancies."

Many highly respected researchers from the University of Southern California, UCLA, Georgetown, University of Tennessee, University of Cincinnati, and Case Western have also written to the President in support of the proposed tissue bank and have endorsed its scientific efficacy. The consensus of these researchers is that medical research should avoid unnecessary controversy and that using tissue from intentionally aborted babies is not necessary to meet research needs given the viable, nondiseased tissue from spontaneous abortions and ectopic pregnancies.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER] made various references to the alleged role fetal tissue played in developing the polio vaccine. It should be noted for the RECORD that fetal tissue was never essential to growing the polio virus and thus, to the development of the polio vaccine. Dr. Peter McCullagh, senior fellow in developmental physiology at the John Curtin School of Medical Research at the Australian National University has stated:

[F]ollowing the 1949 reports of growth of polio virus in a range of tissues, sources of tissues other than the fetus were identified as optimal for the purposes.

Thus, the crucial discovery which had made the "breakthrough" of polio virus growth in non-nervous tissues possible in 1949 was not the use of fetal tissues. As recognized by the original researchers, and described in the Journal of Immunology in 1952, the "breakthrough" was a critical modification of cell culture technique."

The technology of production of cell lines rests on the potential of a single cell, appropriately cultivated, to undergo multiplication and produce enormous supplies of cells. * * * [T]he entirety of world production of polio vaccine between 1968 and the late 1970s appears to have been achieved with the progeny of one fetal cell line.

[F]etal tissue did not fill the essential role often assigned to it in polio vaccine development. Attempts to assert the polio vaccine could not have been developed if fetal tissue had not been used represent selective amnesia. Fetal tissue represented one of several alternatives for growth of polio virus.

Madam Speaker, the practice of harvesting baby parts from intentionally aborted children is unconscionable, but the situation will be worse if the House votes to subsidize with Federal funds this unethical experimentation when other, ethical, and promising avenues of research are being explored.

□ 1150

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] for yielding this

time to me, and I must say it pains me to come to this floor to have to, one more time, plead that we refocus what this issue is about. It is about women's health and the fact that this country has never taken that issue seriously.

Madam Speaker, time after time I have come to this Congress with people as distinguished as Betty Ford, as distinguished as Mrs. Rockefeller, and many, many others, talking about how the medical community and the tax dollars that they send into this Federal Government never seem to be spent on their health needs. They always got pats on the head and, "How nice you are here," but there is always some reason this body cannot vote to do it this year, at this time.

This is an absolutely critical women's health bill. It deals with all the research on diseases that both men and women have, heart disease and all sorts of things like that, and women have been left out of, and, therefore, it is very important that we do that, and make sure that women are included in those trials, and that never again do they exclude them.

As I have said, when women have those kinds of diseases, they may as well go to a veterinarian because we do not have the research to know how to treat women when they get those, and then there is the whole area of things that basically only women get that they have also not focused on. They are always going to get to it another year and another time.

Madam Speaker, this bill straightens that out.

Now what do we hear this year? We hear, first of all, that it breaks the budget.

Madam Speaker, it does not break the budget. It is under the cap, and this is an authorization bill, so do not let anybody say that. It does not do that. Do not use that excuse.

We also hear that this is unnecessary, that suddenly, after 200 years, NIH has a new vision, and they are going to do this.

Madam Speaker, they are going to do this only because this bill is coming at them at 100 miles an hour, and they do not have any choice.

And I also say, if they are going to do this, why are they so upset then if we pass a bill saying we must do this? That makes me a little suspicious if they say, "This is unnecessary because we will do it anyway."

Believe me, those of us who have been around here for a long time have heard that promise from NIH before, and they did not keep their word before. They may intend to, but something always happened.

And now we are also hearing from people, "Oh, it's the fetal issue area that is keeping us from voting for this."

Let me say this entire list of medical groups in America has said that the fetal tissue bank that the President is proposing will not work. Such distinguished Members of the other body as STROM THURMOND, who is certainly not pro-choice, has said, "The fetal tissue will not work, the bank that the President is proposing," and the prior Reagan Secretary of Health and Human Services, Dr. Bowen, has come forward and said, "The President's fetal tissue bank will not work."

Madam Speaker, we could have used that at any time during the last 12 years. We did not because, unfortunately, miscarried tissues often have genetic problems and infection problems, and they cannot work for that kind of research.

So, the only ones who are saying it will work are those who have a political hatchet over their head, and, if they do not want to say that it will not work, then, let me tell my colleagues, they are out of a job.

I tend to believe the ones who are anti-choice, but worked for Reagan, but now do not have a political hatchet over their head. I tend to believe all the rest of the medical community outlined on this page. I tend to believe distinguished Members, such as STROM THURMOND, who no one can accuse of being soft on ethics or anything else when he stood up in the other body and said, "No, we must move forward on this."

My colleagues, please let us send this out with a resounding vote. Let us move forward on the very important issues of women's health that have been ignored for 200 years, and let us not hear any more excuses.

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Speaker, I yield 4½ minutes to the distinguished chief deputy minority whip, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for yielding this time to me.

Madam Speaker, there is another minor little matter that the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] did not talk about that does disturb a few of us, and that is the issue of the amount of spending which is in this bill. We have heard the issue framed here today as an issue of health, and in some cases it has been called an issue of women's health. We have talked about the fetal tissue issue. Those are important and related issues to this bill. There is absolutely no doubt about it, but they are not the only issues.

Madam Speaker, the issue for many in this body, at least, ought to be about spending, the nonhealth and the nonfetal tissue spending, which is in this bill. This bill is $3.1 billion over the President's budget. It left the House $450 million over. Many of us thought that was outrageous. It is now $3.1 billion over. At a time when we are just about to vote on a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution the question becomes: How often do we listen to people who continue to come to the floor and suggest to us that there are billions, and billions, and billions, and billions, and billions, and billions, and billions more for us to continue to pour into programs and somehow not have it impact on the Federal deficit?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Madam Speaker, I think, if the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] looks, he will see this is an authorization bill, and I think he will find it is under the caps that came out for the House budget and the only thing that stands out are the line items that we put in for breast cancer, cervical cancer, and ovarian cancer.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I am just about to inform the gentlewoman from Colorado that there is something a little bit different being authorized in the bill that goes well beyond some of the issues she has raised, and let me just give her a couple of examples because it adds up to about $200 billion in the bill which does not relate to any of those line items.

For example, how about $342 million for a brand new campus for the NIH that was put in there? It is pure pork barrel. It was put in there and singularly given to the State of Maryland by who else? The Senator from Maryland decided to get a little bit in the bill, $342 million worth. That is the estimate of NIH for the upgrade of infrastructure and land acquisition.

Now there is another little problem in here, and that is that there is a $1.6 billion project in here. That happens to be for the Warren Magnuson Clinical Center. This is not my estimate. This comes from the Army Corps of Engineers. They took a look at this thing and figured out we got $1.6 billion in money that is in the bill for this Warren Magnuson Clinical Center. That is just about $2 of the $3 billion I am talking about that are in there for two projects.

Madam Speaker, I would suggest to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] that none of those have anything to do with breast cancer research. None of them have anything to do with the line items she is talking about. It is $2 billion of money that may be very worthwhile and may do all kinds of good things, but the fact is they are not related to the items she is talking about. That is my point here.

Madam Speaker, we heard a series of speeches, including the speech of the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] about all the good things that are in this bill. I have do doubt there are many good things in this bill. There are a lot of us that would like to

vote for a bill that is fiscally responsible and does all those good things.

It is an authorization bill, but authorization bills do have consequences. In all honesty, I am a little tired of people like the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] coming to the floor and suggesting that authorization bills do not have consequences on spending.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. Of course they do. When the money is way over, the fact is that that money becomes an appropriations level then which is not possible to do, and the appropriators are expected to try to come up and to try to hit those levels, and the gentleman from Kentucky, when he brings his HHS bill to the floor, will be under tremendous pressure to come up and meet what we have done in this authorization bill.

The fact is that we ought not do a couple of these things at a time when we have tight fiscal constraints. We cannot at the present time, in my opinion, justify doing $3.1 billion over what the President has suggested as a level, particularly when I can find on just two projects $2 billion of that $3.1 billion—$2 billion into two projects, one of them in Maryland and one of them in the Warren Magnuson Clinical Center.

Madam Speaker, that is too much money. We cannot afford it at the present time. That has nothing to do with health issues; that has nothing to do with fetal tissue. It has to do with spending what we can afford.

□ 1200

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

Mr. RICHARDSON. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation.

This is not a bill of special interests and pork. This is a bill that is going to benefit women's health, children's health, and the health of the elderly. What it does is it redresses the imbalance in research on women's health issues such as osteoporosis, such as breast cancer research, and such as ovarian cancer and prostate cancer research.

If we reject this bill, these are the consequences: Would we slow breast cancer research when 1 of every 9 American women will have breast cancer over her life and when over 40,000 American women will die this year of the disease?

Would we eliminate the prostate cancer research provisions when prostate cancer is the leading cause of cancer in men and the second leading cause of cancer deaths in men?

Would we slow heart disease research when it is still the No. 1 cause of death?

Would we slow research on aging when the elderly are the fastest growing portion of the American population?

Madam Speaker, the fetal research position is not a pro-life or a pro-choice position. I think that has been established. I have a quote here: "Support for fetal tissue research is the true pro-life position." That is from Senator ROBERT DOLE, minority leader of the Senate. We have pro-choice and pro-life individuals supporting this legislation.

There are a number of safeguards in this legislation. There is a prohibition on the sale of human fetal tissue. There is a prohibition against directed donation of fetal tissue for a specific individual. There is a prohibition against payment for abortion.

Madam Speaker, we are starting to play politics with this issue. Fetal tissue research can save lives. It can help us in the fight against diabetes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New Mexico for his very kind statement and for yielding.

The gentleman who spoke previously would not yield further, and I just want to point out that what I wanted to say was that what this is about is renovating the labs that are there to do the research the gentleman in the well is talking about, and the sums were those that were necessary to renovate, not to move, but we know in science that we must upgrade to be able to do those kinds of things.

Madam Speaker, I think the gentleman is making an excellent statement, that to do those things in the modern world we have to keep current.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her contribution. She has said it. This spending is under the cap, and the American people want us to spend money in human investment and on health care, on the aging, on women's research, and on prostate cancer.

This fetal tissue bank issue is politics. It really is not something that this body should consider as a true pro-choice or pro-life position.

Madam Speaker, let us support this legislation. It is important. It needs to move ahead, and it deserves our support.

Madam Speaker, as the cochair of the congressional biomedical research caucus and a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee which has jurisdiction over this legislation, I rise in strong support of the conference report on H.R. 2507, the National Institutes of Health Reauthorization Act.

Despite the fact that women represent over half of our population, astonishingly little research has been done on women's health issues. I support the NIH conference report because it establishes an Office of Research on Women's Health and contains vitally important language ensuring that women and minorities will be included in all NIH supported research.

The report also contains important language authorizing an additional $40 million in research on osteoporosis that I and my colleagues OLYMPIA SNOWE and MARCY KAPTUR worked to include. This debilitating disease affects an estimated 27 million Americans of all ages and is responsible for 1.3 million bone fractures annually. While the medical costs of osteoporosis are an estimated $27 million per day, scientists are convinced we can bring osteoporosis under control with an expanded research program.

There has also been a great deal of discussion about the bill's fetal tissue research provisions. I understand the concerns that have been raised but I am convinced that women do not take the issue of abortion lightly nor do I believe women would seek to gain financially or otherwise from an abortion. More importantly, I am convinced the provisions of the conference report provide strong safeguards against the abuse of fetal tissue research.

The conference report codifies the procedural safeguards and ethical guidelines recommended by the Reagan appointed Human Fetal Tissue Transplantation Review Panel and adds additional prohibitions and requirements. These include:

A prohibition on the sale of human fetal tissue;

A prohibition against directed donation of fetal tissue for a specific individual;

A prohibition against payment for abortions;

A requirement that there be written informed consent from the woman donating the tissue;

In the case of induced abortion, a requirement that the attending physician provide a written statement that the woman gave consent for the abortion prior to giving consent for tissue donation;

In the case of an induced abortion, a requirement that the attending physician provide a written statement that no alteration in the timing, method, or procedures used to terminate the pregnancy were made solely for the purpose of obtaining the tissue;

A requirement that the researcher provide a written statement that disclosure has been made to any researchers involved and to potential recipients;

A requirement that the researcher provide a written statement that he or she has had no part in any decision on timing, method, or procedures used to terminate a pregnancy;

A prohibition against the transplantation of tissue into a relative of the donating individual; and finally,

The report contains strict civil and criminal penalties for any violation of these prohibitions or requirements.

The President knows his proposed compromise to establish a fetal tissue research bank using only fetuses lost from miscarriages or ectopic pregnancies won't work. The President's campaign has even acknowledged that there are no substantive reasons for the White House to oppose this legislation.

In closing, this is what we know: Fetal tissues research can save lives, it can help us in the fight against diabetes, Parkinson's, Alzheimer's, and Huntington's diseases, among others. The President is playing politics and it

is time to stop. I urge my colleagues to support this very important legislation.

[From the Albuquerque Journal, May 24, 1992]

REJECT BUSH'S CYNICAL SOP TO FETAL TISSUE RESEARCH

(By Charles Krauthammer)

WASHINGTON.—Once more around the block. In 1988, the Reagan administration imposed a ban on federally funded transplantation research that uses fetal tissue taken from abortions. The ban effectively killed U.S. research on fetal tissue transplants, research that may be crucial to the understanding and treatment of Parkinson's, diabetes, and other intractable and debilitating diseases. Because fetal tissue is almost magically adaptable and regenerative, there has been pressure from both scientists and citizens' groups (the "disease lobbies") to lift the ban.

Congress is now poised to do exactly that. With several anti-abortion senators coming out strongly in favor of fetal research, there might be enough votes to override a presidential veto. Accordingly, President Bush has tried to defuse the issue and win swing votes with an executive order creating a "Fetal Tissue Bank" to meet research needs with tissue taken only from spontaneous abortions and ectopic pregnancies.

Problem is, however, that it will not meet the need. Spontaneous abortions occur, generally speaking, when the fetus is non-viable, often due to chromosomal damage or infection. Only 1 percent of spontaneous abortions produce tissue suitable for transplantation research. And nearly 9 out 10 of that 1 percent occur outside a medical setting, making the tissue unrecoverable for scientific purposes.

It makes no sense to try to support transplant research using only spontaneous abortions and ectopic pregnancies. It will cost a fortune and it won't work. Meanwhile millions of abortions are being performed legally in medical settings throughout the country and the tissue ends up simply being discarded.

The Fetal Tissue Bank is a transparent device to try to appease the scientific community while remaining on the right side of the more fundamentalist pro-lifers. In order to appear adamantly anti-abortion to a constituency that rightly questions his fealty, President Bush finds it necessary to make a show of steadfastness on this most tangential proxy issue.

The Bush position is more than politically cynical. It is intellectually flimsy. When the Bush administration reaffirmed the Reagan ban in 1989 it did so on the stated grounds that allowing the use of aborted fetal tissue encourages abortion. Can you think of one person who would be influenced to have an abortion because of the research value of the tissue? Well, you might say, what about a poor woman? Or a woman whose father needed a fetal tissue transplant for Parkinson's?

These are the only conceivable ways in which fetal research might be an inducement to abortion. Accordingly, proponents of fetal research, from the 1988 National Institutes of Health panel that voted to overturn the Reagan ban to the congressmen trying today to do the same, insist on three ironclad safeguards that break any connection between fetal research and the abortion decision.

First maintain and enforce the legal prohibition against the sale of fetuses or parts of fetuses. Second, prohibit any woman from designating the recipient of her fetal tissue. This prevents a family member from voluntarily conceiving and aborting in order to provide fetal tissue for the experimental treatment of a loved one. And third, prohibit raising the issue of using aborted tissue for research until after the decision to abort has already been made.

The federal government has every right to try to do what it can to discourage abortion, but wrecking fetal transplantation research is a particularly useless and particularly destructive way to go about it.

One legitimate avenue of discouragement is, for example the gag rule. It prohibits all but doctors from discussing abortion with patients in federally financed clinics. A government elected on an openly anti-abortion platform has no obligation to subsidize abortion counseling and referral. (The objection that the gag rule might endanger the life of the mother is answered adequately by allowing the one person uniquely qualified to evaluate the danger, namely the doctor, to discuss abortion if he or she believes it medically warranted.)

Counseling and referral have an obvious and real connection to a woman's decision to abort. Fetal research has only the remotest connection, and even that can be broken with simple safeguards. If the president feels the need to make a stand on abortion, fine. It's a free country and an election year. But fetal research is the wrong place to make that stand. With so much at stake in fetal research, it is a shame to make it hostage to the politics of abortion.

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, despite the characterizations by the media and by Members here, this is not an issue on fetal tissue research. I want to make it clear, however, that I support the changes with the limitations and safeguards that are part of this legislation.

This is also not an issue about research activities related to women's health issues.

I support those kinds of changes. I have been a strong supporter of increased attention focused on women's health issues such as breast and ovarian cancer.

This is a budgetary issue. This is $3.1 billion more authorized than the President asked for. This is $1 billion more than what came out of the House in the first place. This is an issue about medical pork. This is an issue about reallocating resources at the National Institutes of Health. That is what it is about.

This is also about this syndrome of the disease of the month or the disease of the week. There simply must be a limitation on the amount of funds we are authorizing. The American people want research, but they want it to be done in a fiscally responsible fashion.

Madam Speaker, the conference report authorizes over $1 billion more than was included in the House-passed bill. This measure also includes $3.1 billion more than was requested by the administration for the National Institutes of Health programs reauthorized by this bill.

In Congress, this Member has been a strong supporter of increased attention focused on women's health issues, such as breast and ovarian cancer research. However, because of fiscal constraints, this Member believes that deserved increases for funding for these important programs must come at the expense of other NIH budgetary elements. Congress must not continue this borrow-and-spend mentality.

One of the most controversial sections of this measure would overturn a 4-year moratorium of federally funded fetal tissue transplant research from induced abortions. As amended, H.R. 2507 now imposes a variety of restrictions intended to ensure that a woman does not have an abortion in order to supply fetal tissue. Under the measure, a woman donating fetal tissue must complete a written consent form stating that the woman donates the fetal tissue for research purposes, the donation must be made without any restrictions as to the recipient of the transplant, and the woman must not be informed of the identity of the recipient. These are important provisions which I support.

If there were the opportunity for a straightforward vote on fetal tissue research, this Member would vote to allow fetal tissue transplant research from induced abortions. The safeguards surrounding the use of fetal tissue for research purposes included in this legislation should ensure that abortions will not be encouraged for the purpose of providing fetal tissue for research.

Nevertheless, I must oppose the legislation because of the large increase in funding for NIH—for larger than current levels and far larger than the administration's proposed increase.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the rule but in opposition to the conference report.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding time to me, and I rise in support of the rule.

Madam Speaker, new advances in research involving the transplantation of fetal tissue hold promise for the treatment and cure of many diseases, including Alzheimer's disease, Parkinson's disease, diabetes, and even AIDS. However, since 1988, the National Institutes of Health [NIH] have been prohibited from doing this promising research because of an administration ban on the use of fetal tissue in research.

Today, Congress will take up a conference report on legislation reauthorizing the research functions of the NIH. This conference report includes provisions overturning the current prohibition on fetal tissue transplantation research. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this report.

This legislation contains specific safeguards recommended by President Reagan's panel that would prohibit di-

rected donations and sale of fetal tissue. The decision to have an abortion must be made separately from the decision to donate tissue. Thus, allowing this research will not increase the number of abortions.

Lifting the prohibition on fetal tissue transplantation research will bring hope to millions of Americans who suffer from a variety of diseases and disabilities. Let today be a victory for hope.

Madam Speaker, I support the rule and the conference report.

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of our time on this side of the aisle.

Madam Speaker, let me just say this to my colleagues: From those who support the conference report that this rule makes in order, we have heard a lot of very legitimate and very sincere appeals to spend more money on research concerning women's breast cancer, men's prostate cancer, Parkinson's disease, arthritis, heart disease, and many other very serious and debilitating illnesses. I sympathize with every one of them. I lost my mother not too many years ago to that dreaded disease of cancer, and I have suffered from a prostate problem myself for the last number of years. So I know firsthand what the problems are.

But there is a whole list, a whole litany of other programs, too, such as WIC, which I support very strongly, and Head Start, that need additional funding. But I say to my colleagues that the money is not there. We are operating in a sea of red ink that is bankrupting this Nation and making us a debtor Nation. This conference report is a perfect example of how we got to that point.

So with all due respect, let me say this: I recognize all the sincerity and conscientiousness of those who have spoken for the conference report, but this legislation is an example of what I am talking about. We have $3.1 billion in unrequested authorizations here, and the money is not there. We have got to turn the economy around so there will be more money to spend on these programs. That is why those of us who oppose this conference report will be voting for the rule to get the legislation on the floor. But I ask the Members to vote against the conference report itself. Let us have a little fiscal responsibility around here. When we restore some fiscal discipline and sanity around here, the economy will be on the road to recovery and the money to pay for worthwhile programs will be available.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, if I might just reiterate one thing I said in my previous statement, almost every dollar that we spend in health research is going to save us $10 or $20 in health costs in the future.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to our last speaker, the gentlewoman from Tennessee [Mrs. LLOYD], who will sum up our position.

Mrs. LLOYD. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding this time to me.

Madam Speaker, I do support this conference report, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

This is under the spending caps. It is within the Budget Act, and it is within the budget resolution for the year.

A lot has been said about some of these diseases that we are hoping we can learn new ways of treating, and I must tell my colleagues that these are not diseases that go by the week or go by the month. These are diseases that affect every one of us. If not individually, they affect a member of our family.

□ 1210

A very important feature of this bill includes the language to overturn the administration's ban on fetal tissue research. The use of fetal tissue is considered critical by the medical research community for research to treat incurable debilitating diseases such as Alzheimer's, Parkinson's disease, and diabetes.

Madam Speaker, I suppose all of us, when we get here on such critical legislation, always have one or two of their constituents that come to mind. That is no less true for me today.

Charles and Margaret Hokett go to church where I do, and, Madam Speaker, they used to be there every time the doors were open, Sunday morning, Sunday night. But Charles and Margaret are not there any more, because Charles has Parkinson's disease, and his wife Margaret asked me to vote to overturn the administration's ban on fetal tissue research. She and her husband are hoping that they can find a cure for his dreaded illness.

So to Charles and Margaret and the thousands like them across this country, we say, this one is for you, and I urge my colleagues to vote to support this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2507, the conference report on National Institutes of Health Revitalization Amendments Act, and urge my colleagues to pass this critical legislation.

As a nation, we witness many miraculous and exciting programs funded by our Government. A few weeks ago we watched with great anticipation and wonder as our astronauts performed the longest space walk in history while tending to a multiton satellite in need of repair.

We also read about important medical breakthroughs which unlock the mystery of disease and give hope to afflicted patients and their families. These advances do not occur overnight. They are the result of years of adding to our existing building blocks of knowledge. With science we never know which experiment or research project will unlock the door to knowledge or a cure. We do know that unfunded research efforts and a lack of commitment get us nowhere.

Breast cancer is case in point. Breast cancer rates have increased for the past 20 years. More than 46,000 women will die this year and we still know very little about its cause or cure.

We as a nation pay for the medical advances that benefit us. We determine what is important to us. Ultimately, all taxpayers can take credit for the exciting advances that can provide answers to our questions and give hope to those diagnosed with disease. This bill before us today continues that commitment to eradicating the diseases that plague our Nation.

Last June, I joined with my colleagues on the congressional caucus for women's issues to challenge our medical research community to find the causes and cure for breast cancer research by the year 2000. Dr. Sam Broder, Director of the National Cancer Institute, accepted our challenge provided the Institute be given the resources to succeed. H.R. 2507 contains the fuel to keep those NCI research fires burning in order to rid breast cancer from the lives of women through an increased emphasis on basic and clinical research, through the development of innovative programs to attract talented scientists, and through improved education and outreach efforts.

The conference report also contains a number of key provisions to move us closer toward understanding, treating, and ultimately curing other diseases that cause so much needless suffering and loss of human life, such as osteoporosis, prostate cancer, ovarian and reproductive cancers, and multiple sclerosis.

This bill also includes language to overturn the administration's ban on fetal tissue research. The use of this tissue is considered critical by our medical research community for research to treat incurable, debilitating diseases such as Alzheimer's, Parkinson's disease, and diabetes. Important legal safeguards to prevent potential abuses of the use of fetal tissue are included in the bill, such as a prohibition on the sale of fetal tissue, an informed consent requirement from women donating the tissue, and increased penalties for violations of these provisions. As a matter of fact, Margaret Hokett, a member of my church, recently appealed to me to support the fetal tissue provisions of this bill to aid her husband, Charles, currently suffering from Parkinson's disease.

I am pleased to note that the conference report includes legislation which I recently introduced with my colleagues, Representative WYDEN and Representative DOWNEY, and Senators ADAMS and BINGAMAN, which will provide for two studies to address the serious problem of malnutrition and the elderly. Not only does malnutrition affect the health and quality of life of older Americans, it also is a cause of often preventable institutionalization. The first study will address the cost-effectiveness and efficacy of nutrition screening among our older population.

The second study will take a look at the causes of malnutrition among the institutionalized elderly as well as individuals living independently within the community.

Improving the Nation's research commitment is fundamental to improving the health care received in this country. Let's pass H.R. 2507.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. UNSOELD). The question is on the resolution.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 308, nays 100, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 146]

YEAS—308

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Anderson
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Bacchus
Baker
Barnard
Barrett
Bateman
Bellenson
Bennett
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blackwell
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonior
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Broomfield
Browder
Brown
Bryant
Bustamante
Byron
Camp
Cardin
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Chapman
Clay
Clement
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coughlin
Cox (CA)
Cox (IL)
Coyne
Cramer
Cunningham
Darden
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Dickinson
Dicks
Dingell
Dooley
Doolittle
Dorgan (ND)
Downey
Dreier
Durbin
Dwyer
Early
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English
Erdreich
Espy
Evans
Ewing
Fascell
Fawell
Fazio
Feighan
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Gradison
Grandy
Green
Guarini
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harris
Hastert
Hayes (IL)
Hayes (LA)
Hefner
Henry
Hertel
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hopkins
Horn
Horton
Houghton
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Inhofe
Jacobs
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnston
Jones (GA)
Jones (NC)
Jontz
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klug
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kostmayer
Kyl
LaFalce
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Levin (MI)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey (NY)
Machtley
Markey
Marlenee
Martin
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCrery
McCurdy
McDermott
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McMillan (NC)
McMillen (MD)
McNulty
Meyers
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Miller (WA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Montgomery
Moody
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Morrison
Mrazek
Murphy
Myers
Nagle
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nichols
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Olver
Ortiz
Owens (NY)
Owens (UT)
Oxley
Pallone
Panetta
Pastor
Patterson
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pease
Pelosi
Perkins
Peterson (FL)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Porter
Price
Pursell
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Richardson
Ridge
Riggs
Ritter
Roe
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Sanders
Santorum
Savage
Sawyer
Scheuer
Schroeder
Schumer
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solarz
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Staggers
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Thomas (WY)
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vento
Visclosky
Walker
Walsh
Waters
Waxman
Weiss
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolpe
Wyden
Yates

NAYS—100

Allard
Allen
Annunzio
Archer
Armey
Ballenger
Barton
Borski
Bunning
Burton
Callahan
Clinger
Coble
Costello
Crane
Davis
de la Garza
DeLay
Dornan (CA)
Duncan
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
Fields
Franks (CT)
Gaydos
Goodling
Goss
Gunderson
Hall (TX)
Hammerschmidt
Hancock
Hefley
Herger
Holloway
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Ireland
James
Johnson (TX)
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kolter
Leach
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Lowery (CA)
Luken
McCollum
McDade
Miller (OH)
Mollohan
Murtha
Nowak
Nussle
Orton
Parker
Paxon
Penny
Peterson (MN)
Poshard
Quillen
Rahall
Ramstad
Ray
Regula
Rhodes
Rinaldo
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Roth
Sarpalius
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schulze
Sensenbrenner
Smith (OR)
Stallings
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sundquist
Tallon
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thornton
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Weber
Weldon
Wolf
Wylie
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—26

Alexander
Anthony
Boxer
Bruce
Campbell (CA)
Campbell (CO)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Dannemeyer
Dixon
Donnelly
Dymally
Hansen
Hatcher
Lagomarsino
Lent
Levine (CA)
Livingston
Manton
Michel
Oakar
Packard
Sangmeister
Torres
Traxler
Washington

□ 1230

Messrs. RHODES, WYLIE, and TAYLOR of Mississippi changed their vote from "yeas" to "nay."

Messrs. HOBSON, McCANDLESS, MARLENEE, DOOLITTLE, and BATEMAN changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, pursuant to rule XXVIII and House Resolution 466, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2507) to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the programs of the National Institutes of Health, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. UNSOELD). Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of Monday, May 18, 1992, at page 11597.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

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

Madam Speaker, I will be brief, because I know there are many Members who wish to speak and there is very little time. This conference report is about many things. It is an important piece of legislation. It is about creating a new program for breast cancer research, the disease that will strike 1 out of 9 American women and will kill 40,000 American women this year. It is about creating a new program for prostate cancer research, the leading cause of cancer in men, and the second leading cause of cancer deaths in men. It is about extending programs in heart disease research, the No. 1 cause of death in America, and it is about research on aging, on children's vaccines, on osteoporosis, AIDS, on fertility, and on ovarian cancer. It is about the health of America.

We hear a lot about health care costs. One way to deal with those costs is to find out a way to control and prevent these diseases through research at the NIH. However, the major point of debate is the provision regarding fetal tissue transplantation. This research is promising for treatment of Parkinson's disease, Alzheimer's disease, diabetes, spinal cord injury, and even genetic diseases and birth defects.

The bill before us would reverse the current ban on Federal funding for such research. It would implement the

safeguards recommended by the Reagan-appointed review panel at NIH. It would prohibit the sale of fetal tissue and would prohibit the donation of tissue for any specific person. This is not a bill about whether abortion is legal or should be legal or not. It is about what happens after an abortion, whether the tissue from the abortion may be used to save another life or simply thrown away.

This bill will not cause more abortions. I cannot believe the comments that we hear, that women will simply go out and have more abortions to support research. I find that an incredible statement. It is a theoretical possibility, but for those of us who have heard from Rev. Guy Walden, a man whose wife had had two children with Hurler's syndrome, a genetic disease that causes death shortly after birth, we know about reality. He has talked about the ability of the in utero transplant of fetal tissue to save the life of his child, a situation in which most people would go out and get an abortion. If we can correct these problems before the child is born, more women will, in fact, avoid abortions, and that will not be theoretical.

Women simply do not have abortions done to support research. How do we know that? In countries where they allow fetal tissue transplantation, there has been no evidence of women going out and getting abortions to support research. The fact of the matter is, no increase in abortions has been shown to be caused as a result of this research.

There have been people who have lobbied hard on this bill. Unlike the lobbyists who have financial interests in the legislation, we have had the incredible efforts of Anne Udall, the daughter of our colleague, Mo Udall, who has told us what fetal transplantation would mean to her father, who is suffering from Parkinson's.

There is Joan Samuelson, who has knocked on doors, a young women who has Parkinson's herself, simply making a plea on her own behalf and others who are suffering from that disease. They can be helped. Do not deny them the help that this research may bring. It can save their lives and many others.

I urge my colleagues to overturn the ban, to bring hope to those people who are suffering from diabetes, spinal cord injury, Alzheimer's, and other diseases. We need to understand these diseases and treat them in a way that can give the gift of life. Just as we allow transplant of organs, we should allow transplants of fetal tissue from a fetus that is dead, just as a human being who has died donates an organ for transplant purposes.

Madam Speaker, I would now like to comment on other provisions of the conference report.

The principal purpose of the legislation is to preserve America's preeminence in biomedical and behavioral research. Maintaining a strong, independent NIH is critical to this objective. The success of NIH in medicine and the health sciences testifies to the wisdom that Congress and the American public have demonstrated by their continued support of this noble institution.

The legislation under consideration today will further Congress' support for the NIH. It provides the national research institutes with the necessary authorities to meet the exciting challenges ahead in the 1990's.

Last year, we celebrated the 20th anniversary of the National Cancer Act. That act established the National Cancer Institute and led to our Nation's leadership in, and commitment to, cancer research. That commitment has yielded impressive dividends with significant advances in understanding the disease about which Americans are most fearful.

The conference report builds upon the success of the past 20 years. It proposes major funding increases for breast, ovarian, and prostate cancer research. The report provides for a significant increase in cancer control activities by requiring that at least 10 percent of the NCI budget be allocated to control activities, particularly those cancer control activities identified in the annual bypass budget. An expanded commitment to cancer control will spur development of programs to lift the shadow these diseases cast upon the lives of thousands of patients and their families.

The conference agreement also provides for increased involvement of the Centers for Disease Control in developing prostate cancer prevention programs. In carrying out this authority, the CDC and State and local health department should give priority to those individuals at highest risk of developing prostate cancer and those individuals with limited access to the appropriate preventive health services.

Madam Speaker, the conference agreement addresses more than cancer research. New initiatives are proposed in areas of aging, women's health, trauma care, chronic fatigue syndrome, toxicological research, and multiple sclerosis. The agreement addresses longstanding concerns over the infrastructure of our Nation's research facilities. A new construction grant program is authorized to help in the replacement of outmoded facilities and to increase capacity to accommodate the increasingly sophisticated research environment. Special provisions have been included to facilitate improvements at the national primate research centers. The conference agreement also addresses the need for improvements in the intramural laboratories and clinical facilities on the NIH campus, including the establishment of a satellite campus in Maryland.

The conference agreement also includes provisions to address concerns over scientific misconduct, conflicts of interest, and retaliation against whistleblowers in connection with research supported by the NIH. Implementation of these requirements will help maintain the historically high and deserved level of public confidence enjoyed by NIH and the talented scientists that it supports.

Finally, the legislation contains important provisions designed to put in place a procedure to further important, lifesaving research involving the use of fetal tissue. The legislation lifts the Bush administration's imposed ban on research involving the transplantation of fetal tissue. Despite the recommendations of two Federal panels that this research is promising and should proceed, the administration has stubbornly refused to yield to empirical evidence and expert opinion.

The administration has implicitly told Americans afflicted with Alzheimer's disease, Parkinson's disease, and paralysis that the cure for their disease is too controversial to study and too political to pursue. Twice before, once in the House and once in the Senate, overwhelming majorities have passed legislation authorizing this important research to go forward. A strong showing of support today, for the conference report, will reaffirm our Nation's commitment to scientific freedom and to the pursuit of knowledge that can cure disease and ameliorate human suffering.

Madam Speaker, I urge support for the report and reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1240

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BLILEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH].

Mr. GINGRICH. Madam Speaker, I first want to say categorically that there should be no discrimination against women and minorities with respect to inclusion in clinical research studies. And this is certainly the administration's position. To respond to past problems, the National Institutes of Health in February 1992, issued 80 pages of detailed guidelines ensuring the inclusion of women and minorities as subjects in research.

The conference report goes way too far to address a legitimate concern. The conference report creates a Federal mandate for a quota system of minorities and women as subjects in clinical studies at the NIH. This section requires that women and members of minority groups be included in all clinical research projects. The statute specifically states that the additional, and possibly prohibitive costs, of including minorities and women in a research project cannot be a permissible consideration for exclusion of these individuals from a study.

In addition, the statute specifically dictates to the highly trained scientific researcher the type of methodology and statistical analysis he or she should use in designing the study. The legislation mandates that the Secretary ensure that every project is designed and carried out in a manner that provides for a valid statistical analysis of whether the variables being tested in the study affect women and members of minority groups differently than other subjects. I am sure that our elite biomedical scientists will be shocked to learn that Congress is now directly interfering with the design and analysis of their complicated research projects.

Now let us take a look at how this mandate is going to affect research in

the real world. Biostatisticians at the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute of NIH were asked to look at how the quota requirement of this legislation would affect a current study.

Board No. 1: The first board shows the current study of the digitalis investigation group at the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute [NHLBI]. This study is determining whether digitalis reduces mortality for those suffering from heart failure. This trial randomly assigns patients with heart failure to a treatment group or a placebo group. The sample size is 7,000 subjects to assure that statistical differences between the groups can be detected. The cost of the study is $16 million.

Board No. 2: Now let us look at the study design as it would be transformed under the conference report. To meet the gender and minority mandate of statistically valid samples we now have five male ethnic groups and five female. These ethnic groups include American Indian/Alaskan Native, Asians, Blacks, Hispanics, and whites. To meet the requirements of the conference report, the study would need 70,000 subjects at a cost of $160 million.

Board No. 3: Let me repeat that—the study would cost $160 million—10 times the amount of the current study. And could this astronomical cost be considered in redesigning the study more realistically? No. Why? Because section 131 provides that in designing research studies the guidelines "May not provide that the costs of including women and minorities in clinical research are a permissible consideration."

This one example demonstrates that this provision of the legislation, while well-intentioned is totally unrealistic in the real world. The bottom line effect of this provision is that biomedical research will be stifled—under current law 10 studies could be conducted for the price of 1 under the conference report. Mr. Speaker, this alone is reason enough to vote against this conference report.

I would like to quote from a letter I received from Secretary Sullivan concerning this provision:

Of critical concern is section 131 of this bill, which—while well intentioned—is unacceptable and unworkable on scientific grounds. * * * such an inflexible requirement could in fact jeopardize the initiation of NIH clinical trials, including the very trials that would provide data relevant to women's health.

Finally, I would like to quote several passages from a memo sent to the Director of NIH from Dr. Vivian Pinn, Director, Office of Research on Women's Research and Dr. William Harlan, Associate Director for Disease Prevention and I would like to introduce this into the RECORD. Referring to the research mandate in the conference report, these two research physicians state:

The following requirement has grave implications for clinical research.

This provision would have a stultifying effect on clinical research and paradoxically could hamper planned investigation of racial/ethical differences that have been identified.

In summary, the provision would profoundly and adversely affect the conduct of clinical research, however well intentioned it may be.

Madam Speaker, I enter in the RECORD a letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, Dr. Louis Sullivan, a letter from Dr. Bernadine Healy, the Director of NIH, and a letter from two senior researchers, Dr. Vivien Pinn, Director of the Office of Research on Women's Health, and Dr. William Harlan, Associate Director for Disease Prevention, on the kind of destructive impact this quota system will have on mandating congressional interference with the design of research.

The letters to which I referred follow:

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 20, 1992.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR NEWT: This is in further response to our mutual concern about the peer review provisions contained in the conference agreement on H.R. 2507, the NIH Reauthorization Act of 1992.

Of critical concern is Section 133 of this bill, which—while well intentioned—is unacceptable and unworkable on scientific grounds. This section would require that a large percentage of the clinical trials conducted or supported by the NIH assess gender and racial differences in treatments under evaluation even in the absence of a scientific reason to suspect that such differences exist. Such an inflexible requirement could in fact jeopardize the initiation of NIH clinical trials, including the very trials that would provide valuable data relevant to women's health.

As you know, the conference agreement on H.R. 2507 contains a number of other unacceptable provisions previously addressed by the Administration. These provisions are discussed more fully in the attached Statement of Administration Policy.

Sincerely,

LOUIS W. SULLIVAN, M.D.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE,
NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH,
Bethesda, MD, May 28, 1992.

Hon. LOUIS W. SULLIVAN,
Secretary of Health and Human Services, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY SULLIVAN: I am writing to alert you to the impact on clinical research that would occur if the Clinical Research Equity Act contained in Title 1, Subtitle B of H.R. 2507, the National Institutes of Health (NIH) Revitalization Amendments of 1992 was enacted.

As you know, I strongly endorse the need for representation of women and minorities in clinical research. I believe that the NIH is making great strides to insure their appropriate inclusion. However, the requirement embodied in H.R. 2507 would have grave implications for clinical research. It specifies that, "the NIH Director shall ensure that the project is designed and carried out in a manner sufficient to provide a valid analysis of whether the variables being tested in the research affect women or minorities differently than other research subjects." This would have the effect of multiplying the sample size for any given group by a factor of at least 5 to 10, depending upon the study. A clinical study comprising both men and women would need an approximate tenfold increase in size to test for differential affects by gender and ethnicity.

This requirement would affect the design of all clinical studies despite the fact that no important differences in effect across race/ethnic groups are expected for most clinical questions. Where differences would have been expected, the study design including sample size would be altered to provide for reliable group analysis. Paradoxically, the excessive costs this Act demands could hamper planned investigations of racial/ethnic differences that have already been identified.

For example, the Dietary Intervention Trial of the Women's Health Initiative already requires the inclusion of 48,000 women at a cost of $26 million a year for fourteen years. This study is intended to determine if a reduction in dietary fat will have an impact on the incidence of breast and colon cancer in post-menopausal women. If it were necessary to answer the questions of the Dietary Intervention Trial in 5 ethnic groups, the number of women required would be 5 x 48,000, or 240,000, and the cost would be approximately $130 million per year for fourteen years. If conducted under the requirements of this Act, the annual cost of this single study would greatly exceed the annual cost of the entire Women's Health Initiative and all of its attendant trials.

In planning clinical trials, NIH investigators strive to answer health questions which affect the entire population irrespective of ethnicity. The structure of a clinical trial allows us to generalize the results of the trial to other people with characteristics similar to those who entered the trial. When it is suspected that there may be differences among ethnic groups, NIH scientists will continue to conduct trials to determine those differences. However, the mandatory design of all NIH clinical trials to include representative populations for each ethnic group will greatly limit our ability to conduct the large number of clinical studies on many different diseases and necessitate the conduct of only a few very large trials on a smaller number of diseases.

This information must be seriously considered due to the fact that it would greatly hamper our ability to conduct clinical research.

Sincerely yours,

BERNADINE HEALY, M.D.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE,
NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH,
Bethesda, MD, May 27, 1992.

To: Bernadine Healy, M.D., Director, NIH.
From: Associate Director for Disease Prevention.
Subject: NIH Reauthorization Legislation.

The purpose of this memorandum is to alert you to the potential impact on clinical research of proposed Clinical Research Equity (Title 1, Subtitle B) of the NIH Reauthorization Legislation.

Women and minorities should be included in clinical research studies and attention should be directed to insuring their inclusion and we all endorse the need for their representation. However, the following requirement has grave implications for clinical research. It specifies that, "the NIH Director shall ensure that the project is designed and carried out in a manner sufficient to provide a valid analysis of whether the variables being tested in the research affect women or

minorities differently than other research subjects." As specified, this would have the effect of multiplying the required sample sizes for clinical trials and epidemiological studies. The sample sizes for observational and interventional studies are based on providing adequate power to reliably detect estimated differences in effect. If the differences must be detected for each group the total sample needed would be multiplied by factors of 5 or 10. Assuming 5 minority groups, a single gender study such as the Women's Health Initiative would need 5 times the current estimated size of 50,000 women to reliably detect differential responses of each race/ethnic group. A clinical study comprising both men and women would need approximately tenfold increase in size to test for differential effects by gender and ethnicity.

This requirement would affect the design of all clinical studies despite the fact that no important differences in effect across race/ethnic groups are expected for most clinical questions. Where differences would have been expected, the study design including sample size has been altered to provide for reliable group analysis.

This provision would have a stultifying effect on clinical research and paradoxically could hamper planned investigation of racial/ethnic differences that have been identified. As the sample size increases severalfold, issues of feasibility, availability of all groups within a particular geographic region and cost are similarly multiplied. Researchers in some geographic areas may not have adequate numbers of certain minority groups available. Several studies are under way or being planned to explore differences in disease risk or treatment response in a particular racial/ethnic group (e.g. hypertension in African Americans). Would these studies be required to increase the sample size so as to include other groups? This could actually impede scientific investigation of important differences.

In summary, the provision would profoundly and adversely affect the conduct of clinical research, however well intentioned it may be.

WILLIAM R. HARLAN, M.D.,
Associate Director for Disease Prevention.
VIVIAN W. PINN, M.D.,
Director, Office of Research on Women's Health.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ROSE] for the purposes of a colloquy.

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

Madam Speaker, some questions have arisen concerning section 251 of title II of the conference report to this bill. Section 251 makes it a crime to engage in various acts against federally funded health facilities such as stealing facilities' records or property. I know of no one in Congress, myself included, that would in any way condone or excuse theft or vandalism on behalf of a cause, and we do not in this situation. But I would like to ask the gentleman if any of the language in section 251, particularly the reference to "break or enter" or to "engage in conversion" are intended to thwart or inhibit or even criminalize whistle blowing?

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman will permit me to say, the intent of this legislation to the conference report to H.R. 2507 is not to limit or inhibit whistle blowing. I want to add that nothing in title II, Protection of Health Facilities, is intended to make an offense out of entering a facility without actually breaking in, or out of copying records, or taking photographs, or disseminating any information and material with the intent to show that a violation of a State or Federal law or regulation may have occurred in that facility. I hope that clears this matter.

Mr. ROSE. I thank the gentleman and urge my colleagues to support the conference report.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the conference report on H.R. 2507, the National Institutes of Health Revitalization Amendments of 1992. The bill is flawed in every respect and is far worse from a philosophical, fiscal, and management viewpoint than the bill that passed the House.

First and foremost, the conference report authorizes spending of an estimated $3 billion above the President's fiscal year 1993 budget request and the House-passed bill. We need to remember that when the House passed the bill it cost $4.3 billion. The conference report now ups the ante to $7.3 billion. Members who are serious about reducing the Federal deficit cannot possibly vote for this bill in good conscience.

Second, the conference report includes provisions that require the HHS Secretary to appoint an Ethics Advisory Board comprised of private citizens whenever he declines to fund research on ethical grounds. The decision of these private citizens could then overrule objections by the Secretary and the President. Thus, these new boards would have unilateral authority to make important decisions concerning major research initiatives. While this provision is usually discussed in the context of fetal transplantation, it has much wider implications. This provision clearly violates the appointments clause of the Constitution. It is blatantly unconstitutional.

Third, the conference report is weighed down with a new construction program for universities authorizing spending of $100 million. This is not new money; it will have to come out of existing research dollars—in real terms it will mean the loss of 400 research grants per year. This $100 million is in addition to the $1 billion in indirect costs for the maintenance, renovation, and replacement of university owned facilities that the Federal Government already pays.

Finally, the bill authorizes the NIH to purchase 300 acres of land in the State of Maryland for a satellite campus. This provision is pork barrel, plain and simple. It was never the subject of hearings or any type of serious scrutiny. The administration letter correctly points out that this provision confers special benefits to a single geographic location.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting "no."

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR].

□ 1250

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, my colleagues, 9 years ago this month my wife received the shattering news that a biopsy revealed the presence of breast cancer. In the succeeding years, she went through two surgeries, seven courses of chemotherapy, two kinds of hormone therapy, and the maximum dose of radiation.

Just a few days after she was admitted to the hospital a year ago this coming July for what were to be her last 2 weeks of life, a letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services to the Committee on Energy and Commerce was handed to me as I was coming over to the floor, with this passage: "The $50 million earmarked for breast cancer research and development of a test for early detection of ovarian cancer is unnecessary." I exploded. I went directly to the floor and, in very strong terms, denounced the Secretary's statement.

My wife did not like emotion-laden discussion, preferring rational discussion, and I told her that evening, "I am sorry, honey, I lost it. I was furious," and I repeated what I had said on the House floor. She said, "Maybe some good will come of this disease."

She left behind three daughters, who are now third-generation vulnerable to breast cancer.

We need early detection. We need research on cures. We need more, not fewer, minds committed to research on breast cancer. We need more, not fewer, dollars committed to the cause of finding a cure and developing humane, physically tolerable, effective treatments.

In that 9 years, over 350,000 women died of breast cancer, and now comes a letter from the Director of the National Institutes of Health saying in part, "I believe that the section in this bill on women's health is unnecessary." Congress is being told: Do not earmark it. We will take care of it. We will address this issue. Trust us, but the women's health initiative is unnecessary. Targeting funds for breast cancer research is unnecessary.

Are women also unnecessary? I do not believe this administration be-

lieves that, but I will tell you, I do not trust them to make the appropriate investments in the breast cancer and other women's health programs, unless we prioritize the initiative, commit the funds, and direct the NIH to pursue specific programs designated in legislation.

There was a song in the 1960's of the civil rights protest movement that asked, "How many deaths will it take until they know that too many people have died?"

Those who have lost a wife, a mother, a sister to breast cancer know that one is too many. I do not want any more. This bill will help us to get the cause and to the cure and to the human treatment of women afflicted with this epidemic-size disease in our society. Three weeks ago a coalition of woman, led by Mrs. Christine Norton, gathered in a peaceful rally on the steps of the State capitol in St. Paul, asked for no less than what this conference report offers. I must keep faith with their plea.

For me, this is the overriding issue, to deal humanely with women, the authors of life.

Madam Speaker, a final note: We have heard reports of a veto threat because of the fetal tissue provision in this conference report. If the president decides to veto this bill, and if the veto is limited only to the fetal tissue provision and does not endanger the rest of this bill, I could vote to sustain such a veto.

Mr. BLILEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON].

Mr. EMERSON. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the conference report as it currently stands. We do need to fund the NIH; we need to fund cancer research, and diabetes research, and Parkinson's research, and Hurler's research, and Alzheimer's research, and more, and we all know that we will do that—irrespective of the outcome of the debate today. But we do not need to overturn the regulatory moratorium on fetal tissue transplantation. I know that many of our well-respected colleagues who are ordinarily pro-life are convinced that this issue is not one of abortion. I say to all of them, both here in the House and in the other body: You have been misled. This is an issue of abortion, and abortion only.

The plain and simple truth is that we already have enough fetal tissue to meet research needs, and the President's order establishing a tissue bank makes existing tissue even easier to access. Ectopic pregnancies and spontaneous abortions provide more than enough fetal tissue. Proponents of fetal tissue research will tell you that 99.7 percent of the fetal tissue from ectopic pregnancies and miscarriages is not usable. Even if that's true, that means that 0.3 percent—three per thousand—is usable. There are about 800,000 ectopic pregnancies and spontaneous abortions annually in this country. Do the math—2,400 of these provide usable tissue. Considering that only 60 transplants have been done in the last 30 years, 2,400 per year should be more than enough—particularly when the new human fetal tissue bank is established at NIH.

Proponents here on the floor are telling us that the tissue bank will not work. But scientists and researchers are telling us that the tissue bank will work. Consider the words of Drs. DeGiorgio and Goodwin from the USC and Dr. Shewmon of UCLA: "Substantial evidence exists that spontaneous abortions are an acceptable source of fetal tissue for transplantation." Or the words of Drs. Caudle and Holls from the University of Tennessee: "The problems—of chromosomal disorders or infections—should not detract from the fact that a reasonably high proportion of spontaneous abortion fetuses have normal undiseased tissue suitable for transplantation." Or the words of Dr. Michejda of Georgetown University: "Tissues—from spontaneously aborted fetuses—could be collected in tissue banks * * * [this] preserves the life-saving elements of the original legislation but removes the morally objectionable aspects."

It is clear that we do not need elective abortions to provide fetal tissue for research. Why, then, are we having this debate? The issue boils down to one of abortion, and abortion only. Take Professor Tribe at his word: He testified that medical demand for fetal tissue gives Congress constitutional authority to pass the so-called Freedom of Choice Act to ensure a nationwide policy of abortion on demand.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. PASTOR].

Mr. PASTOR. Madam Speaker, today this body will vote on a piece of legislation that will have a profound impact on millions of people throughout this Nation. I am speaking of H.R. 2507, which seeks to overturn the senseless ban of fetal tissue research.

The lifting of this ban is critical. Some 13 million people in this country suffer from Alzheimer's, diabetes, or Parkinson's disease. Research has shown that as many as a third of the people suffering from these conditions could benefit from research with fetal tissue transplants.

In my own State of Arizona and in this august body, we have seen one of our best-loved public figures struck down by Parkinson's disease. I am speaking of course, of our friend and colleague, Mo Udall.

I applaud the untiring efforts of the Udall family to overturn the ban on fetal tissue research. Their personal odyssey has touched us all, and made us more aware of the profound and personal impact the repeal of this ban can have on millions of people.

I urge my colleagues to face with courage and conviction, this moral obligation to save lives and vote for H.R. 2507.

Mr. BLILEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY].

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

Madam Speaker, I wish my colleagues would just put the fetal tissue issue aside.

I know how most Members feel, but look at the bill, read the bill. it is one of the most awfully written bills I have seen come down in a long time.

What most Members have been saying is that they think that more money means better research and more money buys you a cure to disease.

Our debt leads to economic disaster. A poor nation cannot cure any disease. We are not talking about no research here. What we are saying is living within our means.

Madam Speaker, we are already spending almost $10 billion on NIH. The issue here is: Do you want to add $3 billion to your children's debt? That is the amount the conferees added over and above the President's request.

We are talking, when this bill left the House, as you well know, it was $238 million over the President's request, and it comes back from the conference committee at a staggering $3.1 billion above the President's request.

There is an economy of diminishing returns here. With or without the massive budget-busting increase in this bill, breast cancer research will continue. Prostate cancer research will continue. What will also continue, unless we vote against this bill, is more debt which will burden our children.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY. Madam Speaker, the NIH conference report is a vital piece of legislation. The debate over this bill has been mired by unnecessary controversy over whether or not it is ethical and appropriate to use transplanted fetal tissue in research. The medical community has been heard on this subject and strongly supports using fetal tissue. The research in this area will save many lives. We must reach out to the victims of Parkinson's disease, diabetes, birth defects, and the other devastating conditions for which fetal tissue research may provide treatment or even a cure. Moreover, fetal tissue research is ongoing in the private sector, but without the ethical guidelines this bill would establish.

But, Madam Speaker, we should not have to stand here today and talk about the ethics of fetal tissue transplantation. We should be talking about the crucial research funding this bill

provides. In spite of the comments of the Director of the National Institutes of Health, this bill includes what are obviously much needed provisions to advance women's health research, including breast cancer, ovarian cancer, osteoporosis, Paget's syndrome and other conditions specific to women.

These are but a small piece of the vital programs this bill funds: AIDS research, heart and lung illnesses, adolescent health, the establishment of cancer registries, and many, many others.

Madam Speaker, let us not be sidetracked by nonissues and misguided arguments. This bill is important. I urge my colleagues to support the conference report.

Mr. BLILEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON].

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the NIH conference agreement and urge my colleagues to vote to overturn the ban on fetal tissue research.

My colleagues, each one of us has benefited from fetal tissue research. The polio and German measles vaccines were developed from research that used fetal tissue.

How can we as beneficiaries stand in the way of research that promises cures for a number of today's most devastating diseases?

We know more than we did when the Department of Health and Human Services first implemented the ban on fetal tissue research almost 4 years ago. We know that the effect of the ban has been to bring fetal tissue transplant research to a near standstill with only two research facilities in the Nation able to raise significant private funds to move research forward.

The suffering of patients with Parkinson's and Alzheimer's is being needlessly prolonged. Hope for children with diabetes fades as we struggle to gain the courage to reinstate research that went on without controversy for 30 years and brought us to this moment of opportunity.

□ 1300

Today we have a chance to muster the courage to allow this research to move forward and also to govern it responsibly in the public and private sectors.

In offering to set up a bank for tissue from miscarriages and ectopic pregnancies, the administration has recognized that fetal tissue research holds great promise and can be responsibly governed. As important, they have acknowledged that such research requires a small supply of tissue, and so in fact fetal tissue research will not provide an incentive for abortions.

I am pleased the administration has now rejected the incentive argument and recognized the need for this research. The tissue bank they will provide, however, will not work. In the real world, and this is what matters, in the real world tissue from spontaneous abortions is too often genetically inadequate, infected, or oxygen starved. Miscarriages and ectopic pregnancies happen as emergencies, and so assembling the right team of the neurosurgeon, the neuroanatomist, the cryotechnologist to dissect and process the tissue in the 20-minute window allowed is extremely difficult. Furthermore, gaining consent for needed blood tests to assure tissue quality, obtaining appropriate tissue for the 7- to 12-week period of fetal development that is needed makes gathering tissue from this source extremely difficult.

We cannot risk the transplantation of defective tissue, and I hope those who care about the future will vote to raise the ban on this important research issue.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SHARP].

Mr. SHARP. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the NIH conference report and I urge the House to give it overwhelming support.

Although the focus of controversy has been on fetal tissue research the bill establishes a number of vitally important initiatives and continues others which are now threatened by the unjustified position taken by the President. Specifically, the bill would establish an Office of Research on Women's Health to identify women's health research needed at NIH and to make sure women and, in other sections of the bill, minorities are included as research subjects. The authorization for funding research into breast cancer, ovarian cancer and osteoporosis is substantially increased. A new Office of Scientific Integrity is established to address scientific misconduct and to protect whistleblowers who have serious questions about scientific misconduct or who cooperate with investigations. The bill requires support for research in the development of new and improved childhood vaccines. It requires support for research into biomedical research and experiments not requiring the use of animals. It establishes a juvenile arthritis research center and allows NIH to support chronic fatigue syndrome research centers.

The true controversy centers on the provisions of the bill lifting the ban on funding research involving fetal tissue imposed under the Reagan administration. Frankly, both sides in the dispute understand that there are ethical standards and safeguards established by the legislation if the ban is repealed, applicable to both federally funded research as well as privately financed research which is not currently subject to guidelines or restrictions. The moratorium has greatly diminished very promising research that could save and improve the lives of the many Americans that suffer from Huntington's disease, Parkinson's disease and other debilitating conditions and diseases. In no way can anyone seriously conclude that under these tight restrictions this type of research will entice any woman to seek an abortion. The results of the research, in fact, are very likely to both extend and improve the quality of life for millions of Americans.

I urge anyone considering voting against the conference report to read the guidelines and restrictions, and then tell me and the rest of the House how it is conceivable that one single additional abortion might be performed as a result of this legislation. To the extent that any is now occurring in the private sector, these restrictions will stop it. I urge a "yes" vote on the conference agreement.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON].

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, the importance of this bill goes beyond the authorization of a sum of money. It represents the recognition that the health of one-half the population is as vital as the health of the other half.

It is deeply demoralizing to imagine how many women's lives might have been saved had equality been a part of health research and health funding before now.

Would the present epidemic in breast cancer be the case today if we had invested in breast cancer research yesterday?

Would ovarian cancer, cervical cancer, and osteoporosis be pervasive, life-threatening diseases?

Even when breast cancer struck women who could not go unnoticed, a Vice President's wife, Happy Rockefeller, and First Lady Betty Ford in the 1970's, NIH did not get it. There is no better way to get it than to appropriate money to get it done, and the permanent establishment of the Office of Research on Women's Health is the only way to insure that it continues to be done.

The exclusion of people of color from clinical trials was less surprising in light of our history, but the inclusion of both minorities and women is necessary in a democracy that values equally the lives of all its citizens.

Madam Speaker, this entire bill is overdue. It deserves our support.

Mr. BLILEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WEBER].

Mr. WEBER. Madam Speaker, the President's proposal for the establishment of a fetal tissue research bank is a scientifically sound proposal that deserves better consideration than it has been given in the course of this debate. Unfortunately, it appears to me that ideology on this issue has decided the issue for many before they actually consider the facts.

I serve on the appropriating subcommittee for NIH. I have a commitment to NIH and I want to support valuable research of all types.

Less than 100 fetuses have been utilized for research in the last 30 years. It is important to keep the scope of this research well in mind. The NIH estimates today that a maximum of 200

fetuses per year could be effectively utilized for research, 200 per year. We are talking about a small number. So when opponents of the President's proposal suggest that only a fraction of the fetal cadavers resulting from spontaneous abortions and tubal pregnancies are useful, they are right, but that does not disprove the validity of the President's proposal.

There are 750,000 spontaneous abortions a year and 100,000 tubal pregnancies, and the administration estimates that 2,000 usable fetuses could result from these 850,000 spontaneous and tubal pregnancies, 2,000 total; that is 10 times the number estimated as the maximum number that could be effectively utilized in research today.

Madam Speaker, the President's proposal should be a consensus proposal for everybody who is interested in this research. There is no reason to overturn the ban by people who are supportive of fetal research.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GRADISON].

Mr. GRADISON. Madam Speaker, I have requested this time for the purpose of entering into a colloquy with the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, a member of the Appropriations Committee.

One of the arguments against this bill is that it will cost too much money and is above the President's budget request. Is it not true that the exact funding will in fact be decided by the Labor-HHS Appropriations Subcommittee, of which the gentleman from Michigan is a member?

Mr. PURSELL. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, that is absolutely correct. The budget-buster argument does not hold water here when it comes to this bill. As Members know, this is an authorization bill. Today we will be supporting the goals of that bill, but at a later date members of the Appropriations Committee will set the funding levels and it is at that time that we will be debating and arguing the levels of funding for each of these programs that will be set by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. GRADISON. It is my further understanding that once those figures are set, they must be within the cap set by the budget agreement in 1990; therefore, not a dime of additional spending could result, no matter what the level of this authorization might be.

Mr. PURSELL. Madam Speaker, that is right. There are a lot of authorization bills with a high authorization level that are not funded by the Appropriations Committee because of the caps and the restraints of fiscal responsibility.

Mr. BLILEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HOLLOWAY], a member of the committee.

Mr. HOLLOWAY. Madam Speaker, I want to speak to those who supported and voted for this bill when it was up before the House.

Basically, this bill has been totally changed. I respect the colloquy I just heard. If it was the gentleman from Michigan who was going to be doing the appropriating, I would not have a problem voting for this bill, because I know what he would vote and he would vote in a way that I would vote, and that would be not to spend taxpayers' money that we do not have; but I want to speak to the people who supported it and say that there is a lot more in this bill than meets your eye and a lot more in this bill than we voted for the last time. I want you to take another look at it.

To those who have joined in the cry of special interest and legislation with runaway deficit spending, I say take another look. This bill is more than it is cracked up to be. This bill is wholly different from the House bill agreed on last July.

The NIH conference agreement authorizes spending which could reach $3 billion above the House plan level.

How? It provides $1.6 billion for rebuilding the NIH clinic that was not in the original legislation. It allows $150 million that is now in the bill for construction authority.

Now, you did not vote for the additional $342 million to buy 300 acres of land. I wish I had 300 acres of land to sell at $342 million of the Government's money. That is special interest in itself.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I just want to put a few things out in perspective one more time.

As I said, since I have been here there has always been a reason not to vote for women's health. It is always that they are for it, but it is just in this one case they do not like this thing or that thing.

Let me point out today, this is the biggest breakthrough we have ever had. I certainly hope no one tries to duck behind any issues that they are using.

□ 1310

This is either for women's health or against it; these are not diseases of the week or month. These are very serious diseases that affect over half the population and contribute very significantly to the money that does the research. But the budget issue is equally important. This is not above the cap, it is below the budget cap. These things that are being talked about may have to go in for upgrading the laboratories. You are not moving them. You are not buying new ones. But you have got to keep them contemporary.

Finally, we are constantly told that every dollar invested in research saves the Federal Government many, many, many more dollars in further health care.

So it is the best investment we can make, job creating and everything else. I just cannot understand why anybody could be against this.

Mr. BLILEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON].

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

Madam Speaker, and colleagues, the issue we face here today is whether or not we have to support the enactment of a bad bill in order to support this Congress' commitment to fetal tissue research. I think the issue of fetal tissue research has been resolved in the broad majority of Members' minds here in the Congress. I, like many of my colleagues, have members of my family suffering from genetic diabetes, and I would like to find a research tool that can help solve that problem.

So I would like to vote for fetal tissue research, but do I want to vote for this bill in order to get it?

The first question everyone legitimately asks is, and it is quite unfortunately special-interest groups, is:

> Well, the Administration has raised this fetal tissue bank and, frankly, the question is do they really mean it and are they really serious about it?

Frankly, that is a fair question.

I asked that question, and I was not content for a very long time that they were serious. But in conversations with Dr. Bernadine Healy, the director of NIH, I have now been given the assurance that they are serious.

Madam Speaker, in a letter received this morning, she wrote:

> NIH is committed to establishing a bank and will name a team of scientists to closely monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the bank. After 1 year NIH will review the progress of the bank and report its results to the Secretary.

Listen to those words if there is any doubt, there is going to be the naming of a scientific panel to monitor and evaluate and advise in the creation and establishment of the tissue bank. The department will within 1 year report back to this Congress as to the availability of the fetal tissue through the processes they have suggested in the tissue bank.

The reality of that is that within 1 short year from the date of enactment they have to not only have it up and running but they have to have a sufficient history to prove that indeed the fetal tissue is available because if it is not, you and I well know this Congress at that point will then lift the ban.

This says we can achieve it in a way that is, hopefully, acceptable to the majority of Americans. I think it merits a trial.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

I would like to respond to the gentleman's last comment. I want to point out to the Members that what this administration has done is to try to defuse the absolute outrage that people feel when they are being told this research will not be conducted. The administration came out just a couple of days ago with the idea that it will have a tissue bank consisting of fetal tissue from spontaneous abortions and ectopic pregnancies.

Well, they could always have done that. It is just not sufficient for the research because that tissue is diseased in more cases than not.

But Secretary Bowen, the Secretary of HHS, under President Reagan, indicated he thought we ought to have this ban lifted. And he said that for those who are pro-life and pro-research, the research should go forward. The Reagan-appointed panel also recommended the research go forward. I think what the gentleman has just illustrated is another ruse, another excuse why this administration is going to try to keep us from lifting the ban. And that ban will be in place and research will be stopped and people will die, and it is wrong; it is absolutely wrong.

Mr. BLILEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA].

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this conference report, H.R. 2507, to reauthorize the National Institutes of Health. I would first associate myself with the remarks of so many of my colleagues, who have so eloquently discussed the countless people who will benefit from the research, medical, and scientific advances this legislation will foster. In that light, the funds we invest today are truly some of the wisest, compassionate, and cost-effective dollars we spend.

I must address my remarks today, however, to the issue that has become central to this debate: The administration's moratorium on fetal tissue transplant research, and the provisions within this conference report which overturn that ban.

I urge each of my colleagues to ignore the rhetoric and the Washington babble that surrounds this issue, and look instead to what medicine and science tell us: Simply, that this ban must be lifted. Now. Lifted to enable research, treatment, and knowledge on real world problems—diabetes, Alzheimer's, Parkinson's disease—to go forward. Lifted to allow medicine and science to advance. Faced with such a choice, I do not think we can afford to engage in politics as usual.

So much political babble has come to surround the issue of fetal tissue transplant. I am sure many of you have been besieged this week, as I have, by letters and callers who fear Congress is poised to legalize baby harvesting. That we are ready to sell spare parts for humans. Or that women will now casually undertake the most personal and painful experience of abortion, to supply some demand cycle. These blatant untruths would be laughable, were they not morally repugnant.

This bill does no such thing. What it does is allow research on cures for diseases plaguing millions of Americans to continue.

We do not arrive at this position easily, or without scientific documentation. And, it is clear that this reauthorization does protect the complex medical, personal, and ethical rights surrounding fetal tissue donation. The conferees have heeded the counsel of two separate panels of NIH medical and scientific experts—appointed, I might add, by President Ronald Reagan—which reported that fetal tissue transplant research should continue, within the guidelines contained in this bill.

Perhaps our good friend, the former Secretary of Health and Human Services under President Reagan, Dr. Otis Bowen, put it best. Calling for an end to this moratorium, Doc Bowen notes:

> In 1987, we needed answers about the science and ethics of this new research, and now we have them * * * vital scientific progress should not fall victim to politics.

That is the choice we have before us today. The incendiary rhetoric of the radical right, or the opportunity afforded us by science and medicine. I cannot imagine a more humane and ethical choice.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2507.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I support the conference report, I support the efforts of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN], to see to it that this conference report is adopted.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 2507, the National Institutes of Health Revitalization Amendments of 1992.

The National Institutes of Health [NIH] is the principal biomedical research agency of the Federal Government. Through the conduct, support, and promotion of biomedical research, NIH seeks to improve the health of the American people by: Increasing the understanding of processes underlying human health, disability, and disease; advancing knowledge concerning the health effects of interactions between humans and the environment; developing methods of preventing, detecting, diagnosing, and treating disease; and disseminating research results for critical review and ultimately for medical application. In the pursuit of this critical mission, NIH supports biomedical and behavioral research in this country and abroad, conducts research in its own laboratories and clinics, trains promising young researchers, and promotes the acquisition and distribution of medical knowledge. Such research activities will determine much of the quality of health care for the future and reinforce the quality of health care currently available.

Madam Speaker, the legislation before us, today, is a comprehensive bill addressing a wide variety of health research issues. Its primary purpose is to reauthorize: First, the National Cancer Institute; second, the National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute; third, the Medical Library Assistance Act; fourth, the National Center for Biotechnology Information; fifth, the National Research Service Awards Program.

Other provisions of the bill would: Provide new authorization of appropriations for the National Institute on Aging; increase funding for research on breast and ovarian cancer; nullify the moratorium on Federal funding for human fetal tissue transplantation research; protect federally funded health facilities from illegal activities; and increase the focus on women and minorities in clinical research.

Madam Speaker, during the past year, the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations conducted a number of hearings which raised questions about the adequacy of NIH mechanisms to guard against scientific misconduct. In response to those concerns this legislation contains provisions that would: First, establish an Office of Scientific Integrity to conduct investigations into allegations of scientific misconduct; second, mandate the establishment of standards to protect against financial conflicts of interest in clinical research; and third, create standards to protect whistleblowers who report cases of alleged misconduct. These measures are necessary to restore public confidence in NIH and its vital mission.

Madam Speaker, the research activities of NIH are critically important to our Nation's future health care. These activities represent the most productive investment funded by the Federal dollar. Biomedical research offers a ray of hope to those suffering in the darkness of disease. New discoveries in disease prevention greatly reduce the enormous burden of human suffering and economic loss inflicted by illness. These discoveries significantly improve the quality of life and health of the American people. Through biomedical research, we shape the effectiveness of the American health care system. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. BLILEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Madam Speaker, by Executive order last week President Bush established a fetal tissue bank which provides the opportunity to conduct medical research on tissues garnered from unborn children who die as a result of miscarriages or as a result of ectopic pregnancies. When fully operational, the bank will include approximately 20 centers strategically located throughout the country.

What the President has wisely done is to provide an ethical, rational, and effective means by which fetal tissue research can be conducted.

Dr. Bernadine Healy, Director of the National Institutes of Health, has stated unequivocally as a physician and a scientist that the President's fetal tissue bank—

Is feasible and should be given a chance to prove its efficacy in terms of furthering one of the many needed research options for treatment of diseases such as diabetes, Parkinson's and certain inherited disorders.

According to Dr. Louis Sullivan, Secretary of HHS: "The tissue that would be available from a bank of this sort can meet the current estimated research needs."

Dr. Sullivan wrote on May 19, that the total number of transplants over the last 30 years is around 60, while suitable tissue from ectopic pregnancies and spontaneous abortions is estimated at 2,000 per year.

Moreover, the Secretary pointed out, this is a conservative estimate based on a total of 750,000 spontaneous abortions and 100,000 ectopic pregnancies per year.

Thus, Madam Speaker, the medical efficacy of transplantation of fetal cells can and will be ethically explored—its potential to cure or mitigate disease either scientifically verified or debunked.

Significantly, two highly respected researchers, Drs. R.C. Cefalo and Watson A. Bowes, Jr., from the University of North Carolina School of Medicine have written that—

The creation of a human fetal tissue registry, fetal tissue bank and fetal cell lines using tissue obtained from spontaneous abortions and ectopic pregnancies * * * (have) great merit. There is evidence that a proportion (5–7%) of spontaneous miscarriages will provide tissue appropriate for use in tissue transplantation research.

Dr. Cefalo voted to lift the fetal tissue moratorium as a member of the NIH panel. He now endorses the administration's fetal tissue bank because it will be free from the controversy that currently surrounds the use of tissue from induced abortions.

According to Maria Michejda, M.D., of the International Center for Interdisciplinary Studies of Immunology at Georgetown University Medical Center,

* * * On the basis of our survey we believe that there may be a sufficient amount of healthy and viable fetal tissue available for transplantation. Clearly, an ability to make use of fetuses from spontaneous abortions would reduce the current reliance on fetuses from induced abortions. It would obviate many of the moral concerns associated with transplanting fetal tissue.

And according to six additional professors of obstetrics and gynecology from the University of Southern California School of Medicine—C. Paul Morrow, M.D., Kathryn Shaw, M.D., Laila Muderspach, M.D., Lynda Roman, M.D., T. Murphy Goodwan, M.D., and Richard Paul, M.D.:

In our institution we see more than 1,000 cases of spontaneous pregnancy loss occurring at greater than 9 weeks gestation. In addition, we see an average of 350 ectopic gestations per year. Based on the collective experience of numerous colleagues, in 5 to 10 percent of cases a recently dead fetus will be identified at the time of surgery. Most of these will be suitable for tissue harvesting since the incidence of anomalies or infection in this condition is low. Thus a total of 85 to 100 fetuses suitable for obtaining fetal cells can be expected from our institution alone each year.

Let me remind Members that the son of Rev. Guy Walden received his lifesaving transplant from fetal tissue obtained from an ectopic pregnancy—not from an induced abortion. Again this type of ethical transplantation is entirely permissible under the President's policy.

Dr. Frank Young, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Health, Science and the Environment has written that—

It is likely according to NIH that 500 to 800 ectopic pregnancies with embryos, that are chromosomally normal and uninfected would be available nationwide per year.

Drs. Michael R. Caudle and William M. Holls of the University of Tennessee Medical Center at Knoxville have also called on the administration to establish such a tissue bank—

We think that substantial scientific evidence exists that tissue obtained from spontaneous miscarriages would satisfy the needs of these studying fetal tissue transplantation.

The Bush approach embraces a deep and abiding reverence and respect for the lives of unborn children—children that the abortion lobby and some in the research community sadly regard as throwaways—while recognizing the desirability of going forward with ethical fetal tissue research.

The Bush approach is fair and it's humane. The conference report on the other hand, establishes an unethical policy that reduces an unborn child to the status of an object, a commodity, a mere body parts provider wanted only for his or her innate ability to involuntarily donate a brain or other organs.

If you want to get a clear picture of what your vote in favor of H.R. 2507 will fund, consider this verbatim description of some fetal tissue extractions reported in the June 1989 issue of Archives of Neurology.

Two methods to collect fetal material were used. With the first method, a plastic cannula, connected to a 60 ml syringe, was inserted into the uterus. Under ultrasound guidance, the opening of the cannula was directed to the fetal head. Suction was applied, and the fetus was slowly aspirated and fragmented into the cannula. Alternatively, a similar low-pressure vacuum aspiration technique (regulated by a vacuum pump), but without ultrasound guidance and using a metal cannula, was employed.

You may be shocked to learn that one member of the research team that conducted these hideous brain-sucking, brain stealing experiments included one of the NIH fetal tissue panelists Dr. Barry Hoffer of the University of Colorado, who was among those who voted to overturn the administration's moratorium on fetal tissue research from induced abortion.

It is outrageous that ultrasound—that marvelous diagnostic tool—is being used to search, in order to destroy the baby in a way that is most likely to yield usable baby brain tissue.

If you think this kind of cruel research is ethical, applying suction to the skulls of helpless infants—your vote is for the conference report.

But it seems to me that we wouldn't treat our pet dog or cat with the same cruelty, indifference, irreverence, and insensitivity afforded unborn children in this legislation.

If you believe that establishing a close collaborative relationship between abortion mills and researchers is prudent and ethical, your vote is for the conference report. But it seems to me that linking medical research with those who butcher babies for profit is not morally or ethically defensible.

Madam Speaker, the issue of giving one's consent to be carved up for science is another compelling issue that must be considered in this debate. Who gives it? The parents who abandon their child to the abortionist's knife and suction machine?

All organ donations are predicated on the premise of consent and in the case of a child, a responsible guardian acting in the interests of the child assumes this responsibility. The conference report fails miserably in this regard.

When a child's life is lost through miscarriage or ectopic pregnancy, surely a reasonable assumption can be made that the parents, acting as guardian and protector, didn't will the death of the infant and thus can exercise moral authority over disposition of the body. No such child-centered concern or humanitarian care, or love is apparent when the child is deliberately handed over to an abortionist.

Then there's the concern expressed by many of us including Dr. James Mason, head of the U.S. Public Health Service who has said that:

Permitting the human fetal research at issue will increase the incidence of abortion across the country. The additional rationalization of directly advancing the cause of human therapeutics cannot help but tilt some already vulnerable women toward a decision to have an abortion.

In response to the so-called safeguards—a fig leaf if ever there was one—Dr. Mason has said a distinction between the decision to abort and the decision to donate the body may be easy to theorize but such a neat separation is very doubtful.

Studies show that—ambivalence toward abortion is a well documented reaction of many women when confronted with a problem pregnancy—said two NIH panelists in 1988.

In their heavily footnoted report "Dissent to the Report of the Human Fetal Tissue Transplantation Research Panel of the National Institutes of Health," panel members James Bopp and James Burtchaell provide insight to why this bill will likely lead to more abortions. They wrote:

Ambivalence toward abortion is a well-documented reaction of many women when confronted with a problem pregnancy. A period of intense anxiety and ambivalence is often experienced during the first twenty-four hours preceding an abortion. This ambivalence is reflected in the fact that from one-fourth to approximately one-half of women aborting find the decision difficult to make. In addition, studies of pregnant women who chose to abort and others who chose to deliver their children, approximately one-third to 40 percent of the women, whatever their ultimate decision, were reported to have changed their decision at least once, with women who aborted being significantly more likely to report their decision as a relatively difficult one, to rethink their initial choice, and to regret having to have made that decision. Some women who have made an initial decision to abort will change their minds at the last minute, with approximately five percent changing their minds after making an appointment to have an abortion and approximately one percent changing their minds at the abortion clinic itself. Significantly, studies reveal that from 24 to 37 percent of women who abort do not make up their minds until just before the procedure.

Thus, the knowledge that the aborted baby's remains might be of use in medical research or transplantation could tip the scales in favor of abortion. No one is suggesting fetal transplantation is likely to constitute the sole reason for proceeding ahead with an abortion—but it is likely to provide an additional rationalization in certain circumstances.

Madam Speaker and Members, we should be under no illusions that the pro-abortionists desperately want the Bush pro-life moratorium lifted in order to undermine efforts in the States to protect unborn children from abortion.

This not-so-hidden abortion rights agenda was underscored in recent testimony before the House Judiciary Committee by Harvard Prof. Lawrence Tribe. In urging passage of the so-called Freedom of Choice Act, he stated that the interstate nature of medical technology may give Congress authority under the commerce clause to ensure that it will not be—hinder (ed), by a—patchwork of State and local restrictions.

Madam Speaker, Members are being encouraged to embrace the conference report in order to curb commercial traffic in fetal tissue.

What Members are not being told is that such trafficking in fetal tissue is already illegal with offensives punishable by 5 years in prison or a $50,000 fine as a result of enactment in 1988 of the Organ Transplant Act.

To the best of my knowledge no case has been made by Mr. WAXMAN or anyone else that the criminal provisions contained in the Organ Transplant Act are inadequate.

Finally, the ugly specter of authorizing federally funded experimentation on live unborn babies is contained in the Conference Report.

In the past, grisly experiments on infants were subsidized by NIH.

In one such NIH-supported experiment, researchers severed the heads of dying victims of second-trimester abortions and kept their brains alive to study brain metabolism.

Those who participated in these cruel experiments, it seems to me, should have been prosecuted rather than given Government grants.

But then again, the sick logic of the abortionists is at least consistent. If a child is deemed to have no rights whatsoever and Government no duty to protect that child, why not engage in live fetal experimentation if it might yield useful information. Of course such a view dehumanizes the child to the level of guinea pig.

The conference report strips the power and authority of the Secretary of HHS to withhold funding for experiments he finds ethically objectionable and vests that power instead in ethics boards packed with researchers and those with a vested interest.

The way the language of the pending legislation reads, an experiment must be approved if the ethics board can't muster a majority vote condemning the experiment as ethically objectionable.

Given their track record in the past, it is highly likely that these ethics boards will approve unethical experimentation on live unborn kids and you and I and the administration will be almost powerless to stop it.

□ 1320

Mr. BLILEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Madam Speaker, I rise to express my disappointment in this report. I basically support the right-to-life notion, and I have voted that way. However, when this issue came up in the Senate, I took a great deal of time to look at it and talked about it with people in my district. I concluded that I am in support of the idea of using fetal tissue, and I am prepared to do that.

So, Madam Speaker, I am disappointed, however, when it comes in at $3 billion over the President's request because I also believe in a balanced budget, and I lined up, as did many people in this House down here the other day, to sign up to balance the budget, and I think there is a great inconsistency between doing that and voting for a bill with an authorization that goes $3.1 billion over where we ought to be to balance the budget.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Madam Speaker, I yield this 1 minute to myself just to make a comment to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS]. I do not know if he was here to hear the comments that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GRADISON], the ranking Republican on the Committee on the Budget, made. He pointed out the fact that this bill does not break the budget, that it is an authorization bill and that the appropriation would be consistent with that budget resolution.

Madam Speaker, the question of the budget is another one of those ruses to try to pull people off this bill who might otherwise support it, who believe, as the gentleman has indicated he does, that fetal tissue transplantation research offers hope.

Madam Speaker, that hope will go away if this legislation goes away, and I think those who are arguing the budget are misleading people into thinking that this bill perhaps should be voted against for other reasons.

I wanted to share that with the gentleman from Wyoming and refer him to the comments of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GRADISON] in the RECORD.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] for yielding this time to me, and I want to commend him for his work.

Madam Speaker, there are a lot of people who have come to this floor on this debate today and previous to today. They have talked about this as an issue of choice, and they are right. The only difference is it is not the choice of abortion or non-abortion. The choice here is whether people will live and whether people will die, whether people who are sick will be cured, or whether people who are well will ever be prevented from becoming sick.

Madam Speaker, I say to my colleagues, when your mother, your father, your family, your parents, your grandparents are ill with a disease that might possibly be cured under the provisions of this bill, are we going to stand and argue that a few dollars stood in the way? Are we going to deny people the right to be able to seek and receive the best medical attention that can be provided to them as American citizens? Veterans who have spent many years protecting this country? Elderly citizens who have made this country what it is? Young people who have the future ahead of them who may be helped? Cured from their diseases by what happens in this bill?

Madam Speaker, that is the choice we are facing, and, if it was me, and I was alone on this floor, I would stand here to my death arguing that this bill is the right thing to do for the American people, and I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HENRY].

Mr. HENRY. Madam Speaker, I rise as a strong and consistent supporter of the right-to-life position. I believe personally that abortion on demand, as provided for and protected under the conditions of Roe *v.* Wade, is one of the great moral outrages of contemporary American law, and it is within that moral and legal framework, in addition to personal conviction, which I rise in support of the National Institutes of Health authorization conference committee report.

Madam Speaker, I believe the leadership of the right-to-life community has made a major political and ethical misjudgment in attacking this legislation because it would allow for the Federal Government to renew its past practice of providing funds for fetal research. Surely the entire area of biomedical research raises a host of morally troubling and complex questions. But to focus on this question of tissue research, choosing this particular concern amidst broader questions related to biomedical research and ethics, has trivialized the question. And I am afraid it may have the effect of weakening the overall right to life argument.

What about in vitro research in which many fertilized ova are discarded in favor of the one ovum which will live? What about DNA research and human genome research? Yes, there are major ethical issues of import associated with fetal tissue research—but they must be discussed and debated on a much higher plane and a more comprehensive framework than that which has been posed thus far in the current question before us.

While serious questions can and must be raised in regard to overviewing these forms of research, it is nonetheless important to note that the purpose and effect of such research is directed toward restoring the wholeness and fullness of life, not destroying it.

Madam Speaker, of all the people phoning my office and writing to me expressing their concerns about this, most of them have taken advantage, for themselves or for their children, of measles inoculation, polio vaccine, and most of them, I am sure, would take advantage of subsequent medical breakthroughs that this research promises.

Madam Speaker, as a right-to-life supporter, I urge cautious support for this legislation.

I would like to make one other point for my right-to-life friends. For the first time in 20 years, since *Roe* v. *Wade*, we are finally to the point where the court, we hope, we pray from my side of this question, will reopen this question and cause the American public to reexamine the entire issue of abortion on demand, which I find morally reprehensible. For right to life to attach itself to this issue as we approach this national debate is, I fear, destructive to the cause and the interests which I have sought to represent as a Member of Congress, and I would urge those who feel this way with me to have the courage to speak up in this afternoon's vote.

Mr. BLILEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, as my colleagues know, the backbone of this country is the American family, and we are now considering a bill which is riddled with provisions that go against the grain of our traditional American values.

We talk about balancing the Federal budget and getting our economy back on track. Yet it amazes me that some of my distinguished colleagues would even consider a bill that exceeds the President's budget request by $3.1 billion. That is ridiculous. They are talking about brand-new research facilities, expenditures not even included in the President's budget request. They are talking about a purchase price for a piece of property that no one has bothered to figure out what the cost is.

Madam Speaker, I just do not get it, and neither will the American taxpayers. We are once again threatening the legitimate research and health programs with a bill chock full of wasteful liberal spending. This Nation is nearly $4 trillion in debt, and here we go again, one bill after another jeopardizing the good will of American people who work.

I recognize that some of my colleagues have said it is not an appropriation it is an authorization. Come on. Madam Speaker, let us put aside this election year rhetoric. It has got to stop somewhere, and, if we do not stop it in the authorization, it will never stop in the appropriation.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on this report, send it back, and let us cut out the pork.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

Mrs. MINK. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the conference report on H.R. 2507, the National Institutes of Health reauthorization bill.

This bill, which authorizes our primary source of Federal health research, is absolutely vital to the future of American women.

For over a century, women have suffered from neglect by the medical establishment and the lack of Federal funds for research on women's health needs.

Documented by a 1990 General Accounting Office report, no one disputes the fact that women have been purposely left out of clinical trials, and that research on diseases which affect only women have been tragically insignificant.

We all know and recognize this, and for the first time we are about to authorize the largest increase in women's health research which will begin, and only begin, to correct the inequity that women have faced throughout history.

This bill will permanently establish in the law, the Office of Women's Health Research at the NIH, and it promotes increased participation of women and disadvantaged individuals in the field of biomedical and behavioral research. It also provides for $300 million for increased basic research on breast cancer, $40 million for osteoporosis and related diseases, and $20 million for contraception and infertility research centers.

Of primary concern to me is the authorization of $75 million for research on ovarian and other reproductive cancers, which is in line with a bill I introduced at the beginning of this Congress, H.R. 179, the Ovarian Cancer Research Act.

Ovarian cancer is perhaps one of the most glaring examples of the neglect and disregard of women's health needs. As ovarian cancer continues to threaten over 21,000 women each year, there is still no early detection test to diagnose this disease in its early stages. The result is that two-thirds of the women with this terrible disease will die.

Yesterday, it was with shock and utter dismay that I read a letter from the Director of the NIH recommending a veto of this legislation, not primarily on the issue of fetal tissue research, but citing that the women's health provisions are unnecessary.

They call this micromanagement. Well, for a system of research that has discriminated against women for over 100 years, I think some intervention by this Congress is necessary.

I don't want to discredit the tremendous gains that the NIH has made over the last 2 years in establishing an Office of Women's Health Research and directing more funding toward breast cancer, ovarian cancer, osteoporosis, and contraceptive and infertility research. But unless we continue to be vigilant, unless the women of this country have a voice in the kind of research that is being conducted by the Federal Government, the gains that we have made in the last several years could be lost.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to recognize the importance of the legislation before us today, and what it means for the women of our Nation. Vote "aye" on the NIH reauthorization conference report.

□ 1330

Mr. BLILEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

Mr. VOLKMER. Madam Speaker, there is much in most of this bill that

I and others in this House support. However, because of the provisions for fetal tissue research from the voluntary termination of pregnancies, I must ask Members to reject this conference report.

There have been statements on this floor today that you cannot use fetal tissue from ectopic pregnancies because the tissue is no longer usable. However, just back in April, last month, you had testimony before one of the subcommittees of this House that tissue from ectopic pregnancies was used and used successfully, and that it can be used.

Dr. Bernadine Healy, Director of the National Institutes of Health, has stated unequivocably as a physician and a scientist that the President's fetal tissue bank is feasible and should be given a chance to prove its efficacy.

Madam Speaker, we have only had about 60 fetal tissue transplants in this country in all this time. We can have from involuntary abortions, from miscarriages, and ectopic pregnancies, at least 2,000 fetal tissue transplants a year for research. That is sufficient. We do not have to use voluntary abortion fetal tissue.

Mr. BLILEY. Madam Speaker, how much time is remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. UNSOELD). The gentleman from Virgina [Mr. BLILEY] has 7 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. BLILEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN of California. I would say to the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] that I am going as slow as I can here, vamping for you. Maybe the gentleman will give me a minute to kill some of his time, pardon the expression, until some of his speakers get over here. I would rather have gone a little closer to the end of the debate.

Madam Speaker, I spent some time at the platform hearings for my party with a lady who ran abortion clinics all the way through north Texas. Without any pride she says that she was the overseer of over 35,000 deaths in the abortion clinics.

I would vote against this bill on economic reasons alone. The point has been made in this well over and over and over again that it is a budget buster.

There are exceptions to everything, and there are some exceptions to what I am about to say, and that is that most abortionists, who do nothing else, deal in raw evil and killing at a level every bit worthy of the name holocaust in this slaughter of 1,600,000 American children, because they are all Americans, in their mother's womb.

I did see a red-headed lady doctor traveling the Dakotas like a doctor of old with a surry with a fringe on top, saying that she was doing it because it was her feminist cause. I am willing to accept that she had other motives.

But most doctors in the abortion industry, who are not obgyn, who do nothing else, they skim dollars exactly like Bugsy Segal in Las Vegas at the Flamingo. They come in with a wham, bam, thank you, young lady, where is your cash. They do not even look at the faces of one of their victims, and they kill the other victim.

They cheat the IRS. They are like prostitutes in the street, with even less dignity, and they kill by the tens of thousands.

Carol Everett of Texas described it to me, when a girl is dying in an abortion clinic, and this happened at killer Tiller's operation in Wichita, they send them down the street to die in a motel so they can tell other young girls, "No one has ever died in our clinic."

If people think these doctors are not going to harvest little fetuses for tissue and rake off more money, they are sadly mistaken.

Mr. BLILEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

Mr. DREIER of California. Madam Speaker, who cannot be in support of attempts to try and deal with the various health crises that we face in this country and throughout the world. Obviously, we all want to find cures for all of these ailments, and I applaud the work of NIH and the important advances achieved in biomedical research. But, Madam Speaker, we have a very serious malady when it comes to our budget.

Madam Speaker, I voted against H.R. 2507 when it was $400 million over budget and sent to conference with the Senate. Now it comes back $3.1 billion over budget. That is the reason I am going to vote against this conference report.

Madam Speaker, if we continue down the road that we have for the past several decades, we are not going to see any prospect for balancing our budget at all. So it seems to me that the responsible thing to do is to oppose this conference report, send it back to conference, and let them bring back something that is within the budget, so that we can effectively turn the corner on this fiscal malady which we face.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. NEAL].

Mr. NEAL of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I wish to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN].

Madam Speaker, I heard an earlier claim that this was $3 billion, I believe was the figure, over what the House passed. I looked into it a little bit. Now I understand that that is not the case, because those that are saying that this is $3 billion over what the House passed are claiming some very high amount for refurbishing facilities at the National Institutes of Health, amounts that are not in our bill.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEAL of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, the gentleman is correct. The authorization for most of NIH is such sums as may be necessary, to be filled in by the Committee on Appropriations. This authorization spells out numbers for the Cancer Institute and for the Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute. But when these numbers are thrown out as being $3 billion over the President's budget, they are just making wild statements to try to discredit the bill.

Mr. NEAL of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, so the amount in this bill is somewhat more than the amount that left the House before the conference committee, but that amount is for prostate cancer research, breast cancer research, and so on. Is that not correct?

Mr. WAXMAN. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. BLILEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. RAMSTAD].

Mr. RAMSTAD. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the conference report, the NIH reauthorization bill. I do this with a heavy heart. I certainly do not want to vote against more funding for cancer research, for breast cancer research, for AIDS research, research on Parkinson's disease, Alzheimer's disease, or any of the other meritorious and necessary research projects. But I rise in opposition to this conference report because it is, if you look at the numbers, $3.1 billion over the President's budget.

Madam Speaker, given the unprecedented $400 billion deficit facing this country, this is no time to promise the American people more than we can afford. This is a classic example of what is wrong with the authorization process and why the American people are angry at Congress. We are promising more than we know we can deliver.

Madam Speaker, this is a flawed process, and somebody has to blow the whistle on it. Nobody wants to vote against these meritorious and necessary research projects. But when we have a $400 billion deficit, I do not believe it is responsible to vote for a bill that authorizes spending up to $3.1 billion over budget.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the conference report on H.R. 2507, the NIH reauthorization bill.

While listening to this debate, I have been very disappointed to see that the issue of fetal tissue research has clouded over the most objectionable aspect of this bill: deficit spending.

This conference report authorizes $3.1 billion in funding over the level requested by the President. Given the unprecedented $400 billion budget deficit facing America, this is no

time to promise the American people more than we can afford.

Unfortunately, that's exactly what Congress has done year after year, sowing the seeds for economic disaster by spending over $3 trillion it does not have. As a result, we are paying nearly $300 billion on interest on the debt alone, destroying American jobs and competitiveness.

Last week, we took a small step toward this goal when we passed the conference report for H.R. 4990 to rescind $8 billion in Government spending.

But we must do more. Congress has been playing a shell game with the American people, and it's the average American taxpayer who stands to lose the most. It's time to blow the whistle on runaway deficit spending and this phony authorization process.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this conference report and for deficit reduction.

□ 1340

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN].

Mr. WYDEN. Madam Speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN], who has been very sincere and very blunt about his views over many years, has suggested in his remarks that somehow the abortion clinics would be in cahoots with the medical researchers if this legislation were to go into effect, and that somehow this legislation would encourage abortions.

I just want to emphasize to my colleagues the protections in this bill that would prevent that from happening. Under this legislation, tissue could not be sold. Under this legislation, it would not be possible to specify the donee. Under this legislation, one cannot change the timing and method of procedures. And I would say to my colleagues that all of this is backed up with criminal penalties. All of these provisions are backed up with criminal penalties. That is to make sure there would not be inappropriate abuses, or the kind of abusive relationship between researchers and abortion clinics, that seems to have been discussed and would not be permissible under this legislation.

I hope my colleagues will look specifically at the protections, the very sincere and strong restrictions that bar the abuse of fetal tissue.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS].

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Madam Speaker, we have heard a great deal about the provisions in this bill that would lift the current ban on the use of Federal funds for fetal tissue transplantation research. Due to the great promise this type of research holds for the sufferers of Alzheimer's disease, Parkinson's disease, or diabetes, I support those provisions in the bill overturning the current moratorium.

However, there are several other important provisions in the conference report that are worthy of my colleagues' support. This bill authorizes an additional $400 million in fiscal year 1993 for research on breast, ovarian, and other cancers of a woman's reproductive system; $72 million is authorized for research on prostate cancer.

The conference agreement will also require that women and minorities be included as subjects in NIH-funded research projects, except in those cases where it would be inappropriate to the purpose of the research or place the participants at risk. Congress should not dictate to NIH researchers how to do this work but Congress should ensure that federally funded research take into consideration the health needs of women in this country.

The conference agreement also contains important provisions in support of contraception and infertility research. The lack of research in this area has led to the development of one truly new contraceptive method—Norplant—in the last three decades. Further, while 3 million unplanned pregnancies occur each year to American women, many others find themselves unable to conceive children.

One in every six couples in the United States is infertile, or fails to conceive within a year of deciding to have a child. This conference report provides funds to establish five applied research centers—three for research into new and improved methods of contraception and two devoted to new treatments of infertility.

This conference agreement will also increase funding for research on osteoporosis, Paget's disease, and other related bone disorders.

Madam Speaker, this bill is about research that will help save the lives of millions of Americans, and it deserves the support of all my colleagues.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I want to take this opportunity to thank the people on our staff that have done such yeoman work on this legislation: Ruth Katz, Tim Westmoreland, Rip Forbes, for the subcommittee; for the full committee, David Keeny; for the Legislative Counsel's Office, Peter Goodloe.

Finally, I want to say to my colleagues: I have had Members tell me that they recognize this research is promising and that they agree with the Reagan-appointed blue ribbon panel that it will not increase abortion. But then they say they cannot face the opponents of abortion if they vote with us.

First, I want Members to recognize that there are many people who are opposed to abortion who do support this legislation, ranging from former Secretary of HHS Dr. Bowen to many distinguished Members of this and the other body.

Second and more important, if Members vote "yes" today, they may have to face some extreme antiabortion groups for the next few weeks. But if they vote "no," if they vote against this legislation, they will have to face people with Parkinson's, parents of diabetic children, and families with genetic diseases, and they will have to say, "I knew what you needed and I didn't do it." And a Member will have to say that for the rest of his or her life and the rest of the lives of these individuals with devastating diseases.

There are few opportunities in this body to be clear about politics and substance, about right and wrong. This is one.

Support research, support hope. Vote "yes."

Mr. BLILEY. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Madam Speaker, we have heard so much misinformation today, and I do not say it is deliberate misinformation, but it is just wrong.

On the efficacy, on the workability of the fetal tissue bank, we have letters not only from the head of the National Institutes of Health, but we have letters from the following universities and professors and doctors: Stanford University, the University of Southern California Medical School, UCLA Medical School, University of North Carolina Chapel Hill, University of Tennessee, Georgetown University, University of Cincinnati, Case Western.

All of these people certify this is workable, this is doable, and we do not need induced abortions to conduct the research.

Why can we not understand that? Why do we negate all of these responsible professionals who will not lose their jobs if they failed to support the bank, as the gentleman from Colorado charged?

These are professional teachers and experts in the medical profession who say this is workable and feasible.

Do my colleagues want to know another name? I direct this to my good friend from California: C. Everett Koop, M.D., supports this, the former Surgeon General, whom the gentleman learned to admire and respect and he thinks the fetal tissue bank is workable. So why not give it a chance?

Now, private research goes on. We are only talking about federally funded research. And before I lose my time, let me share with my colleagues a letter from American Humane, protecting animals since 1877, a worthy cause, the animal rights people. And they support this bill, oh, do they support this bill, because it says, "It would forward important research, including promoting the development and validation of alternatives to the use of animals."

In other words, we will save the guinea pigs and the hamsters. Let us use human tissue. Let us use little babies instead of animals.

The problem with this bill is, it will create a market for fetal tissue. It ad-

vances abortion by providing a rationalization to an indecisive and vulnerable woman who is pregnant to go ahead and have the abortion because at least the dead baby's tissue will be put to good use.

There is a fundamental difference between being an organ donor who knowingly and voluntarily donates an organ, and having ones organs coercively "donated," taken from the baby without him or her ever having a voice in the matter. This is what happens when fetal tissue from induced abortion is used.

This bill is one more step toward desensitizing our culture toward the preborn so that they are reduced to being things, commodities, means, not an end in themselves.

First of all, private research will continue. Second, there are 700,000 spontaneous abortions, 100,000 ectopic pregnancies from which fetal material from about 2,000 of these fetuses can be extracted, frozen and then used in research. This will provide ample fetal material for testing.

Please vote no. This bill is dehumanizing and unnecessary.

□ 1350

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, before yielding for the closing arguments on our side, I want to thank several private citizens who deserve special recognition for their unique contributions on behalf of scientific freedom: Guy Walden of Florida, Joan Samuelson of California, Anne Udall of Arizona, and Judy Culpepper of Florida.

Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON], a member of our committee who has taken a leadership role in advancing research at the National Institutes of Health and ending this moratorium on the most promising research using fetal tissue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. UNSOELD). The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the NIH conference report. A vote for this bill is a vote for important research and treatment for so many diseases affecting literally millions of Americans.

As a Republican, it is never easy for me to oppose this administration, but the rhetoric and the inaccuracies that have been thrown around here about this bill, particularly about the fetal tissue transplantation research, greatly disturbs me. I would like to take this opportunity to knock down some of those straw dummies.

First, there is the assertion that fetal tissue research will cause more abortions. I will remind the Members that it was a Reagan panel led by a pro-life judge that voted 18 to 3 that this research would not lead to more abortions. Every safeguard they recommended and then some were included in this bill. What really surprised me was that my amendment, which prohibits the sale of such tissue in the private sector, where there are no restrictions today, was actively opposed by this administration. Why? It improved the bill. Why not put these safeguards where there are none now?

The second assertion many Members are hiding behind is that the tissue bank established by the administration will be enough to continue this vital research. Wrong again. As the former Secretary of HHS, Dr. Otis Bowen, who was there at the time the ban was put into place recently, said, "Politics should have no place in the world of scientific research." He said that in a statement urging Congress and the administration to overturn the ban, saying that the political compromise put forth by the administration will produce no scientific results.

There are those who are in the forefront of fetal tissue research, who know that this type of tissue that would be used at the so-called fetal tissue bank is of little or no value in advancing their efforts to find cures and treatments for some of the most devastating diseases known to date.

The third argument against the bill that I have heard a lot is that the bill simply costs too much, especially when compared to President Bush's budget. I am sorry that the President's budget did not include enough money for breast cancer, which strikes one in nine American women. Want to talk about politics in an election year? Try going home to your constituents and telling them that you thought that we were spending too much to find a cure for breast cancer, when 44,000 women died last year from this insidious, terrible disease. Good luck.

The bottom line—and everyone in this Chamber knows this full well—is that the funding issue will be decided at the Appropriations Committee in the Labor/HHS bill—not here. I know many of us spend time with folks that have terminal diseases. Rare is it that one finds a single family that hasn't been struck with cancer. We all have known a spouse, a staffer, a parent, a neighbor, a child—a colleague—with some terrible, tragic, disease that has snuffed out their life long before their time. And when you sit by that bedside—holding their hand, somehow showing your strength, praying for a miracle, looking for that sparkle in their eye, their acknowledgement that hope is alive. That's what this bill does. This bill is promise and hope.

How can you possibly go back to your district and face your neighbor who has perhaps Lou Gehrig's disease or Parkinson's, your brother with diabetes, your wife/mother with breast cancer, or Alzheimer's, and tell them you voted against their hope? How is it that this body can pass billions for a space station bringing vision to our planet and then deny hope and vision for millions of its own people? This bill is life and I ask that you let your head and your heart dictate your vote, not politics.

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report on H.R. 2507, the bill that will reauthorize funding for the National Institutes of Health [NIH]. H.R. 2507 will enable our Nation's top scientists and researchers to continue the basic, essential research that will lead to the new knowledge necessary to help prevent, detect, diagnose and treat disease and disability.

The controversy in H.R. 2507 surrounds its fetal tissue transplantation research provisions. In 1988, the Reagan administration banned funding of research performed on transplanted fetal tissue obtained through induced abortions. This ban went into effect—supposedly temporarily—pending recommendations of an NIH advisory committee. Needless to say, 4 years later, we find ourselves still stifled by the Reagan ban, in spite of the fact that this very same Reagan-appointed advisory committee determined that this research is acceptable, so long as ethical guidelines are developed. We find ourselves still stifled by the Reagan ban even though Dr. Otis Bowen, who was Reagan's Secretary of Health and Human Services and who originally ordered the ban back in 1988, has now come out of retirement to say that the ban should have been lifted years ago.

H.R. 2507 is controversial because it now lifts the ban on fetal tissue transplantation research. Opponents of this research will argue that it increases the number of abortions in this country. Yet, it has been documented that countries in which fetal tissue transplantation research is supported experience no abortion increase. Opponents will also maintain that this research will create a demand for fetal tissue. But the ethical provisions in H.R. 2507 ensure that a woman's decision to have an abortion remains separate and distinct from the decision to donate the resulting tissue to research.

Opponents ignore the fact that fetal tissue transplantation research holds tremendous promise for a number of incurable diseases and conditions, including Parkinson's disease, diabetes, Alzheimer's disease and epilepsy, as well as for the prevention of birth defects. Doctors have found that, if fetal tissue is transplanted into a diseased or disabled part of a patient's body—such as the brain of a Parkinson's disease victim—the fetal tissue cells may begin to function as units of the patient's disabled organ, causing the patient's health to improve. Unlike adult cells, transplanted fetal cells are not rejected by the patient's body. There are people whose lives are unalterably changed by the impact of fetal tissue research—adults and children, both born and unborn, whose lives are extended due to fetal tissue transplants.

The controversy surrounding fetal tissue transplantation research generates a lot of attention. But what we need to focus on is the essence and substance of the work that is done at NIH—the work that this bill authorizes. For example, NIH research encompasses juvenile diabetes, as well as heart disease and

arthritis in our children, and results in immunizations against the infectious diseases that threaten them. It has resulted in decreases in both heart disease and stroke mortality in Americans of all ages.

Recognizing that, in the course of a lifetime, one in every three Americans is expected to contract some form of cancer, H.R. 2507 includes a provision enabling all States to set up cancer registries—for all cancers—operating under uniform standards.

One out of every nine women in this country will develop breast cancer; this year alone, 46,000 women will die from this terrible disease. H.R. 2507 establishes the first congressional program targeted specifically at breast cancer prevention and cure. It increases research on the causes and prevention of breast cancer, ovarian cancer and other cancers of the female reproductive system. It also requires that women be included in clinical research studies, where appropriate.

H.R. 2507 contains an amendment that increases research and prevention programs in prostate cancer, a disease that is diagnosed in 132,000 American men every year. Prostate cancer kills 34,000 American men annually—second only to lung cancer.

H.R. 2507 is supported by the Alzheimer's Association, the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, the Huntington's Disease Society of America, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American Cancer Society, the American Diabetes Association, the American Heart Association, the American Medical Association, the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation International, the March of Dimes, and more.

Madam Speaker, I commend Chairman WAXMAN and his subcommittee for their efforts in bringing this bill to the floor and for reminding us of the challenge that remains—the challenge for us to better prevent and treat cancer, diabetes, heart disease, kidney disease, stroke, Alzheimer's disease, AIDS, blindness and arthritis, and to better understand both the aging process and the lifestyle practices that affect our health. NIH research is one of the best tools we have in meeting this challenge.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the reauthorization of our National Institutes of Health. A vote for H.R. 2507 is an investment in the health of America's citizens.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of lifting the ban on federally funded fetal tissue research. Yet, my colleagues and I once again find ourselves embroiled in the abortion debate. And once again, this debate has managed to focus attention away from the real reason we are here today—to do our part to encourage research that will save the lives of people who are suffering from deadly and debilitating diseases.

Fetal tissue from induced abortions is important in research for cures to diseases, such as diabetes, Parkinson's and Alzheimer's. Some have suggested that this research can continue using fetal tissue obtained from miscarriages or ectopic pregnancies. However, this tissue is often unhealthy, and therefore useless for research purposes. With the current ban on tissue from induced abortions, necessary research has come to a virtual standstill and progress has slowed. Madam Speaker, I don't think we can afford to ignore research that has proven to promise cures for so many diseases.

Opponents argue that lifting the ban on fetal tissue research will encourage women to have an abortion. I don't believe lifting this ban will promote abortion. I believe fetal tissue research can and is being done in an ethical manner. The bill before us today explicitly states a number of safeguards which separate what I believe to be a woman's personal decision to have an abortion from the use of fetal tissue in promising research. Under this bill, a woman cannot sell fetal tissue, it must be donated for research. This bill also makes it a Federal crime to solicit or accept donations of fetal tissue intended for a specific individual. In addition, a woman must acknowledge, in writing, that her consent to have an abortion was obtained before her consent to donate the fetal tissue.

Madam Speaker, the debate here should be focused on how lifting the ban on fetal tissue transplantation research will help save the lives of so many people now, and in the future. Although we are not, and cannot, be dependent solely on fetal tissue research to find a cure, we cannot throw away the opportunity this research has proven to provide. In my judgment, we need to encourage, not discourage, research that is providing opportunities for cures for deadly and debilitating diseases.

Mr. SERRANO. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the conference report for the National Institutes of Health Revitalization Act, H.R. 2507.

The National Institutes of Health [NIH] is one of our Nation's most vital institutions. For over 100 years NIH has been at the forefront of the scientific community's efforts to understand and find cures and treatments for diseases that have afflicted millions of people here in the United States and around the world.

But as we are all so painfully aware, the demands upon the resources of NIH have never been greater. The expanding AIDS epidemic and the continuing crises of heart disease and cancer strike thousands of people in this country every single day. The crippling effects of Alzheimer's and Parkinson's disease, multiple sclerosis and cystic fibrosis, are becoming ever more visible and heart rending.

Madam Speaker, we need to fully support the extensive efforts of NIH to eradicate these and many other threats to our Nation's health. The return on the investment in research and preventive medicine is tremendous, saving our Nation billions of dollars in eventual health care costs and the losses that accompany worker disability.

Madam Speaker, we must move forward in our efforts to overcome the devastating diseases that afflict Americans and people around the world. The work of the National Institutes of Health deserves and needs our unwavering support.

Mr. PACKARD. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2507. I do so with reluctance, as the bill authorizes funds for cancer, AIDS and other important research and programs.

However, I cannot countenance the use of Federal funds for research on the remains of elective abortions. H.R. 2507 would lift the current moratorium which prohibits the use of Federal funds for research using human fetal tissue from induced abortions. The moratorium does not apply to research funded by the private sector.

As we all know, the President has created a nonprofit fetal tissue bank to provide tissue from ectopic pregnancies and spontaneous abortions that produce usable tissue. This bank provides approximately 10 times what our present research needs are. I believe that this is a moral solution to this problem.

In addition, the total cost of this bill exceeds the President's budget by $3.1 billion. For all of these reasons, I cannot support this bill, and urge my colleagues to oppose its passage.

Mr. COX of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2507, which would lift the current ban on fetal tissue research. Many of my colleagues, who are opposed to lifting the ban, contend that this is one of the most important pro-life votes of the year. I agree. The use of transplanted fetal tissue has proven to be beneficial to the treatment and research of several catastrophic diseases, such as Parkinson's disease, diabetes and cancer. A "yes" vote will give the victims of these and other illnesses a glimmer of hope. A "no" vote will send a message that, although we have the technology to relieve pain and perhaps save lives, we do not care to do so.

Madam Speaker, the administration would have you believe that we can accomplish the same goal by using only those fetuses that were spontaneously miscarried. This is untrue. Miscarriages are not only far less prevalent, but the tissue is often damaged or genetically abnormal to the point of uselessness. The President's alternative is simply not enough.

Antichoice activists are trying to make people believe that this is an abortion issue. It is not. It is a question of what should be done with fetuses that are safely and legally aborted—dispose of them, or use them to advance medical research.

Understandably, there are concerns that lifting the ban will create a free market with people buying and selling fetuses for profit. This bill embodies several ethical safeguards to assure that these fears will not become reality. Consent for the abortion must be obtained prior to and separate from the decision to donate the fetal tissue. The sale of fetal tissue is prohibited. The legislation makes it a Federal crime to sell or solicit human tissue punishable by fines and imprisonment.

The ethical concerns having been addressed, the decision should be uncomplicated. We can vote to work toward treatment and cures for debilitating diseases from which thousands of Americans suffer, or we can continue to deny our medical technology and ignore this crisis altogether. One can maintain a pro-life position and pro-choice position and vote "yes" on H.R. 2507. Let us lift the ban on fetal tissue research today.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to voice my support for H.R. 2507, the National Institutes of Health reauthorization bill which includes a number of provisions for women's health and ends the moratorium on fetal tissue research. Dr. Bernadine Healy, Director of NIH, recently recommended that

President Bush veto the bill because she feels the women's health provisions are unnecessary and because she personally disagrees with fetal tissue research. I strongly disagree with Dr. Healy's recommendations. Both provisions are extremely important and are far from unnecessary. In fact, women's health concerns have been ignored and overlooked for far too long.

A few of the women's health provisions in this bill that the administration believes are unnecessary: a permanent authorization of the office for Research on Women's Health; a requirement that women be included in clinical trials where appropriate; and increased funding and emphasis for research on important women's health concerns such as breast and ovarian cancer. The bill also establishes five contraceptive and infertility research centers. These requests are for basic, fundamental research on health concerns for women.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill and let the women of America know that you understand and support their concerns and well-being.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report to H.R. 2507, the National Institutes of Health reauthorization bill.

Of primary importance to me, Madam Speaker, is the significant increase in both attention to and funding for women's health problems. For too long, medical problems unique to women have been either ignored, or funding levels were kept so low as to stifle serious research. This legislation, however, includes many of the important provisions of the Women's Health Equity Act and once and for all sets women on the path to equality with men in terms of medical research.

Last year, Madam Speaker, I sponsored National Breast Cancer Awareness Month, which was signed into law by the President, and I am pleased to see the message is finally sinking in that breast cancer must be stopped; 46,000 American women, and even 300 men, will die from breast cancer in 1992. H.R. 2507 authorizes an additional $325 million for breast cancer research and will hopefully go a long way to assuring the demise of this tragic disease. In addition, this legislation significantly expands funding for ovarian cancer and obgyn research.

Also of importance to women is the permanent authorization of the Office of Women's Health Research at NIH, the establishment of several centers for the study of infertility and contraception, as well as provisions to assure that women and minorities are equally represented in all research funded by NIH.

This is not to say that women are the only beneficiaries of this legislation. All Americans will benefit by the important research funded by this bill into the causes of cancer, diabetes, osteoporosis, heart disease, AIDS, and a host of other tragic diseases which will probably affect every American's life at one time or another. Furthermore, H.R. 2507 will fund important education initiatives to teach Americans preventive medical techniques.

With regard to fetal tissue research, I find it extremely disheartening that the administration and antiabortion advocates have once again chosen to make this vote a litmus test on abortion. Overturning the ban on fetal tissue research will not in any way increase the number of abortions performed in the United States. But it will give new hope to those Americans who suffer from diabetes, Parkinson's disease, and other diseases which could be cured by research using fetal tissue. Overturning this politically motivated ban on fetal tissue is the true pro-life position, Madam Speaker, and I ask my colleagues to support the conference report to H.R. 2507.

Mr. WEISS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the conference report to H.R. 2507, the National Institutes of Health Revitalization Amendments of 1992.

This measure authorizes $5.4 billion in fiscal year 1993 and such sums as may be necessary in fiscal year 1994 through fiscal year 1996 for the National Institutes of Health [NIH] and NIH-related activities. The conference report provides authorization for the National Cancer Institute, the Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, and the National Institute on Aging, and continues and makes improvements in the other institutes of the NIH.

Of utmost importance is the measure's provision lifting the administration's onerous ban on the use of Federal funds for fetal tissue transplant research. Fetal tissue transplantation is the vanguard of biomedical research. It has shown great promise in treating a number of incurable diseases by substituting healthy cells from an aborted fetus into an individual with genetic, metabolic, or neurological conditions. If the transplant is successful, these cells may take on the function of the organ into which they are transplanted. This research provides a ray of hope for the millions of Americans and their families who suffer from the most debilitating diseases known to science, including Parkinson's, Alzheimer's, epilepsy, hemophilia, diabetes, cystic fibrosis, and spina bifida. Tragically, a majority of these diseases afflict the most vulnerable in our society, our children and our seniors.

Despite its immeasurable value, fetal tissue transplantation research has been held hostage by the Bush administration's unbelievable claim that it promotes abortions. This preposterous position has been rejected even by the Reagan administration official who first recommended a moratorium on fetal research, former Secretary of Health and Human Services, Dr. Otis R. Bowen. According to Dr. Bowen, the ban was issued in 1988 as a temporary measure until a Reagan-appointed panel answered a series of medical and ethical questions about the transplants. Well, the panel reported in December 1988 that the experiments should go ahead, that they would not encourage abortions. But the Bush administration has ignored the recommendations. Just this week, Dr. Bowen urged a long overdue reversal of the ban on publicly funded research in this area.

Now, contrary to the recommendations of scientists and the medical community, President Bush threatens to veto this conference report because of its fetal tissue research provisions. In a spiteful attempt to deceive the public and offer an excuse for an unjustifiable veto, President Bush recently announced the establishment of a tissue bank for federally funded research. But the tissue bank would use only tissue from miscarriages and ectopic pregnancies. This tissue usually contains chromosomal damage or infections and, therefore, is rarely suitable for successful fetal tissue research. True freedom of research can be achieved only through a direct lifting of the ban. True freedom of research can be achieved only by approving this conference report by a veto-proof margin.

The conference agreement also contains ground breaking provisions relating to women's health, including the statutory establishment of an Office of Research on Women's Health in NIH—which will identify and resolve the gaps in women's health, standards for the inclusion of women in clinical trials in NIH research, and an osteoporosis research program. The conference report also contains new initiatives and increased authorization for breast cancer research, prostate cancer research, and research into reproductive cancers.

I also want to express my strong support for the provisions of this conference report that address problems with bias and fraud in biomedical research. These provisions are based in part on legislation I introduced last year, H.R. 1819, the NIH grants research integrity amendments. NIH deserves our greatest praise for the quality of research it conducts and supports. Nevertheless, the Human Resources and Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, which I am privileged to chair, has investigated cases where NIH-funded researchers were biased in their reporting of medical treatment. Any fraudulent reporting relating to the effectiveness and safety of treatments risks harm to millions of people. That is why I am very pleased that the conference report mirrors my bill's provisions regarding whistleblower protection, conflicts of interest, and scientific integrity, which are aimed at ensuring that federally funded research is not tainted by scientific misconduct or bias.

Madam Speaker, to have life-saving programs and funds threatened by antichoice politicking is unconscionable. We must lift the ban on fetal tissue transplant research and we must authorize the vital NIH initiatives contained in this conference report. I urge my colleagues to approve this conference report by a veto-proof margin.

Mr. STUDDS. Madam Speaker, consideration of the conference report on the National Institutes of Health revitalization amendments is especially timely. Just last week, the Governor of Massachusetts announced that breast cancer is an epidemic in our State.

Between 1982 and 1988, the incidence of breast cancer in Massachusetts increased 26 percent. This year, 1,200 Massachusetts women will die from this disease.

I recently wrote the conferees on this bill to urge them to authorize additional funding for breast cancer and other serious illness striking. I am heartened that the conference report increases the authorization for breast cancer research by $325 million, for ovarian and other reproductive cancers by $25 million, and osteoporosis research by $40 million.

If fully funded, these additional money will help bolster and sustain the tremendous advances we are witnessing on many fronts in treating and possibly preventing breast cancer. For example, the nationwide clinical testing of the anti-estrogen drug tamoxifen holds promise for preventing breast cancer in women at

high risk of the disease. Similarly, the experimental drug taxol, derived from the Pacific yew tree, has shown promise in combating breast and ovarian cancer.

This legislation contains numerous other provisions which will increase our understanding of women's health conditions. In particular, it would rectify past practices to ensure that women are included in appropriate Federal clinical trials.

Madam Speaker, we cannot sit back and watch helplessly as an epidemic claims the lives of millions of American women. The conference report on this bill makes breast cancer research a top priority and I urge its adoption.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2507, the conference report for the NIH reauthorization bill.

This vote is critical to women's health—it includes a number of provisions which will go a long way toward filling the enormous gaps in research on women's health. Many provisions of the Women's Health Equity Act are part of the bill, including the requirement that women and minorities are represented in clinical trails, when appropriate. This provision is vitally important to the understanding of diseases as they affect women, and the effectiveness and safety of drug treatments on women. For example, because so few women have been enrolled in AIDS clinical trails, many questions remain unanswered about the progression, manifestations, and treatment of the disease in women.

Funding for breast and ovarian cancer, osteoporosis, and other women's diseases is increased. Funding for women's diseases has long lagged behind, and this bill includes clinical increases for this research. The legislation also requires the establishment of three contraceptive and two infertility research centers, and requires the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development to establish a clinical research program in obstetrics and gynecology.

The Office of Research on Women's Health is permanently authorized in the bill. Its purpose is to identify the research priorities for women's health and to ensure that women are adequately represented in clinical trials. The Office also is to work to increase the numbers of women who are senior scientists and physicians at NIH and NIH-funded institutions.

I am pleased that the conference report also includes the provisions of H.R. 4206, legislation introduced by Congressman SANDERS to establish a national cancer registry; I am an original cosponsor of the bill. If we are to wage an effective campaign against cancer, it is critical that we establish a national system of statewide cancer registries. Many of our States lack statewide cancer registries, and the States with registries are often incomplete and lacking in the resources necessary to adequately track the incidence, stage, and treatment of cancer. A complete and uniform system would allow health professionals to effectively target and evaluate cancer prevention and control efforts.

The legislation also authorizes a study of the high increase of breast cancer in the Northern and Mid-Atlantic States. Indeed, Maryland ranks ninth in the country for breast cancer mortality; it ranks No. 1 in cancer deaths. If we are to reverse the higher incidence in certain States, we must understand the factors behind this phenomenon.

Women's health concerns have lagged behind for generations, and it is vitally important that the needs of millions of women across the country are addressed now—the health of these women cannot wait.

The bill also overturns the ban on the use of Federal funds for fetal tissue transplant research. Fetal tissue research has already led to a number of medical advances and is very promising in fighting diseases ranging from Alzheimer's and Parkinson's disease to juvenile diabetes and leukemia.

The legislation includes important safeguards to ensure that any future research is conducted in an ethical manner. For example, fetal tissue could not be sold nor could donations be targeted to any particular individual. As a result of these protections, ethical concerns have been addressed. A fetal tissue bank, as proposed by the administration, is simply not adequate. Countless researchers and other experts have expressed their view that ectopic pregnancies and spontaneous abortions will not produce enough transplantable tissue to meet the needs of researchers.

Indeed, former HHS Secretary Otis Bowen has stated that:

> A bank of tissue from miscarriages and ectopic pregnancies is medically unworkable and will be unable to provide tissue free from infections and genetic defects. Such tissue has always been unaffected by the ban, but the problems of quality and availability are so insurmountable that research has come to a halt. This political compromise will produce no scientific results.

Madam Speaker, the NIH conference report is critical to the health of millions of Americans. I urge my colleagues to vote yes on H.R. 2507 and thereby pave the way for vital scientific progress.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam Speaker, I support the National Institutes of Health [NIH] conference report which makes women's health issues a top priority.

Last year, I joined my colleagues from the congressional caucus for women's issues on the House floor to make the case for greater Federal funding for research on breast cancer and ovarian cancer—two giant killers of women—and osteoporosis, a damaging disease leading to frailty and sometimes permanent disability for women.

We demonstrated that NIH fails to adequately include women in clinical research trials, and that contraceptive research is woefully behind many European countries. We pointed out that NIH only spends 13 percent of its budget on women's health.

Today, we have a historic opportunity to rectify the imbalance, and I am proud to support the NIH conference report which permanently establishes the Office for Research on Women's Health, mandates the inclusion of women in clinical trials, permanently establishes contraceptive and infertility research centers, authorizes an additional $225 million for basic research on breast cancer, an additional $100 million for clinical research on breast cancer and further prevention efforts, $75 million for research on ovarian and other reproductive cancers, and $40 million for research on osteoporosis.

The bill also authorizes an additional $72 million for research on prostate cancer, and $20 million for prostate cancer screening programs and other preventive measures. It further assists the Centers for Disease Control in establishing State cancer registries to record data on the incidence, stage, and treatments of all cancers. This information is vital to our national efforts to cure cancer.

I thank my colleagues in the House and Senate for recognizing the importance and urgency of adequately funding these necessary programs.

Mr. KOPETSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2507.

Madam Speaker, the primary issue holding up passage of this important reauthorization bill is the use of fetal tissue in research. This particular bill is different, however, in that many pro-life members are supporting it. They are doing so for a number of reasons.

First, fetal tissue research holds great promise for significant medical breakthroughs.

Second, the fetal tissue bank proposed by the White House, using tissue from miscarriages and ectopic pregnancies, will be of little or no use to researchers.

Third, the use of fetal tissue will not lead to increased abortions. This is the overwhelming conclusion not of a pro-choice group, but of a panel appointed by the Reagan administration in 1988 to consider the science and ethics of fetal tissue research. H.R. 2507 mandates that consent for the use of fetal tissue can only be obtained or requested after the woman has decided to have an abortion. Additionally, H.R. 2507 prohibits compensation for the donation of tissue to both public and private research facilities. Currently, women who have had an abortion can be paid for tissue donated to private facilities.

Madam Speaker, the National Institutes of Health is our Nation's medical research department. It needs to be reauthorized, and it needs to have its blinders taken off.

Finally, I would like to thank the gentleman from California and the gentleman from North Carolina for clarifying that the bill's provisions regarding the protection of health facilities do not apply to whistleblowers who may photocopy records or take photographs in efforts to call attention to possible violations of State or Federal statutes or regulations.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Madam Speaker, I believe I have no recourse other than to cast my vote against this conference report because I am unalterably opposed to lifting the ban on fetal tissue transplantation.

I cannot support this legislation because it contains language to suspend the 4-year ban on federally supported research on the use of living fetal tissue acquired from induced abortions.

My position on the use of Federal funds for abortions is a matter of record and my position has not changed and will not change. I have stated that if such language was included I would be forced to vote against this authorizing legislation.

By lifting this ban I feel we are encouraging women who might not otherwise do so to seek abortions. I cannot and will not be a party to sanctioning such a move.

Also contained in this bill are several noteworthy provisions which would increase funding for women's health research including breast cancer, ovarian cancer, and

osteoporosis as well as making the Office for Research on Women's Health a permanent entity. I strongly support these initiatives.

I applaud the research which is being conducted at the National Institutes of Health to find a cure for diseases such as Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, and diabetes. I have no objection to the use of fetal tissue as proposed by President Bush.

Should this conference report be sent back to the House without this particular provision, I would then support it.

Mr. SCHEUER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2507, the National Institutes of Health Revitalization Act. The conference report authorizes $400 million for research on breast, ovarian, and prostate cancers, as well as $30 million for State cancer registries. The President's budget provides absolutely no money for research on these types of cancers.

There are several Members of this Congress who have been stricken and have survived the trauma of breast cancer. I admire and respect these Members for sharing their experiences with us in hopes that people will realize that breast cancer has become a virtual epidemic in the United States.

In my district on Long Island the breast cancer rate is extremely high, and I recently conducted a field hearing to address the possible correlation between environmental pollution and the instances of breast cancer. The money authorized under the conference report can assist in discovering the possible link between the environment and breast cancer rates.

Breast cancer threatens the lives of millions of American women, and it is only through extensive funding for research that we will be able to gain the knowledge and technology necessary to save the lives of millions of women through methods of early detection.

H.R. 2507 also requires that women and minorities be included in clinical research studies. History has repeatedly shown that women have been treated as second-class citizens in business, education, and social relations. Health care has proven to be no exception. Studies of the treatment of heart disease have revealed that women are treated less aggressively and there is very little data available on the effectiveness of heart disease treatment on women.

The National Commission on AIDS recently identified women as the fastest growing group in the HIV epidemic, yet a number of barriers currently prevent access for high-risk women to preventive and treatment services. Under H.R. 2507, researchers will no longer assume that women are just like men, and will begin to examine the differences in the treatment of disease that ultimately will expand the knowledge and extend the lives of the women of this country.

The controversy—the veto bait—of this reauthorization bill is the lifting of the ban on fetal tissue research. It is through fetal tissue research that we will be able to find cures to the debilitating ailments of Parkinson's disease, Alzheimer's disease, diabetes, and spinal cord injuries.

These diseases do not discriminate by sex or race. While some may be more susceptible to one or the other, these diseases can strike anyone at any time. The administration says it wants to maintain a partial ban on fetal tissue research and only permit the use of miscarried fetuses. But the President must realize that a miscarriage results in damaged fetal tissue—and damaged tissue cannot be used in research.

The fetal tissue research dilemma all boils down to the issue of abortion—this is yet another gag rule that the President wants to impose on the field of medicine. If we were to poll the citizens of this country, we would find that they support life and they support choice; ultimately they would support the use of fetal tissue in order to save millions of lives from the ravages of Parkinson's, Alzheimer's, diabetes, and injuries to the spine.

It is a travesty to the democratic process that a small group of individuals is able to hinder progress that will benefit the majority. It is time to return to majority rule and lift the senseless ban on the use of fetal tissue.

There is no question that H.R. 2507 raises the dark curtain that has concealed women's health concerns for much too long. It places them in the light, to be examined and treated as concerns of the entire Nation.

As the Earth summit approaches, I have to wonder how the United States expects to hold itself up as a model for other nations to follow when we continually take steps backward to the time when a woman was not able to make decisions about her own welfare. H.R. 2507 is a life-saving bill, it advocates good health, well-being, and progress. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of life and support the National Institutes of Health conference report.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support today of the conference agreement for H.R. 2507, the National Institutes of Health reauthorization bill. I would like to commend the gentleman from California for his leadership in bringing this bill to the floor. This bill is significant in that it funds the NIH which is the Federal agency which has primary responsibility for much of the biomedical research that is supported in this country. Activities supported by NIH are vital to improving the health of the people of this Nation, as well as health of others across the world. These programs deserve the support of Congress and will require our continued investment over the years.

The conference agreement we have before us today endorses and enhances the role NIH historically has played in helping our Nation become the world's leader in biomedical and behavioral research. Specifically, H.R. 2507 authorizes $2.2 billion in fiscal year 1993 for the National Cancer Institute, and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1994 through 1996. It extends the authorization for AIDS research programs at NIH, and lifts the current ban on the use of Federal funds for fetal tissue transplant research from induced abortions.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, some of the most exciting initiatives contained in the bill address the issue of minority participation in medical research. Similar to the House bill, the conference agreement requires that women and minorities be included as subjects in NIH-funded research projects, except in special circumstances. For instance, under the agreement, women and minorities could be excluded from studies if first, it would be inappropriate to the purpose of the research; second, it could put participants at risk; or third, it is determined to be inappropriate under the circumstances specified by the Director of NIH.

Other provisions of the bill provide for the establishment of a scholarship and loan repayment program to address the continued underrepresentation of individuals from disadvantaged backgrounds pursuing professional careers in the life sciences and in midlevel and senior scientific and administrative positions at NIH and the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration. These programs, modeled after legislation I introduced last spring, H.R. 2000, would allow NIH and ADAMHA to enhance their ability to recruit and retain scientists and administrators while increasing their representation of individuals from disadvantaged backgrounds within their professional work force.

As the House noted in its report, this type of loan repayment program for clinical researchers from disadvantaged backgrounds will help to address their disincentives that large educational loan debts place on postdoctoral graduates considering Federal health science as a career. Specifically, the bill gives NIH and ADAMHA authority to provide scholarships of up to $10,000 per year to individuals from disadvantaged backgrounds who are undergraduates at accredited institutions of higher education and who wish to train for careers in professions needed by those agencies.

Another key provision in the bill authorizes the construction of biomedical research facilities at some of our Nation's institutions of emerging excellence. This program was included as part of the reauthorization in recognition of the emerging and significant contributions that many of our Nation's minority health professions schools are making to study diseases and disorders that disproportionately affect African-Americans and other minorities in this Nation. The Senate committee, which established the provisions developing this authority for biomedical facility construction at minority schools, recognized that those institutions which are participating in the Research Centers at Minority Institutions Program [RCMI] through NIH have been developing their research infrastructure by further enhancing their research capacities, improving their research lab equipment, and taking on the challenging task of studying the difficult questions of why minorities suffer disproportionately high rates of cancer, stroke, diabetes, AIDS, and other prevalent disorders. RCMI has helped these schools begin to address these national problems.

Currently, there is a proposal by the Department of Health and Human Services in the fiscal year 1993 budget for $12 million for facilities development at historically black colleges and universities and similar institutions. This is the second year that this program has been proposed by the Department. Last year, the Labor—Health and Human Sciences—Education Appropriations Subcommittee was unable to provide the funding because a distinct authority did not exist. Once H.R. 2507 is passed and signed by the President, our Health Appropriations Subcommittee should be able to consider providing the funding for this program in fiscal year 1993.

Mr. Speaker, biomedical research stands on the threshold of significant discoveries that have the potential to put within our reach the cures and preventative treatments for many diseases including AIDS, diabetes, cancer, heart disease, stroke, and much more. The bill we have before us today will permit us to pursue the many advances that will reduce sickness and suffering for persons throughout the United States and across the globe. For this reason, I ask my colleagues to join me in passing this measure.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE, NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH,

Bethesda, MD, May 20, 1992.

Hon. LOUIS W. SULLIVAN,

Secretary of Health and Human Services, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY SULLIVAN: I know the House will soon be considering the Conference Report on H.R. 2507. I would concur with the recommendation to the President to veto the bill. I have several concerns. For example, the highly intrusive language of the bill micromanages some of NIH's important research programs. I believe that the section on woman's health is unnecessary. NIH has moved ahead of the bill with aggressive programs on the health of woman and minorities and their career development, and on inclusion of women and minorities in clinical trials. The bill also imposes activities and a number of advisory committees, including an Ethics Board, on NIH that are costly, unnecessary and duplicative, and in some cases intrude on the existing authorities of the Secretary.

With regard to the fatal tissue transplantation moratorium, my own personal views are well known. However, in terms of the fatal tissue bank, I can state unequivocally as a physician and scientist that this approach is feasible and should be given a chance to prove its efficacy in terms of furthering one of the many needed research options for treatment of diseases such as diabetes, Parkinsons and certain inherited disorders.

I believe that such a bank with an established and NIH funded tissue procurement effort will provide a means to continue the transplantation research effort. In particular, harvesting tissue from ectopic pregnancies, which are life threatening to women, should be vigorously pursued. Such tissue is apt to be uninfected and more likely to be genetically normal. Furthermore, with existing echocardiographic diagnostic technology, ectopic pregnancies are being detected earlier resulting in the opportunity for surgical removal of viable and intact fetal tissue in some of these cases. Indeed, in the case of the widely reported success story of fetal tissue transplantation into a young child from Texas for a devastating disease called Hurlars syndrome, the source of the successful transplant was an ectopic pregnancy.

NIH is committed to establishing the bank and determining its efficacy within one year of its initiation. Using this tissue we hope also to accelerate research to establish human fetal cell lines in laboratory cultures where they can be properly characterized, assured of being pathogen free, and in some cases genetically engineered to be of more therapeutic value.

NIH exists to find the best ways to enhance the health and quality of life of the American people. A simple extension of appropriation authorization would be the most affective way to continue our work.

Sincerely yours,

BERNADINE HEALY, M.D.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 260, nays 148, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 147]

YEAS—260

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Anderson
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Annunzio
Applegate
Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Bacchus
Beilenson
Bentley
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Blackwell
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown
Bryant
Bustamante
Byron
Cardin
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Chapman
Clay
Clement
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Collins (IL)
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Cox (IL)
Coyne
Cramer
Darden
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Dicks
Dingell
Dooley
Dorgan (ND)
Downey
Durbin
Dwyer
Early
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English
Erdreich
Espy
Evans
Fascell
Fawell
Feighan
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Frost
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Gradison
Green
Guarini
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harris
Hayes (IL)
Hefner
Henry
Hertel
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Horn
Horton
Houghton
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Jacobs
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnston
Jones (GA)
Jones (NC)
Jontz
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klug
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kostmayer
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Leach
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Levin (MI)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey (NY)
Machtley
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDermott
McHugh
McMillen (MD)
McNulty
Meyers
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Miller (WA)
Mineta
Moakley
Molinari
Montgomery
Moody
Moran
Morella
Morrison
Mrazek
Murtha
Nagle
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nowak
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Olver
Owens (NY)
Owens (UT)
Pallone
Panetta
Pastor
Patterson
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pease
Perkins
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Porter
Price
Pursell
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Richardson
Ridge
Riggs
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Savage
Sawyer
Scheuer
Schumer
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solarz
Spratt
Staggers
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tanner
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Vento
Visclosky
Washington
Waters
Waxman
Weiss
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolpe
Wyden
Yates
Zimmer

NAYS—148

Allard
Allen
Archer
Armey
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett
Barton
Bateman
Bennett
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehner
Broomfield
Bunning
Burton
Callahan
Camp
Clinger
Coble
Combest
Costello
Coughlin
Cox (CA)
Crane
Cunningham
Davis
de la Garza
DeLay
Dickinson
Doolittle
Dornan (CA)
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
Ewing
Fields
Fish
Gallegly
Gaydos
Gekas
Gingrich
Goodling
Goss
Grandy
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hammerschmidt
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hayes (LA)
Hefley
Herger
Holloway
Hopkins
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Inhofe
Ireland
James
Johnson (TX)
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kolter
Kyl
LaFalce
Lightfoot
Lowery (CA)
Luken
Marlenee
Martin
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McEwen
McGrath
McMillan (NC)
Miller (OH)
Mollohan
Moorhead
Murphy
Myers
Nichols
Nussle
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Parker
Paxon
Penny
Petri
Poshard
Quillen
Rahall
Ramstad
Ray
Regula
Rhodes
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Roe
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Santorum
Sarpalius
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schulze
Sensenbrenner
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Solomon
Spence
Stallings
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sundquist
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (WY)
Thornton
Vander Jagt
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weber
Weldon
Wolf
Wylie
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff

NOT VOTING—26

Alexander
Anthony
Barnard
Boxer
Bruce
Campbell (CA)
Campbell (CO)
Collins (MI)
Dannemeyer
Dixon
Donnelly
Dymally
Fazio
Hatcher
Lagomarsino
Lent
Levine (CA)
Livingston
Manton
Michel
Mink
Oakar
Packard
Pelosi
Schroeder
Traxler

□ 1416

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mrs. COLLINS of Michigan for, with Mr. LAGOMARSINO against.

Mrs. BOXER for, with Mr. PACKARD against.

Mr. LEVINE of California for, with Mr. LIVINGSTON against.

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, on the last vote I was at a location where the bells were not audible.

Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on the conference report on the NIH reauthorization bill.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Madam Speaker, I was in the same meeting where the bells did not ring.

Had I been here, I would have voted "aye" on the conference report on the NIH bill.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. MINK. Madam Speaker, on the vote just taken on the NIH conference report, I was unavoidably detained at a meeting and unable to cast my vote.

Had I been here, I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Speaker, I missed the last vote on the National Institutes of Health reauthorization because I was in a room here in the Capitol in which no bells functioned. So I want to go on record as saying that if I had been here, I would have voted "aye" on the authorization, and I wish to be recorded as such in the RECORD immediately following the vote.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent on official business during rollcall votes Nos. 145 and 146. Had I been present on the House floor I would have cast my vote as follows:

Rollcall No. 145: "Yea" on House Resolution 471, Mr. GEPHARDT's resolution authorizing the Sergeant at Arms to provide certain records to the Special Counsel relative to the operation of the House bank.

Rollcall No. 146: "Yea" on House Resolution 466, the rule providing for consideration of the National Institutes of Health reauthorization conference report.

AUTHORIZING FUNDS FOR INVESTIGATIONS AND STUDIES BY STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 379) providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for the expenses of investigations and studies by standing and select committees of the House in the 2d session of the 102d Congress, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 379

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House in accordance with this primary expense resolution not more than the amount specified in section 2 for investigations and studies by each committee named in such section, including expenses—

(1) in the case of a committee named in section 3, for procurement of consultant services under section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946; and

(2) in the case of a committee named in section 4, for provision of assistance for members of professional staff in obtaining specialized training under section 202(j) of such Act.

SEC. 2. The committees and amounts referred to in the first section are: Select Committee on Aging, $1,650,197; Committee on Agriculture, $2,370,834; Committee on Armed Services, $2,833,694; Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, $4,683,453; Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, $1,081,160; Committee on the District of Columbia, $397,626; Committee on Education and Labor, $4,527,765; Committee on Energy and Commerce, $6,992,081; Committee on Foreign Affairs, $4,299,933; Committee on Government Operations, $4,051,337; Committee on House Administration, $2,079,350; Select Committee on Hunger, $719,392; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, $130,000; Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, $2,294,516; Committee on the Judiciary, $2,846,343; Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, $2,548,069; Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, $802,426; Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, $2,111,864; Committee on Public Works and Transportation, $3,526,439; Committee on Rules, $722,479; Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, $3,081,602; Committee on Small Business, $1,117,000; Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, $400,000; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, $882,576; and Committee on Ways and Means, $5,280,493.

SEC. 3. (a) Of the amounts provided for in section 2, each committee named in subsection (b) may use not more than the amount specified in such subsection for consultant services under paragraph (1) of the first section.

(b) The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, $50,000; Committee on Armed Services, $40,000; Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, $10,000; Committee on the District of Columbia, $12,000; Committee on Education and Labor, $100,000; Committee on Energy and Commerce, $25,000; Committee on Government Operations, $35,000; Committee on House Administration, $225,000; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, $5,000; Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, $500; Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, $175,000; Committee on Public Works and Transportation, $50,000; Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, $55,000; Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, $250,000; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, $37,500; and Committee on Ways and Means, $10,000.

SEC. 4. (a) Of the amounts provided for in section 2, each committee named in subsection (b) may use not more than the amount specified in such subsection for specialized training under paragraph (2) of the first section.

(b) The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, $9,000; Committee on Armed Services, $8,000; Committee on the District of Columbia, $1,000; Committee on Education and Labor, $10,000; Committee on Government Operations, $2,000; Committee on House Administration, $20,000; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, $10,000; Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, $500; Committee on the Judiciary, $5,000; Committee on Public Works and Transportation, $30,000; Committee on Rules, $4,500; Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, $18,000; Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, $5,000; and Committee on Veterans' Affairs, $2,500.

SEC. 5. Payments under this resolution shall be made on vouchers authorized by the committee involved, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 6. Amounts shall be available under this resolution for investigations and studies carried out during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 1992, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 1993.

SEC. 7. Amounts made available under this resolution shall be expended in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. GAYDOS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute: Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

H. RES. 379

(1) in the case of a committee named in section 3, for procurement of consultant services under section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946; and

(2) in the case of a committee named in section 4, for provision of assistance for members of professional staff in obtaining specialized training under section 202(j) of such Act.

SEC. 2. The committees and amounts referred to in the first section are: Select Committee on Aging, $1,542,240; Committee on Agriculture, $2,359,544; Committee on Armed Services, $2,627,451; Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, $4,518,362; Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, $764,593; Committee on the District of

Columbia, $356,400; Committee on Education and Labor, $4,326,063; Committee on Energy and Commerce, $6,608,119; Committee on Foreign Affairs, $4,502,070; Committee on Government Operations, $3,420,756; Committee on House Administration, $2,067,644; Select Committee on Hunger, $654,274; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, $130,000; Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, $2,284,516; Committee on the Judiciary, $2,575,819; Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, $2,426,550; Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, $729,502; Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, $2,015,876; Committee on Public Works and Transportation, $3,125,480; Committee on Rules, $722,479; Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, $3,031,973; Committee on Small Business, $1,103,530; Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, $400,000; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, $830,287; and Committee on Ways and Means, $5,100,260.

SEC. 3. (a) Of the amounts provided for in section 2, each committee named in subsection (b) may use not more than the amount specified in such subsection for consultant services under paragraph (1) of the first section.

(b) The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, $50,000; Committee on Armed Services, $40,000; Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, $10,000; Committee on the District of Columbia, $12,000; Committee on Education and Labor, $100,000; Committee on Energy and Commerce, $25,000; Committee on Government Operations, $35,000; Committee on House Administration, $225,000; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, $5,000; Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, $500; Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, $175,000; Committee on Public Works and Transportation, $50,000; Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, $55,000; Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, $25,000; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, $37,500; and Committee on Ways and Means, $10,000.

SEC. 4. (a) Of the amounts provided for in section 2, each committee named in subsection (b) may use not more than the amount specified in such subsection for specialized training under paragraph (2) of the first section.

(b) The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, $9,000; Committee on Armed Services, $8,000; Committee on the District of Columbia, $1,000; Committee on Education and Labor, $10,000; Committee on Government Operations, $2,000; Committee on House Administration, $20,000; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, $10,000; Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, $500; Committee on the Judiciary, $5,000; Committee on Public Works and Transportation, $30,000; Committee on Rules, $4,500; Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, $18,000; Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, $5,000; and Committee on Veterans' Affairs, $2,500.

SEC. 5. The Committee on House Administration—

(1) shall, through House Information Systems, develop, operate, maintain, and improve computer and information services for the House, including direct computer and information systems support for Members, committees, administrative offices, and other governmental entities, and shall conduct necessary investigations and studies of such services;

(2) is authorized to receive reimbursement for services under paragraph (1) and to expend amounts so reimbursed in accordance with policies of the committee; and

(3) is authorized to provide for professional development programs, office and personnel management consultation services, and periodic publication of handbooks, guides, bulletins, and other items necessary for the House.

SEC. 6. Payments under this resolution shall be made on vouchers authorized by the committee involved, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 7. Amounts shall be available under this resolution for investigations and studies carried out during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 1992, and ending immediately before noon January 3, 1993.

SEC. 8. Amounts made available under this resolution shall be expended in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 9. The Committee on House Administration shall have authority to make adjustments in amounts for investigations and studies under section 2, if necessary to comply with an order of the President issued under section 254 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 or to conform to any reduction in appropriations for the purpose of such section 2.

Mr. GAYDOS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GAYDOS TO THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GAYDOS to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute: Page 2, strike out line 11 and all that follows through page 3, line 9, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 2. The Committees and amounts referred to in the first section are: Select Committee on Aging, $1,542,240; Committee on Agriculture, $2,257,937; Committee on Armed Services, $2,464,082; Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, $4,336,240; Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, $764,593; Committee on the District of Columbia, $342,035; Committee on Education and Labor, $4,110,649; Committee on Energy and Commerce, $6,287,459; Committee on Foreign Affairs, $3,840,825; Committee on Government Operations, $3,282,875; Committee on House Administration, $1,941,450; Select Committee on Hunger, $654,274; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, $130,000; Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, $2,192,434; Committee on the Judiciary, $2,430,018; Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, $2,322,057; Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, $729,502; Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, $1,910,783; Committee on Public Works and Transportation, $2,893,963; Committee on Rules, $722,479; Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, $2,901,410; Committee on Small Business, $1,055,000; Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, $400,000; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, $739,451; and Committee on Ways and Means, $4,780,000.

Mr. GAYDOS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAYDOS] is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 1420

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GILLMOR], the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Accounts, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume, with the understanding that any additional time which I may yield will be subject to the specific limitation, for debate purposes only.

Before explaining this amendment, I wish to indicate how we arrived at the present situation.

The funding resolution is the product of a very exacting and detailed commnittee budget review process which begins after the adoption of the previous year's resolution. Specifically, during the year subcommittee staff monitors and reviews committee expenditures on a monthly basis. This task is an important oversight function that is often overlooked.

The resolution before the House, today, began to take shape in a systematic way in November and December of last year. At that time, subcommittee staff met with each of the committees' top staff persons to review expenditures for 1991 and budget plans for 1992. These meetings for the most part facilitated the submission of rational, timely, and thorough budgets from the committees for 1992.

In early February, the committees submitted detailed budgets to the Subcommittee on Accounts for consideration and review. At this time, I wish to thank all of the chairmen, the chairwoman, and the ranking minority members from the respective committees, and their staffs. Their cooperation enabled us to evaluate all the budgetary requests in a thorough and timely manner.

Upon receipt of these budgets, the staff provided the subcommittee members with a very detailed analysis of each budget submission in preparation for hearings on each budget proposal. These hearings were conducted during the last week of February and the first week of March. At the hearings, testimony was heard from each chairman and ranking minority member which

was subject to questioning by the subcommittee members.

At the conclusion of the hearing process, the subcommittee conducted a markup session on March 11 at which it reported the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute which is pending before the House today. This bipartisan committee amendment was reported from full committee on March 19. The committee amendment was reported from both the subcommittee and full committee by unanimous voice vote and it reflected a 4.9-percent overall increase.

The overall increase of 4.9 percent was justified on grounds that the amount was within the appropriation and that it provided for the 4.2-percent Federal pay comparability increase [COLA] and the inflation factor of 3.3 percent [CPI]. Furthermore, it was justified when measured against the approved administrative and personnel budgets of several executive branch agencies. For example, a review of executive branch department budget authority for the 1992 fiscal year indicated that several entities received large increases over 1991 fiscal year budget authority in their administrative and personnel accounts.

Thus, by March 19, the subcommittee and the committee had discharged its obligations regarding the funding of committees in a very timely, professional, and thorough manner. It delivered a bipartisan agreement to the House for consideration.

Concerning the rationale for amending the committee amendment, it is based on a sense of what the majority of Members desire. These are difficult financial times for the country. We are in a recession and the availability of Government funds is very limited. Accordingly, adoption of this amendment would set an example and restrain the growth of committee funding this year by freezing the 1992 authorization at the 1991 level.

Accordingly, my amendment to the committee amendment reduces the funding level for each committee from the level provided in the committee amendment with the exception of the three committees seeking no additional funds for 1992—Committee on Rules, Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. The amendment accomplishes this reduction by providing a substitute amount for each of the 22 committees seeking increases. This substitute amount is equal to each committees' 1991 authorized amount. The amounts provided to the other three committees are identical to the amounts contained in the committee amendment.

As a result of this reduction, the amendment would establish a total authorization of $55,031,756 for investigations and studies by all standing and select committees of the House of Representatives with the exception of the committees on appropriations and the budget for 1992. The total authorization for 1991, excluding funding for HIS, was $55,050,356. Therefore, the total amount contained in the pending amendment represents a decrease of .03 percent from this total 1991 authorization. Furthermore, the amendment, in effect, cuts the sum of all the amounts requested by the committees in their original expense resolutions for 1992 by $6,398,873.

It should be noted that the Federal pay comparability adjustment [COLA] for most Federal workers is 4.2 percent. This amendment provides no additional funds to any committee for the COLA. The amendment, also, does not provide any additional funds to compensate for the 3.3-percent projected rate of inflation for 1992. The bottom line is that the level of funding in our pending authorization will require tough fiscal discipline and perhaps, we shall set an example for other governmental entities.

On the subject of pay equity, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Accounts, I have encouraged the committee chairmen and the ranking minority members to review their compensation practices on a continuing basis to assure that there is no prohibited discrimination. This encouragement was made during the hearings and in the preliminary meetings between the staff of the accounts subcommittee and their staff directors of the respective committees. During the past 8 years, improvements have been made. More and more women are occupying key policymaking positions at the subcommittee and full committee levels. For example, women hold the position of staff director on the Committee on Education and Labor, the Committee on Agriculture, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families, and the position of General Counsel on the Committee on Armed Services. On the Committee on House Administration the minority staff director is a woman. These are but a few of many examples indicating substantial progress.

Since this funding resolution will be the final one that I present to the House, I wish, at this time, to acknowledge my deep appreciation to all Members who have served on the Accounts Subcommittee with me during the full 8 years of my chairmanship. In particular, I thank AL SWIFT, MARY ROSE OAKAR, SAM GEJDENSON, FRANK ANNUNZIO, BILL THOMAS and PAUL GILLMOR. I am indebted to each of you for your hard work, wise counsel, and vigorous support over the years. If nothing else, I think that all of us have exemplified the congressional decisionmaking process at its best. Our budget review process and markups should serve as a model to others. Our work together has demonstrated that Members with different and sometimes very strong views can reach a sound rational consensus if attempted with consideration, cooperation, and good faith.

Finally, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the amendment, the committee amendment as amended, and the resolution.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like first to recognize Chairman GAYDOS for his diligent efforts and hard work as chairman of the Accounts Subcommittee. He has been a pleasure to work with and he will be very much missed in the next Congress.

This has been a very unusual year in Congress, to which many of us can attest. The Members of this Congress are facing some very harsh realities, which will result in many Members not returning to Congress next year. There are those who have been elected and have decided not to run for re-election due to their frustration, due to their inability to make a difference in representing their constituents.

This frustration has become a two-edged sword as many of our constituents have lost faith in our collective ability to represent them in giving them good government.

Many of our fellow Americans are simply saying that we are out of touch. The time has come when we are seeing a national anti-incumbent movement developing. Many of our constituents are saying they have had enough of high taxes, increased spending, and mindless projects that have received financial support here.

Now, I mention those things because it is in that context, in the public climate, that we consider this resolution for the funding of our committees.

The Accounts Subcommittee originally looked to providing committee funding along the lines of the COLA, which for this year is 4.2 percent. In fact, the committee resolution reported by the full committee was 4.9 percent. After that, many Members of this Chamber looked to their homefront and they saw that their constituents did not receive a COLA in their paychecks; rather, many of them were faced with financial setbacks from unemployment to health insurance costs.

The internal operations of this House are being scrutinized as they have never been scrutinized before. We are being held accountable for our every action.

I support the amendment to be offered to lower the committee funding from that reported to the freeze level, at last year's level.

Over the past 30 years, we have seen our committees increase dramatically, not only in staff numbers but in the dollars that we give them. I think we are fortunate to have some truly outstanding people working on the staff of

this House and in our offices; but in fact, since 1960 the congressional staff has tripled in numbers.

Select committees which have no legislative jurisdiction have been created over the years. While many of these select committees do excellent work, they do consume more funds year by year.

It is time that the structure of our committees be evaluated and be assessed wherein their jurisdiction lies. Complaints of overlapping jurisdiction with staff members from different committees doing the same work are common. While it is not within the jurisdiction of the Accounts Subcommittee to restructure the committee system, it is within that subcommittee's jurisdiction to affect the purse strings.

Representation on our committees should be reformed to allow for the one-third ratio which Republicans have sought for the minority in order to be effective.

There have, and I commend the chairman of the subcommittee, been in recent years some modest progress made in that direction.

Today we are going to be bringing to the floor an amendment which will freeze all the committees' budgets to last year's level.

□ 1430

The only exception is Intelligence, which will receive $130,000 less than their budget last year and which is what they requested this year. Thus the amendment will actually represent a 3/100ths-percent increase in actual dollars. But I think it is worth pointing out that the freeze amendment in fact is a cut because in real dollars adjusted for inflation the freeze is a cut in terms of purchasing power.

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

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN].

Mr. GLICKMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAYDOS], for coming in with a freeze on committee budgets as opposed to an increase in committee funding. I know this is a difficult thing for people around here who have been accustomed to continuous increases over the years. I do not want to be self-righteous about this, but I do believe at a time when we are talking about potential major cuts as a result of a constitutional amendment to balance the budget, when we are talking about programs all over this country being cut and when people believe that charity "begins at home," that it is appropriate for us to live a little bit by example by cutting, or at least freezing, our committee budgets. But this year I think it is appropriate that Congress looks as if it is hearing the message from the American people that some of the excesses in Government need to be stopped.

So I want to compliment the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ROSE], the chairman of the full committee, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAYDOS], chairman of the subcommittee, as well as some of my colleagues here in the House, such as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], and others who have been the leaders trying to make sure that the committee budgets are restrained during a very difficult year in this country.

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of a freeze on committee funding. This is my second year serving with my colleague Congressman GILLMOR as a referee in the game of committee funding. This year the game has taken an interesting twist, and has essentially gone into overtime.

The minority began this committee funding adventure with a game plan that targeted an increase of only 4.2 percent, for cost-of-living adjustments. While reviewing budget proposals in the subcommittee on accounts, the minority tried to keep the budget allowances as close to that mark as we could, without cutting our own precious and few committee staffers.

As we approached the March 30 deadline, albeit, what we thought was the end of the game, it became clear that in these tough economic times, it would be wise for Congress to do as many American families have had to do, and cut back on our expenses.

Thus, the game of committee funding went into overtime, and these committees continued to operate on 1991 funding levels. As we prepare to end this game, and pass a final resolution, an interesting question presents itself. That question is: Who are the winners and losers?

It would seem that because Congress will be spending less money, the American taxpayers would be the winners. However, my fear is that the minority staff of these committees will be the losers, once the budget cuts come down. Right now the minority receives approximately 20 percent of total committee funding, some receive more, and others less. This barely gives the minority enough staff and resources to keep up with the majority.

However, let us think about what would happen if the minority received less. If the minority did not receive enough funding to adequately do our job, could Congress really be considered representative of the American people? Would alternative plans even be adequately studied and considered? Probably not. While this may sound great to those in the majority party, the lack of consideration of minority views, would ultimately make the American people the losers in this game.

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support the reduction of Government spending, but if cuts are going to be made, I want an assurance that these cuts will be fair. I understand that the minority submitted legislation that guaranteed that the minority funding would also remain at 1991 levels, if a funding freeze occurred. Unfortunately, this request was rejected.

I think Congressman GILLMOR and his hard-working staff for their work on this matter, as well as the House Administration Committee staff, who put in many hours on what is usually a noncontroversial issue.

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE].

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to oppose this freeze. I think it is incredible that the minority can come up here and ask to have it both ways. If you do not think the people working for your staffs are worth the money, if you do not think they are worthy of their labor, then say so. They are right here on the floor. Turn around and tell them they are not worth the money. The people who work on the staffs of all the committees work for the people of the United States, and they do terrific service for them.

To try and blame the staffs and have them take the heat for profligate spending by this Congress or by the administration is totally unfair. It is victimizing them.

Every public employee across the country who is out there doing their job, that man or woman doing the job on behalf of the people, on behalf of justice and on behalf of opportunity for everybody in the country, is being victimized by this kind of an attitude.

You say your constituents are worried about it. Your constituents have been the victims of the Reagan/Bush administrations for the last 12 years. And if you want to set the blame, then set it where it belongs.

Why take it out on the people that are doing the work for us? We get terrific service. I am on the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Select Committee on Aging, and I defy you to find a better group of people who work on a nonpartisan basis for everybody in this country. To make them bear the burden of somebody standing up politically, to take a shot at you, who say you are paying too much, who say that you are not doing your job, if you cannot stand up to that, what are you doing in the Congress? Why are you making the em-

ployees of the people of the United States stand in for you because you cannot take the heat?

And to stand up and argue now that you want to make sure that your employees get the full funding, after standing up here saying that those folks are not entitled to the money that they have earned, is the ultimate hypocrisy. Stand up now and turn around and tell the people sitting on this floor who work for you that they are not worth the money. Otherwise you are hypocrites.

I am not going to be a hypocrite. I am voting for the people who work for the people of the United States their full share. And if somebody wants to take me on, or any other Member, and say that we are spending too much money, I am willing to take that shot any time, not make people who are earning their money have to take the shots for us.

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time we have left on this side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURTHA). Each side has 22 minutes remaining.

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], the ranking member of the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. THOMAS of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, now back to the matter at hand. For over a decade I have worked on this committee, originally on the Subcommittee on Accounts. Now it has been my pleasure to turn that work over to some other folks—but on the full committee, I serve with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAYDOS]. I know that in many instances we are required to assume partisan positions. My guess is that before this vote is finally recorded, there will be some partisan positions assumed.

So prior to doing that, I want to let the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAYDOS] know that in the years that I have worked directly with him, which was the better part of a decade, I did not work with a fairer, more reasonable person or one who attempted to make things work if it was at all possible. You cannot ask for more than that in this business. Unfortunately, it is not found often enough.

□ 1440

I am sorry he is leaving, but I enjoyed very much the working relationship and the friendship that I had with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAYDOS].

During that same time period, Mr. Speaker, while working with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, committees have been and still are statutorily required to have a one-third ratio between the majority and the minority. The minority gets one-third of the staffing and resources.

In the area of investigative employees, a growing area over the last several decades, there were no hard and fast structures. There were no guidelines, and so there was a tremendous diversity between committees. Some committees honor the one-third structure in their investigative funding, as well as in their statutory funding. The Committee on Public Works and Transportation and the Committee on Agriculture, are two that readily come to mind. There are others, however. Some committees were not conducted in that fashion. It was deplorable, the way in which the investigative staff was controlled, frankly, by the majority and some of the chairmen.

Over the decades we have seen the chairmen change. We have seen an attitudinal change among the Democrats which has resulted in a structural change in dealing with investigative staff leading to 1989 committee report language filed by the Committee on House Administration which said;

> The minority has proposed that, during this funding cycle, investigative staff positions designated for the minority be at least 20% of the total number of the investigative staff positions on each committee. The minority proposes to increase this percentage annually over the next few years until it reaches 33%. When committees use bipartisan or non-partisan staff, the minority has indicated that an agreement needs to be reached as to a reasonable percentage allocation between majority and minority staff positions. The majority agrees with these principles but believes that the minority proposal cannot be achieved without additional funding as well as through attrition.

There were two ways to reach this goal, through attrition, where possible, but through additional funding as well.

This did not become the Democrat caucus rule; in fact, it was stood on its head. Rule XXXIV, paragraph F in the Democrats' rules says that the committee caucus shall not be required to provide for more than 20 percent of the total funding for minority investigative staff for the full committee and each subcommittee of that committee. It became a ceiling rather than a floor.

Notwithstanding that rule, there are a number of committees that continue to honor the one-third provision, and there are a number of committees that are striving to reach the 20 percent.

Both sides of the aisle began the discussion this year focusing on the 4.2 percent number. A 4.9-percent number was agreed to in the committee, and I think everybody on the floor needs to know that everything above the 4.2 number went to the minority. It was our commitment to fulfill the agreement to move to reasonable investigative numbers through attrition or additional funding, and the additional funding above the freeze at the 4.2 COLA level went to the Republicans, went to the minority. We committed to support that.

However, Mr. Speaker, as we began discussing what could or could not be done, frankly things began to slip in terms of some kind of reasonable comity between the groups. First it was a 4.2 across-the-board with no examination whatsoever in terms of the functions of the committees, whether or not they even had the ability to move legislation. We currently have a number of committees called select committees that are growing in size, consuming resources, but have no legislative function. At some point, Mr. Speaker, we are going to have to examine whether or not we can continue to treat these committees as though they were full legislative committees with the power to move legislation, especially in light of the kind of amendment which is now being offered, a freeze across the board at 1991 levels.

This background, Mr. Speaker, is to provide you with a bit of concern about the way in which the amendment has been presented, as the minority has been willing to vote for more than this amount. If it was to assist the committee's agreed-upon agenda in changing the ratios of the investigative staff, it seems entirely appropriate that, if we entered into a freeze, that there be an understanding on the part of the majority that the committee chairmen do not find the money they believe they need between the 1991 freeze and a 4.2-percent increase out of the Republicans' budget.

This is likely to happen. We were hopeful that the majority would own up to its commitment in terms of honoring a continued professionalization on the side of the minority and provide language in the amendment which would not allow the chairmen to take money away from the minority. We did not want language which specified fixed dollar amounts. We simply requested that the chairmen and the ranking members work it out between them. It might be entirely possible that shifts in funding between the minority and the majority would solve both of their problems.

I am sorry to say that I believe that the vote today is a step backward. It is a step backward, one, because it removes the continued working together of the majority and the minority on the Committee on House Administration to professionalize the committee staffs on both sides of the aisle. Second, by failure to include any kind of language which indicates that the committee was willing to honor its previous agreement, it appears as though that agreement has been repudiated, that we have not moved forward, we have moved backward. In the area of committee funding of investigative staff, when the majority on one committee has 120-plus staffers and the minority has less than two dozen, when it is a 6-to-1 and a 7-to-1 ratio, and there is no willingness to even protect that feeble allocation, then it is a clear indication to me that the majority of the

committee is giving in to a number of Members on their side of the aisle who have never been happy with the fact that the minority could possibly have a professional staff, that the minority could reach a atio of three members to each staff, or even two members to each staff, to begin to counter the Democrats' two staffers to each member or three staffers to each member ratio.

Mr. Speaker, that condition is intolerable, and to the degree this resolution not only perpetuates it, but allows it to slip in terms of a ratio, this Member is willing to enter into any kind of activities necessary to communicate to the majority that the decision we are making today in terms of funding is clearly secondary and unimportant compared to the slippage of what I thought was a firm commitment on the part of the majority of the committee to allow the minority side to continue to professionalize itself.

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT].

□ 1450

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 379 was reported by the Committee on House Administration at 4.9 percent, an increase that represented a fair and bipartisan approach in committee to funding all the committees of the House. This essential task has not always been undertaken in the harmonious spirit of bipartisanship which was evidenced this year by our committee's unanimous vote in support of the subcommittee's version of House Resolution 379.

When Chairman GAYDOS assumed the leadership of the Subcommittee on Accounts in 1985, the vote on the funding resolution drew 158 nays. By 1988, the no votes were down to 104; and last year only 58 Members voted against the resolution. That trend line resulted from the bipartisan approach of Chairman GAYDOS and a sincere recognition that funding levels needed to be set with restraint.

During his years, the issue of pay equity for women employees, was consistently pursued. When Chairman GAYDOS took over the leadership of the subcommittee there were no women committee staff directors. Today there are four, with several chief counsels, as well.

Supplemental funding resolutions were routinely granted in the 1970's, if a committee ran out of money during the year. They were never granted under Chairman GAYDOS, except in rare cases of institutional emergency such as judicial impeachment or ethics investigations. The average annual increase in committee funding since 1985 to the present is only 2.5 percent.

Chairman GAYDOS will retire after this session. He can be proud of this evenhanded stewardship of this important subcommittee over the last 8 years.

Unfortunately, partisan rancor has replaced comity lately and threatens to undermine the progress which has been made. The amended version of House Resolution 379 which is before you, provides for a freeze across the board, except for one committee who requested less this year than they received last year. The approach we take this year sidetracks the bipartisan process established by Chairman GAYDOS. We should all hope that it can be reestablished after the current feeding frenzy within this institution is over. In the meantime, we need to recognize the progress which has been made and thank you, JOE for a job well done.

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. JAMES].

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, the trouble with this committee funding freeze proposal is that it comes too late.

Had Congress frozen funding for committee staffs and for many other programs in recent years, the Federal budget deficit would not be nearing $400 billion a year. And debt service would not consume over 40 percent of the individual income taxes we pay annually.

But Congress did not exercise that sort of discipline. It did not vote for freezes when they could have kept us out of the budget crunch we now face.

As a consequence, an occasional freeze is not enough. Budget cuts reinforced by a constitutional amendment to balance the budget are essential if we are going to get the Nation's financial house in order.

So really I am going to vote no on the previous question, and hope there will be an amendment which will provide a further reduction, hopefully a 5-percent reduction. I think there is planned to be one.

If the budget is to be balanced, with or without a constitutional amendment, we must begin to actually cut spending. And what better place to start than right here, with the committees of the House of Representatives.

Cutting committee funding would set the tone and establish the precedent for cuts in other Federal programs. It would tell the country that Congress is serious about cutting spending and that it will not exempt itself from the cuts.

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ROSE], the chairman of the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAYDOS], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Accounts of the Committee on House Administration. Let me join those voices that have given much deserved praise to JOE GAYDOS, who through the years has guided the Subcommittee on Accounts and produced extremely good results for all the committees of the House. Chairman GAYDOS is going to be greatly missed on the Committee on House Administration, but I am sure we will have an opportunity to call on his abilities from time to time in the future.

Mr. Speaker, let me pick up on something the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] mentioned. Members heard the gentleman talk about how the Committee on Accounts very carefully crafted a 4.9-percent increased budget, and that everything over 4.2 percent went to the minority.

Then I listened to the gentleman very carefully, and the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] said somewhere after that, the lines of comity sort of broke down.

Mr. Speaker, my impression of what broke down was that not because of the gentleman, by any means, or anybody on the committee, but the decision was made somewhere on your side of the aisle that they were not going to put any votes behind what the gentleman and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GILLMOR] and your colleagues had done. So the gentleman was left with the rest of us supporting a 4.9-percent package coming out of committee, and he had to back away from that position. I feel very badly about that.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

What occurred, I believe, was a discussion in the committee about the ability to move that percentage on the floor. I think the gentleman heard assurances that our leadership was supporting that position. It was the gentleman's side of the aisle that questioned that number, and the agreement began to break down.

Where I was concerned was following that, and the subsequent decision to move to 4.2 percent, and now to a freeze. It has been done in a way that we have not assessed the workloads of the committees. When you are adding money to the pile, it is less urgent to examine workloads and rules of the committees. When you are subtracting money from the pile, I think it is absolutely critical that you examine what committees can do and cannot do. There has been no critical examination of those committees that simply have no legislative jurisdiction, but they are being carried along with the rest of them. At some point we need to sit down and begin to examine in a tight money time which committees do the work, and which committees do not.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I will yield to the gentleman further on another point in just a minute that I am sure we need to dis-

cuss together. But basically I went to the Members on my side of the aisle and said, "Who will support a 4.2-percent increase?" We were pretty close to 200 people, but without having sufficient votes on this side, and without any assistance from the other side, that is why we agreed to go to this freeze.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you why this is a problem. All of our office staffs got 4.2-percent increases in January. All of the statutory staffs around here that are not covered by the Speaker's pay order got 4.2 percent. Members of Congress and everybody under the Speaker's pay order got 3.5 percent.

The executive branch of Government gave 4.2 percent to all of the white collar workers, and most of the committee chairmen gave 4.2 percent to the investigative staffs in January.

Basically what we are saying now to the committee chairmen is you have got to eat the 4.2-percent increase that you gave to your investigative staff in January. You either have to take it away from them, or you have to collapse the work of the committee to make up for that.

The gentleman rightfully asked that there be assurances given with respect to the division of the funds remaining for 1992. I would say the committee chairmen are going to have to look at the work of their committees and make decisions on what they have in front of them for the remainder of 1992, and then make those decisions.

I would say this, though, to all the committee chairmen, and I think my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], whom I enjoy working with very much, I think the gentleman would agree, the committee chairmen should be very careful to be fair in the division of these funds for the remainder of 1992, because the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] and I will be monitoring that very closely. Then next year is another budget cycle, and we will begin in January of next hopefully to prepare for the next Congress, if we are reelected.

□ 1500

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, there may be some Members that assume that a COLA is automatic and has to be given to everybody and their committee budget is trouble, but I can assure the gentleman that this Member's office does not automatically pass through anything, but ensures that it is merit that determines whether or not even something like a cost of living is received by staff.

I know that there are committees that are in part run in that fashion. When the chairman indicates that the committees are going to have to eat the reduction, the concern of this Member is that it is not Republicans that are eating.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, I agree.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, both of us know and can name those committees that are of great concern to us. If the chairman will assure me that this will be one of the primary considerations in examining committee funding and that those committees which, in fact, require the minority to suffer during this period, which we hope is temporary, will be scrutinized in terms of the amount of money that they are to receive, that is not nearly as satisfactory a position as requiring the chairman and the ranking member to work together to come to an agreement as a team on a committee, but at least it is an assurance that those Members who might be partially consumed can at least get some kind of assistance after the fact.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, I give the gentleman that assurance.

I would also remind the committee chairmen, they know that the gentleman and I attempt to work together by unanimous agreement on what we do in the committee and that many of the chairmen have come to me and said, "We have worked with Mr. Thomas. He ought to be happy with us now because we are giving the minority more of what they need for the work of the committee."

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, on that point there is no question there is more cooperation on a number of committees. It is a much better working atmosphere. Those are not the committees we are concerned about.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, I understand.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman knows and understands the committees. It, in part, is a reflection of the chairmen of those committees. And to the degree the chairman assures me, which he has, that the funding of the committee the next year will in large part be reflected on the basis of the way in which they handle the difficulties during this period, then this gentleman is minimally satisfied.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, I would add, and the gentleman does not need to respond to that, it would not be any other way because the gentleman would not agree to anything if I did not agree to that. So that is the bottom line.

I see one of our colleagues from Alabama out in the audience, who many Members told me they thought he ran, and on our side of the aisle, they thought he ran his full committee staff for a number of years, until the current chairman came in place. But he did a good job.

I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAYDOS] for his magnificent work here. I urge my colleagues to vote for this freeze, and I urge that the committee chairmen be, as we have said with the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], very fair and judicious in the way they handle the rest of the year's money.

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my committee chairman for those kind remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY].

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Gaydos amendment and the 1992 committee funding resolution. Let me take just a moment to commend Chairman GAYDOS for his responsible handling of this resolution.

As reported from the Committee on House Administration, House Resolution 379, provided for $57.8 million in committee funding, nearly a 5-percent increase over 1991. Many of us on both sides of the aisle found a $2.7-million increase over 1991 levels excessive given our budget deficit and the need to tighten our internal belt and clean up the general operation of the House.

Along with our colleagues CHARLIE STENHOLM and DAN GLICKMAN, I was prepared to move to defeat the previous question in order to make a freeze-level amendment in order. Fortunately with the cooperation of the committee, such an action is not necessary.

This funding resolution is a responsible action on our part and should not disrupt committee operations. In fact, a little belt tightening and reorganization of subcommittee and committee activities is needed. Hopefully, we can swiftly move to consider the Hamilton-Gradison resolution to set up a committee to in part study committee operations. With reorganization, additional committee funding reductions may follow.

Let me also challenge the Appropriations Committees to carefully scrutinize all executive branch funding requests. I intend to do my own review and, if necessary, offer floor amendments to reduce administrative funding for Cabinet agencies and departments.

Mr. Speaker, again I commend Chairman GAYDOS for his handling of this resolution and for graciously accepting the concerns earlier expressed by myself and others. I urge an aye vote on the resolution.

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. NUSSLE].

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. NUSSLE].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. NUSSLE] is recognized for 2½ minutes.

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

Maybe the genteman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY] before he leaves can answer a question for me. I have a letter

indicating that he was willing to cut funding for committee staff and willing to introduce a bill and a resolution similar to the one that I would like to introduce today, which would cut funding 5 percent.

I cannot believe some of the conversations I have had, as a new Member of Congress, with the different committee members as we have worked through the committee funding bills individually on the different committees on which I serve.

I remember when I was at a committee hearing over this resolution and we were talking about how much money was necessary to increase funding this year. And I was having a colloquy with one of my chairmen and I said, "How does this work? You just come up here and you ask for 7 percent and you really hope for 5 and so you ask for a little bit more, knowing that you are going to get cut?"

And he said, "That is basically how it works."

I said, "Isn't that a game?"

He said, "Yes, it is kind of a budget game that we play around here."

I said, "Isn't it time to stop that game playing?"

I mean, there are some people out there that are listening, Mr. Speaker, that do not get to play that game, when they are sitting around their coffee table balancing their checkbook, trying to decide what bills to pay during the month. They do not get to play that game. They do not get to decide that they get to spend a little bit extra here, ask for a little bit more so that they have a little bit, so that if they get cut, they actually get to spend exactly what they wanted.

We play that game. We ask for a little bit, knowing that we are going to get cut, so that we can justify our existence.

I just do not think that is right. I would like to defeat the previous question. I would like to suggest to Members of Congress that they defeat the previous question so that we can introduce a resolution that would cut committee funding 5 percent.

I think that is reasonable. I think that is justified, especially when just this last week, I heard another committee chairman come before the media and say that this balanced budget amendment that we have coming up is going to be so difficult because we cannot find any places to cut.

I would suggest that we could find maybe one little place to cut right here and now, and I think this is a good place to start. Why not start today?

If it is going to be so difficult next year, why not just start today?

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NUSSLE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, how does the gentleman propose to deal with the majority/minority problem that I outlined earlier?

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I think one of the ways that my resolution, if we could defeat the previous question, and if I have the opportunity to introduce it, it would cut 5 percent on both sides, which is fair, 5 percent for the majority side, 5 percent for the minority side. That way they cannot play around with the gamesmanship that we always hear about.

Let us not even get to that point. Let us say 5 percent for one side, 5 percent for the other side.

I think that is fair. It is a fair way to dispose of this. It is a fair way to move the process along. It is a fair way to talk about what we can do individually as Members of Congress in order to get ourselves back into fiscal sanity.

I ask my colleagues to defeat the previous question.

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

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

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman cognizant of the fact that as of this time, the appropriation already has been set and that the resolution that I have finally proposed does cut 5 percent?

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman explain to all of us how that would work?

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, it is not how it would work, it is working if we pass this resolution in the form that I have submitted. It would be a 5-percent cut in the appropriation.

Mr. NUSSLE. It would be easy for the gentleman to make that statement. We do not believe that on this side. We would like to know how that would work.

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, not how it works, it will be an accomplishment. It will be a 5-percent cut.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is saying that next year, that the committees will be receiving 5 percent less, 5 percent less than they received this year?

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, this is a 5-percent cut.

Mr. NUSSLE. For next year?

Mr. GAYDOS. This year.

Mr. NUSSLE. I am talking about next year. What about next year? Is the gentleman saying that it is a 5-percent cut this year over last year?

Mr. GAYDOS. It is a 5-percent cut over the moneys that have been appropriated for this year.

Mr. NUSSLE. What kind of increase was that in appropriation over last year?

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

Mr. NUSSLE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. Speaker, we have as a matter of fact, in the budget solution that was adopted, enacted, a 5-percent reduction in the legislative operations as well as the executive operations for fiscal year 1993. And hopefully, that will be reflected in the appropriations bills because that is reflected in the budget resolution.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, this gentleman is talking about this year. What about this year then? He is talking about 1993.

□ 1510

Mr. PANETTA. Obviously for this year what is being proposed here is a freeze, which represents close to a 5-percent reduction.

Mr. NUSSLE. Exactly. And reclaiming my time, if I may, I am proposing a 5-percent cut.

Mr. NUSSLE. That is the difference between the hocus pocus that is being proposed here.

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I plan to vote for the resolution, but a freeze is going to adversely affect our Veterans' Committee work. I appreciate the leadership of the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAYDOS], and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GILLMOR].

I also want to thank the chairman of the full committee, Mr. ROSE, and the ranking minority member of the full committee, Mr. THOMAS.

Although I do support the resolution, I regret that our committee will have to operate at last year's funding level. Our committee's history shows that it has kept its budgets and staffing levels to a minimum. Except for the Committees on Rules and the District of Columbia, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has the smallest budget for permanent standing committees in the House. Yet, the workload continues to increase and Members continue to expect more investigations and studies. The requests come from both sides of the aisle. We cannot continue to be as active this year as we have been in the past.

The freeze in this year's budget means a shortfall of $63,186 for our committee investigative and oversight budget. It means severe reductions in travel funds for oversight investigations within our 172 VA medical centers and other VA facilities located throughout the country; it means a delay in the purchase of much needed equipment. What this means is that some staff will not receive merit increases.

Last year our committee requested only a 2.7-percent increase in its budget but let it be known that a higher increase would be required in 1992. This year's freeze hits our committee par-

ticularly hard since last year's increase was so low.

My colleagues on the committee and in the House need to know that it is very likely that many of our oversight plans may have to be curtailed simply because travel funds will not be available because of the freeze.

We will live within the constraints of this resolution and will continue to do the best work possible within those constraints. But, a freeze this year will cause problems in carrying out our oversight responsibilities of our VA facilities.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I do want to respond to the gentleman from Mississippi, and he is absolutely correct. His committee is one of those committees that is victimized by the terror of percentages; that when we deal only in percentage increases, those committees with the larger amounts getting a fixed percentage increase get far more dollars.

I want to pledge to the gentleman that I will continue to try to fight to make sure that the allocations are not mindless and across the board, but that those committees that need the money will get the money, and that I want to try to do a dollar amount, rather than a fixed percentage. We need adjustments between committees as well as equity among all committees. His committee is the prime example of the tyranny of the percentage increase.

I apologize to the chairman for what occurred to him, and will do everything we can to make it up.

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

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a closing statement. I would like to refer back to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. NUSSLE]. He mentioned this is somewhat of a game. I want to be most sincere when I explain that we have been going through this game for 24 years, as long as I have been on the committee. I want to assure the gentleman it is not a game. Every month we are in very close contact with every standing committee and the select committees. We monitor what they are spending and what they are spending for.

I want the gentleman to understand that the committee interrogates specifically on many items, including the items that are referred to by the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] when he talked about equity and fairness, and we have been doing that for the last 24 years. I have been on the subcommittee as a chairman for the last 8 years, but for those that preceded me, those were items that were paramount in our consideration.

It is very complicated to take a lump sum like $60 million and then try to divide that equitably. Maybe one of the comparisons would be with a mother bird or chicken that would have so many peeps, everyone asking for their share and their share alone, and not paying any attention to the needs and wants of other committees. It is the same thing. It is a very difficult task.

I do not say this in criticism to my friend, who was going to support the resolution he talked about, or the motion. I do want to impress upon him that I thought he did somewhat of a disservice to the committee, because of the hard work that the committee has done over the years.

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

Mr. GAYDOS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, my point was not that I called it a game. My point was that a committee chairman called it a game. That is the person the gentleman needs to talk to, is the committee chairman who said, "Yes, I guess it is a game." That is what offended me and offends the people that listen.

Mr. GAYDOS. I am sure that my good friend is not gullible. That is probably one of the chairmen where we said, "Hey, you have had enough. Last year we took care of you. This year you have not justified what you need." That is probably who the gentleman talked to.

Mr. Speaker, I want at this time to compliment the Members on my side and also on the Republican side that serve on the committee for the work that they have done over the years. It is very tedious work, the members are criticized, it is very sensitive work, and I think it serves a vital function as far as providing funds for actually running this establishment or this House.

Since this funding resolution will be the final one that I present to the House, I wish, at this time, to make personal acknowledgement and give my deep appreciation to all the Members that have served with me during the full 8 years of my subcommittee chairmanship, on the Subcommittee on Accounts on the Committee on House Administration.

I particularly thank the full committee chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ROSE]; also the gentleman from Washington, AL SWIFT, who has been so close and so affirmative in his support of what we have been doing over the years; the gentlewoman from Ohio, MARY ROSE OAKAR; the gentleman from Connecticut, SAM GEJDENSON; the gentleman from Illinois, FRANK ANNUNZIO; and on the other side, the gentleman from California, BILL THOMAS; the gentleman from Ohio, PAUL GILLMOR; and the gentleman from Nebraska, BILL BARRETT, who is doing a great job, and I know he will continue to next year.

I am indebted to each of the Members for their hard work, wise counsel, and vigorous support over the years. If nothing else, I think that all of us have exemplified the congressional decision-making process at its best.

I am hopeful that our budget review process and markups would throughout the years serve as a model to the others who have that task before them. Our work together has demonstrated that Members with different and sometimes very strong personal views can reach a sound, rational consensus, if attempted with consideration and sincere cooperation, fairness, and good faith.

Finally, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the amendment, the committee amendment as amended, and the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA].

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I support the committee funding resolution, which freezes funding at the 1991 level, but I do so with some reluctance, since a freeze does not accommodate the 4.2 percent pay increase which all executive branch employees received and other inflationary increases, and therefore reduces the real value of funding which is necessary for committees to do the legislative and oversight work of the House. But we do recognize the state of the Nation's economy which prompts this resolution to be presented without any increase and we will attempt to meet our agenda with the freeze.

Providing our committees with adequate resources to develop effective and responsive legislation to the many complex and vital issues before us is important. At the moment, our own committee is involved in legislation to amend the law which governs use of pesticides and insecticides which affect the safety and quality of our food and ground water; legislation which affects the old-growth forest reserve and the endangered spotted owl; a bill to improve the delivery of credit to our farmers and ranchers; and legislation which governs the operation of the trading of futures, valued in the tens of trillions of dollars, on the commodities markets.

The work of committees in overseeing the Federal programs within our respective jurisdictions is vital. Good oversight can result in significant taxpayer savings—limiting the investigative ability of a committee through reduced funding could, in the long run, be fiscally unwise.

During the 8 years that Mr. GAYDOS, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Accounts, has been responsible for committee funding, the aggregate increase has been about 3 percent. This is not an extravagant figure.

The Committee on Agriculture has traditionally been a conservatively funded and staffed committee; and at year's end, we have often returned considerable amounts to the Treasury when we have found it possible to meet our commitments without spending our entire authorization. The budget proposals we submit for the consideration of the Subcommittee on

Accounts are not deliberately inflated. The amount requested is intended to give us the resources to meet the proposed legislative and oversight agenda of our eight subcommittees and the full committee which we plan to undertake for the session. During the 12 months of our authorization we are mindful of the way these funds are expended and we conserve wherever and whenever we can.

The majority and minority members and staff of the Committee on Agriculture work well together and we have always endeavored to equitably share funding and other resources with our minority.

We do intend to continue doing the best work possible for the House of Representatives and using allocated funds thoughtfully to ensure that taxpayer dollars are used judiciously. Unfortunately, the freeze in funding will hurt the investigative staffs of committees by not allowing the 4.2-percent cost-of-living adjustment, which the President recommended for all Federal employees.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the committee funding resolution, and I commend the chairman of the Committee on House Administration, Mr. ROSE, and the Subcommittee on Accounts, Mr. GAYDOS, for their diligent labors on this unrewarding task. In particular, I want to pay tribute to the distinguished subcommittee chairman, who will be retiring at the end of this Congress and has always dealt with our committee courteously and fairly.

I would be less than candid, however, if I did not express my profound disappointment and distress over the course this resolution has taken since the Subcommittee on Accounts acted in executive session to recommend a 5.1-percent increase for our committee—an increase that, while not all we asked for, was certainly well within the bounds of fairness and supported by the real needs of the committee as it addresses a difficult and heavy legislative burden.

The Committee on Energy and Commerce requested for 1992 an 11.2-percent increase over its 1991 authorization. This request was comprised of two components—a 7-percent increase sought for committee operations, and a 27.5-percent increase that the minority requested for its operations. Only after our minority submitted its request—which, I emphasize, we incorporated whole and unchanged in our submission to House Administration—did the Republican leadership decide that its position would be that committee funding should be limited to a 4.2-percent increase for 1992.

One would have thought this was enough. But instead, we have spent the last several months bottom fishing, talking about freezes, 5-percent cuts, and 10-percent cuts. This is penny wise and pound foolish. Through diligent oversight and investigation, the Committee on Energy and Commerce alone has returned to the taxpayer over the last several years many times the amounts spent to fund its operations. In 1991, our work resulted in savings of $125 million, and an additional $500 million in questionable billings to the taxpayer are currently being reviewed. Freezes and cuts may look good to your constituents today—but they seriously hamper our ability to root out the real waste, fraud, and abuse that plague us.

I would also observe that the President of the United States does not appear to be limiting himself in the same manner that we are being asked to limit ourselves. The Bush administration's budget for fiscal year 1993 proposes an increase of 16.8 percent in the Executive Office of the President. Even excluding the 238 percent increase sought for the office of the drug czar, the President has requested an increase of 4.8 percent for the White House Office—including 13 new staff members—a 7.4-percent increase in special assistance to the President, which can charitably be described as DAN QUAYLE'S slush fund, a 4.9-percent increase for the Council of Economic Advisers, a 7.9-percent increase for the Office of Environmental Quality, a 4.9-percent increase in the Office of Policy Development, a 5.8-percent increase for the U.S. Trade Representative, and—get this—a 100-percent increase for the Points of Light Foundation.

I will support a freeze today because it is preferable to a cut and because we are not being offered the opportunity to vote for a higher amount. I appreciate the hard work and diligent efforts of Chairman ROSE and Chairman GAYDOS, and only wish that their colleagues had given them the support they needed to do their difficult job properly.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution because it doesn't go far enough in reducing committee funding.

Government is too big for its own good and for the good of the people it's supposed to serve. Our Nation faces a $4 trillion debt and a $400 billion Federal deficit—it's no wonder that Congress itself has grown by leaps and bounds. The sheer size of the Congress speaks volumes: There are nearly 13,000 congressional staff and support staff—a figure which is 9 times larger than the number of staff at the Canadian Parliament, the second largest legislative body in the world; there are 27 committees and 136 subcommittees. In 1960, the budget for the House and Senate was $130 million. In three decades, that figure has risen by more than 1,600 percent to $2.24 billion.

What can be done to halt this hiring binge? Very simply, we must cut funding for the committees in this House. Second, bring up for House consideration, a bill I introduced which would reduce the number of congressional committee staff by 30 percent. It goes without saying, Mr. Speaker, that staff and funding reductions should affect Democrats and Republicans equally.

Cutting committee funding won't eliminate the debt or the deficit but it's a small step in the right direction and it's a step worth taking. Let's begin a process of returning more of the Government back to the people; let's reduce the amount of funding for congressional committees.

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, and the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURTHA). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 254, nays 146, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 148]

YEAS—254

Abercrombie	Frost	Mineta
Ackerman	Gaydos	Mink
Anderson	Gejdenson	Moakley
Andrews (ME)	Gephardt	Mollohan
Andrews (NJ)	Geren	Montgomery
Andrews (TX)	Gibbons	Moody
Annunzio	Gilchrest	Moran
Applegate	Glickman	Morella
Aspin	Gonzalez	Mrazek
Atkins	Gordon	Murphy
AuCoin	Guarini	Murtha
Bacchus	Hall (OH)	Nagle
Beilenson	Hall (TX)	Natcher
Bennett	Hamilton	Neal (MA)
Berman	Hammerschmidt	Neal (NC)
Bevill	Harris	Nowak
Bilbray	Hayes (IL)	Oberstar
Blackwell	Hayes (LA)	Obey
Boehlert	Hefner	Olin
Bonior	Hertel	Ortiz
Borski	Hoagland	Orton
Boucher	Hochbrueckner	Owens (NY)
Brewster	Horn	Owens (UT)
Brooks	Horton	Pallone
Browder	Hoyer	Panetta
Brown	Hubbard	Parker
Bryant	Huckaby	Pastor
Bustamante	Hughes	Patterson
Byron	Hutto	Payne (NJ)
Cardin	Jefferson	Payne (VA)
Carper	Jenkins	Pease
Carr	Johnson (SD)	Pelosi
Chapman	Johnson (TX)	Penny
Clay	Johnston	Perkins
Clement	Jones (GA)	Peterson (FL)
Coleman (TX)	Jones (NC)	Peterson (MN)
Collins (IL)	Jontz	Pickett
Condit	Kanjorski	Pickle
Conyers	Kaptur	Poshard
Cooper	Kennedy	Price
Costello	Kennelly	Rahall
Cox (IL)	Kildee	Rangel
Coyne	Kleczka	Reed
Cramer	Kopetski	Richardson
Darden	Kostmayer	Roe
de la Garza	LaFalce	Roemer
DeFazio	Lancaster	Rose
DeLauro	Lantos	Rostenkowski
Dellums	LaRocco	Rowland
Derrick	Laughlin	Roybal
Dingell	Lehman (CA)	Russo
Dooley	Lehman (FL)	Sabo
Dorgan (ND)	Levin (MI)	Sanders
Downey	Lewis (GA)	Sangmeister
Durbin	Lipinski	Sarpalius
Dwyer	Lloyd	Savage
Early	Long	Sawyer
Eckart	Lowey (NY)	Scheuer
Edwards (CA)	Luken	Schroeder
Edwards (TX)	Markey	Schumer
Engel	Martinez	Serrano
English	Matsui	Sharp
Erdreich	Mavroules	Sikorski
Espy	Mazzoli	Sisisky
Evans	McCloskey	Skaggs
Fascell	McCurdy	Skelton
Fazio	McDermott	Slattery
Feighan	McGrath	Slaughter
Flake	McHugh	Smith (FL)
Foglietta	McMillen (MD)	Smith (IA)
Ford (MI)	McNulty	Solarz
Ford (TN)	Mfume	Spratt
Frank (MA)	Miller (CA)	Staggers

Stallings
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Thomas (GA)
Thornton
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Unsoeld
Valentine
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Washington
Waters
Waxman
Weiss
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolpe
Wyden
Yates
Yatron

NAYS—146

Allard
Allen
Archer
Armey
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehner
Broomfield
Burton
Callahan
Camp
Chandler
Clinger
Coble
Coleman (MO)
Combest
Coughlin
Cox (CA)
Crane
Cunningham
Davis
DeLay
Dickinson
Doolittle
Dornan (CA)
Dreier
Duncan
Emerson
Ewing
Fawell
Fields
Fish
Franks (CT)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodling
Goss
Gradison
Grandy
Green
Gunderson
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Henry
Herger
Hobson
Holloway
Hopkins
Houghton
Hyde
Ireland
Jacobs
James
Johnson (CT)
Kasich
Klug
Kolbe
Kyl
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Lowery (CA)
Machtley
Marlenee
Martin
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McMillan (NC)
Meyers
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Molinari
Moorhead
Morrison
Myers
Nichols
Nussle
Oxley
Paxon
Petri
Porter
Pursell
Quillen
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Rhodes
Ridge
Riggs
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schulze
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sundquist
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Upton
Vander Jagt
Vucanovich
Walker
Weber
Weldon
Wolf
Wylie
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—34

Alexander
Anthony
Barnard
Boxer
Bruce
Bunning
Campbell (CA)
Campbell (CO)
Collins (MI)
Dannemeyer
Dicks
Dixon
Donnelly
Dymally
Edwards (OK)
Hatcher
Hunter
Inhofe
Kolter
Lagomarsino
Lent
Levine (CA)
Livingston
Manton
McEwen
Michel
Oakar
Olver
Packard
Ray
Stark
Traxler
Walsh
Young (AK)

□ 1537

Messrs. GOODLING, MORRISON, and RHODES changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURTHA). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAYDOS] to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

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

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 323, nays 76, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 149]

YEAS—323

Ackerman
Anderson
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Annunzio
Applegate
Archer
Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Bacchus
Barrett
Barton
Bateman
Beilenson
Bennett
Bentley
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blackwell
Bliley
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Broomfield
Browder
Bryant
Bustamante
Byron
Cardin
Carper
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clement
Clinger
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Collins (IL)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Coughlin
Cox (IL)
Coyne
Cramer
Cunningham
Darden
Davis
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Derrick
Dickinson
Dicks
Dingell
Dooley
Dorgan (ND)
Downey
Durbin
Dwyer
Early
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English
Erdreich
Espy
Evans
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gallegly
Gallo
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Green
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Harris
Hastert
Hayes (IL)
Hayes (LA)
Hefner
Hertel
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hopkins
Horn
Horton
Houghton
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hutto
Hyde
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Johnston
Jones (GA)
Jones (NC)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klug
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kostmayer
Kyl
LaFalce
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Levin (MI)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowery (CA)
Lowey (NY)
Luken
Machtley
Markey
Martin
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McGrath
McHugh
McMillen (MD)
McNulty
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Moran
Morella
Morrison
Mrazek
Murphy
Nagle
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nichols
Nowak
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Olver
Orton
Owens (NY)
Owens (UT)
Oxley
Pallone
Panetta
Parker
Pastor
Patterson
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pease
Pelosi
Penny
Perkins
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Porter
Poshard
Price
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Rhodes
Richardson
Rinaldo
Roberts
Roe
Roemer
Rogers
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Savage
Sawyer
Schaefer
Scheuer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Serrano
Sharp
Shuster
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Solarz
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Staggers
Stallings
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stump
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Thomas (WY)
Thornton
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Unsoeld
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Washington
Waters
Waxman
Weiss
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron

NAYS—76

Abercrombie
Allard
Allen
Armey
Baker
Ballenger
Bereuter
Boehner
Burton
Callahan
Camp
Chandler
Coble
Cox (CA)
Crane
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Ewing
Fawell
Fields
Franks (CT)
Gekas
Gingrich
Goss
Gradison
Grandy
Hancock
Hansen
Hefley
Henry
Herger
Holloway
Hunter
Ireland
Jacobs
James
Leach
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (CA)
Marlenee
McCollum
McMillan (NC)
Meyers
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Moorhead
Myers
Nussle
Paxon
Petri
Pursell
Quillen
Regula
Ridge
Riggs
Ritter
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Saxton
Schulze
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Smith (OR)
Snowe
Stearns
Taylor (NC)
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Weber
Weldon
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—35

Alexander
Anthony
Barnard
Boxer
Brown
Bruce
Bunning
Campbell (CA)
Campbell (CO)
Collins (MI)
Dannemeyer
Dixon
Donnelly
Dornan (CA)
Dymally
Edwards (OK)
Hatcher
Inhofe
Kolter
Lagomarsino
Lent
Levine (CA)
Livingston
Manton
McEwen
Michel
Murtha
Oakar
Ortiz
Packard
Ray
Stark
Traxler
Walsh
Young (AK)

□ 1555

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Anthony for, with Mr. McEwen against.

Mr. Dymally for, with Mr. Packard against.

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

Messrs. ARCHER, DELAY, HOBSON, and NICHOLS changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GAYDOS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE MICHAEL J. SHINAY, POSTMASTER, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Postmaster of the U.S. House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER,
Washington, DC, May 28, 1992.

Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY,
The Speaker, H-204, The Capitol, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that three (3) employees of my office have been served with subpoenas issued by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL J. SHINAY.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE DAN BURTON, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable DAN BURTON, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 27, 1992.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have previously notified you of my receipt of a subpoena issued by the Superior Court of Marion County, Indiana.

After consultation with the General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is not consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

DAN BURTON,
Member of Congress.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1306, ADAMHA REORGANIZATION ACT

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 467 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 467

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report on the bill (S. 1306) to amend title V of the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend certain programs, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are hereby waived.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] for purposes of debate only, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Madam Speaker, House Resolution 467 is the rule providing for the consideration of the conference report on S. 1306, the Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services Improvement Act of 1992. The rule waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration. This rule is necessary so that we may expeditiously bring up the report which was agreed to by the conferees.

This legislation, Madam Speaker, is the culmination of several years of negotiations over the reauthorization of Federal substance abuse and mental health programs. The agreement reorganizes the current block grant structure to be more responsible to the needs of communities in fighting substance abuse, and in responding to mental health needs. The measure authorizes funds for fiscal years 1993 and 1994, and crates several new worthwhile programs to offer help to children and families who suffer the effects of drug and alcohol abuse.

Madam Speaker, this conference report is a carefully crafted compromise. The rule was unanimously voted out of the House Rules Committee, and I urge my colleagues to adopt it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1600

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

Madam Speaker, this conference report was brought up on the Suspension Calendar last week, but it failed to attain the necessary two-thirds vote for passage. This rule allows the conference report to be considered under regular order.

It does waive points of order against what our friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] refers to as minor scope and germaneness problems. I take him at his word that these are minor problems, and I have no serious objections to the rule.

I do, however, have some concerns about one of the offices contained in the new Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. It is the Office of Substance Abuse Prevention, which will be renamed the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention. It has been brought to the attention of many of us in the House that OSAP may be involved in direct or indirect lobbying activities that are prohibited by law.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. HALL] and I, along with nearly 100 of our colleagues from both sides of the aisle will be sending a letter to the GAO requesting an investigation into allegations of inappropriate lobbying or advocacy activities on the part of OSAP. The office undertakes a number of worthwhile activities, and I would hate to see their efforts tarnished by legislative advocacy that deviates from their legal mandate.

I hope that a GAO investigation can adequately clear up these allegations. In the meantime, Madam Speaker, I believe we should move forward with this process, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] if he has any requests for time.

Mr. DREIER of California. Madam Speaker, we have no requests for time, I urge support of the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Madam 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.

MEDICAL DEVICE AMENDMENTS OF 1992

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 2783) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to medical devices and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

Mr. BLILEY. Madam Speaker, reserving the right to object, while I will not object, I take this reservation for the purpose of asking the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] to explain what is in the bill.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLILEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY] for yielding to me.

Madam Speaker, the Medical Device Amendments of 1992 represent several modifications to the Safe Medical Device Act of 1990. These modifications have been enacted unanimously by the Senate. They have been agreed to by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LENT], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], and myself. The modifications have been developed at the request of representatives of medical device companies and consumer. The administration and representatives of hospitals have been consulted. I know of no opposition to the bill, and I would urge that we be permitted to adopt this legislation by unanimous consent.

STATEMENT OF EXPLANATION ON S. 2783, THE MEDICAL DEVICE AMENDMENTS OF 1992

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND REFERENCE

Section 1 states that the short title is the "Medical Device Amendments of 1992."

SECTION 2. EFFECTIVE DATE AND REGULATIONS TO IMPLEMENT SECTION 519(e)

Section 2 pertains to the timetable for issuing final regulations and the effective date for final regulations for section 519(e) of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act ("FFDC Act"). Section 519(e) was added by section 3(b) of the Safe Medical Devices Act of 1990, Pub. L. 101-629 ("SMDA"). The SMDA required the Food and Drug Administration ("FDA") to issue proposed regulations within nine months of the date of enactment (August 28, 1991), and final regulations nine months later (May 28, 1992). It also provides that if the agency misses the deadline for the final regulations, the proposed regulations will go into effect and become the final regulations, with the statute to take effect immediately.

The FDA issued the proposed regulations to implement section 519(e) on March 27, 1992. Even though the deadline for the final regulations is May 28, 1992, the agency provided a 60-day comment period. Thus the comment period will close one day before the final regulations are due to be issued. The agency has informed the Congress that it does not intend to issue the final regulations by the may 28 deadline.

Therefore, under section 3(c)(2) of the SMDA, the FDA's proposed tracking regulations will become the final regulations on May 28, 1992. Section 2 of S. 2783 provides that the tracking regulations that became final regulations by operation of section 3(c)(2) of the SMDA will revert to their proposed status as of May 27, 1992. Under section 2 of S. 2783, the deadline for issuing final device tracking regulations will be extended by 6 months, or until November 28, 1992. The agency has indicated that this extension will allow sufficient time to issue the final regulations. However, if the final regulations are not issued by November 28, 1992, then Section 2 provides that the proposed regulations will become the final regulations on November 29, 1992. The FDA is directed to publish promptly in the Federal Register notice of the new status of the proposed regulations.

Section 2 also provides that the final regulations will go into effect 9 months after they are published or no late than August 29, 1993 (9 months after November 29, 1992). This date may not be extended by the FDA under any circumstances.

In some cases, device manufacturers may need to obtain a section 510(k) clearance or an approval of a supplemental device application prior to initiating tracking of devices. This could occur where an effective tracking system required new packaging (such as single packaging instead of bulk packaging) or an alteration in processing (such as the sterilization of the product. It is expected that the FDA will expedite decisions on such clearance applications so that manufacturers can have tracking systems in place by the effective date of the regulations.

SECTION 3. POSTMARKET SURVEILLANCE

Section 3 makes failure to comply with a requirement imposed by section 522 of the FFDC Act (Postmarket Surveillance) a prohibited act subject to criminal and civil penalties. Section 3 also makes any device product misbranded if there was a failure or refusal to comply with a requirement under section 522 with respect to the device.

SECTION 4. REPAIR, REPLACEMENT, OR REFUND

Section 518(b) of the FFDC Act provides the circumstances under which the FDA may order a manufacturer, importer or distributor to repair a device, replace it, or refund the purchase price to the consumer. Under subsection (b)(1)(A)(ii), the Secretary must determine that there are reasonable grounds to believe that the device was not properly designed and manufactured with reference to the state of the art as it existed at the time of its design and manufacture.

There is some concern that this provision could not be applied to a device that was improperly designed (but properly manufactured) or improperly manufactured (but properly designed). Such an interpretation makes no sense, and the amendment would make it clear that subsection (b)(1)(A)(ii) may be satisfied by a demonstration of improper design or manufacture.

SECTION 5. REPORTING

Section 5 amends section 519 of the FFDC Act, which requires manufacturers, distributors and certain users of devices to report adverse device experiences to the FDA. The Medical Device Amendments of 1976 added section 519(a) to require manufacturers, importers and distributors to make certain reports to the FDA. In 1984, the agency issued regulations to implement section 519(a) which, among other things, require manufacturers and importers to report information that "reasonably suggests that one of its marketed devices may have caused or contributed to serious injury or death." 21 C.F.R. 803.1(1991). Although the 1984 regulations did not cover distributors, the Safe Medical Devices Act of 1990 added section 519(a)(6) which directs the FDA to issue regulations that require reporting by distributors.

Section 519(b) covers user reporting and requires device users (such as hospitals) to report to the FDA or the device manufacturer information that "reasonably suggests that there is a probability that a device has caused or contributed" to a death, serious illness, or serious injury. In proposed regulations that the agency published on November 26, 1991, the agency proposed to use the statutory standard for device users for both users and manufacturers. 56 Fed. Reg. 60024.

Section 5(a) would adopt a single standard that would determine when injuries caused by devices must be reported to FDA. Under Section 5(a), where information "reasonably suggests that a marketed device may have caused or contributed to serious injury or death," the manufacturer, importer or user would be required to report to the FDA.

Section 5(a) also provides a new definition of the types of injuries or illnesses that must be reported. The agency's regulations require reporting of "serious injuries" which are defined to mean injuries that are "life threatening," that could result "in permanent impairment of a body function or permanent damage to a body structure," or that "necessitate medical or surgical intervention" to prevent such impairment or damage. 21 C.F.R. 803.1(h)(1991). Section 519(b)(5)(6) includes a similar definition for the types of injuries that must be reported by medical device users, although it states that the injury must necessitate "immediate" medical or surgical intervention. The regulations applicable to manufacturer and importers (but not the statutory definition applicable to users) go beyond the provisions described above and require the reporting of injuries that necessitate medical or surgical intervention to "relieve unanticipated temporary impairment of a body function or unanticipated temporary damage to a body structure." 21 C.F.R. 903.1(h)(1991). In the proposed revisions to its regulations regarding manufacturer reporting, the FDA has deleted the requirement for reporting of unanticipated temporary impairment or damage. 56 Fed. Reg. 60025, 60033 (November 26, 1991).

Section 5(a) adopts a single definition for "serious injury." This definition applies to device manufacturers, importers, distributors and users. It requires reporting of an injury that "(A) [is] life threatening, (B) results in permanent impairment of a body function or permanent damage to a body structure, or (C) necessitates medical or surgical intervention to preclude permanent impairment of a body function or permanent damage to a body structure." This definition differs from the current definition of "serious injury" that is applicable to device users since the immediacy requirement in Section 519(b)(5)(B) has been dropped.

In addition, language directing the FDA to require reporting of other significant adverse experiences that it identifies in regulations has been added to both section 519(a) (manufacturer, importer and distributor reporting) and section 519(b) (user reporting).

These amendments are not intended to mandate that the FDA adopt the requirements of its current regulations, 21 C.F.R. 803.1, 803.3(h) (1991), for manufacturers. However, the amendments do give the agency the discretion to identify adverse device experiences that must be reported. While this language is not limited to injuries, examples of injuries that might not qualify under the definition of "serious injury" but which the agency could require to be reported are: concussions or fractures (which could be caused by a defect in a stretcher, hospital bed or platform for an MRI system), burns, temporary paralysis, temporary loss of sight, temporary loss of hearing, or temporary loss of smell.

Section 519(b), which is applicable to user reporting uses the term "serious illness" in addition to serious injury to describe the events that must be reported. Although the term "serious illness' is not used in section 519(a), the agency's proposed regulations issued on November 26, 1991, would require manufacturers to report serious illnesses in addition to serious injuries. While the term "injury" probably covers any illness that

could be caused by a device, the bill is not in any way serious illnesses by manufacturers of devices.

SECTION 6. TECHNICALS

Section 6 makes a number of changes to correct a number of technical errors in current law. The changes are as follows.

(a) In the definition of device in section 201, "any of its principal" is stricken and "its primary" is substituted to make the section read consistently. No substantive change is intended.

(b) References throughout the FFDC Act to Department of Health, Education and Welfare are changed to Department of Health and Human Services, and the term "Commissioner" is defined as the "Commissioner of Food and Drugs."

(c) Certain incorrect references in section 304(d)(1) are corrected.

(d) In section 503(g)(3), the word "clearance" is substituted for "approval" so that the definition of "market clearance" in section 503(g)(4)(B) applies.

(e) In section 513(f)(3), incorrect designations of three subparagraphs are corrected and the word "section" is added before "510(k)."

(f) An incorrect citation in section 517(a)(10) is corrected.

(g) Several incorrect citations in the Safe Medical Devices Act of 1990 are corrected.

Mr. BLILEY. Madam Speaker, I strongly support the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN]. This bill solves a medical problem that has arisen with regard to the implementation of the Safe Medical Devices Act of 1990 and is supported by all interested parties.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield further to me?

Mr. BLILEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I indicate to the gentleman from Virginia that he and I have agreed to a statement of explanation as to the legislative intent of S. 2783.

Mr. BLILEY. Madam Speaker, I certainly agree with that.

Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 2783

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND REFERENCE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Medical Device Amendments of 1992".

(b) REFERENCE.—Whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

SEC. 2. EFFECTIVE DATE AND REGULATIONS TO IMPLEMENT DEVICE TRACKING.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Section 3 of the Safe Medical Devices Act of 1990 (21 U.S.C. 360i note) is amended—

(1) is subsection (b)(3), by striking out "upon the effective date" and inserting in lieu thereof "upon the expiration of 9 months after the issuance";

(2) in subsection (c)(2)—

(A) by striking out "and 519(e)" the first place it occurs; and

(B) by striking out "and 519(e) of such Act are" and inserting in lieu thereof "of such Act is"; and

(3) by adding at the end of subsection (c) the following:

"(3) Not later than November 28, 1992, the Secretary shall issue final regulations to implement section 519(e) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. If the Secretary does not promulgate such final regulations by November 28, 1992, the Congress finds that there is good cause for the proposed regulations to be considered as the final regulations without response to comment because the implementation of section 519(e) of such Act is essential to protect the health of patients who use devices. In such event, the proposed regulations issued under paragraph (1) shall become the issued final regulations on November 29, 1992. There shall be promptly published in the Federal Register notice of the new status of the proposed regulations.".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect as of May 27, 1992 and any rule to implement section 519(e) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act proposed under section 3(c)(2) of the Safe Medical Devices Act of 1990 shall revert to its proposed status as of such date.

SEC. 3. POSTMARKET SURVEILLANCE.

(a) PROHIBITED ACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 301(q)(1) (21 U.S.C. 331(q)(1)) is amended—

(A) by striking out "or (B)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(B)"; and

(B) by inserting before the period a comma and "or (C) comply with a requirement under section 522".

(2) MISBRANDED DEVICES.—Section 502(t) (21 U.S.C. 352(t)) is amended—

(A) by striking out "or (2)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(2)"; and

(B) by inserting before the period a comma and "or (3) to comply with a requirement under section 522".

(b) APPROVAL.—Section 522(b) (21 U.S.C. 3601(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking out "(a)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(a)(1)";

(2) by inserting a comma after "commerce"; and

(3) by adding after the first sentence the following: "Each manufacturer required to conduct a surveillance of a device under subsection (a)(2) shall, within 30 days after receiving notice that the manufacturer is required to conduct such surveillance, submit, for the approval of the Secretary, a protocol for the required surveillance.".

SEC. 4. REPAIR, REPLACEMENT, OR REFUND.

Section 518(b)(1)(A)(ii) (21 U.S.C. 360h(b)(1)(A)(ii)) is amended by striking out "and" each place it occurs and inserting in lieu thereof "or".

SEC. 5. REPORTING.

(a) AMENDMENTS.—Section 519 (21 U.S.C. 360i) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (6) of subsection (a) as paragraphs (4) through (9), respectively, and by inserting before paragraph (4) (as so redesignated) the following:

"(1) shall require a device manufacturer or importer to report to the Secretary whenever the manufacturer or importer receives or otherwise becomes aware of information that reasonably suggests that one of its marketed devices—

"(A) may have caused or contributed to a death or serious injury, or

"(B) has malfunctioned and that such device or a similar device marketed by the manufacturer or importer would be likely to cause or contribute to a death or serious injury if the malfunction were to recur;

"(2) shall define the term 'serious injury' to mean an injury that—

"(A) is life threatening,

"(B) results in permanent impairment of a body function or permanent damage to a body structure, or

"(C) necessitates medical or surgical intervention to preclude permanent impairment of a body function or permanent damage to a body structure;

"(3) shall require reporting of other significant adverse device experiences as determined by the Secretary to be necessary to be reported;"; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking out "there is a probability that a device has" each place it occurs and inserting in lieu thereof "a device has or may have";

(B) in paragraph (1)(B)—

(i) by striking out "aware of information" and inserting in lieu thereof "aware of—

"(i) information"; and

(ii) by striking out "facility, the facility" and inserting in lieu thereof: "facility, or

"(ii) other significant adverse device experiences as determined by the Secretary by regulation to be necessary to be reported,

the facility";

and

(C) in paragraph (5)(B)(iii), by striking out "immediate".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect—

(1) 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act; or

(2) on the effective date of regulations of the Secretary to implement such amendments,

whichever occurs first.

SEC. 6. TECHNICALS.

(a) SECTION 201.—Section 201 (21 U.S.C. 321) is amended—

(1) in subsection (h), by striking out "any of its principal" and inserting in lieu thereof "its primary"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(ff) The term 'Commissioner' means the Commissioner of Food and Drugs.".

(b) REFERENCE.—

(1) Subsections (c) and (d) of sections 201, subsections (a), (d), (h), (i), (l), (m), and (o) of section 408, subsections (a) and (b) of 536, section 701(b), and subsections (a) and (b) of 801 (21 U.S.C. 321 (c) and (d), 346a (a), (d), (h), (i), (l), (m), and (o), 360mm (a) and (b), 371(b), and 381 (a) and (b)) and section 351(c) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(c)) are each amended by striking out "Health, Education, and Welfare" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Health and Human Services".

(2) Section 201(y), section 506(a), section 507(a), section 702(c), section 702A, and section 706(b)(5)(C)(i) (21 U.S.C. 321(y), 356(a), 357(a), 372(c), 372a, and 376(b)(5)(C)(i)) are each amended by striking out "of Health, Education, and Welfare" each place it appears.

(c) SECTION 304.—Section 304(d)(1) (21 U.S.C. 334(d)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking out "801(d)" each place it occurs and inserting in lieu thereof "801(e)"; and

(2) by striking out "clauses" and inserting in lieu thereof "paragraphs".

(d) SECTION 503.—Section 503(g)(3) (21 U.S.C. 353(g)(3)) is amended by striking out "approval" and inserting in lieu thereof "clearance".

(e) SECTION 513.—Section 513(f)(3) (21 U.S.C. 360c(f)(3)) is amended by redesignating clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) as subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), respectively, and by striking out "the 510(k)" and inserting in lieu thereof "the section 510(k)".

(f) SECTION 517.—Section 517(a)(10) (21 U.S.C. 360g(a)(10)) is amended by striking out "520(c)(4)(B)" and inserting in lieu thereof "520(h)(4)(B)".

(g) SAFE MEDICAL DEVICES ACT OF 1990.—Section 18(b) of the Safe Medical Devices Act of 1990 is amended—

(1) by striking out "(b)(4)(B)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(b)";

(2) in paragraph (1), by striking out "(3)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(4)"; and

(3) in paragraph (2), by striking out "(4)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(5)".

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1306, ADAMHA REORGANIZATION ACT

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, pursuant to rule XXVIII and House Resolution 467, I call up the conference report on the Senate bill (S. 1306) to amend title V of the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend certain programs, to restructure the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 467, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of May 14, 1992, at page 11320.)

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, I am opposed to this legislation. I understand that neither of these two gentlemen are, and, under rule XXVIII, I am requesting that I be permitted to control one-third of the time on general debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY] opposed to the conference report?

Mr. BLILEY. No, Madam Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia is not opposed to the conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS] is entitled to one-third of the time, so the time will be divided, as follows:

The gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] will be recognized for 20 minutes, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report on S. 1306.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, on behalf of the House conferees, I am pleased to present the conference report on S. 1306, the ADAMHA Reorganization Act. Passage of this landmark legislation represents an important continuation of the Federal Government's leadership in the fields of addictive and mental disorders.

First and foremost, the legislation provides for the reorganization of the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration. Under the legislation the three ADAMHA National Research Institutes for Alcohol Abuse, Drug Abuse and Mental Health will be transferred to the National Institutes of Health. All service related activities of the institutes, including clinical training and program evaluation activities, are transferred to the new Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. Under the proposal, three new Centers—the Center for Mental Health Services, Center for Substance Abuse Prevention, and Center for Substance Abuse Treatment Improvement—will be established to administer the Federal Government's substance abuse prevention, treatment, and mental health services programs.

The legislation also provides for the first comprehensive reform of the Federal Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Services Block Grant. The conference agreement reflects the original House proposal to establish two discrete block grants: one for mental health services and one for substance abuse services. In addition, the funding formula for allotting block grant funds between the States is revised to more accurately target funds to those populations most in need. Under the agreement, the relative population at risk will be taken into account as well as the State's fiscal capacity and cost of providing services.

In addition to extending expiring programs, the legislation establishes several new initiatives.

In the mental health area a new categorical program is authorized to develop systems of care to assist severely disturbed children and adolescents. The gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] deserves special recognition for his leadership—and that of the Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families, in promoting this initiative. Combined with related incentives in the Mental Health Services Block Grant, the legislation will help put the needs of children, a particularly vulnerable population, back on the national mental health agenda.

In the substance abuse area I want to highlight three important initiatives. The conference agreement provides for establishment of new categorical programs to establish treatment programs for expectant mothers, to provide financial assistance to trauma centers impacted by drug-related violence, and finally to establish a first rate, national treatment demonstration program in the National Capital Area. The agreement represents the culmination of three years of work by many Members and I'd like to recognize several for their contributions.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] was of great assistance in advocating establishment of residential treatment programs to help reduce the numbers of infants born exposed to drugs. The agreement responds forcefully to the continuing problem of women being denied access to drug and alcohol abuse treatment programs because they are pregnant. Under the legislation, new residential treatment programs will be established that can provide the child care and prenatal services that these women seeking drug treatment need. In addition, the legislation prohibits the denial of treatment services to women because of their pregnancy and makes States responsible—as a condition of receiving block grant funds—for assuring the availability of appropriate care.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN] and the gentleman from California [Mr. LOWERY] were tireless advocates for including trauma care centers as full partners in the fight against illicit drugs. The legislation authorizes a new program of grants to assist financially troubled trauma centers, particularly those serving large undocumented populations.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SYNAR] was instrumental in fashioning provisions of the conference agreement assuring that States enforce—as a condition of receiving Federal substance abuse block grant funds—minimum age of sale laws for tobacco products. The legislation also requires that federally funded drug prevention programs include strategies that will discourage the use of tobacco products by youth. The legislation recognizes the important relationship between early tobacco use by minors and the use of illicit drugs such as marijuana.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN], first as mayor of Alexandria, and now as a colleague, provided eloquent testimony of the need to channel new drug treatment resources into the National Capital Area to make it an example of quality for the Nation. Under the agreement, the Department of Health and Human Services will allocate $25 million over 3 years to better organize and improve the availability of drug treatment in Washington and the surrounding jurisdictions of Maryland and Virginia.

Passage of the legislation is also necessary to implement the recommendations of the President's National Drug Control Strategy. The legislation: First, establishes a new substance

abuse treatment capacity expansion program; and second, provides greater State accountability for the use of Federal substance abuse block grant funds through the preparation of State substance abuse prevention and treatment plans.

Finally, I want to say a few words about the importance of this legislation in the fight against AIDS. It has become increasingly clear that AIDS and substance abuse are public health threats that are integrally linked. The conference agreement recognizes this reality. New provisions are provided to require the provision of interim treatment services—including interim methadone at the option of the State and only if the State health officer certified that such treatment would not reduce the availability of comprehensive treatment services—to all intravenous drug abusers seeking assistance and to begin, on a limited basis, the provision of intervention services to IV drug users infected with HIV. In view of the skyrocketing rates of HIV among many drug using populations, it is essential that HIV risk reduction methods be incorporated into all drug treatment programs.

Madam Speaker, I urge support for the conference agreement.

□ 1610

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

Madam Speaker, despite significant strides that have been made in the reduction of illicit drug abuse, many problems associated with substance abuse still remain. Among the problems that continue to plague the country:

Each year an estimated 375,000 babies are born exposed to cocaine and other drugs;

Fetal alcohol syndrome [FAS] affects as many as 1 to 3 infants per 1,000 live births;

Nearly 50 percent of Federal prison inmates and 75 percent of State prison inmates have used drugs. In major cities, as many as 80 percent of those surveyed who were arrested for serious crimes tested positive for drug use; and

IV drug use now accounts for almost a third of the people infected with AIDS and is the primary cause of transmission of AIDS to newborns. Over half of the heterosexuals infected with HIV have contracted the virus through sex with an IV drug user.

These few statistics demonstrate the need for an effective program of substance abuse treatment. In light of this, I am pleased that a compromise could be reached on the reauthorization of the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration [ADAMHA].

One of the major objections that the minority has had with the House bill is that it placed a number of onerous set-asides, earmarks, and taps on the block grant to fund new categorical programs. This shifting of moneys from the block grant to set-asides and categorical grant programs significantly reduces the flexibility of States to address the critical needs of their populations.

To increase State flexibility in administering the block grant, the conference agreement has eliminated the set-aside for drug abusers and narrowed the existing set-aside for women. In addition, the taps on substance abuse and mental block grants have been eliminated or considerably narrowed.

Also, I am pleased to state that this conference report meets the administration's goal to reorganize the agencies of ADAMHA. This legislation transfers the three research Institutes to the National Institutes of Health [NIH]. The remaining agencies are reconstituted as the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, with the responsibility for Federal treatment and prevention programs. Also, a new Center for Mental Health Services has been created.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support this bill.

Madam Speaker, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN].

Madam Speaker, I am concerned that one of the block grant enforcement provisions in the conference report would give complainants a right to participate in noncompliance hearings that is broader than the right they currently enjoy. Under current law, complainants may present evidence at a hearing, but may not participate as parties. I do not believe that the conferees intended to give complainants the right to participate as parties, but the conference report provisions are somewhat ambiguous and might be misconstrued to expand the participation rights of non-Federal entities. Will the chairman confirm that we did not intend to expand such rights?

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLILEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WAXMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BLILEY. Am I, therefore, correct that if the conference report is enacted into law, non-Federal entities should not be permitted to participate as parties in noncompliance hearings?

Mr. WAXMAN. I agree with the gentleman's statement.

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Madam Speaker, I would like to preface my remarks with two assurances: First, the conference report on S. 1306 does indeed implement many needed accountability measures, safeguards, and new initiatives vital to the field of alcohol, drug abuse, and mental health services across this country.

Second, while my own State of Florida, as well as Texas, Arizona, Colorado, Virginia, Maryland, Delaware, Nevada, and California, stand to lose substantial funds as a result of the proposed funding allocation formula, it is not my intent to propose changes to the formula itself. While many components of the proposed formula are of questionable merit and even are controversial, I recognize that the formula is a result of prolonged and tireless bipartisan efforts. I stand ready to support the formula.

Having laid out those assurances, let me now bring to your attention some concerns. While the first concern relates only to the States that stand to lose funds, the remaining concerns impact every State in this country.

Due to these concerns, I will oppose the bill and will be supporting a motion to recommit the conference report at the end of general debate.

Madam Speaker, the nine States that I just mentioned, and I will repeat them, Texas, Arizona, Colorado, Virginia, Maryland, Delaware, Nevada, California, and Florida, stand to collectively lose $36,226,806 by this legislation.

Three-quarters of these funds, Madam Speaker, have already been allocated to these States, and in some cases spent or planned for by the respective State legislatures. To require these States to revert these funds, to refund these funds, if you will, at this stage of the Federal fiscal year, is not only unprecedented, but would cause irreparable harm. Florida alone will lose $16.5 million as a result of this legislation.

Madam Speaker, let me take a few minutes to describe how these reductions will affect the State of Florida.

First, there would be a $12.5 million reduction for substance abuse services. Reductions would be seen in residential services, which include detox, short- and long-term residential facilities and halfway houses. Outpatient services, which include counseling, testing, methadone treatment, aftercare, case management, and day treatment services would also be drastically cut.

The improvement to the entire health picture, the entire drug picture, substance abuse picture that this legislation is intended to help, would in fact be hurt.

Currently, there are over 3,000 clients on waiting lists statewide for residential and outpatient services at this time. As a result of these reductions, statewide waiting lists will increase by over 100 percent. Is that what we want to accomplish here in this Congress? I think not.

Florida would also lose the Florida Addiction Treatment Center, the only statewide facility exclusively for substance abusers with mental health

problems. This loss will result in 450 clients not receiving services.

In adult mental health services, the State of Florida will see a $4 million reduction. Most adult mental health initiatives will be set back.

By reducing the ability of communities to serve people with serious mental illness, increased utilization can be expected in mental health institutions and crisis stabilization units, all of which are already overcapacity.

Madam Speaker, several of my colleagues will address concerns with Federal funding for clean-needle programs and also address the provision allowing the Health and Human Services Secretary to issue regulations permitting methadone maintenance treatment programs and, therefore, I will not go into any extension of those.

My colleagues, I say to you through the Speaker, you owe it to yourselves and the constituents of your respective States to consider how this legislation might adversely affect your State through loss of dollars and through other mandatory provisions, and then demand an improved version.

By opposing the bill and supporting the motion to recommit, my colleagues can prevent bad public health policy and legislative procedure from becoming law. The result of investing a minimal amount of additional time and effort in conference over the next week or over the next few days will be a sound ADAMHA Reorganization Act, which implements responsible public health and drug abuse policy of which we can all be proud.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume on the issue of the formula for allocation for mental health and substance abuse funds.

Madam Speaker, this formula I think is fair and equitable. It was developed in close consultation with the General Accounting Office. It targets funds to States based upon the relative need of the State. The mental health formula allocates funds based on each State's population at risk for mental illness, the State's fiscal capacity, and the State's relative cost of providing services.

□ 1620

The substance abuse formula takes into account both the fiscal capacity of the State, the relative cost of providing services, and the population at risk, particularly the population of urban youth. Current law formula is flawed. Mental health funds were allocated by the same formula that applied for substance abuse. The populations at risk are very different.

Under current law, the formula placed great emphasis upon the relative urban population of a State. Urban population is a reasonable measure of the need for substance abuse services but not mental health services.

In 1991, the Department of Health and Human Services notified each State that its allotment for fiscal year 1992 would likely change. States were notified at the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], Senator KENNEDY, and myself. It was made clear to each State that the allocation formula was likely to change and, too, the change would be effective in fiscal year 1992.

States were encouraged to budget accordingly. All States were given protection.

In addition to providing States with early notification of change, the conference agreement includes provisions that protect for 3 years any State allocation from falling below the fiscal year 1991 level. All States are protected uniformly. Not every State is happy with the allocations, with the outcome. Some States, such as Florida or Texas, actually prefer current law. It is understandable. Current law provided larger net increases relative to fiscal year 1991 than the conference agreement.

No States, however, will actually experience a loss of funding. Every State was aware that a formula change was likely in fiscal year 1992.

If we go back into the conference, as some would have us do, to try to do something more for Florida and Texas, as they would like, we are going to have to do less for States that have done well, such as Indiana, New York, Ohio, Michigan, Washington, Tennessee, South Carolina, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Maine, Louisiana, Kentucky, Alabama, and Arkansas, just to name a few. My own State of California could argue that they should get more money, and I would love to get more money for the State of California. But we have got to get a formula that everyone can agree upon and get this bill moving. We have been deadlocked on this legislation for some years over this fight.

I want to point out again, a reminder to every Member, when the conference report came to the conferees, every single member of the conference signed it and every single member of that conference is supporting it. And that is on a bipartisan basis.

There are Members going to be unhappy with various aspects of this conference agreement. Some States, like Florida, are unhappy. Some are going to be unhappy about other provisions. We did the very best we could.

I would urge that we support this conference agreement, put this issue behind us in a way that I think resolves these outstanding questions in a fair and equitable manner.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BLILEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA].

Mrs. MORELLA. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1306, legislation to reauthorize Federal substance abuse and mental health programs.

This legislation will provide the authority for a number of critical substance abuse prevention and treatment programs. I am particularly pleased that the conferees retained language providing for residential substance abuse treatment for pregnant women. This provision embodied legislation introduced by my good friend and colleague, Congressman DURBIN; I am an original cosponsor of the bill.

Our failure to provide residential treatment for pregnant women has had a tragic impact on our Nation. An estimated 375,000 drug-affected babies are born every year, many with serious medical problems. The cost of providing medical treatment and foster care for these children is far greater than the cost of residential substance abuse treatment for pregnant women. Hospital care for drug-affected newborns alone totaled $121 million in Maryland in 1989. The cost of providing hospital and foster care services through age 5 for the 9,000 cocaine-exposed children in only 8 major cities in 1989 totaled $500 million. This cost does not include special education programs and services needed after the age of 5.

And yet, two-thirds of the hospitals surveyed in 1989 by the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families reported that they had no place to refer pregnant addicts for treatment. This bill authorizes grants for residential treatment, providing these women with the services needed to regain control over their lives, and preventing damage to their children. Society will benefit from the contributions of these women and their children, and we will avoid the enormous costs of caring for addicted infants.

I also commend the conferees for selecting the Washington, DC, metropolitan area for a substance abuse treatment demonstration program. Local governments will provide comprehensive substance abuse treatment services to thousands of area substance abusers, and will allow the Capital area to serve as a national model for treatment service delivery. This is particularly important in view of the recent revelation that the Washington area has the highest rate of new HIV infection in the country—and the disease is now spreading most quickly among intravenous drug users.

The Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments reports that more than 128,000 individuals over the age of 12 need drug or alcohol treatment; however, public resources are available to treat only 40,000 individuals. In addition, clients seeking treatment must wait from 4 to 24 weeks to enter available services. Increased Federal funding in combination with State, local, and regional efforts is necessary if we

are to provide critical and cost-effective treatment services.

Madam Speaker, I commend Chairman WAXMAN and the members of the committee for their efforts, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. RAMSTAD].

Mr. RAMSTAD. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the conference report on S. 1306.

Last week, 148 Members voted against passing this conference report on the Suspension Calendar. Much of this opposition was due to the fact that this reorganization bill does not include the current prohibition on the use of Federal funds for needle exchange programs.

As a result, States would be allowed, for the first time, to use Federal tax dollars for the distribution of needles to intravenous drug users. This would be a disastrous move and a virtual surrender of the fight against drug abuse.

I call my colleagues' attention to an editorial in the Washington Post dated February 29, 1992, about a failed needle exchange experiment in Zurich, Switzerland, known as Platzspitz.

Under this program, heroin addicts could gather together in a park, far from residential neighborhoods, where they were provided clean needles and medical care. The purpose of the park was twofold: To slow the spread of AIDS among intravenous drug users and to separate potentially dangerous abusers from the rest of society.

The experiment was, in the words of the Post, a disaster. In addition to the increased number of violent crimes and medical emergencies—including 81 drug-related deaths in 1 year alone—park users claimed that the absence of legal prohibitions against drugs attracted many youngsters to the park.

Fortunately, city officials came to their senses and closed the park in February. But not until after too many people had died from drug overdoses, or had been victims of drug-related crime, or had become addicted to drugs after visiting the park.

The lesson from Platzspitz is simple: The only way to keep people who use intravenous drugs from killing themselves is to get them into real, zero tolerance treatment programs and off drugs for good.

That is what ADAMHA is supposed to be about: Programs to help people receive the treatment they need for substance abuse problems. That's why ADAMHA does and should continue funding projects like the consolidated chemical dependency treatment fund in Minnesota, which pools together Federal, State, and local assistance for cost-efficient treatment services.

But legitimate programs like these suffer when funds are used for experiments, like needle exchange programs, that encourage, facilitate, or condone illegal drug use. In addition to providing money for substance abusers, we must give them the right message. Unfortunately, the present conference report does not do that.

That's why I sent a letter with a number of my colleagues asking the administration to support this motion to recommit the conference report, and I am pleased by the administration's decision to do so.

I urge my colleagues to support the antineedle exchange position of the National District Attorneys Association and vote for this motion to recommit the bill to conference. Let's pass an ADAMHA reorganization bill which will help save lives, not destroy them.

I ask that along with the full text of my statement, this editorial from the Washington Post, the policy position paper of the National District Attorneys Association, my letter to Secretary Sullivan, and the administration's policy statement be printed in the RECORD.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 29, 1992]

SECOND THOUGHTS IN SWITZERLAND

An experiment prompted by good intentions has failed in Switzerland. In response to the rising rate of both heroin addiction and AIDS in that country, city authorities in Zurich decided in 1989 to create a refuge for addicts in a park near the main railroad station. Because of this central location, the area, known as Platzspitz, was easily accessible to addicts, and because it is on a peninsula of land it was easily avoided by the general public.

The idea was to gather the addicts in a convenient place to keep them out of the increasingly frightened residential neighborhoods, while also making medical care, free syringes and condoms available at a place of congregation. But in order to draw drug users, a moratorium on arrests for possession and use was declared, and small sales were ignored.

In theory, it was a thoughtful, well-meaning plan. In practice it was a disaster. A few hundred addicts came in the beginning, but as the word spread, tens of thousands congregated, many from other countries in Europe. By last year, drug dealers from as far away as the Middle East had moved in.

International coverage of conditions in the park, including some stories in this paper, presented a picture of young people shooting up, hallucinating, acting wild or staring, stoned, into space. Television images were powerful. In Zurich, citizens were quickly disillusioned. There were increases in theft and violence in the area and almost continuous medical emergencies. Last year, there were 81 drug-related deaths in the park.

Swiss officials closed Platzspitz in February, and though they fear the dispersal of addicts throughout the city, they could no longer tolerate either the flood of outsiders or the chaotic conditions in the park. The incidence of AIDS in Switzerland is still high, though authorities claim that the rate of increase among intravenous drug users in Zurich has been slowed. Is there more addiction? That is not yet known. Statistical comparisons are hard to make because of the influx of addicts from other cities in Europe. But even some of the park's users have said that the absence of barriers to use and the easy availability of drugs in a public place attracted youngsters.

There must be a better way to reach addicts and to deal with AIDS in that population. That effort must continue. But an important lesson can be learned from the Zurich experience and from a similar experiment in Amsterdam, where drug use in public was tolerated. Notwithstanding the crime and related social problems associated with the drug culture, addiction itself is a terrible condition—degrading, dehumanizing and dangerous. One glimpse of the faces in the crowds at Platzspitz should convince even the most fervent reformer that legalization is the wrong way to go.

OFFICIAL POLICY POSITION OF THE NATIONAL DISTRICT ATTORNEYS ASSOCIATION

OPPOSING NEEDLE EXCHANGE EXPERIMENTATION

Whereas, a number of jurisdictions have or are considering experimentation with needle exchange programs; and

Whereas, proponents of needle exchange experimentation argue that permitting addicts to trade dirty for clean needles will reduce the transmission of HIV through shared needles; and

Whereas, this argument contains several faulty and unsupported assumptions such as:

Incorrectly assuming that addicts share needles because clean needles are unavailable. America's police and prosecutors have learned through interviews of addicts and seizures from addicts that needle sharing occurs as part of the drug culture even when addicts have unused needles readily available. Addicts often share the drugs contained in a single syringe and view needle sharing as an expression of trust with one another.

Incorrectly assuming that a needle exchange experiment will make needles more available. Insulin needles are commonly available and inexpensive. Several jurisdictions which have experimented with needle exchange have failed to show any benefit from the experiment, few addicts have exchanged needles, and no decrease in the spread of HIV has been established.

Incorrectly assuming that the only harm to be avoided is the transmission of HIV and ignores the fact that drug usage, particularly during pregnancy, causes permanent and even fatal effects on users and infants; and

Whereas, needle exchange experiments, to the extent they are successful, encourage addicts to continue illegal drug usage and are inconsistent with providing for education, enforcement, and treatment;

Therefore, be it resolved, that the NDAA condemns needle exchange experiments because they are being supported by faulty and unsupported assumptions which ignore the realities of drug usage; and

Be it further resolved that NDAA condemns needle exchange experiments as tolerating and even encouraging illegal drug usage; and

Be it further resolved the NDAA supports drug education, aggressive enforcement and readily available treatment as the most effective combination to eliminate the host of evils caused by the illegal use of drugs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 27, 1992.

Dr. LOUIS W. SULLIVAN,
Secretary, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Washington, DC.

DEAR DR. SULLIVAN: We the undersigned respectfully request that you and the Bush Administration oppose the present conference report on S. 1306, the Alcohol, Drug

Abuse and Mental Health Administration Reorganization Act of 1991.

We have two specific problems with the conference report: it does not include the current prohibition on federal funds for needle exchange programs and it requires the Department of Health and Human Services to issue regulations permitting "no-frills" methadone maintenance programs.

This is unsound public policy. Hard-core addicts need emergency outreach and drug treatment programs, not clean needles. They need comprehensive treatment and rehabilitative services, vocational training and employment counseling—not methadone. They need programs that *save* lives, not destroy them.

As you wrote House and Senate conferees on March 29, 1992, "There is no evidence that such programs reduce the incidence of HIV infection. Making sterile needles available to HIV Drug users only encourages more drug use." You were absolutely right.

While all of us are concerned with the spread of AIDS in our nation's cities, it does not make sense to remedy the problem by adopting HIV control programs that encourage dangerous and illegal drug use. Instead, we should promote aggressive outreach programs to educate intravenous drug users about the dangers of the HIV virus and drug treatment programs to get people off drugs for good.

Last week, 148 members voted against the conference report after minimal notification. We want to see an ADAMHA reorganization bill pass this year, but not if it includes provisions encouraging drug abuse.

For these reasons, we urge your support for a motion to recommit the conference report with instructions to the conferees to reinstate the prohibition on needle exchange and the removal of the "no-frills" methadone maintenance program. Your support will be a crucial factor in our efforts to clean up the conference report.

Thank you for your efforts and those of the Bush Administration to free America from the scourge of drugs. We look forward to your support for the motion to recommit.

Sincerely,

Jim Sensenbrenner, Tom DeLay, James M. Inhofe, Vin Weber, Porter J. Goss, Jim Ramstad, Robert K. Dornan, Bill Paxon, Sam Johnson, John T. Doolittle,

Members of Congress.

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 28 1992.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: We understand that you will soon have under consideration the conference report to accompany S. 1306, the ADAMHA Reorganization Act.

We are pleased that the conferees chose to include as the centerpiece of the legislation the reorganization of the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration (ADAMHA). We also support the other provisions that are consistent with the Administration's proposals to establish a substance abuse capacity expansion programs and to require statewide substance abuse treatment and prevention plans.

The Administration strongly objects to the conferees' removal of the prohibition against the use of State block grant funds for clean needle exchange programs. There is no evidence that such programs reduce the incidence of HIV infection. Making sterile needles available to IV drug users only encourages more drug use. We feel adamantly that the prohibition should not have been removed and we will support a motion to recomit with instructions to add the prohibition to the bill. The adoption of the prohibition would make the conference report acceptable to the Administration.

We are advised by the Office of Management and Budget that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely,

LOUIS W. SULLIVAN, M.D.

□ 1630

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the bill, particularly section 124, which targets trauma centers that are troubled by drug-impacted violence.

Madam Speaker, I wish to pose to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN], a question, to secure clarification on title VI of the conference agreement concerning trauma centers and drug-related violence.

The city of Newark, in the heart of my district, is the location for a nationally recognized level I trauma center, one which is confronted daily with a high incidence of drug use-related violence and injury. In addition, this trauma center serves an inordinately large indigent population.

This is the type of trauma center considered eligible to apply for assistance under the program. My question is, therefore, Mr. Chairman, in my interpretation, the violence stemming from drug trafficking emphasized by the conference report is inclusive of drug use-related violence and injury, as well as the violence associated with the importation, distribution, and sales of illicit drugs.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, the gentleman is correct, and I appreciate the opportunity to clarify this point.

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman for his response.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL].

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. WAXMAN], for the professional job that he has always done in this area.

Madam Speaker, I reluctantly rise in opposition to the bill and support its recommittal, because nowhere in the House bill and nowhere in the Senate bill did I find a provision which would allow for the interim use of methadone maintenance. Most of my colleagues know that methadone is an addictive drug, far more addictive than heroin, and many times it has been proposed as a treatment for heroin addicts, but only if provided with some type of counseling, some type of therapeutic assistance, but never just as a substitute drug.

HHS had already considered a proposed rule that would authorize the use of methadone, methadone maintenance, without providing the type of support service, and in the proposal in 1989 and 1990, State drug treatment agencies all over the country indicated that we were further eroding a very fragile treatment delivery system by superimposing the congressional will on those professionals who know best how to take care of drug addicts.

I have gone around the State and around the country as the chairman of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, and nowhere have I found that using methadone by itself as a treatment modality should be accepted. Indeed, I have in my hand a telegram that was sent to me by the former Director of the Division of Substance Abuse, Herbert D. Klieber, who is now a professor of psychiatry, that says that:

> Because the intra-methadone maintenance provision is not only a bad idea in itself, but that bad treatment can be worse than no treatment, it carries the risk of undercutting effective treatment, and given the budget difficulties of many States, it is conceivable that the full service slots might be sacrificed to expand these slots.

Indeed, as relates to the AIDS epidemic, we may be doing more damage than what we are trying to cure.

Madam Speaker, I do not know why this matter could not have had hearings, could not have been debated, could not have come before the House. But in the middle of the night it finds itself in the conference report. I must say that I would hope that even though it is in the bill, that the bill be recommitted and the conferees try to bring back to us what we have deliberated, what we have debated, and what we have asked them to come back with in conference, and not this material that was germane, but certainly was not voted in the House or Senate.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RANGEL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, first, we would not permit under this legislation permanent treatment slots to be turned into these temporary slots. The idea behind this interim service notion was that when people are on the waiting list to get into a treatment slot, and if there is not one available to them, we simply do not say, "Go home and we will call you when something is available." We let them, at the State option, choose to provide some interim services. A State would have the deter-

mination, the power to determine, what that would mean. A State could use methadone.

I know the gentleman opposes that, but from our point of view, better to do that than nothing; better to do counseling than nothing, especially when IV drug users might be sharing needles and spreading AIDS.

I would prefer, as the gentleman would, that everyone who needs a drug addiction program be given full and comprehensive services, but interim services are better than no services at all. That was our hope, to see them be made available under this legislation.

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, I would like to respond to the gentleman. That might be the right legislative view, and indeed, it might be the political view, but those that provide the services say that we may be doing more damage than good. We have had hearings on this and we have had State agencies say that if they cannot provide a full service, they should not be giving this very dangerous drug called methadone. There would be diversion, there would be people that OD by using this with other drugs. If we take a look at the places that are providing these interim services, they are not places we would want to see our friends or family have to attend.

Mr. WAXMAN. It sounds like the gentleman distrusts the ability of the States to use their good judgment on this matter, and in terms of the bill, we leave it up to the State to determine what short-term services should be available.

Mr. BLILEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OXLEY].

Mr. OXLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report, and give a great deal of credit to the conferees for putting together what I consider to be a very effective package. I say that for several reasons. First of all, the funding formula, particularly concerning the hold harmless clause, makes certain that no State is inadvertently or otherwise taken advantage of in the overall funding formula. I think that that has been, in the funding formula, set up very well by the committee to make certain it was fair.

Second, I think all of us for a long time had hoped that we could essentially split the alcohol-drug abuse program block grants from mental health, recognizing that they had two different and distinct functions. As a result of the conference committee report, we are doing exactly that.

Last, Madam Speaker, in regard to the needle exchange program, I for one oppose the concept of needle exchanges. However, I have to say that in the conference report the language is neutral. Indeed, it really does not speak to that controversy, essentially allowing jurisdictions to make their own determinations.

While I would like to see an outright ban, I recognize that in many instances it was simply impossible to provide, particularly based on what the Senate language had provided. So for those reasons, I think that those who apparently are trying to derail this worthwhile conference report by arguments about the needle exchange programs, I would ask that the Members keep their eyes on the ball here and find out specifically how their own individual State will do under the new funding formula, understand that the silence of the language regarding needle exchange is there for a purpose, and look to see how their own particular State does.

I, for one, urge particularly my colleagues from Ohio to support this worthwhile conference report.

□ 1640

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH].

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the conference report on S. 1306. Because of the change in the funding formula proposed in the conference report, the State of Nevada would lose approximately 5 percent of its funding for mental health services and alcohol and drug abuse services.

While 5 percent may not seem large to you, it is to Nevadans. In fact, it means that approximately 200 Nevadans would not be able to access alcohol and drug treatment and over 1,000 will be denied alcohol and drug prevention activities because of these cuts. Mental health services, too, would suffer losing $106,639.

The most troubling aspect of this conference report is that the formula change becomes effective immediately and is retroactive to October 1, 1991. Since three-quarters of these funds have already been allocated to States and used by some States like Nevada, these States would be required to return to return these funds. Surely this would cause irreparable harm to Nevada which is already under financial distress.

Let me share some statistics with you. According to a U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee study, Nevada ranks second in the Nation in the number of hardcore cocaine addicts. Even worse, over 50 percent of Nevada sixth graders report the use of alcohol and other drugs. The numbers are quite startling.

Furthermore, Madam Speaker, this conference report would allow the use of Federal funds to give needles to drug addicts. Rather than supporting this gimmick, Federal funds should be used for useful treatment programs—to improve the quality of life of our citizens in Nevada, and throughout the country.

Madam Speaker, we cannot let drug, and alcohol, and mental health statistics get worse. The conferees must reconsider this report so that States' awards for this fiscal year are held harmless and the formula is not implemented until October 1992. I urge my colleagues to vote to recommit this legislation.

Mr. BLILEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LOWERY].

Mr. LOWERY of California. Madam Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the managers of this bill, Mr. WAXMAN and Mr. BLILEY, for their efforts and cooperation in ensuring that the measure I introduced, H.R. 4285, the Trauma Care Center Alien Compensation Act of 1992, stayed intact throughout the House and Senate conference. I would also like to thank the conferees for their support of this important piece of legislation. I introduced this same measure last Congress, with the intention of assisting State and local governments in the maintenance and improvement of regional systems in trauma care.

Based upon recent Congressional Budget Office estimates of the undocumented alien population and the Census Bureau's estimates of yearly growth in this targeted population, approximately 6 million undocumented aliens and alien workers will be potential users of America's health care systems in 1992. Of the 6 million undocumented aliens present in the country, approximately 1.8 million will utilize some form of health care services available to the population at large, and of that, 40 percent of the costs incurred will be attributable to emergency medical services.

My legislation establishes a program of formula grants to compensate in whole or in part certain trauma care centers for unreimbursed costs incurred by treating undocumented aliens. It is my understanding that the conferees realized the crisis facing our Nation's trauma care centers and authorized $100 million to assist them for the fiscal year 1993.

Under my provision, trauma care centers must prove that at least 15 percent of their unreimbursed trauma care costs are attributable to undocumented aliens. Furthermore, trauma care centers must prove that they attempted to track down the patient to recover the costs. But once they have demonstrated to the Secretary of Health and Human Services that a genuine effort at recouping the costs of trauma care provided has been attempted, assistance from the Federal Government will be provided. While the formula may be subject to change, it is estimated that the 15 percent figure will address the most dramatic needs of the various trauma care centers throughout the country—enabling them to keep their doors open.

This problem is not a new one. In 1977, the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the House Subcommittee on Health and the Environment held hearings on five separate pieces of legislation which would have authorized the Public Health Service to provide financial assistance to medical facilities for trauma and medical emergency treatments provided to indigent and undocumented aliens. More recently, on September 11, 1985, the House Subcommittee on Immigration, Refugees, and International Law held similar hearings on this exact issue.

I do not think it is necessary for me to stand here on the floor and praise the virtues of trauma care centers and the role they play in saving lives. Without immediate treatment, many trauma patients die within the first hour of sustaining their injury. States such as California and Florida have set up trauma care network systems to ensure that state of the art surgical services would be available during the critical 60-minute period in which trauma patients must receive medical treatment or quite possibly die.

However, the financial viability of trauma centers is under tremendous strain. My legislation is but one response to the plea for Federal assistance from various hospitals and trauma care centers throughout the country.

While undocumented aliens are not the sole reason for the untimely closings and financial problems facing many of our Nation's trauma care centers, these individuals receive approximately 18 percent of our Nation's uncompensated emergency care. If the Federal Government ever gets around to implementing an effective immigration policy and regaining control of our international borders, the costs associated with this bill will decrease significantly.

I am pleased that the House and Senate conferees found that there is a proper role for the Federal Government to assist State and local governments with the costs of providing uncompensated trauma care to undocumented aliens. The costs of providing emergency medical services to undocumented aliens are increasing the already heavy burden shouldered by county taxpayers. Cities such as San Diego, Los Angeles, Houston, Tucson, Miami, and El Paso are treating a growing number of uninsured, undocumented trauma patients. The closing of over 60 trauma care centers in recent years is clear and convincing evidence that the time for Federal assistance is now. Closing trauma care centers is literally a matter of life and death.

I realize that there are larger financial problems facing our Nation's trauma care centers. However, it is my belief that a limited measure at this time is all that is possible in light of today's budget environment. But, Madam Speaker, I know with certainty that this beginning will save lives. It may be a child hit by a car, a heart attack patient, or an innocent victim of some senseless crime. We may not know who these benefactors will be, but we can know that our good efforts today will preserve life tomorrow.

Before I close, I wish to thank the chairman and ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. DINGELL and Mr. LENT, the chairman and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment, Mr. WAXMAN and Mr. BLILEY, and the members of the House and Senate conference for ensuring the viability and integrity of this much-needed measure.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BACCHUS].

Mr. BACCHUS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the motion to recommit S. 1306, the conference report that reauthorizes the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration. I certainly recognize the hard work and leadership of chairman WAXMAN and members of the Energy and Commerce Committee. There is much good in this conference report. Regrettably, I am unable to support the report because of the harmful effect it will have on Florida and many other States.

I am voting for this motion in the hopes that the conferees will address the retroactive funding provision for the new funding formula block grant. I am deeply troubled that, under this report, the formula would take effect immediately and would be retroactive to October 1, 1991. Three-quarters of the funds for this fiscal year have already been allocated to the States. In many cases these funds have already been spent or allocated. To require these States to give back these funds is not only unprecedented; it would cause irreparable harm.

In addition to the retroactive funding provision, the conference report also mandates certain substance abuse programs that further limit a State's ability to meet its own substance abuse needs. While these may be laudable programs, the conference report does not provide additional funding to help finance these new services. For example, the conference report requires that each State spend not less than 5 percent of its 1993 allocation on new services for pregnant women and for women with dependent children. Such services should be provided; however, there is not funding increase to meet this mandate. Quite the contrary, this conference report would immediately cut Florida's allocation of these block grant funds by $16.5 million—or more than 20 percent of the State's allocation of Federal funds. How can we cut funding retroactively and still mandate that another $3 million be set aside to provide new services for pregnant women and women with dependent children? Florida simply does not have the resources to meet these needs.

Like so many States during these recessionary times, Florida faces a severe budget crisis. Florida's State government is having to cut minimal services, while State and local administrators must stretch public funds to their limit to meet substance abuse and mental health needs, all of which are multiplying in our fastgrowing State. A reduction in these funds 8 months into this fiscal year would be a devastating blow to Florida's ability to maintain the current marginal levels of critically needed alcohol, drug abuse, and mental health services. This conference report is an abandonment of people in Florida and many other States who rely on these services. I support the motion to recommit this bill to the conferees.

Mr. BLILEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON].

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the motion to recommit the conference report on S. 1306, the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration block grant program.

If this legislation is approved by Congress here today, the State of Florida will lose approximately $16.5 million of our share of the block grant. To make matters worse, this loss is retroactive to October 1, 1991. Florida would have to give back $16.5 million with only 4 months left in the current fiscal year.

Of this cut, $4 million would be taken from mental health programs, which will result in an elimination of services to an estimated 3,536 seriously emotionally disturbed individuals requiring a range of community support services in order to be productive members of society.

The remainder of the cut would come in the form of a $12.5 million reduction in grants for substance abuse programs in Florida. This will result in elimination of services for an estimated 1,383 alcohol and drug abusing/addicted individuals requiring a wide range of community-based treatment services.

Madam Speaker, I am unaware of any such cut being imposed on a State before. It is unacceptable for this legislation to be retroactive. This bill reneges on a $16.5 million obligation to the State of Florida. It is an unsound and unfair financial practice to take back $16.5 million of Florida's grant award with only 4 months remaining in the grant year left to obligate the funds under statutory requirements of a 1-year obligation period.

But this is only one in a series of examples where Florida gets the shaft when it comes time to return Federal

funds. In fact, Florida, the Nation's fourth most populous State, is next to last among the States, 49th out of 50, in receipt of Federal formula and grant programs for State and local governments. And under this bill, Florida would lose more money, $16 million, than any other State by far. This is blatantly unfair and impossible to justify.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the strongest possible terms to support the motion to recommit.

Mr. BLILEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report, and I particularly want to comment on one aspect of it.

These are grants that are used for various purposes, and in the past they have been rather restrictive, and I think most of us have worked for more flexibility so that when they come to a State they can be used for those purposes that are of the highest priority for that particular State.

So I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for the work that has been done in this particular bill to make those, particularly for intravenous drug users, more flexible and more useful for a State like mine.

I urge my colleagues to support the conference report.

Mr. BLILEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today to oppose the conference report on S. 1306 and support the motion to recommit. I cannot, in good conscience, support the clean needle exchange provision or the methadone maintenance stations, especially when these programs in part will be instituted at the expense of drug abuse and mental health clients in the State of Florida. How in the world do we justify supporting the drug habits of hard-core addicts across this country at the same time closing the doors of working treatment and outreach centers in Texas, Florida and several other States? There is no logic in forcing States to return money that is currently well spent, committed to providing successful treatment to victims of drug and alcohol abuse. What can we tell individuals who suffer from mental illness and are currently receiving treatment in Florida? "Here's a clean needle? Have some methadone?"

Madam Speaker, I am asking my colleagues to recommit S. 1306 because it sets terrible precedents and because States like Florida will be unable to make up the million dollar losses to substance abuse and mental health programs. These vital assistance programs are counting on this money to continue their work for the next 4 months. It this bill passes, it is likely that: First, the State of Florida will fall out of compliance with Federal regulations, resulting in a Federal court takeover of adult mental health services; second, an additional, multimillion dollar cost to the State's taxpayers, and; third, loss of additional block grant funds because on noncompliance with public law.

I am asking my colleagues to recommit S. 1306 because we will lose the only statewide facility exclusively for substance abusers with mental health problems, the Florida Addiction Treatment Center. A waiting list of over 3,000 individuals will grow as residential services to 1,383 clients are cut, outpatient services to 2,416 clients are cut and, as the immigrant population continues to increase, Florida and every other reorganized border State will be in deep trouble.

I am asking my colleagues to recommit S. 1306 because we must provide for these people today, before they end up on Medicaid and everyone, State and Federal Governments, will end up footing an even greater bill.

Mr. BLILEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT. Madam Speaker, no State in the Union has greater problems with regard to the things that are attempted to be helped by this legislation, and to make a retroactive cut of $16 million against Florida seems to me to be not wise and certainly not fair.

The State of Florida has tried real hard to control drugs. It has a large area of penetration where people could come in with drugs.

The State of Florida has a lot of people who come to Florida who have been ill and are experiencing mental problems, and there are many special problems with regard to Florida. I think the new formula is unfair to Florida and should be corrected, and I hope the people will send this back by a motion to recommit.

Mr. BLILEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished minority whip, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH].

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

Madam Speaker, let me say that I rise because I will have a motion to recommit which has been cleared with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] and which is strongly supported by the Bush administration. The motion to recommit has nothing to do with the funding issue and no one should have any concern from the State level with a State that is involved in the funding fight.

The motion to recommit is narrowly and specifically instructing the managers to agree to a prohibition against using Federal funds to provide individuals with hypodermic needles or syringes so that such individuals may use illegal drugs.

Let me read from a letter today from Secretary of Health and Human Services Lou Sullivan to the Speaker:

> The administration strongly objects to the conferees' removal of the prohibition against the use of State block grant funds for clean needle exchange programs. There is no evidence that such programs reduce the incidence of HIV infection. Making sterile needles available to IV drug users only encourages more drug use. We feel adamantly that the prohibition should not have been removed and we will support a motion to recommit with instructions to add the prohibition to the bill. The adoption of the prohibition would make the conference report acceptable to the administration.

Madam Speaker, let me emphasize this for just a moment. A "yes" vote will be a vote to insist that the Federal Government not pay for any clean-needle programs for drug addicts. A "yes" vote will be a vote which says we are going to stop any taxpayer money at the Federal level from going to pay for drug addicts getting needles from their Government. Let me quote again what the Secretary of Health and Human Services said: "Making sterile needles available to IV drug users only encourages more drug use."

So in Lou Sullivan's words, based on his judgment as a doctor and as the head of Health and Human Services, a "no" vote would be a vote to encourage more drug use. I do not want any Member to be confused about this, that to vote against the motion to recommit as characterized by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, not by me, but by Dr. Sullivan, a "no" vote allows an activity to go on which, as he says, only encourages more drug use. So I want to ask every Member of the House to join in. I believe this can be handled cleanly and simply, to pass the motion to recommit, to accept the Senate language to prohibit using Federal funds to provide individuals with hypodermic needles or syringes so that such individuals may use illegal drugs.

I would strongly urge every Member to vote "yes" for the motion to recommit to cut off any Federal money being used to give needles to drug addicts.

Again, I would strongly urge you not to vote "no," because as Dr. Sullivan characterized it, a "no" vote would "encourage more drug use."

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in reluctant opposition to the bill and in support of the motion to recommit.

Madam Speaker, I must reluctantly rise today to oppose this conference report on the Community Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services Improvement Act. It is with re-

gret that I oppose the conference report because of the many critically needed programs authorized in this bill.

For example, the conference report includes a provision sponsored by my colleague CRAIG THOMAS which allows rural States more flexibility in meeting the needs of drug abuse victims. Another very important provision contained in this bill is sponsored by GLENN POSHARD. It directs the National Institute of Mental Health to establish an Office of Rural Mental Health whose purpose is to develop ways to deliver basic mental health outreach services to Americans living in rural areas.

These programs and others like them make it very difficult for me to vote against this bill. However, the funding allocation in the conference report contains a provision which would retroactively cut $10 million from Texas' funding for the current fiscal year. To me, this is unconscionable. It will effectively reduce for Texas residents the very services this legislation is designed to provide. I urge my colleagues to support the motion to recommit without instructions.

□ 1700

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes to oppose the motion to recommit and in support of this legislation.

I want to point out to my colleagues that this is not a conference report condoning needle exchange programs. The original House bill, H.R. 3698, passed the House on March 24 under suspension of the rules. That legislation did not restrict the option of States to design drug treatment programs, including the option of needle exchange programs as a part of AIDS prevention activities. In this regard, the conference report is identical to the original House-passed provision.

The point that has been raised is really a tangential issue to what this bill is all about. I do not think it is being raised legitimately in terms of what the provision does.

There are no provisions regarding needles in this bill. States have total discretion in this area. We should have confidence that the State drug directors will act in the best interests of their States.

The National Commission on AIDS recommended against a Federal ban on State-run needle exchanges.

The AIDS epidemic in some States is highest among IV drug abusers and their sexual partners and children, but we should not federally preempt the ability of States to slow the spread of AIDS.

Now, there are a lot of people here who have talked against this bill because they do not like the funding formula. They think that Florida ought to do better. I understand that you would like your State to do better. The motion to recommit does not address that issue. The motion to recommit, however, will put us all back into conference.

I think we ought to recognize that once we are in conference, there is a good chance that we will get so bottled up on all the issues that might be raised that we may not come out of conference again. It took 3 years for us to work on this formula issue and to resolve it.

I am very much concerned if this motion to recommit is adopted that we end up with an inability to address the important mental health substance abuse programs, the research programs.

The administration supports this conference report because they want the reorganization of ADAMHA, and that is what the conference agreed to.

I would urge that the Republican motion to recommit be defeated. Those who do not like the conference report, do not vote for it, but let us get this thing adopted by, I think, the overwhelming majority here who should want to support this legislation.

Mr. BLILEY. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER].

Mr. HERGER. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report on S. 1306. This bill was correctly defeated under suspension of the rules last week and should be defeated again today.

This conference report removes the current prohibition on the use of Federal funds for drug needle exchanges. How can we claim to be fighting a war on drugs when we are giving abusers the very tools of their self-destruction.

As a member of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, I understand the exploding problem of AIDS among intravenous drug users. We need treatment and prevention programs that address this problem, but this provision sends the wrong message.

I also join a number of my colleagues who are concerned about the mandate for no-frills methadone treatment. It has been reported that addicts would be able to go to a number of different methadone centers every day, even receiving doses to go. This is not treatment, it is abuse.

It has been reported that individuals have died as a result of unrestricted access to methadone. We cannot allow that.

This is an important bill, but too seriously flawed to be passed by this House. I urge your "No" vote on the conference report.

Mr. BLILEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HOLLOWAY].

Mr. HOLLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant opposition to this because I do believe that it is a good bill overall, but I do have a problem with giving free needles when proven facts show it does not work.

It bothers me to think that if we were to give condoms out, to think we would have less sex, and if we give free needles out, we think we would have less drug use, and figures show that we are not preventing the spread of the HIV virus by doing it. It bothers me very much.

The gentleman just said that we do not want to go back to conference. I think the only thing we would like to see happen with this bill is to go back to conference and take out the ability to use block grant funds to give out free needles.

I know other States have problems with funding levels.

I think the bill is a good bill, but so often we end up having to vote against a bill in this Chamber because of something that is put in it that makes it totally offensive to support.

So I rise in opposition to this. I ask that we recommit this bill and in doing so that we encourage the conferees to take out the use of block grant funds for free needle use.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW].

Mr. SHAW. Madam Speaker, I would like at this time to associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues from Florida.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. JOHNSTON].

Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida. Madam Speaker, I reluctantly request the body to agree to the motion to recommit because of the formula.

Madam Speaker, we are all here today to support vital programs dealing with alcohol, drug abuse, and mental health services. In general, the aims of S. 1306 should be applauded; however, I must reluctantly rise in support of a motion to recommit the S. 1306 conference report because of provisions that place undue burdens on several States including the State of Florida.

The aims of S. 1306 are undermined when it includes provisions to slash funding for vital State services. Florida alone stands to lose $16.4 million. Because of these cuts, 11,500 substance abuse clients and 3,400 mentally ill clients will go without necessary treatment services.

Congress must move forward in partnership with State government to provide a strong program of alcohol, drug abuse, and mental health services. S. 1306 includes retroactive provisions to reclaim funds already appropriated for State services. To require States to give back program funds is unprecedented and unfair, and destroys the foundation of trust between Federal and State government.

The funding provisions in S. 1306 must be reexamined to affirm our commitment to alcohol, drug abuse, and mental health services. Please support the motion to recommit.

Mr. SHAW. Madam Speaker, I would urge all my colleagues to take a very close look at this bill. It has many fine parts, there is no question about it. The committee has worked very hard and it has a lot of bipartisan support right here in this body, but there is one thing in this bill other than the funding which I am upset about, and that is an original basis, on a State basis; but I am terribly concerned that for the first time this bill would permit federally subsidized needle exchange programs.

Now, how many times do we have to say no to drugs? How many times do we have to talk about this, and the people who are supporting this and put this in the bill have been very strong on the idea of educating people on the harmful effects of illegal drugs in this country.

Then you turn around and say, "But if you are going to use it, we are going to be sure that you have clean needles."

That is like you are saying you are going to outlaw bullets, but if somebody is going to use them, you are going to give them the guns. It makes absolutely no sense.

And look at this. You are telling the American taxpayer that out of some of their tax dollars we are going to make funds available for drug users to go shoot themselves up.

Now, what sense does that make? How are we going to possibly go home and explain that wasteful use of Federal money?

Now, there are enough problems around here to last us for two or three sessions. This is one we certainly do not need.

A vote for the motion to recommit is a vote to instruct the conferees simply to take that portion out of the bill which relates to federally mandated needle exchanges, and nothing else.

A vote to recommit does not solve Florida's problem, unfortunately, but a vote to recommit makes sense for everybody here in this Chamber, no matter what your State formula is.

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

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to S. 1306, the conference report on ADAMHA authorization.

As a microcosm of the national drug problem, my home State of Florida continues to lead the Nation in innovative law enforcement and drug treatment programs. However, should the provisions of this bill be enacted, Florida will lose $16 million in critically needed substance abuse and mental health funding. This will not only critically injure an already overburdened drug and mental health treatment system, but divert funds away from a State which holds a unique position to create and implement positive solutions to the nations's drug problem.

Second, while I share my colleagues' goal of stemming the spread of the AIDS virus, distribution of clean hypodermic needles for intravenous drug use cannot accomplish this. Such action only encourages the spread of this deadly plague by allowing current users to safely continue their addiction until the day they use an infected needle because the government isn't there to put a clean one in their hand. Let's reduce the spread of AIDS by reducing drug use, not encouraging it.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the conference report.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the provision of this conference report that establishes a new grant program to provide comprehensive residential treatment services to substance-abusing pregnant and post partum women and their children.

It has been my pleasure to work on this provision with the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. WAXMAN, and I would like to thank him for his support.

Madam Speaker, 375,000 babies are born each year in the United States who were exposed to illegal drugs before birth—1 out of every 10 newborns. The cost of caring for them is enormous: Hundreds of millions of dollars in hospital costs each year just to stabilize them immediately after birth, and billions of dollars annually for health care, foster care, special education, and other social services they will need as they grow up.

For many addicted pregnant women, only a long-term residential treatment program can provide the services they need, including counseling, child care, room and board for the women and their children, and other services. Many women need to be able to get away from the environment that nurtures their drug use. A residential treatment program provides the support system they need to stop their drug use and focus on their recovery.

According to the Institute of Medicine, the clients of longer term residential treatment programs end virtually all illicit drug taking and other criminal behavior while in residence. They also demonstrate lower drug use and criminal activity and greater social productivity after discharge than they did before admission and than other individuals who did not receive similar treatment. As a result, the Institute of Medicine included residential treatment programs for pregnant women and their children in its core strategy for addressing our Nation's drug treatment needs.

Unfortunately, many of our Nation's residential treatment programs currently refuse to serve pregnant women or refuse to make provision for their children. As a result, pregnant women who desperately need treatment languish on the waiting lists for the few programs that are available. While they look for a program that has an opening and will accept them, they and their children suffer the continuing effects of their addiction.

This measure will help change that tragic reality, by establishing a grant program offering to addicted pregnant women and their children the opportunity for comprehensive treatment in a residential setting in which the children are allowed to reside with their mother.

The legislation spells out the comprehensive list of services that must be provided, so that programs will deal with the women and children's full range of needs. For example, services for women must include health care, AIDS, and domestic violence counseling, training in parenting, involvement of other family members as appropriate, counseling on obtaining employment, and planning and counseling to assist re-entry into society both before and after discharge. Similarly, services for children must include health care, child care, counseling as appropriate, and other social services to help them overcome the effects of maternal addiction.

This residential treatment grant program and a related outpatient program for pregnant women are jointly authorized at a funding level of $100 million in 1993, and such sums as necessary in 1994. Emphasis is given to the residential treatment program, including additional funding from the block grant and potential funding from the special drug asset forfeiture fund. It is my hope that we will soon see many women and their children given a new lease on life because of the residential treatment services authorized in this program.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, as I did last week when the House first considered this legislation, I again rise in strong opposition to this conference report on S. 1306, the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administrative Reorganization Act, because it would cause irreparable damage to alcohol, drug abuse, and mental health programs throughout Florida.

This legislation significantly alters the formula under which Federal alcohol, drug abuse, and mental health block grants funds are awarded to the States. Most importantly, it includes a retroactive change to the formula effective October 1, 1991. This unfair retroactive change in the formula means Florida will lose more than $16.5 million in Federal funds which are planned for use in the final quarter of the current fiscal year for substance abuse treatment and mental health programs. In principal, I oppose any legislation that seeks to retroactively recapture previously allocated funds especially in a case when the care and lives of thousands of individuals are jeopardized.

As I indicated to my colleagues during debate on this legislation last week, Pinellas County, FL, which I represent, has developed a number of nationally recognized model programs in these areas. The retroactive loss of Federal support will force many of these programs to close or substantially reduce the number of people they serve.

Two of the principal sponsors of these programs in my district, Operation PAR, and Gulf Coast Jewish Family Services, would be greatly impacted by the retroactive formula changes in this legislation and redistribution of Federal funds allocated for these programs earlier this year. Operation PAR runs a number of outpatient and residential substance abuse treatment programs including an in-jail substance abuse program which would be eliminated. Florida already has a waiting list of 3,000 persons seeking outpatient and residential services. The impact of this bill will be a doubling in the size of this waiting list.

Gulf Coast Jewish Family Services would have to eliminate its geriatric caregiver support team which provides support for the families of mental health patients. This will drive up the cost to families and the Federal and State government by forcing families to rely more heavily on nursing homes and other institutional care facilities to provide these services at much greater cost.

Following my remarks, Madam Speaker, I would like to include for the benefit of my colleagues an editorial entitled "A Cruel Federal Cut" from the May 25 edition of the St. Petersburg Times which reiterates the catastrophic impact the enactment of this legislation would have on these types of programs in Florida. In many cases, entire programs will have to close leaving vulnerable residents of all ages without vital services.

Florida is one of 12 States which will lose funds under these new formulas and the dropping of any protection offered by a hold harmless provision which would prevent the recapture of funds awarded to the States earlier this year. Given the financial situation of Florida and the other State governments, it is doubtful that the State can find available funds to offset this reduction in Federal support.

State officials advise me that in Florida's case, the $12 million reduction in Federal support for substance abuse programs will result in a loss of services for 1,400 alcohol and

drug abusing and addicted individuals seeking community based help. The $4 million in lost mental health funding will mean 3,500 seriously disturbed individuals will not receive the support they require to remain in their communities and not in more expensive institutional settings.

Madam Speaker, through my work on the House Appropriations Subcommittee which funds our Nation's substance abuse and mental health programs, I am aware of the urgent need to provide greater, not less, support for these community based programs which provide innovative services that help thousands of American families. Public and private agencies throughout the State of Florida, and particularly in Pinellas County which I represent, have developed a number of exceptional programs to combat the problems of drug abuse and mental illness. Their work and innovation are threatened by this conference report today and I again urge my colleagues in the House to reject this legislation. We should support the upcoming motion to recommit this legislation back to the conference committee. There it can be amended to include a hold harmless provision to protect Florida in the current fiscal year or some other way revised so that it does not unfairly and retroactively penalize Florida and the 11 other States that would lose vital Federal support for a number of important ongoing programs.

[From the St. Petersburg (FL) Times, May 25, 1992]

A CRUEL FEDERAL CUT

A drug rehabilitation program in Pinellas County keeps substance abusers and their newborns together. The special needs of babies born to addicted mothers are tended at PAR Village, and the bonding helps speed the mothers' recovery.

Families who care for elderly mental health patients benefit from special attention themselves. Gulf Coast Jewish Family Services runs a geriatric care-giver support program that provides the encouragement and nurturing that is so critical to families facing such a challenge.

These are just two of the effective programs in serious jeopardy because of congressional action. The Florida delegation should scramble to stave off an impending loss of $16.5-million.

What makes this worse than most cuts in federal funding is that Florida already has received most of the money allotted for the current fiscal year, has planned for its use and, in some cases, already spent it. The Federal Government in essence would be asking Florida to hand the money back, an unacceptable request in any year but preposterous in this time of painful budget cuts at the state level.

The problem resulted from a restructuring of the formula used to distribute federal money, something that was not unexpected by officials who administer alcohol, drug abuse and mental health programs for Florida. Traditionally, the formula had favored states with heavy urban populations at the expense of more rural states, and there was a need to revise the distribution process to make it more equitable.

What wasn't anticipated and, officials say, was unprecedented, is the provision in the legislative package that would refigure Florida's 1991-1992 share under the new formula and require the state to return the difference.

"At no point did we expect they would take out the money we (already) were programing to spend," said Pam Petersen, deputy assistant secretary for drug and alcohol abuse at Florida's Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services.

A final vote on the package has been delayed in Congress. It should be sent back to conference committee and at the least, language should be restored that would allow Florida and 11 other affected states to keep this year's allotment.

That would give state legislators a little more time to figure how to make up for the loss of federal support. It also would give them more time to consider the suffering they cause by lacking the courage to accomplish serious financial reform.

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Madam Speaker, I rise in support for the conference report for the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration [ADAMHA] Reorganization Act.

I am proud to have worked in the Energy and Commerce Committee to ensure that this legislation maintains the current level of funding for drug and alcohol rehabilitation programs in the State of Pennsylvania. Further, I am pleased that the conference report includes a provision which I introduced which allows the State to maintain the current funding level for it's mental health programs.

Pennsylvania provides one of this Nation's most effective and established programs for mental health services and residential and out patient drugs and alcohol treatment. I encourage all of my colleagues to support this legislation which will continue this Nation's efforts in combating drug abuse and provides treatment for the mentally ill.

Mr. KOPETSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the conference report on S. 1306, the Community Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services Improvement Act of 1992.

Mental disorders and substance abuse are among the most widespread, destructive, and costly public health problems our Nation faces. Nearly 19 percent of American adults suffer from mental or addictive disorders in any 6-month period. Some 7.5 million American children suffer from mental disorders such as depression, autism, and learning disabilities. The direct and indirect costs of disorders of the brain and central nervous system are estimated to be $401.1 billion. These are serious illnesses, and they deserve a serious and substantial effort targeted at their elimination and treatment.

Most attention in this debate on the reauthorization is focused on two issues, the block grant formula and needle exchange programs.

Madam Speaker, this conference report represents the end of a long road for the issue of the alcohol, drug abuse, and mental health services, or ADMS, block grant program formula.

Since its creation in 1981, the ADMS block grant formula has been the focus of great controversy. An initial problem with the formula was that States which aggressively pursued funding under the earlier Community Mental Health Centers Program were essentially penalized, because the formula was based on States' 1981 allocation for mental health and substance abuse services. The formula was changed in 1984 to reflect the relative population and per capita income of each State. However, a 1986 report by the University of California, San Francisco, recommended that the formula be refined to include need indicators based on age and gender. The war on drugs of the mid- to late-1980's resulted in preference in the formula being given to States with large urban areas, when the block grant was reauthorized in 1988.

Madam Speaker, ever since then, rural States have come out on the short end of the stick, despite the fact that residents of rural areas have the same incidence rates for alcohol abuse and mental disorders. The General Accounting Office recommended changing the formula to remove the urban weight in these categories, and the conference report's formula does this. This new formula is largely the same as the one contained in the Senate version of the bill. The Senate unanimously passed its version of this bill, showing the breadth of support for the formula. Much of this support is due to the inclusion of a hold harmless provision for largely urban States. The conference report contains a hold harmless provision for length of the authorization, which is 3 years.

Madam Speaker, while there will be some short-term pain for a handful of States, the new formula contained in the conference report is a dramatic improvement.

A second controversial issue regarding the conference report is needle exchange programs. I would like to clarify that this bill will not establish a Federal needle exchange program. However, it will give States the discretion to use Federal funds for programs that provide clean needles or bleach to drug addicts to reduce the spread of disease and induce addicts to enter treatment. The President's Commission on AIDS strongly endorses needle exchange programs based on the available evidence that suggests such public health measures can reduce the spread of AIDS and encourage addicts to enter treatment programs.

Madam Speaker, needle exchange programs work. Taking this treatment option out of the hands of States is short-sighted.

I urge my colleagues to support the conference report.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I urge the Members to vote against the motion to recommit and support the conference report.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. UNSOELD). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. GINGRICH

Mr. GINGRICH. Madam Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. GINGRICH. I am opposed, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GINGRICH moves to recommit the conference report to accompany the bill, S. 1306, to the committee of conference on the dis-

agreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to agree to section 205(f) of the Senate bill (relating to a prohibition against using funds to provide individuals with hypodermic needles or syringes so that such individuals may use illegal drugs).

Mr. BROOKS. Madam Speaker, I rise before the House in support of the motion to recommit S. 1306. I do not usually support motions of this nature, and I am aware and appreciative of the dedicated bipartisan efforts that have been put into this measure. But I cannot support the immediate retroactive cut in funding that the State of Texas and the eight other States will be forced to accept should this bill not be recommitted to conference. At a time when our State health communities are faced with serious budget crises, a retroactive cut in funding will cause a critical disruption of assistance to our constituents who need alcohol, drug abuse, and mental health services. Texas is slated to lose $10 million in this conference report—effective in this fiscal year. This action could deal a devastating blow to our States—we must not put our ability to deliver critically needed health services in jeopardy. If this bill is recommitted to conference and States are held harmless for these much needed funds, we can prevent our States from serious financial burdens.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 214, nays 157, answered "present" 1, not voting 62, as follows:

[Roll No. 150]

YEAS—214

Allard
Allen
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Bacchus
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett
Bateman
Bennett
Bentley
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Boucher
Browder
Bryant
Burton
Bustamante
Callahan
Camp
Carper
Carr
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Combest
Condit
Coughlin
Cox (CA)
Crane
Cunningham
Davis
de la Garza
DeLay
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan (CA)
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
English
Erdreich
Ewing
Fascell
Fawell
Fields
Fish
Franks (CT)
Frost
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Gradison
Gunderson
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hancock
Hansen
Harris
Hastert
Hayes (LA)
Henry
Herger
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Holloway
Hopkins
Horton
Houghton
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Ireland
James
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Johnston
Jones (NC)
Kasich
Kleczka
Klug
Kyl
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Lloyd
Lowery (CA)
Lowey (NY)
Luken
Machtley
Martin
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McGrath
McMillan (NC)
McMillen (MD)
McNulty
Meyers
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Molinari
Mollohan
Moorhead
Myers
Nichols
Nussle
Olin
Ortiz
Orton
Patterson
Paxon
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Porter
Poshard
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Regula
Rhodes
Ridge
Riggs
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Saxton
Schiff
Schroeder
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Smith (FL)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Staggers
Stallings
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sundquist
Swett
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Traficant
Upton
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Weber
Weldon
Wise
Wolf
Wylie
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—157

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Anderson
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Annunzio
Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Berman
Blackwell
Bonior
Borski
Brewster
Byron
Cardin
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cox (IL)
Coyne
Cramer
Darden
DeFazio
Dellums
Derrick
Dickinson
Dicks
Dorgan (ND)
Downey
Durbin
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Engel
Espy
Evans
Fazio
Feighan
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Grandy
Green
Guarini
Hall (OH)
Hayes (IL)
Hefner
Hertel
Hoagland
Horn
Hoyer
Hughes
Jacobs
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jones (GA)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kostmayer
LaFalce
Lancaster
Lantos
Lehman (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Long
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDermott
McHugh
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Montgomery
Moody
Moran
Morella
Mrazek
Nagle
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nowak
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens (NY)
Owens (UT)
Oxley
Pallone
Panetta
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Pease
Pelosi
Perkins
Peterson (MN)
Price
Reed
Richardson
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Sanders
Savage
Sawyer
Scheuer
Schumer
Sharp
Sikorski
Skaggs
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Solarz
Stokes
Studds
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Thomas (GA)
Thornton
Torres
Towns
Unsoeld
Valentine
Vento
Washington
Waters
Waxman
Weiss
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wolpe
Wyden
Yates

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Levin (MI)

NOT VOTING—62

Alexander
Anthony
Barnard
Barton
Beilenson
Boxer
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown
Bruce
Bunning
Campbell (CA)
Campbell (CO)
Chandler
Chapman
Clay
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Dannemeyer
DeLauro
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dwyer
Dymally
Early
Edwards (OK)
Gaydos
Hatcher
Hefley
Inhofe
Kolter
Lagomarsino
Leach
Lehman (CA)
Lent
Levine (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Livingston
Manton
Marlenee
McEwen
Michel
Morrison
Murphy
Murtha
Oakar
Packard
Payne (VA)
Ray
Roe
Roukema
Schaefer
Schulze
Stark
Torricelli
Traxler
Vander Jagt
Walsh
Wilson
Yatron
Young (AK)

□ 1733

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Brooks for, with Ms. DeLauro against.

Mr. Payne of Virginia for, with Mr. Dymally against.

Messrs. THOMAS of Georgia, DERRICK, TAYLOR of Mississippi, HAYES of Illinois, MFUME, and CRAMER, Mrs. KENNELLY, and Ms. KAPTUR changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. SMITH of Florida, BUSTAMANTE, COBLE, SWETT, DOOLITTLE, RAHALL, WISE, and VISCLOSKY, Mrs. SCHROEDER, and Messrs. TRAFICANT, COX of California, and BOUCHER changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan changed his vote from "nay" to "present."

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. COLLINS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, due to an emergency involving my mother, I was forced to miss five important votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on the rule to the conference report on H.R. 2507, the National Institutes of Health Revitalization Amendments of 1992, and "yes" on the final passage of this conference report. Programs under the National Institutes of Health are critical not only for medical research, but also for the development of a universal health plan that assists all Americans, both rich and poor. These programs are also crucial for studying women's health issues which have been largely ignored. Should the President veto this measure, I will also support the override.

On the vote authorizing funds for investigations and studies by standing and select committees of the House, I would have voted "yes" on the rule, and "yes" on final passage of the measure.

On the vote on the motion to recommit S. 2783, the medical device amendments, I would have joined 157 of my colleagues in voting "nay."

I apologize to my constituents for being unable to vote on these consequential subjects.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, May 28, 1992, I was granted a leave of absence on account of the death of my Father. I was not able to vote on the following rollcall votes: Rollcall No. 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, and 150.

Had I been present on May 28, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall 145, "aye" on rollcall 146, "aye" on rollcall 147, "aye" on rollcall 148, "aye" on rollcall 149, and "aye" on rollcall 150.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Speaker, if the Members would listen up, we are about to hear what is going to happen for the rest of the week and next week. I would yield to the majority leader to enlighten the membership.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Obviously that is a very effective way to bring order in the House.

Madam Speaker, we are finished for today with business. There will not be votes on tomorrow.

The House will meet at noon on Monday, but there will be no legislative business.

On Tuesday the House will meet at noon and take up seven bills on suspension, but any votes on the suspensions will be postponed until the end of the day on Wednesday.

The suspensions to be taken up are:

H.R. 4801, to extend the authorization for the historic preservation fund.

H.R. 3905, to authorize appropriations for the advisory council on historic preservation.

House Concurrent Resolution 156, emancipation of the Baha'is.

House Concurrent Resolution 297, Israeli Embassy bombing in Buenos Aires.

House Concurrent Resolution 299, regarding the Kurds in northern Iraq.

House Concurrent Resolution 305, commending Albania for democratic elections, and a House resolution.

House Concurrent Resolution 305, regarding Burma.

On Wednesday, June 3, and the balance of the week, the House will meet at noon on Wednesday. We will be taking up the Department of Defense authorization bill for fiscal year 1993, subject to a rule. Members can expect a possible vote on a rule by 1:30 or 2 o'clock on Wednesday. There then is general debate. Last year the general debate was approximately 1 hour. So Members can expect amendments would start on that bill and votes might start at 3 or 4 o'clock in the afternoon.

At the end of the day on Wednesday we will take up the votes, if any, on the suspensions.

On Thursday and the balance of the week we will continue with the Department of Defense authorization and the Unemployment Compensation Amendments of 1992, subject to a rule.

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Speaker, I thank the majority leader.

Just to repeat what was said, there will be no votes on Monday and Tuesday at all, and the earliest there may be possible votes on Wednesday would be sometime around 1 o'clock.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Madam Speaker, that is correct.

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Speaker, if the majority leader could tell us, the Committee on Rules being a committee of jurisdiction, reported the Hamilton-Gradison congressional reform resolution today. Might that be taken up next week at all?

Mr. GEPHARDT. Madam Speaker, it will not be taken up next week.

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Speaker, the other matter of interest to Members is the appointment of conferees to the supplemental. Is that likely to take place early next week?

Mr. GEPHARDT. Madam Speaker, that will take place early next week.

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Speaker, the majority leader did not mention next Friday. Is there any way to judge from this calendar for next week whether we would expect votes next Friday?

Mr. GEPHARDT. Madam Speaker, we do expect votes on Friday.

Mr. SOLOMON. We expect to be in session and have votes on Friday?

Mr. GEPHARDT. That is our expectation.

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Speaker, is there any idea when we might adjourn on Friday, so that Members can make their reservations?

Mr. GEPHARDT. We always try to adjourn at an early hour on Friday, no later than 3 o'clock.

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Speaker, I thank the majority leader for enlightening us and wish him a good weekend.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Madam Speaker, I would inform Members that at this point we will be taking up right after this the report from the Committee on House Administration on the House post office. That report will be forthcoming in the next few moments. There will be no votes on that, but that report will be taken up.

HOUR OF MEETING ON MONDAY, JUNE 1, 1992

Mr. GEPHARDT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 3, 1992, AND THURSDAY, JUNE 4, 1992

Mr. GEPHARDT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Tuesday, June 2, 1992, it adjourn to meet at noon on Wednesday, June 3, 1992, and that when the House adjourns on Wednesday, June 3, 1992, it adjourn to meet at noon on Thursday, June 4, 1992.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. GEPHARDT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 5056

Mr. ALLEN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO] be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 5056.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1740

AUTHORIZING LITIGATION RELATIVE TO CERTAIN TRIBES OF SOUTH DAKOTA, NORTH DAKOTA, AND MONTANA

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the Senate bill (S. 2342) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgment in favor of the Mississippi Sioux Indians in Indian Claims Commission dockets numbered 142, 359, 360, 361, 362, and 363, and for other purposes," approved October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1168 et seq.), and

ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. UNSOELD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. RHODES. Madam Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so for the purpose of yielding to the gentleman from South Dakota to explain the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Madam Speaker, S. 2343 is sponsored by Senator DASCHLE of South Dakota. The bill simply extends the period of time that three Sioux Tribes may challenge the validity of a 1972 act which was to distribute a judgment fund to them. The judgment came from the Indian Claims Commission in 1967. In 1972, the Congress passed an act which recommended distributing the judgment fund to the tribes and provided for a 25-percent distribution to lineal descendants who are not members of the tribes. This provision was inserted by the Interior Department. The tribes opposed a distribution to nonmembers and the lineal descendancy funds have not yet been distributed. The tribes missed the 6-year deadline after the enactment of the act to file a legal challenge. S. 2342 allows the tribes to get into court to challenge the act. The committee views this as a fair and reasonable approach.

This bill requires no Federal spending and has bipartisan support.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. RHODES. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his explanation. The minority has no objection to the passage of the bill.

Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 2342

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

SECTION 1. AMENDMENT TO ACT OF OCTOBER 25, 1972.

The Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1168), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"SEC. 306. AUTHORITY TO BRING ACTION.

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any action of the Sisseton-Wahpeton Sioux Tribe of South Dakota, the Devils Lake Sioux Tribe of North Dakota, or the Sisseton-Wahpeton Sioux Council of the Assiniboine and Sioux Tribes of Montana filed in the United States District Court for the District of Montana to contest the constitutionality or validity under law of this Act shall not be barred by any statute of limitations, lapse of time, or bar of laches, if the complaint is filed no later than April 1, 1993. Exclusive original jurisdiction over any such action filed on or before such date is hereby vested in the United States District Court for the District of Montana. Nothing in this section or section 307 shall be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States.

"SEC. 307. AUTHORITY TO SETTLE ACTION.

"Notwithstanding any provision of this Act or any other provision of law, the Attorney General is authorized to settle any action that may be brought pursuant to section 306 of this Act.".

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Had I been present, on May 28, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall 145, "aye" on rollcall 146, "aye" on rollcall 147, "aye" on rollcall 148, "aye" on rollcall 149, and "aye" on rollcall 150.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the Senate bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME RELATIVE TO REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION ON THE HOUSE POST OFFICE

Mr. ROSE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time period contained in House Resolution 340 for the Committee on House Administration to report on the House post office be extended until July 6, 1992.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSE. Madam Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, on February 5, 1992, the House adopted House Resolution 340, which directed the Committee on House Administration to conduct a thorough investigation of the operation and management of the House post office. Immediately thereafter, I consulted with my ranking Republican Member and established a bipartisan task force of three Democrats and three Republicans to investigate the post office.

I want to describe the unprecedented way in which the task force was set up and ran its investigation. The process was a true test of bipartisan cooperation. Back in February, as chairman, I promised my colleagues that no reasonable line of inquiry would be refused. This has been a very thorough and professional investigation. The task force has conducted 59 extensive interviews of post office personnel, members of the Capitol Police, and others, and reviewed countless post office documents.

In fact, in order to ensure that all areas of inquiry have been addressed, the task force has agreed to conduct two additional interviews in June. These interviews will necessitate that we file our written report in June, rather than today. We would have liked to have conducted these interviews already. However, one of the witnesses was seriously ill and not available to the task force. Another appeared before the grand jury, and the U.S. attorney asked the task force to delay its interview of this person. Thus, the task force needs a little more time to finish and that is the reason for our unanimous-consent request.

I should note that the task force effort has been accomplished in the face of a major impediment to our investigation. As many of my colleagues are aware, the Justice Department has been conducting a separate investigation into criminal allegations relating to the post office for over 1 year. Their investigation was triggered by the discovery of an embezzlement last April. Audits conducted by the Capitol Police and the United States Postal Inspection Service led to the discovery of additional shortages and the well-publicized indictments.

I join with all members of the task force in condemning the embezzlements which have been uncovered. We have been very sensitive to the Department of Justice's investigation. When the task force itself discovered possible evidence of criminal wrongdoing, it was immediately forwarded to the U.S. attorney's office. Yet, despite this, we, in the House, did not receive the same amount of cooperation in return. In fact, the Justice Department asked us to leave the investigating to them. This the task force could not do. Because our process has not been equally respected by the executive branch, we are compelled to ask for a delay in filing our written report until June.

Clearly, the post office in its operations was an imperfect institution, and we have uncovered many problems which warrant attention. But I am also happy to report that we have worked closely with the new Acting Postmaster to identify and solve those problems. A host of changes have already been made. At the same time, the Acting Postmaster assures me that the vast majority of employees in the

House post office are hard-working, competent individuals, who enthusiastically put in a day's work for a day's pay. In fact, the Acting Postmaster told the task force that, contrary to news reports, there were absolutely no so-called ghost employees at the House post office.

Our written report will identify the problems that existed. Some will have been cured, and we will recommend actions to ensure that others are corrected. If need be, possible violations of ethics rules will be referred to the Standards Committee. Mismanagement of the post office will be fully uncovered. I am hopeful that we can use this experience as a valuable lesson in bipartisan cooperation and problem solving for the future.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues assigned the task of investigating the House post office to request additional time to allow completion of our work.

On February 3, I took a special order on the floor of the House to urge the creation of a special counsel to conduct an independent investigation of the House post office.

My suggestion followed multiple published allegations of the operations of the House post office, including drug use and sales, embezzlement of funds, ghost employees, overtime fraud, and other abuses.

During my special order I had a colloquy with the gentleman from North Carolina regarding the need to conduct a thorough investigation and review of the allegations. At that time he agreed such a review should proceed and said, "Let the chips fall where they may."

The following day, April 4, the House approved House Resolution 340, a Democrat resolution to begin a House Administration review of this matter.

□ 1750

This matter has been very difficult for both sides of the aisle, with several disagreements, frustrating time delays, and unforeseen scenarios regarding all of the witnesses. We have had problems with the Department of Justice, and the retrieval of documents and other materials have all slowed the progress of the task force.

The task force has also found itself on the frontlines of defending the interests and the prerogatives of the Congress as outlined in the U.S. Constitution, while still attempting to protect the integrity of an ongoing criminal investigation by the Department of Justice.

Madam Speaker, I want to assure my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that every effort to get to the bottom of this entire situation is being made. As the gentleman from North Carolina, Chairman ROSE, has indicated, key witnesses with substantial background and experience in the Post Office are yet to be interviewed. The task force has agreed that the information obtained from these individuals may lead to the interviewing or the reinterviewing of their witnesses. That fact really complicates imposing any future deadline, an issue discussed by the task force at great length. The chips should, indeed, be allowed to fall where they may.

Many reports have appeared in the press speculating on the activities of the task force and the Department of Justice, and commenting on these reports directly could threaten the outcome of both reviews. Several dozen individuals have been interviewed and considerable information has been found. It will be appropriately reported by the task force.

In an effort to fully achieve the objections of House Resolution 340, the investigation must be allowed to continue into the not too distant future. With interviews to still be conducted and documents still to be obtained and reviewed, it is obvious that the work simply cannot be completed by the imposed May 30 deadline. Simply, the House should approve this request to allow the investigation to continue until a comprehensive and thorough review and management proposals can be provided by the task force.

Finally, I would like to close by concurring with the remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ROSE], that the task force is working closely with Acting Postmaster Shinay to make several changes in the Post Office as the investigation does proceed. As well, other recommendations from the task force will be forthcoming in the final report, and our interviews have, indeed, found several individuals in the Post Office, many, that are dedicated, hard-working employees. They have become the innocent victims of the speculation and rumors that have surrounded this investigation. I would hope that this situation could end.

I urge my colleagues to support this request, and would add only one remark to the statement made by the chairman, and that is his statement in regard to ghost employees and the fact that no evidence has been found in regard to ghost employees.

Let me emphasize that this is a finding. I would hope that the chairman would not make any statements in regard to findings at this particular juncture. What he defines as a ghost employee and perhaps what other members of the task force would define as a ghost employee, I would say to the gentleman, could be quite different.

Mr. ROSE. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. ROSE. Madam Speaker, I will accept the gentleman's reservation, and I will keep an open mind as to the final conclusion.

Mr. ROBERTS. I appreciate the gentleman's statement. I just want to say for the record that no findings have been made. There are serious allegations. Some of them do involve ghost employees and all of the other wrongdoings and the allegations that have been made in the press, and what we have determined by interviews. There are no findings. That will be subject to the task force's report.

Mr. BARRETT. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS. I am delighted to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT], who is an outstanding member of the task force.

Mr. BARRETT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, over a month ago I stood on this floor as a member of another bipartisan task force attempting to implement some reform in the management of the House. Today I am back as a part of yet another historical bipartisan equal task force that has been working to figure out exactly what went on under our noses in the House Post Office for the past many months, perhaps years, and how we can prevent this from happening again.

When I came to Congress a little over a year ago, I never imagined that I would be spending my time investigating an internal Post Office situation, as we are today. However, it did not take me long to realize that some major changes needed to be made in the operation of this entire institution, in order for us to effectively do our jobs. A month ago a small window of opportunity opened up for change, as the task force on reform attempted to implement change including change in the House Post Office. However, the majority was only willing to let reforms go so far and the window was closed. So this time it is my hope that we can get the job done right.

House Resolution 340 called for a "thorough investigation of the Office of Postmaster." The creators of this resolution evidently thought a thorough investigation could be done in 3 months. Meanwhile, the U.S. Attorney's Office has been investigating this matter for almost a year. Granted, we are not getting into the depths of criminal matters that the U.S. attorney is looking into, but because we do not wish to impede the course of justice, we have been trying to work with the grand jury investigation. Let me tell the Members, it gets tough when our task force is not even informed that Members of Congress are being subpoenaed to testify before a grand jury until a week after those subpoenas have been served.

As the Members have heard from my colleague, the gentleman from Kansas

[Mr. ROBERTS], this task force has experienced other various delays, delays that were beyond our control. In addition, we have all read the reports today concerning the ongoing grand jury investigation. Clearly, these reports indicate the seriousness of the problems resulting from the mismanagement in the House Post Office. I am satisfied that these delays and the seriousness of this investigation warrant the need for an extension of time, an extension of the deadline, and I, too, ask my colleagues to support this request. I, like them, want to see the investigation done correctly, and I want to see that well thought-out changes are implemented in the House Post Office.

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], the ranking member of the Committee on House Administration and a member of the investigative task force.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, we are forced to come before the House for an oral report meeting the requirements of House Resolution 340 which asks for a May 30 deadline. When we examine a chronology of events unfolding, both just prior to and after the House's passage of Resolution 340, we understand that the time prior to February 5 is dotted with a number of newspaper articles investigating, making allegations and charges of activities at the House Post Office. I am somewhat proud to say that following the passage of that resolution there have been very few newspaper stories, and those newspaper stories that have been written have utilized resources and information from areas other than the task force on the Post Office.

The task force has done, I believe, an exemplary job of investigating a very difficult area, cutting across Members, employees, and activities on a daily basis dealing with one of the primary arteries of the House of Representatives, and that is contact through mail with constituents.

We have gone through a difficult period with the officer of the House who is charged with running the Post Office resigning, an interim appointment, and numerous changes made in the structure of the Post Office, before we even concluded our investigation of the Post Office. But if the Members will look at events that unfolded following the February 5 passage of the resolution, there are two things, I think, that stand out.

□ 1800

They are two activities that I believe are paramount and bring us largely to the point of asking for this extension of time that has been passed unanimously.

One was the creation of the task force. I will place in the RECORD at this point an exchange of letters between myself and the chairman of the Committee on House Administration, CHARLIE ROSE, which are attempts to come to a structure under which the task force would operate.

The exchange of letters referred to follows:

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, DC, February 21, 1992.

Hon. WILLIAM THOMAS,
Ranking Minority Member, Committee on House Administration, Washington, DC.

DEAR BILL: Thank you for your letter of February 13, 1992, regarding procedures governing the charge given to the Committee on House Administration with respect to H. Res. 340.

The terms of the procedures governing the Task Force operation are:

Equal bipartisan representation; Charlie Rose to be Chair, and the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee on House Administration to designate a Vice-Chair.

Both the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee on House Administration will designate staff for the Task Force.

Decisions will be made by a majority of the Task Force.

Staff of both parties should be present at all stages of the investigation, including depositions.

The Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee on House Administration each shall have the power to issue subpoenas. At least one Member of each party must be present when testimony under oath is taken.

No meetings of the Task Force may be scheduled without bipartisan consent.

The Task Force Members shall have the right of access to committee records on this subject.

No Officers of the House or any of their employees should be involved in the investigation other than to respond to Task Force inquiries.

The results and recommendations of the Task Force must be printed and publicly available no later than 10 days following the conclusion of the Task Force.

As we agreed, our staff will prepare a nondisclosure agreement for all Task Force staff to sign, to ensure that we complete our mission without public disclosure of information pertaining to our investigation. The Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee on House Administration will together make any public disclosures.

I look forward to working with you.

Sincerely,

CHARLIE ROSE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, DC, February 13, 1992.

Hon. CHARLIE ROSE,
Chairman, Committee on House Administration, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHARLIE: The Committee is now charged with investigating the operations of the House Postmaster. I believe that an agreement on the structure and process of the Task Force should be reached prior to any action being taken regarding the investigation of the House Postmaster. At a minimum, I think it is vital that our Task Force operate under the following procedures:

Equal bipartisan representation; each party shall designate a co-chair.

Equal staff, to be designated by the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee.

Decisions must be made by a majority vote of the Task Force.

Staff of both parties should be present at all stages of the investigation, including depositions.

Each co-chair shall have power to subpoena witnesses and take testimony under oath. At least one Member of each party must be present when testimony under oath is taken.

No meetings of staff or Members shall be scheduled without bipartisan consent.

The Task Force, including staff, shall have the right of access to committee records on this subject.

No Officers of the House or any of their employees should be involved in the investigation other than to respond to the Task Force's inquiries.

The results and recommendations of the Task Force must be printed and publicly available no later than 10 days following the conclusion of the Task Force.

I was pleased to hear your commitment on the floor to conducting an open and bipartisan investigation and I look forward to working with you. Please let me know your thoughts on the above principles and any suggestions you may have regarding the Task Force.

Best regards,

BILL THOMAS,
Ranking Republican Member.

The result was that on February 21 an unprecedented task force began its investigation. It was a task force that had not only a bipartisan composition, but a structure in which every Member was a full partner. This is virtually unprecedented in the history of the House except for the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. I believe that in the area of staff and the relationship to Members and each individual Member's ability to arrive at what they believe to be the truth that this particular task force transcends even the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

It is unfortunate to have to say that this is the only time this structure has ever been used. The recent reorganization, passed largely by the majority party, creating the so-called bipartisan structure of a House Administration subcommittee to oversee the House Administrator simply pales in comparison to the point that it is not a true bipartisan structure. So this is the first step, setting up a structure in which everyone believed that they could get to the bottom of a problem, and we could find out what went on for the purpose of restructuring the House post office to better serve the Members and the staff.

The ongoing investigation and our attempts to compel the testimony of individuals' information that was necessary to understand the structure then occupied a period of time, and we soon ran headlong into the Department of Justice and its attempt to carry out a criminal investigation. No one on the task force, nor any of the staff of the task force ever had any interest in impeding that criminal investigation at all. Quite to the contrary, we from day one and to this day have attempted to

cooperate and coordinate in supplying information and evidence and in attempting also to change our calendar to allow the Department of Justice to go forward with that criminal investigation. As a matter of fact, if Members examine a chronology of an exchange of letters beginning in early March, including about four exchanges of letters in March, four exchanges in April, and finally an early May letter they will see that the task force and leadership attempted to work out a reasonable timetable for both the House task force to do its work within the timeframe required under House Resolution 340 and for the Department of Justice to go forward with its criminal investigation.

I will include a letter from the U.S. attorney dated May 4 in the RECORD as well, Madam Speaker.

The letter referred to follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, DC, May 4, 1992.

Hon. CHARLIE ROSE,
Chairman, Committee on House Administration, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. WILLIAM M. THOMAS,
Ranking Minority Member, Committee on House Administration, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMEN: I am writing to request that the House Administration Committee Task Force reviewing Post Office operations hold in abeyance for a period of 30 days its interview of Mr. James C. Smith, the former Director of Accountable Papers at the House Post Office.

During the afternoon of April 30, 1992, we learned that the Task Force had scheduled an interview of Mr. Smith for later that day. In response to a request by this office, the Task Force agreed to cancel the scheduled interview. However, the Task Force asked that our request be made in writing, with supporting reasons, so that it could be considered further by the Task Force.

We anticipate that Mr. Smith will testify before a Federal Grand Jury in the near future. Because information that he possesses is within the purview of the grand jury's ongoing criminal investigation, an interview of Mr. Smith by the Task Force at this time would be disruptive to that investigation. We anticipate that our request that the Task Force forbear will extend not more than 30 days.

Your cooperation in this matter is appreciated.

Sincerely,

JAY B. STEPHENS,
U.S. Attorney.

That letter indicates that there was a request to hold in abeyance an interview for 30 days. I would also place a May 12 letter from the Republican leader, BOB MICHEL of Illinois, and myself in the RECORD.

The letter referred to follows:

OFFICE OF REPUBLICAN LEADER,
Washington, DC, May 12, 1992.

JAY B. STEPHENS, Esq.
U.S. Attorney, District of Columbia, Judiciary Center, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. STEPHENS: We understand from your letter of April 24, that the Grand Jury continues to hear testimony from the same witnesses which the House Administration Task Force Investigating the Operations of the House Post office also seeks to interview.

As previously stated in our letter of April 2, we do not want to impede an ongoing criminal investigation by the Department of Justice. At that time we thought it was possible for both the House investigation and the Department's investigation to be conducted simultaneously without conflict. We are no longer of that opinion.

After consultation with Republican Members on the Task Force, we will recommend to the Majority that the House investigation, as authorized in H.Res. 340, issue a preliminary report by May 30, based on the information they have to date. The House investigation would continue after allowing your office reasonable time to conclude its investigation. Reconvening on June 15 would provide your office with more than the requested 30 days. At that time we expect the internal investigation would continue until its completion without interference from your office.

We believe this proposal will allow both investigations to come to conclusion without conflict and in a manner that serves justice and the overall operations of the House.

Sincerely,

ROBERT H. MICHEL,
Republican Leader.

WILLIAM M. THOMAS,
Ranking Republican, Committee on House Administration.

That letter indicates that we agreed with the Justice Department 30-day delay. Clearly that would extend our investigation past the May 30 date. But to extend every opportunity to cooperate with the Department of Justice, we indicated that we would attempt to prolong the task force's period so that we could honor the 30-day period suggested in the Department of Justice's letter and still allow both of us to do our work.

Our side of the bargain is represented by the unanimous consent request which was granted to extend to July 6 the reporting date for this task force. I am sorry to say that after the Republican leader and myself offered this letter, we could not get the Democratic leadership to support a willingness to stand firmly against the Department of Justice so the House investigation could proceed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. UNSOELD). The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] has expired.

Mr. ROSE. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time and continue to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of California. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time and thank the chairman of the committee for the time.

We continue to try to work with the Department of Justice. We understand their important job.

The task force's primary job, based upon House Resolution 340, was to conduct a thorough investigation of the operation and management of the Office of the Postmaster and report the findings and recommendations back to the House. In the process of attempting to understand, again, a knowledge of the operation and management of the post office, we inevitably have come upon information and material which may reflect upon the behavior of Members or staff, whether it be a violation of House rules or perhaps criminal statutes, and we have and will supply that information to either the Department of Justice or to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. That is an ongoing obligation that we will fulfill until the last day of this task force.

We will also write a report to the House on the operation and management of the post office, and our recommendations for change.

I have to say, Madam Speaker, that it has been somewhat helpful to have an interim postmaster who is willing and eager to work with us to make changes as soon as we are aware of problems, so that the adjustments in the operation and management of the post office do not have to wait for a final report but are actually instituted as we discover them and work with the postmaster.

I do have to say though, that the fundamental problem that presented itself in terms of the operation of the post office, both in its reflection on staff and on Members, is that the post office was from its inception and until very recently run on a patronage system. This problem has not fully been resolved, nor can it be fully resolved for some time. It is a situation in which you correct the egregious problems, and then you work through the other problems as you are able. We need the support of the entire House as we make these fundamental changes to an important part of the House of Representatives. Changes are being made, and they need to continue to be made, but people need to understand that this task force in presenting its final conclusions will be focusing primarily upon the operation and the management of the post office.

We, regretfully, will be forwarding to other committees and to the Department of Justice information that may lead to activities on the part of those particular committees or that department. We are grateful to the House for providing a unanimous agreement for us to go forward, because the timetable that we are operating on now is not of our own making. It is largely a reaction to the criminal investigation being carried out by the Department of Justice and our attempt to accommodate their very real needs.

This has been a difficult task force, in part because it has been a unique experience for both Republicans and Democrats in a truly bipartisan operation. There have tended to be some learned behavior reactions which either are not necessary or are not use-

ful. I hope that at the end of this experiment of true bipartisanship there will be enough people who will say that it was useful, it was helpful, and it was significant enough to continue. I had wished that we would have had this continuation in the bipartisan structure that oversees the House administrator. I continue to lend my efforts to the opportunity that a truly bipartisan structure will oversee the new management of the House, because if it does not, many of the same problems we are visiting now we will revisit later, because temptations on one side sometimes are just too great. They need to be shared. There needs to be a pooled, cooperative, truly bipartisan oversight of this institution. We are not yet there in the structure. We are there only in the task force that is attempting to point out the problems of the past.

Unfortunately, I have to point out a problem of the future in a structure that has now been put in place. I hope that we will be able to change that in the near future so that the structure of the task force will in fact be the structure of the bipartisan committee to continue oversight.

□ 1810

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. ROSE. Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time, 5 minutes, to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT], a member of the task force.

Mr. SWIFT. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

Madam Speaker, this morning on the Fox Morning News the Republican whip, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], was asked by one of the interviewers:

Are you satisfied, though, that the House, the post office scandal is being properly looked into?

And Mr. GINGRICH responded in part:

Well, we have some real concern. PAT ROBERTS, the Republican from Kansas who is vice chairman of the investigation into the post office, has encountered consistent problems and consistent delays on the Democratic side.

I have listened very carefully to the reports of my colleagues, and particularly my Republican colleagues, and there is not even an echo of that charge in what they have had to say, and that is because it is simply not true.

The task force is made up of six independent individuals, and because we are each independent, it means we do not always agree with each other. I suppose, if on each occasion when we disagreed, each of us could charge the other with delay so long as it took some time for those disagreements to be resolved, but that would be absurd.

Bipartisanship works, and it only works when you establish a level of trust sufficient that each of the six of us in this instance can turn our back on any of the other five and know that when we turn around there is not going to be anything sticking out of it. I believe we have that relationship, the six of us. We do disagree, not incidentally always along partisan lines. We have worked out those disagreements, and we each feel we can turn our backs on the other and get on with the work we need.

Madam Speaker, that level of trust is essential for true bipartisan work on something as sensitive, as difficult, as controversial as this, but remarks from external kibitzers who are obviously not in possession of the facts is very harmful to that bipartisanship, because apparently we not only have to not worry about those we are working with when we turn our backs, but we apparently have to worry about others now who are external to the task force who would like to plant something in some of our backs. That is very harmful to a process that is working very, very well.

I simply wanted to call the body's attention to the fact that the remarks made in the Fox Morning News by the minority whip today were not accurate. They were not helpful. They were not true. And if you need any verification of that statement, I urge you to read the reports presented just now on the floor by all of my colleagues.

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWIFT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam Speaker, I do not think now is the time to make definitions in regard to what is a serious, say, disagreement or how we proceed in a bipartisan manner or perhaps what the minority whip said over a television station in regard to his interview.

But I would remind the gentleman that we have had serious disagreements, not to say that we cannot put them aside and go forward, and as the gentleman has indicated, without having to worry about something from your back side, perhaps a gentle shove, a swift kick, a whispering in the ear, you know, whatever, and we have been through all of that in regard to this investigation.

A case in point, in talking with the chairman, I did not think the statement would be made that we had made a decision on findings in regard to ghost employees. No finding has been made in regard to that. We have serious disagreements in that regard.

I do not know how the minority whip would refer to that in terms of a TV interview. I am certainly not coaching him, not really privy, not his press assistant. I am not in that business. I am full-time trying to proceed with this investigation.

The gentleman was present when we had quite a bit of difference of opinion as to the direction of the investigation. We thought we had it settled, only to find the next morning that the investigation was closed. The locks were being changed, and we do not need to go into all of that, but that was a pretty serious disagreement, so I would only gently remind my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Washington, that we will persevere, and that we will try to get to the end of the trail in a bipartisan fashion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. UNSOELD). All time has expired.

Mr. ROSE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for permission to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes, the remainder of my time, to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT].

Mr. SWIFT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I will continue to yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

It is in that spirit that we will proceed in the investigation.

I guess when we write things on the blackboard in terms of a definition of what is obstruction, what is a problem, you know, what is being bipartisan cooperation, the gentleman from California put it very well. It has been a rocky road on our side. I would not use the words adjectives, and adverbs that the chairman has indicated, but we will get there. I trust we will get there.

So I take the gentleman's comments in regard to the minority whip's concern to heart. We will have a discussion, and we will try to proceed, and we will try to do it in a bipartisan fashion, and I think we have made our point, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SWIFT. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman. I do not disagree with anything the gentleman has said.

I want to make it clear that it is nothing that the gentleman or other Republican members of the task force have said or done that causes me any concern. We have had disagreements. We worked them out. We are continuing. We probably will have more, and I believe we will continue to work them out.

But the major cause for the delay was a disagreement institutionally between the task force representing Congress and the Justice Department. I am not here making a charge that the Justice Department has done something evil and foul in terms of slowing the process. The fact remains that the disagreement between this institution and the Justice Department is the cause of the delay, clearly and simply. Probably it is very important that we resolve those institutional problems between

an administrative agency and the Congress.

But for the whip of either side to go on television and charge the other side with being the cause of the delay is inaccurate, and it is not helpful to the bipartisan spirit we need if we are going to get past difficult times that we have had in the past, and those that we obviously are going to have in the future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has again expired.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for permission to proceed for 1 additional minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Madam Speaker, I will conclude.

Friction is not necessarily all bad and, frankly, this interesting experiment in bipartisanship has led, I think, to a healthy growth curve on the part of the Democrats. The fact that they cannot just dictate and let it go at that; and the fact that Republicans actually share in the responsibility of the decisions that are being made, and cannot throw bombs and walk away is healthy for both sides. I wish there was more of it.

I am saddened that it will not continue in the form that we have.

So when you look back on this experiment that is not yet concluded, I think you have to say that the most important aspect was the thing that is not done very often around here, and that is to spend a little time in the other person's shoes. That is a very, very healthy thing for this institution.

Mr. SWIFT. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of California. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SWIFT. I would agree with that. I simply was suggesting that I agree with the gentleman, that we should not throw a bomb and walk away. I merely said that this morning that was done, and it should not happen again.

□ 1820

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 5253

Mr. BONIOR. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 5253.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. UNSOELD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTION TAKING AWAY MOST-FAVORED-NATION STATUS FROM SERBIA

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, today's Washington Post, referring to Yugoslavia, says as follows:

A volley of mortar fire crashed into a crowded marketplace in besieged Sarajevo today, killing at least 20 civilians and wounding more than a hundred others in what local officials described as perhaps the bloodiest single attack of Bosnia's two-month-old factional war.

"It was horrible, unimaginable. There were people with arms and legs missing. The street was a river of blood," said one journalist by phone from the Bosnian capital. "There were people cut to pieces with their brains spilling out * * *

* * * * *

Two men carried a woman whose foot had been nearly blown off; another woman cradled her severed leg in her arms * * *.

And it goes on and on.

This Congress and this Government should speak out. I have a resolution which would take away the most-favored-nation status from Serbia. This should be an immediate consideration by this Congress next week.

We have over 70 cosponsors of this bill. For those who are not cosponsors, I ask you to call my office and cosponsor.

For this Congress to remain silent when innocent men and women are being killed in Yugoslavia is absolutely wrong.

I am including the entire article from today's Washington Post in the RECORD as follows:

THE STREET WAS A RIVER OF BLOOD

(By Laura Silber)

BELGRADE, May 27.—A volley of mortar fire crashed into a crowded marketplace in besieged Sarajevo today, killing at least 20 civilians and wounding more than a hundred others in what local officials described as perhaps the bloodiest single attack of Bosnia's two-month-old factional war.

"It was horrible, unimaginable. There were people with arms and legs missing. The street was a river of blood," said one journalist by phone from the Bosnian capital. "There were people cut to pieces with their brains spilling out," a witness told Sarajevo radio amid the screams and sobs of the wounded.

More than 2,500 people have been killed and tens of thousands wounded in the savage conflict between powerful Serb militia units and Bosnia's Muslim-led defense forces, but today's bombardment of men, women and children lined up for bread and ice cream seemed to raise the level of violence to a new pitch.

The scene of the shelling—as shown on Sarajevo television and around the world on Cable News Network—was one of carnage, and some broadcasters warned viewers that they might wish to look aside. Mutilated bodies and body fragments covered the market pavement, and the sidewalk where one group of people had been standing was awash with blood.

Two men carried a woman whose foot had been nearly blown off; another woman cradled her severed leg in her arms; one elderly man, clutching a loaf of bread he had just bought, leaned helplessly against a stone wall as blood poured down his face.

Officials of Bosnia's Muslim-dominated government told journalists that the mortar fire came from the same Serb batteries around Sarajevo that have been raining shells on the city for weeks. But Serb militia commanders called the assertion "Muslim propaganda" and insisted that none of their troops had fired the fatal rounds.

The United States and the European Community have labeled the militant nationalist regime of neighboring Serbia as the aggressor in the Bosnian conflict, and today's attack in Sarajevo came hours before EC officials voted to impose economic sanctions on the new two-republic Yugoslav state that Serbia created and controls.

The EC agreed to ban trade with the new Yugoslav union—composed of Serbia and its tiny longtime ally, Montenegro—freeze export credits and suspend all scientific and technical cooperation with the Belgrade government. Serbia and Montenegro sold more than half their exports to the EC last year, and the trade ban could cost them an estimated $140 million a month in lost revenue.

The EC officials considered an oil embargo, but sources close to the discussions said it was likely the conferees would leave such a step to the United Nations, which is also readying tough sanctions against Belgrade. An oil embargo imposed by West European nations alone would have little effect, said one EC official, since Serbia and Montenegro obtain most of their petroleum products from Russia, China, Iran and Romania.

[The United States is consulting with other members of the U.N. Security Council on a package of economic sanctions against the Belgrade government, and U.S. officials said they were hopeful the council would be ready to vote on the matter by Friday.

[In Washington, State Department spokesman Richard Boucher described the continuing Bosnian bloodshed as "cruelty and suffering" the like of which "Europe has not seen . . . since 1945." Boucher reiterated that the United States considers "Serbia and its allies in the so-called Yugoslav military overwhelmingly responsible for this appalling tragedy."]

Full-scale combat broke out in Bosnia in early April, after the republic won international recognition of its independence from the old six-republic Yugoslav federation. Since then, Serb militias—backed by the Serbian government and the Serb-dominated Yugoslav army—have seized control of about 70 percent of the republic, mostly at the expense of Bosnia's Slavic Muslims.

Muslims—who make up about 44 percent of Bosnia's 4.4 million population and lead its current government—have been the chief victims of the war, accounting for most of the dead and wounded and nearly all of the more than 700,000 people left homeless by Serb attacks on towns and villages. Militants among Bosnia's Serb community—which accounts for about 31 percent of the population—have proclaimed an autonomous state on Bosnian territory with close political ties to adjoining Serbia.

The Sarajevo mortar salvo also shattered a short-lived local ceasefire that surrounding Serb forces had agreed to on Tuesday so that international relief flights could bring humanitarian aid to the capital's 300,000 hard-pressed civilians—most of whom have been without adequate food and medical supplies for weeks. The truce, brokered by Russian Foreign Minister Andrei Kozyrev, had been viewed by Western diplomats as part of a broad new diplomatic effort by Serbia to avert economic sanctions, but analysts here noted scornfully that Belgrade's latest

peaceful pleas and promises sounded like many it had made—and ignored—in the past.

On Monday, the Belgrade government sent a letter to U.N. Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali pledging to help promote a peaceful resolution to the Bosnian conflict and to seek "unhindered engagement" of U.N. and other relief agencies in Bosnia. But at the United Nations today, Venezuelan Ambassador Diego Arria told the Reuter news agency: "I don't buy that. The time for cordial relations is finished. Nothing they can do will stop the actions of the Security Council."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include therein extraneous material on the subject of my special order tonight.

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

There was no objection.

POSSIBLE SELECTION OF PRESIDENT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, the time has come for the House of Representatives to seriously consider adopting procedures should the selection of the next President of the United States fall to the House of Representatives under the 12th amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

Today, I have introduced a resolution amending the permanent rules of the House of Representatives to open up the process for the election of a President should the House be called upon to do this duty. The resolution that I have introduced is rather straightforward. It adopts a new rule 54 of the Rules of the House, entitled "Procedures for Choosing a President," and it says:

> Whenever the right of choice shall devolve upon the House, any vote of a Member from a state in determining the vote of that state to choose a President shall be recorded by the Clerk in open session.

The last time the House of Representatives had to select a President was in 1825 following the failure of all four candidates to obtain a majority in the Electoral College in the Presidential election of 1824. In looking at the precedents that were established in the 1825 election of the President, it is clear that two things happened.

First, the House met in closed session with everybody except House Members, stenographers, officers of the House, and Senators being excluded; and second, the votes cast in each State delegation were done in secret, so not only did the public not know how every Representative voted in the selection of the President, but they did not know how each State's vote was cast.

At the end of the process, the Speaker of the House just announced which candidates had how many States' votes and declared John Quincy Adams elected President of the United States.

Obviously, this secrecy will not do should the new House of Representatives be called upon to select a President beginning January 6, 1993, due to the failure of the three Presidential candidates to achieve a majority in the Electoral College.

It is incumbent upon this House of Representatives to set up the ground rules now before anybody can accuse the House of trying to engineer those rules to favor one candidate or the other, so that the most important vote that is cast by those Representatives who are elected on November 3, that is the election of the President of the United States, will be open to the public and on the record.

My resolution proposes to do that. It opens up the process so that Members of the House can be accountable on how they cast this very important vote should the House be called upon under the 12th amendment to perform this very important function.

Madam Speaker, I would invite my colleagues to cosponsor this resolution. It is one of openness and accountability against backroom deals and secrecy and something that we should make clear prior to the time the voters cast their votes for President on November 3.

I thank the Speaker for recognizing me for this time.

THE CURRENT SITUATION IN YUGOSLAVIA

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

Mr. MOODY. Madam Speaker, the civil war in Yugoslavia has already claimed over 10,000 lives and created close to 2 million refugees. The long years of U.S. investment in economic viability, human rights, and—eventually—democracy for that country is in deep, deep jeopardy.

As someone who lived and worked in Yugoslavia for 2 years, speaks the language, has friends in all parts of the country, and recently met with top leaders in Zagreb, Belgrade, and Sarajevo, please let me share with you some key points about the current tragedy there.

KEY POINTS

First, the conflict is not about ideology or about democracy versus communism, as frequently alleged, although 50 years of rigid, winner-take-all Communist ideology has made political compromise much more difficult. The conflict is about ethnicity and religion, compounded by deep frustration. The Croatians have been frustrated in their long held desire to be independent of a larger Serbia. The Serbs have been frustrated that the West has been so ignorant and indifferent to the suffering visited upon them by the previous independent Croatian state, the 1941–45 Ustashi government which killed over 700,000 Serbs in addition to Jews and Gypsies—seen to this day by Serbs as attempted genocide and ethnic purification.

Second, this frustration reached the boiling point when first Germany, then the European Community as a whole, and then the Bush administration recognized Croatia with borders that consigned roughly 800,000 Serbs to involuntary Croatian citizenship without any serious guarantees for their physical safety or cultural and political rights. The fact that Croatia's new President, former Communist Gen. Franjo Tudjman, had recently run an explicitly anti-Semitic, anti-Serbian campaign for office preceding independence heightened Serb fears.

When, in a sudden reversal of policy, the Bush administration recognized not only Croatia but also Bosnia, where 1.3 million Serbs are one-third of the population and live on about two-thirds of the space, even greater Serbian frustration and fear took hold. The Serb people feel deeply that once again they are fighting for their survival, their homes and their right to exist.

Third, the allegations that Serbs seek to conquer their neighbors or take their territory is simply untrue. But they don't agree that heavily Serbian areas in Croatia and Bosnia can be preemptually detached from Yugoslavia, given the history of persecution of Serbs in those areas. In fact, the Serbs have a noble history of supporting freedom and democracy, and stood with the Allies in World War I and II at great, great cost. Serbia has never seen itself as an ambitious conqueror, but now feels beaten into a corner by the self-interested behavior of the European Community—especially Germany, which has tried to dominate the Balkans in two world wars, directly or through surrogates.

Fourth, Serbia was always the lead group for a united Yugoslavia with civil and religious freedoms for each ethnic nationality. Of all the groups in Yugoslavia, the Serbs have historically been the most tolerant. The attempted genocide of Serbs in Croatia never had its counterpart against Croatians in Serbia. There is absolutely no history of anti-Semitism in Serbia and many Yugoslav Jews survived the facist period by finding safety in Serbia.

Fifth, it is important to separate both the Serbian people and the Croatian people from the heavily armed ir-

regular and guerilla groups operating outside formal government control. These groups—on both sides—have done most of the atrocities.

Sixth, it is important to distinguished the Serbian people from the Yugoslav National Army, the last Communist-led military in Europe. While Yugoslavia is dead, the army lives on with its own agenda of preserving as large a state as possible to sustain the army's vast size. I can tell you personally that the national army is very unpopular in Serbia.

CRUCIAL ISSUE

Now let me elaborate a bit on the second point made earlier. Having come through Axis support of Croatian separatism during World War II, the Serbs felt they had to defend their very lives and the land they have inhabited for centuries when they saw history repeating itself. Specifically in the Krajina area of Croatia and nearby areas of Bosnia, Serbs suffered unspeakable atrocities in the past. Serbs now find it beyond comprehension that the West has deprived exclusively them of the right to self-determination which the Slovenes, the Croats and the Bosnian Moslems have all been encouraged by the European Community, and now the United States, to assert.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, there are no easy answers to this horrible, bloody conflict. It is not a good-guys-versus-bad-guys scenario. There have been terrible actions and atrocities by individuals and roving bands on both sides. The fear and anger among the Serbs and Croatians is intense and enduring—like the bitterness of most civil wars, including our own some 100-plus years ago.

It is tragic that the West, particularly the United States, failed to take decisive action to see that United Nations troops take up stations in Bosnia before the violence began in that Republic. Everyone knew that Bosnia would be the worst killing ground once violence there began. In my opinion it was doubly tragic that the United States—the only country possibly able to play the honest broker role—suddenly abandoned its careful and neutral policy and threw in with the European Community, led by Germany, to recognize an independent Bosnia where the Serbian minority felt most desperate and insecure.

LOOKING FORWARD

Looking forward from this tragedy, there are some constructive actions the United States can take to reduce or end the violence, although there are serious extra difficulties now. What the United States should not do, given the history of the area, is continue to let European Community policy dictate our policy. Most of all, the United States should seek to be the peacemaker, not the punisher or enforcer.

Specifically, the United States should not call for punishing the ordinary people of Serbia itself—or for that matter Serbian people as a whole—for the actions of the national army. Nor for the violence committed by irregular and paramilitary groups in Bosnia. Nor should the Congress itself act in haste to condemn one side or the other. Either action would only fuel the zeal of the various extremists, isolate the Serbian people, and reduce the ability of moderate, peace-seeking people of all nationalities to find an enduring solution. Reconciliation, no matter how hard, must be the goal.

Caution, understanding, and diplomacy are in order. For the people of the region, not we, must live with the result.

EFFORTS TO BRING ABOUT A PEACEFUL SOLUTION IN YUGOSLAVIA, BOSNIA-HERCEGOVINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. UNSOELD). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MCCURDY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCURDY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak about the crisis that is laying waste to the countries that formerly composed the State of Yogoslavia.

By every account, what is happening in Bosnia-Hercegovina is a humanitarian tragedy of incredible magnitude brought on by mass terror. Yesterday, we saw grisly images of a mortar attack by Serbian forces which killed at least 20 innocent civilians and injured over 100 people in Sarejevo as they stood in line to buy bread. This despicable act came on the heels of a Serbian military attack on a maternity hospital which caused 200 mothers, infants, and medical personnel to take refuge in the hospital's basement. And last week, Madam Speaker, Serbian forces launched rockets at a convoy of Red Cross vehicles and hijacked 11 food trucks chartered by the U.N. High Commission on Refugees. As a result of these attacks, both the Red Cross and the United Nations have been forced to suspend their operations in Bosnia-Hercegovina.

These atrocities are part of a much larger and tragic war conducted by the Milosevic regime throughout the former Yugoslavia that has left at least 12,000 people dead, destroyed an estimated $100 billion in property, and created over 1 million refugees. This represents the largest refugee crisis in Europe since the Second World War.

Incredibly, Madam Speaker, throughout most of the agony in this crisis, the Bush administration has stood on the sidelines and watched the last Communist dictatorship in Europe unleash a war and wreak havoc on the ancient cities of Sarajevo, Dubrovnik, and others. Instead of helping Bosnia-Hercegovina, Croatia, Slovenia, Macedonia, and Kosovo break from their totalitarian pasts and become part of a community of democratic nations, the grand architects of the new world order in the Bush administration last year tried to hold Yugoslavia together, even when its breakup was a fait accompli. When that policy failed, the world's only superpower hid under the table for 10 months as more than 50 other countries extended diplomatic recognition to Croatia, Slovenia, and Bosnia-Hercegovina. In the meantime, the Europeans, divided and incapable of developing a coherent policy, would only wring their hands and issue statements which the Milosevic regime treated with utter contempt.

It is only now that the United States and the European Community are beginning to put pressure on the tyrant in Belgrade. Yesterday, the European Community imposed a partial economic embargo against the Belgrade regime, and the United States has imposed some additional symbolic sanctions. But these sanctions are only partial, and we can only speculate if they will have any impact on those responsible for this war. If we want to take this conflict seriously, the international community should impose a complete trade and oil embargo against the Belgrade regime and freeze its international assets. We should expel the Belgrade regime from international financial institutions, deny recognition to Serbia as the successor state to Yugoslavia, and take the lead in ensuring that humanitarian relief supplies reach the victims of this war. If these sanctions do not persuade the Milosevic regime and its henchmen to stop the killing, the United States should take the lead in proposing a NATO peace-keeping mission for Bosnia-Hercegovina and other affected areas.

Madam Speaker, if the humanitarian side of this conflict is not enough to move the world to take serious steps, we would do well to consider the strategic implications of further inaction. The war in former Yugoslavia could be a harbinger of things to come in the former Soviet empire, as long-simmering ethnic rivalries rise to the surface and the difficulties of building democracies and free market economies from the wreckage of communism create new hardships.

Moreover, the war in Bosnia-Hercegovina could easily spread into other parts of Europe and into the Central Asian republics of the former Soviet Union. The people of Kosovo have voted for independence, and it could only be a matter of time before Belgrade unleashes a new round of violence against them. The question of Macedonia's independence has yet to be settled. Ethnic tensions have generated conflict in the former Soviet Republics of Georgia, Armenia, and Azerbiajan.

And the Milosevic regime has conducted itself in a way which could eventually generate bitter divisions between Christians and Moslems throughout that part of the world.

Finally, Madam Speaker, this conflict has demonstrated the pivotal role that the United States will often have to play in resolving international crises in the post-Soviet world. The fall of the Iron Curtain created an enormous opportunity for the people of Europe and the people of the former Soviet empire to live in peace and build democratic governments. Yet we are watching this opportunity to slip away. The old zone of conflict defined by the Iron Curtain has now shifted to the Central Asian fault line, and the Bush administration seems unwilling to recognize this important change.

We should not succumb to the dangers of isolationism when demagogues or our foreign policy savants invoke old cliches about the dangers of the United States becoming the world's policeman. If stopping a war in Europe is not in the national interests of the United States, then we must ask ourselves: What are our interests?

I will enter several articles into the RECORD and urge my colleagues to give this conflict the attention it deserves.

The articles are as follows:

[From the New Republic, Feb. 24, 1992]

YUGOBLUNDER

(By Patrick Glynn)

For months after Secretary of State James Baker's fateful visit to Belgrade in June 1991, observers debated whether the American secretary had inadvertently contributed to civil war in Yugoslavia by throwing his weight behind Yugoslavian "unity" at the very moment when the republics of Slovenia and Croatia were preparing to secede. Since then the mischievous consequences of U.S. policy toward Yugoslavia have so multiplied that the fuss over Baker's trip seems dwarfed by other disasters. In December Germany publicly broke with the United States, announcing recognition of Slovenia and Croatia. In January the EC followed. What began as a gruesome civil war has expanded into a crisis in U.S.-European relations, with major implications for the post-cold war balance of power. At last count thirty-nine nations—including Canada—have recognized the republics. The United States, still resisting recognition, remains isolated, its relations with Germany damaged, its influence and prestige in Europe clearly diminished.

U.S. policy-makers were quick to blame the Germans. In early January The New York Times described State officials "below the level of James A. Baker 3rd"—widely assumed to be Deputy Secretary of State Lawrence Eagleburger, the State Department's lead man on U.S. policy toward Yugoslavia—as beginning to "wince" at German assertiveness. But the effect of such self-exculpating statements was only to aggravate an already bad situation, increasing rancor with Bonn, hastening the loss of American influence in Europe.

What went wrong? U.S. handling of the Yugoslav crisis is in fact a case study in how not to conduct foreign policy in the post-cold war world, combining lack of intellectual rigor and carelessness with what Senator Al Gore has termed "moral obtuseness" about the conflicts and issues at stake. It epitomizes the essential superficiality of the administration's approach to foreign affairs.

Even now administration officials remain unrepentant. When I requested interviews for this story at the office of Eagleburger aide Kenneth Juster, public affairs director Joseph Snyder, to whom I was referred, told me after two days that State officials at the "highest levels," including Eagleburger's office, had determined that "nobody in the building" would talk on the subject. The reason given was the "murky" situation, in which officials' comments would be "overtaken by events." (The likelier explanation was an article critical of U.S. policy on Yugoslavia that I had written the previous week for The Washington Post.)

The main factor in the Bush administration's mishandling of Yugoslavia was its devotion to geopolitical "stability" at the expense of democratic values and human rights. U.S. policy toward Yugoslavia paralleled and was subordinated to U.S. policy toward the Soviet Union. In both cases the administration sought to prop up a declining Communist central government at the expense of democratically minded republics. In the USSR it was Gorbachev; in Yugoslavia it was the reform-minded Prime Minister Ante Markovic. In both cases the effort failed. But while in the Soviet instance it failed peacefully, in Yugoslavia U.S. policy may have contributed to a violent civil war. The errors were reinforced by clientism on the part of State's Belgrade-orientated Yugoslav hands—and possibly, in Eagleburger's case, by a history of personal financial dealings with firms owned by Yugoslavia's Communist government.

What was occurring during 1989 and 1990 in Yugoslavia was an uneven shift to democracy. In the spring of 1990 both Slovenia and Croatia elected non-Communist governments in internationally monitored free elections. Both adopted democratic constitutions. Slovenia, the most prosperous and ethnically homogeneous of the six Yugoslav republics, was also the most eager for independence. The Croatian situation was more complex, given the presence of a 12 percent Serb population and memories of brutal mass murders of Serbs and other minorities under a fascist puppet regime during World War II.

But if Croatia's human rights situation was problematic, human rights problems in Serbia were clear-cut and acute. Since 1987 Serbia had been ruled by a hardline Communist, Slobodan Milosevic, who increasingly based his appeal on fiercely nationalist themes. Under Milosevic, Serbia had perpetrated extreme abuses in the dominantly Albanian province of Kosovo—shooting and jailing protesters, torturing prisoners, firing ethnic Albanians from jobs and invading their homes. Moreover, in sharp contrast to elections in Slovenia and Croatia, Serbia's December 1990 elections were neither free nor fair. Restrictions on freedom of expression, unmonitored army voting, and a scheme whereby Serbian banks were ordered to print almost $2 billion in Yugoslav currency to be distributed to employees of state-owned enterprises prior to the election helped ensure victory for Milosevic and his nationalist neo-Communists.

By 1990 communism in Yugoslavia was ceding to nationalism, but in uneven fashion. In Slovenia and Croatia, nationalism had assumed an imperfect democratic tinge, while in Serbia it remained married to hard-line Leninism. The State Department's crucial failure was to miss the importance of this distinction. Even as Slovenia and Croatia edged toward democracy and the Serbian human rights record worsened, the United States strove to maintain an artificially evenhanded policy. "We have never been admirers of Communist ideology," U.S. ambassador to Yugoslavia Warren Zimmermann told the Serbian newspaper Borba in March 1991. "However, we think that every people, the Yugoslav people included, have a right to the system they choose themselves and to the people they elect. We respect that right, and if they choose communism and the Communists, we are prepared to deal with their leadership."

Back home in Washington, State officials resisted efforts by legislators to change policy. Human rights problems in Yugoslavia, a senior congressional aide was told by high level State Department officials, "are the results of ethnic tensions. . . . Don't make a big deal about them. The Serbs are trying to hold the country together. . . . Don't break up [Yugoslavia] because the Soviet Union will use it as a model. If the Soviet Union breaks up, [the consequences] could be nuclear."

In part, however, policy was also dictated by a flawed conception of how violence in Yugoslavia might originate. Eagleburger warned legislators of deep historical ethnic hatreds in Yugoslavia, arguing that unity was the key to ethnic peace. What he and others failed to see was the difference between democratic and undemocratic nationalism. When violence arose in Yugoslavia, it would come not from the newly democratic republics but rather from the republic—Serbia—where Communist authoritarian forces held sway. The key issue was not ethnic tension but the willingness to employ violent methods.

Eagleburger's approach is best seen as part of the Bush administration's broad return to Kissingerian ideas of stability, where stability—in contrast to Reagan's approach—would be given clear priority over human rights. (Eagleburger was a former Kissinger aide.) Throughout 1990 and 1991 Eagleburger consistently opposed measures that might undercut Yugoslavian unity—or penalize the Serbian republic. Following a high-level congressional trip to Yugoslavia in August 1990, in which visiting senators, headed by Republican leader Bob Dole, were shocked to witness firsthand a crackdown by Serbian police on ethnic Albanians, Senator Don Nickles introduced legislation designed to redirect U.S. aid away from the Yugoslav central government, which had no power to curb Serbian abuses, and toward individual republics, based on criteria of free elections and human rights. State resisted, pleading for Yugoslav unity, and found an ally in Representative Helen Bentley, of Serbian parentage and a tireless defender of Serbian interests. Bentley joined in the House-Senate negotiations on the Nickles amendment, even though she did not belong to the relevant committee. "She camped out in the committee room reading a book called The Rape of Serbia," a congressional aide recalls. Nickles and Bentley were able to strike a compromise—a provision for six-month delay—that permitted the amendment to pass. Bentley was the only individual I interviewed who expressed complete satisfaction with U.S. policy. Even Representative Jim Moody, who also has strong Serbian sympathies, regretted that the United States hadn't played a more active role as a broker between the parties.

In theory, the Nickles amendment provided a new policy framework, anchored

more closely to democracy and human rights. Human rights groups such as Helsinki Watch had urged just such an approach. The point was not just to penalize Serbia, which was committing the grossest abuses, but to increase leverage with Croatia, where the human rights picture was still unclear. Croatia's 1990 elections had been highly nationalistic in tone. Traveling in dominantly Serb regions of Croatia in 1990, Helsinki Watch executive director Jeri Laber says she found "genuine fear" among Serbs of a possible resurgence of World War II persecution and genocide. Laber and others point out that Milosevic deliberately stirred and manipulated such fears—some argue in preparation for a coming war. Moreover, Croatia's President Franjo Tudjman attempted (somewhat unsuccessfully) to respond to Serb complaints in what the U.S. consul in Zagreb described in an August 1990 cable as "sound and judicious" fashion. Tudjman offered the head of the minority Servian Democratic Party the vice presidency but was turned down. Eager for an international presence and receptive to human rights monitoring, Croatia has shown a willingness to meet EC demands. Many now agree a more visible U.S. presence in Croatia and Serbia, backed by the threat of sanctions, might have done much both to reassure Serbs in Croatia and to deter the Serbian republic from violent intervention.

In May 1991 the Nickles sanctions were imposed, and aid was cut to the Yugoslav central government and Serbia. However, a mere twenty days later President Bush waived the sanctions after a phone call with Markovic, the Yugoslav "Gorbachev." But by now Markovic's authority had been completely undercut by Milosevic, whose December money-printing scandal had destroyed the convertibility of the dinar and with it the Markovic economic reforms. Moreover, nine days earlier Serbia had blocked the scheduled assumption of Yugoslav's collective presidency by Stipe Mesic, a Croat, destroying any pretense of a neutral federation.

During the winter of 1990–91, State continued to resist measures to treat the republics differently or to link U.S. aid to human rights. In January 1991 Dole introduced legislation calling for aid to republics in both Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union, based on democratic and human rights criteria. State opposed the measure. Throughout 1991—as militant Serbs in Croatia, stirred by Milosevic, mounted armed rebellion, eventually declaring a small independent state—Serbia resisted efforts by Slovenia and Croatia to negotiate a looser Yugoslav confederation. State advocated standing aside. In May Croatians voted overwhelmingly for independence in a referendum, following a similar vote by the Slovenes. In June Baker traveled to Belgrade and gave his speech emphasizing U.S. interest in the "territorial integrity" of Yugoslavia. "I believe [Baker's speech] suggested to the Serbs—to Milosevic—that we were going to support extreme things to keep the country together," says Yugoslav expert Steven Burg of Brandeis University. Even after the declarations of independence by Slovenia and Croatia, White House spokesman Marlin Fitzwater condemned "unilateral actions that preempt dialogue," arguing that "separation will lead to violence," implicitly blaming Slovenia and Croatia for the war that Serbia and the Yugoslav army were about to start.

As late as October 1991, with war raging and thousands of Croatian civilians fleeing their homes, State testified against legislation introduced by Senator Alfonse D'Amato (another veteran of the Dole trip to Kosovo) calling for a cutoff of aid to and sanctions against Serbia.

From the beginning of the war, Germany and Austria leaned toward recognition of Croatia and Slovenia as the best solution. The United States, following U.N. special envoy Cyrus Vance, argued rather that recognition would only escalate the war. As late as mid-December Eagleburger told the mayors of the besieged Croatian towns of Dubrovnik and Osijek that recognition would only lead to expansion of the war into Bosnia and Herzegovina and Macedonia.

Instead, the German decision to recognize the two republics, coming in December and January, brought the first enduring cease-fire. With Yugoslav army desertions growing, the Serbian economy flagging, and the war increasingly unpopular at home, Serbia's Milosevic now appeared ready to talk. As is not uncommon in dealing with a dictator, pressure had worked. The situation was far from resolved, but for the first time in fifteen cease-fires, the Croatian countryside was mostly quiet. One only wonders now what a differential policy pursued earlier in the game might have done. "If we had summoned the moral courage to act," says Gore, "we could have saved thousands of lives."

In the end of the Yugoslav crisis did more than create two new states: it marked the re-emergence of Germany as a great power. It was an ironic reversal of roles. Throughout the 1980s, when the United States pursued tough tactics against Communist leaders, based on a commitment to democratic principles, West Germany steered a more neutral middle path between East and West based on realpolitik. Now the Germans were acting from principle against a dictator while the United States cultivated realpolitik. It was a measure of the fundamental difference between the Bush and the Reagan foreign policies. It was also a measure of the declining power of the United States. One of the great lessons of the 1980s was that those countries fared best in the global power struggle that stood firmly for their principles. In the 1990s, returning to Kissingerian ideas of stability, the United States eschewed such a course. The result was not merely a botched opportunity and an unnecessary loss of lives, but an absolute loss of international power for the United States.

[From the New York Times, May 21, 1992]

PUNISH THE SERBS

(By William Safire)

In the face of Serbia's bloody invasion of its neighbors, President Bush has ducked under his desk in a way that recalls Benjamin Harrison's 1888 doctrine: "We Americans have no commission from God to police the world."

Excuses for inaction range from "it's Europe's problem" to "our vital interests are not involved" to "those historic hatreds run so deep, there's nothing anybody can do."

The unspoken excuse is that in an election year, no American politician wants to commit American forces to what may be a quagmire. Yet the lack of any threat of harsh consequences encourages the aggression.

What would the other candidates do to stop the killing if they were President right now? I phoned that question to Ross Perot's spokesman and was faxed this prompt, if Carteresque, response: "I would be actively working with the United Nations in an effort to restore peace to the area." Can't get in trouble with a platitude.

Bill Clinton, after criticizing Bush "indifference," responded: "The United States and the international community must adopt immediately the kinds of tough sanctions that will make the Milosevic regime pay a heavy price for continuing its aggression, such as freezing assets, an oil embargo, and suspension or explusion from appropriate international organizations."

That's at least a policy that offers change. Opinion makers as far apart as Anthony Lewis and Jeane Kirkpatrick agree that if collective security is to have meaning, the President of the United States must do more during mass slaughter than send Margaret Tutwiler out to wring her hands and play Benjamin Harrison.

Last year we saw how televised pictures of atrocities turned around a callous, let-it-happen policy in Iraq. After the public outcry, Mr. Bush put a protective air cap over much of Iraqi Kurdistan; as a result, this week, for the first time in a thousand years, Kurds are voting in a free, democratic election.

A Bosnia-Herzegovinan official—this year's Haile Selassie—says that if the world intervened to escort relief to starving, persecuted Kurds, why not Bosnians? "We are real people, too."

Did America set a precedent by protecting the Kurds? Or was that a special case, where our interests were at stake, where we had a moral responsibility because we had called for the anti-Saddam uprising, and where the American public supported our intervention?

Answer: both. The extent of our participation will depend on previous commitment, vital national interest and sphere of influence. But wherever in the world brutality is inflicted on millions of people, America's place is in the vanguard of marshaling civilization's response.

The Serbs have earned a reputation for ferocity. They are now represented by—and not oppressed by—their own dictator, Slobodan Milosevic. They are seizing territory they believe was stolen from them. If this causes death and desolation, they say, so be it—Serbs have suffered in the past, too.

Sorry, but the law of the jungle has been repealed. No longer should any people get away with barbarism in the name of vengeance.

How do we stop the killing? The international community—that's Germany, France, Britain, Russia and the U.S., under U.N. or regional auspices—must put an intolerable cost on continued aggression.

This does not mean Operation Balkan Storm; the Serbs, unlike the Iraqis, would fight forever. Nor would this mean namby-pamby sanctions like suspending airline landing rights.

It means, as Mr. Clinton suggests, embargoing Serbia's oil and freezing its assets. Beyond that, we should impinge on its long-sought sovereignty by seizing Serbian airspace, much as we have done in Kurdistan.

This would not immediately stop Serbian aggression, but it would be a painful and humiliating penalty. Peacemakers would have cards to play.

Harrisonism need not paralyze us. "Chronic wrongdoing," wrote Theodore Roosevelt, "or an impotence which results in a general loosening of the ties of civilized society, may. . . ultimately require intervention by some civilized nation."

Update that to "alliance of nations" and apply the responsibility to intervene to the Balkans today.

[From the New York Times, May 17, 1992]

THE NEW WORLD ORDER

(By Anthony Lewis)

LEXINGTON, VA.—When President Bush took this country and others into the Per-

sian Gulf war 16 months ago, he acted in the name of a new world order. This was not just a war for oil, he said; it was the beginning of an age when aggression against the weak would not be tolerated anywhere.

How cynical that promise sounds today. The world is if anything nastier. There are more victims of aggression. And political leaders show no signs of the firmness needed to stop it—least of all George Bush.

The most painful disappointment is in what was Yugoslavia. For nearly a year now Serbia's Communist leader, Slobodan Milosevic, has used his troops and Serbian irregulars to kill and terrorize other ethnic groups in the neighboring republics. And what are the rest of us doing? Essentially standing by and wringing our hands.

The United States, the European Community and the United Nations have tried various devices in the former Yugoslavia. They have sent mediators, stationed truce monitors on-site, dispatched peacekeeping forces. All have failed to stop the bloodshed.

The reason they have failed is plain. Mr. Milosevic and his Serbian allies do not want peace. They want to acquire territory by force. They will not be stopped by exhortation.

The only thing that would have stopped the aggressors was a credible threat of force. And the United States and European Community gave that leverage up at the start, indicating that in any event they would not intervene militarily to stop the slaughter.

Intervention in struggles among ethnic or religious groups is tricky business. It is often not easy to say who are the good guys, if any. In this case, I have no illusion that the other Yugoslav groups are saints. But the Serbs were and are the principal aggressors. "Stop the Serbian aggression," The Economist wrote recently, "and you end the bloodshed."

Moreover, there have been moments when the aggression was so naked that European and American intervention would have been generally regarded as justified. One was when the Serbian forces pounded Dubrovnik, a Croatian city of great historic and cultural interest and no imaginable strategic value.

Another such occasion is here now, in the merciless Serbian attacks on Sarajevo, the capital of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Watching the television pictures of shells falling on that city and civilians huddling in fear, I thought that civilization had not advanced since Nazi bombs fell on Rotterdam. Some new world order.

At Dubrovnik last fall there was, and at Sarajevo now there is, a way for the United States and the Community to act effectively without undue risk of being embroiled in military action on the ground. That is to take command of the air.

The Americans and Europeans have plenty of warplanes, based near enough, to do exactly that. We could have said to Mr. Milosevic, and still could: Stop your aggression at once, or our military aircraft will control your skies. Not just over Dubrovnik or Sarajevo but over Belgrade.

The Bush Administration has kept Iraq's warplanes grounded since the gulf war—although it had to be shamed into enforcing that rule after Saddam Hussein's slaughter of Kurds and Shiites. The threat to do the same to Serbia would surely be credible.

The failure of nerve and imagination in the face of Serbian aggression is Europe's as well as America's. But President Bush raised expectations so high in the gulf war that disappointment naturally focuses on him. What has happened to the man who three days after Iraq grabbed Kuwait said, "This will not stand"?

The Iraqi invasion must have had special connotations for George Bush: echoes of Munich, the personalized devil figure of Saddam Hussein. Or else the difference really was no more than oil.

There is no oil in Sarajevo. But the failure to stop the Serbian anschluss may have large consequences. The world is that much less likely to be able to prevent the ethnic conflagrations that threaten in large areas of Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. We might remember that this terrible century began its downward slide 78 years ago in Sarajevo.

[From the Washington Post, May 18, 1992]

FOLDING IN THE FACE OF VIOLENCE

THIS ISN'T A COMIC-OPERA WAR, SO HOLD THE TALK OF A NEW WORLD ORDER

(By Jeane Kirkpatrick)

"Milosevic plays by different rules than other European leaders," a European diplomat said last week of Serbia's military leader. According to the diplomat, this "slickest con man in the Balkans" used his "extraordinary personal charm" to deceive U.N. envoy Cyrus Vance, European Community mediator Lord Peter Carrington and U.N. peace forces director Marrack Goulding.

These men thought Slobodan Milosevic was serious about the successive peace talks and cease-fires in which they involved him. "He can utter the most egregious falsehoods with the appearance of the utmost sincerity," another senior European diplomat added.

How quickly diplomats and international lawyers are misled by the likes of Milosevic (and the Ayatollah Khomeini and the Argentine generals and Saddam Hussein). It is difficult for the civilized leaders of civilized governments to believe that the man across the negotiating table is about to bomb civilians, wipe out families and towns, and break solemn agreements. It is difficult to conceive that the smiling leader who is offering assurances of his peaceful intentions is a political psychopath who will respond only to force.

Eventually, though, the reality emerges. Now, at last, Western diplomats think they understand Milosevic's violent behavior. Thus, to protest, the European Community has withdrawn its military monitors and the United States has withdrawn its ambassador, to wait him out in a safer place.

"We are risking too much," Reuters quoted the EC missions leader as saying. "There is wrong behavior toward us, and some people are out of control. I have no right to put my people in danger. . . . Some have wives and children."

As mortar and tank shells bombard neighborhoods of Sarajevo and snipers pick off anyone in sight, Europeans and Americans announce they will punish Milosevic. They will isolate his new Yugoslav state. They will impose economic sanctions. They will deny the new state membership in all international bodies.

And, from a safe distance, they will wait while the sanctions do their work. Meanwhile, Milosevic's troops slaughter Slavic Muslims, more than 1,000 of whom have already perished in the Serbian effort to seize Bosnia-Herzegovina.

The American response is no more heroic—or helpful—to the victims of Serbian violence than that of the European Community. The State Department announced that, in addition to recalling the ambassador, the United States will join in diplomatic efforts and economic sanctions.

"But we are not about to get out in front of the Europeans. They must define the distance and set the pace for the international community in dealing with Yugoslavia," a high-level State Department official commented to me last week while requesting anonymity.

His heroic lines could as easily have been uttered when Mussolini invaded Ethiopia or when Adolf Hitler marched into the Rhineland.

"There's no percentage in injecting yourself in the cross-fire between people intent on killing each other and yelling 'Stop' when they're not listening. We had to fall back on the idea that there wasn't much we or anyone could do until they got the blood lust out of their system and became more willing to listen to reason," he said.

How readily the will of the international community gives way before violence. How flimsy the structures of conflict resolution and peacekeeping turn out to be. How limited the Western commitment to collective security is when confronted with guns and determination—even when slaughter and civil war occur in the heart of Europe, in the very city where World War I was born.

Let us not speak, then, of collective security except as a dream. Collective security depends on having force and will available when mediation and diplomacy fail. Without the option of force to deal with force, there is no collective security. Neither diplomacy nor economic sanctions are an adequate shield against tanks and mortars.

There is anarchy today in Yugoslavia. There is timidity in Brussels and Washington. So let us not speak yet of a new world order. It remains to be built.

□ 1840

UPDATE ON HAITI

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

Mr. OWENS of New York. Madam Speaker, I wish to briefly do an update report on the situation in Haiti.

An astounding release came from the Associated Press today reporting that the San Diego Union Tribune newspaper reported today that a supersecret commando team, known as Seal Team Six, rescued a group of former Haitian officials from their country 2 months ago.

Madam Speaker, the Seals are a naval counterterrorism squad.

The paper quotes an unspecified Pentagon source as saying that the squad rescued a handful of former Haitian officials whose lives were in danger. The raid was reportedly authorized by President Bush, and the former officials were thought to be members of deposed President Jean-Bertrand Aristide's government.

However, Madam Speaker, the Defense Department does not acknowledge the existence of any Seal Team Six, and the Pentagon officials will neither confirm, nor deny, that the incident occurred. A special operation command is responsible for the Navy sea-air-land special commandos known as Seals.

The paper quotes its unidentified source as saying that there were no casualties in the operation. I find that a very interesting piece of news for several reasons. I have no quarrel with the rescue of people who are in danger in Haiti. I have no quarrel with the rescue of people, certainly if they were part of President Aristide's deposed government.

The problem is, if our Government, by order of the President, conducts such a rescue of any persons from Haiti, it is certainly admitting, it is certainly acknowledging, that Haiti is a dangerous place, that it is a place where there is a need to rescue people whose lives are threatened.

Madam Speaker, this is in direct contradiction with the position that our Government has taken publicly that there is no danger to anyone in Haiti and that not only a handful of people are not in danger, but thousands can be returned. They propose to return 15,000 people whose bodies have been plucked from the high seas, who have been carried to Guantanamo Bay and then repatriated to Haiti. This is a shocking situation. It means that public policy means nothing to this administration, that they choose, when they wish, to utilize their military forces, the Armed Forces, the special command, the Seals, whatever you want to call them, as their own private army to do their own private thing. Evidently, there was some group of people they felt individually, privately deserved to be rescued, so those that deserved to be rescued, for whatever reason, were rescued by forces of the U.S. Government.

And my colleagues might say, "Well, why accept this report as the truth? The Pentagon is not confirming, and they're not denying." Well, we have all been around long enough to know that, when the Pentagon refuses to deny it, then that is a confirmation. We have all been around long enough to know that this kind of report from a responsible newspaper would not have surfaced.

This is in direct contrast to the horror of the public posture and the public position of our Government. The horror of our public position is that our Government, the administration, has taken the position that the final solution to the Haitian problem is death by drowning.

Now those are strong words. When I say "final solution," I am well aware of the fact that "final solution" is a phrase associated with Adolph Hitler. I am also well aware of the fact that "new world order" is a phrase that was first coined by Adolph Hitler. Is this the new world order that we envisage where certain people are going to be written off and considered as undersirables, as people who have no place in the new world order? Certain people can be eliminated, not by gas chambers in this case, but by drowning at sea? If the policy of our Government, as announced recently by the President, by the administration, is that we no longer will be picking up Haitians who are in overcrowded boats and in danger of capsizing, we are not going to pick them up and take them to safety, our policy is we are just going to keep them from getting to the shores of the United States, what does that mean? Translated into honest, commonsense language, what does that mean?

Madam Speaker, if we are not going to pick people up in rickety boats, overloaded boats, if we are going to let them venture on into the high seas, as long as they do not get close to our shores, then the likelihood is that those rickety boats will capsize. The likelihood is that those people will drown. If they do not drown voluntarily, if the high seas do not get them, then, as they near the shores of our country, we are saying we will turn them back. The rickety boats will be intercepted. They will be forced to turn back and travel the distance back to Haiti, or in the process of turning them back they might drown in the sea. Many will drown in the sea.

Madam Speaker, it is a final solution to the Haitian problem by drowning people in the sea, and I can think of nothing worse. I can think of nothing more horrible. I can think of no act that our Government ever committed that I would be more ashamed of than to have the problem of Haitian refugees solved by letting them drown at sea.

We have many alternatives of course. The numbers are not so great. We have absorbed many more refugees in the past than the 15,000 who at one time accumulated at Guantanamo. We can make room in a nation of more than 200 million people for a measly 25,000, 30,000, even 100,000 people. That is not the problem. We have absorbed many more Cubans. Some 400,000 Cubans were absorbed in a period of just a few years in Florida. We brought in many plane loads of Hungarian refugees. Thousands and thousands of people at particular times have been absorbed when we felt they were worthy of being saved.

Madam Speaker, the message that we are getting from this administration is that in the new world order that we envisage certain people do not deserve to be saved. This action by the Seals rescuing some people from dangerous Haiti, a place where our Government has publicly said is not dangerous, is an indication that some people deserve to be saved and some do not.

□ 1850

We are picking and choosing human beings who deserve to be saved. Haiti is a dangerous place. I have no quarrel with the administration taking action to save some people from Haiti. But we should go on to recognize and admit to the public and to the whole world, and the United Nations should admit it. I am not proud of the actions of the United Nations. They sit silent and acquiesce and bow to the policies of our present administration. They are not taking the kind of strident positions they should take in defense of the lives of Haitian refugees.

All of us, the United States, the OAS, the United Nations, Europe, and Japan, everybody should admit that this is a situation which is very dangerous, and that anybody seeking to escape from Haiti has a justification for leaving.

The situation has grown more dangerous in the last few days. We returned 587 Haitian refugees just yesterday. At the same time it was reported that in Port-au-Prince there have been shootings in the city every night for the last week. The same report indicates that 16 people were murdered in the past week. One of the victims murdered in Port-au-Prince was the brother of a prominent Haitian businessman who was raising campaign funds in anticipation of the return of deposed Haitian President Aristide. The killers shot the businessman's brother by mistake, thinking he was the businessman. The incident occurred only 150 feet away from a police station in downtown Port-au-Prince.

Haiti is a dangerous place. People need to be rescued from Haiti. Not just a handful should be chosen by the U.S. Navy and rescued, but large numbers need to be rescued. We need a policy where we take them in temporarily into this country by the thousands.

At the same time that the murders were going on, the army brigades were doing other things also which underscore the danger in Haiti.

Scores of young people, as young as people in the sixth through twelfth grades, were arrested last week by Haiti's military thugs because they staged a demonstration against the military government.

Consequently, after that demonstration the government has closed public secondary schools to prevent more protests. They are not only depriving these youth of their freedom of expression, they are also depriving these same youth of an education.

Yesterday soldiers entered a private secondary school to stop another antigovernment demonstration, and they beat students in the school's courtyard.

Haiti is a dangerous place. It is a place where people should be rescued in large numbers.

In Petionville, Haitian police rounded up some young men standing in an open market in an apparent attempt to crush support for President Aristide and intimidate the people of the town. Petionville was a center of support for Aristide from the very beginning. So the fact they have rounded up young people at random in order to prevent them from getting any ideas is nothing unusual.

At the same time, Haiti's outlaw government refuses to accept an accord that was worked out by the Organization of American States. There was an accord worked out after months and months and months of negotiation. The accord was worked out right here in Washington, at the Organization of American States headquarters.

That accord forced Aristide to do some things he did want to do. But in order to alleviate the situation, the rightfully elected President of Haiti, a man elected by 70 percent of the people, agreed to accept some onerous terms, for example, the appointment of a Prime Minister that he did not particularly select. They selected him back in Haiti. He had to appoint that Prime Minister in order to come back.

President Aristide had to agree to grant amnesty to certain people in order to come back. He agreed to all of these terms, and still the regime, the outlaw government in Haiti, refuses to let him come back. They claim if Aristide tries to come back, if he tries to assume his rightful place again as the country's President, Aristide will be arrested for, among other things, murder.

The military thugs who are committing murder every day are threatening to arrest the lawfully elected President if he should return for murder. The outlay government says it will accept a plan for a reconstructed government, but it will not have reconstructive government with Aristide. It must be without Aristide. They are not willing to accept any compromise.

The White House still claims that the safety of Haitians is best assured by remaining in their own country. They made that claim before the newspaper issued this recent piece of news saying that the White House itself had authorized the rescue of some people in Haiti because of the dangers there.

Their official position as of this very moment is that the safety of Haitians is best assured by remaining in their own country. Reports from Haiti strongly indicate that conditions are far from safe, as I just indicated.

The people of Haiti are not allowed the President of their choice, and, as I said before, any open displays of support for Aristide are met with military violence.

Madam Speaker, I support temporary protected status for Haitian refugees in this country. We passed a bill here in the House. We should have that same bill passed by the Senate.

We really do not need a bill. The President, the administration, has the authority under the present immigration laws to accept the Haitians into this country under temporary status. They can temporarily take them in for a period of 6 months without having to do anything else, no interviews, nothing of any consequence has to happen for 6 months.

They do not all have to be taken to Florida or Guantanamo. There are many other places to take them.

Our country has a history of providing asylum. As I said before, we have made arrangements for those people we deem worthy. The problem is we are making an exception in the case of Haitians. We are saying the Haitians are different.

What is the difference? We are sad to say that the difference that is most visible is that the Haitians are black. The only large number of black refugees that have sought to escape persecution and come into this country have been the Haitians. Time after time, the Haitians have received negative special treatment.

We are continuing to subject the Haitians to the same negative special treatment. What alarms me most is we have escalated that negative special treatment, and we are now condemning Haitians to die by drowning at sea.

Our Government has much to be ashamed of. Every American is tainted by this position taken by our Government.

Given Haitians, who are fleeing persecution, who are fleeing a dangerous situation, giving them temporary shelter is the least we can do.

Madam Speaker, I would like to submit for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Bill Frelick which appeared in the Sunday, May 24, Washington Post concerning Haitians' forced repatriation.

Mr. Frelick is a senior policy analyst for the U.S. Committee for Refugees.

Madam Speaker, I submit the article for the RECORD.

[From the Washington Post, May 24, 1992]

HAITIAN EXODUS

(By Bill Frelick)

By its Draconian treatment of Haitian boat people, the U.S. government has managed to shift the debate farther and farther away from how best to treat refugees in need of protection to how to avoid the worst mistreatment. Put simply, the United States ought to recognize that: (1) the military regime that grabbed power in Haiti is viciously and systematically conducting a reign of terror that persecutes large numbers who supported the ousted president and keeps the population as a whole in fear and misery, and (2) refugees fleeing that repression should be provided temporary protection.

Since the beginning of the crisis, however, the United States has sought to avoid its minimal obligations to protect refugees from persecution. In the first stage, our government shopped around the region attempting to coerce or entice poor neighboring countries to take in the Haitian refugees. Not surprisingly, it was difficult to convince these countries that they were better able to provide for the refugees than the United States itself.

Then we held the refugees aboard Coast Guard cutters until there was no room left. Within hours of returning the first boatloads to Haiti in late November, a court order prevented further forced repatriations until the underlying question of international law could be decided: Was this a case of refoulement—the forced return of refugees to a place where their lives or freedom would be threatened—a practice prohibited by the U.N. Refugee Convention and Protocol? The Bush administration argued before the U.S. Supreme Court that the Refugee Convention's ban on forced return "applies only to refugees within the territory of the contracting state." In other words, if we interdict refugees in international waters—physically preventing them from entering our country—we can send them back to imprisonment, torture or death and not be held accountable under international law created to protect refugees from that fate.

Until the Supreme Court lifted the injunction—it never considered the case on the underlying legal merits—the government had to offload the Haitians onto the U.S. naval base at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. From Guantanamo, the Immigration and Naturalization Service began "pre-asylum" screening interviews to determine which Haitians had a "credible fear of return." About one-third met that standard, allowing those who were not precluded for health reasons to be brought to the United States for full asylum hearings. Those who were "screened out" were forcibly repatriated to Haiti without access to legal counsel or to appeal negative decisions.

Despite the resumption of forced repatriation, the numbers fleeing have outpaced the ability of the INS to conduct even the prescreening interviews. Now, the government announces that it will no longer pick up the refugees unless their boats are in imminent danger of sinking, because the Guantanamo base has reached its capacity. Navy Comdr. Greg Hartung, a Pentagon spokesman, explained: "There is no room at the inn."

Coast Guard cutters were seen as a magnet attracting boat departures; withdrawing them is seen as a deterrent measure. But what if the refugees keep coming? For a decade now the Coast Guard has stopped them from landing. They are likely to continue interdicting the boats before they hit U.S. territorial waters. In that case, the prospect looms that the Haitians may be summarily returned with no screening for refugee claims whatsoever.

What are the alternatives? First, despite claims to the contrary, the naval base at Guantanamo Bay is not full. The 47-square-mile base has segregated the 12,500 Haitians on one airfield. The real worry is that within a month or so heat and hurricanes are likely to render the tent encampments uninhabitable. The navy needs to start building shelters now that can withstand the elements.

The second major headache for the government is the overwhelmed INS asylum officer corps. Considering the difficulties of their task—both in terms of conditions at Guantanamo and political pressures exerted on them from the State Department—the asylum offices have, on the whole, performed admirably. However, this relatively small unit of the INS has reached its limit, and regular asylum adjudications back in the United States are backing up and creating a backlog that may take years to process.

The solution is to stop treating this on the model we use for individual asylum applicants. This is a mass exodus. In other parts of the world, when mass flows of refugees flee Afghanistan, Somalia, Cambodia or any of scores of other countries, they are admitted as a group. After being provided "first asylum," they are assisted and protected to the extent the host country is able to help with the support of the international community. This is a well-established practice that has the imprimatur of the U.N. system.

Our government need not consider individual refugee claims—in a mass influx, it is widely accepted internationally that the individual approach would overwhelm any country's asylum adjudication system. But there is an obligation we cannot shirk. We need to provide temporary protection. Many other countries with far fewer resources than the United States do just this.

The United States certainly is better able to temporarily assist refugees than a Sudan, or a Malawi or any of the countries in the Caribbean basin. We also have a legal framework under the Immigration Act of 1990 for providing Temporary Protected Status without having to grant permanent asylum. We can—and should—admit the Haitians on a temporary basis.

We cannot pretend that those risking their lives on the high seas do not exist. We also cannot continue the outrageous fiction that Haitians do not have legitimate fear of persecution upon return. Our government should put its energies into restoring democracy to Haiti. Until that is done, anything less than providing minimal, temporary refuge puts us in violation of the fundamental principles of refugee protection we have heretofore consistently promoted.

PLIGHT OF HAITIAN REFUGEES

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

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, we continue in the House of Representatives to speak out against this cruel, inhumane blockade on Haitians desperately attempting to flee a hated dictatorship that exists in their country.

Today the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees has added her voice of criticism to this new decision to turn back Haitian boat people without giving them a chance to apply for asylum.

High Commissioner Ogata said that she was deeply disturbed by President Bush's order that the United States Coast Guard directly return Haitians to their homeland without determining if they are political refugees or economic immigrants.

Even the High Commissioner expressed surprise and concern at the Executive order, in light of reports of serious human rights abuses and violence in Haiti. Listen to the words of the High Commissioner.

□ 1900

I am deeply disturbed that the Executive Order denies those Haitians genuinely in need of international protection the opportunity to present their claims, thus exposing them to risk upon their return to Haiti.

But today, in Georgia, President Bush said the Haitians were fleeing poverty, not political repression. He said:

Yes, the Statue of Liberty still stands and we still open our arms to people that are politically oppressed. We cannot, as long as the laws are on the books, open the doors to economic refugees all over the world.

He also denied accusations that the policy is racist. It almost sounds as if the President is unaware of the import and impact of his Executive order over the weekend, which does not bother to interrogate anybody. There is no processing anymore. We now have a policy of drowning at sea, to return rickety boats that have only a 50-percent chance of getting to the United States, now turned around, sent all the way back to pursue that very dangerous course in international waters, shark-infested waters, all over again.

I am sorry, Mr. President, you do not understand that you are making the Statue of Liberty weak. You have turned your back on people fleeing repression and violence for the simple reason that they are Haitians. Where, sir, is you humanity?

Listen to Amnesty International, who have called the policy racist. Listen to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees who said that the new Executive order "denies those Haitians genuinely in need of protection the opportunity to present their claims, thus exposing them to risk upon return to Haiti."

Please, sir, consider the course of conduct that you are now costing the lives of people within this hemisphere.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES], a gentleman who has always stood with Members in this body in support of justice and human rights and civil rights.

Mr. TORRES. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for taking this special order to bring to the American public and to bring to this House of Representatives in these sad hours this serious crisis that besets not only the conscience of America but obviously that of the entire world which is watching this drama.

I deem it so insidious that the President of the United States, in the comfort of a golf course, would issue such an order, such an Executive order, denying to thousands of men and women who are fleeing, indeed, political repression, who are fleeing a totalitarian regime, the likes of which we have not seen in our hemisphere as that that exists in Haiti and to deny them, to ask the Coast Guard to return those people in those rickety boats back to certain death, either by drowning or truly eaten by sharks, children, women, men.

I say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS], indeed, this is a sad hour for us in this House.

Ironically, yesterday, and I came upon the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, citing that ironically yesterday, just yesterday we marked 53 years, when this Nation, the United States of America, returned the Hamburg Lines cruiser, the *St. Louis*, which had arrived on American shores with 930 passengers whose passports had a J marked on them, J standing for Jewish. And this Nation, 53 years ago, denied them entry to this country and sent them about to other countries to seek refuge, which was also denied.

And those people, holding those J-marked passports, indicating they were Jews fleeing the oppression of Hitler, went back to Germany.

What was their fate? Where did they end up? To be sure, some of them in camps. Where did those children end up? Men and women who came to our shores to seek safe haven?

We cannot do this now to Haitians simply because they are black. It is a terrible message that the administration is sending out. It is a subtle message and I am so sorry and I am so sad that this message goes out at a time when our Nation is embroiled in a political time. It is a subtle message to tell people that this President, that this administration will not allow these people to our shores simply because they are people from Haiti and they are black.

I want to commend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] for bringing about this attention today, yesterday, that we need as a House of Representatives as Americans who watch us, to tell the world, to tell our President, to tell our administration that we cannot act in this way, that we must, as a House, as a body, as a legislative body, enact the legislation that would provide the temporary protected status which the bill of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS], H.R. 5267, seeks.

We have no other choice. We must do this. We must send the message forth that we are a nation that cares, especially at this time, for these poor people of Haiti who are only seeking an escape for their lives because of the despots that rule their country.

I commend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] for having brought up this special order.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. NAGLE], whose work on civil rights matters, on matters of civil liberty, and questions of conscience have made him a leader in the House of Representatives on these related subjects.

Mr. NAGLE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his kind words. I hope my conduct merits even small measure toward some success in the degree that the gentleman described.

I rise tonight to join the gentleman at what I think is a pivotal and troublesome time in this country's history.

In 1976, 1977, 1978, we had a Republican Governor in Iowa by the name of Bob Ray, and that was at the time of the Vietnam boat people. People were fleeing that area of the country, getting in boats and going out to sea.

Our Republican Governor at that time, from Iowa, which one would not expect, went to the refugee camps and started a program within our State

with the cooperation of Iowa citizens generally and Iowa churches in which we actually recruited those people to come to our State. It caused some eyebrows to be raised around the country because one would not think stodgy old Iowa would be of that nature, but I think it reflected well on our State.

Those people came to our State, and we put food together for them. We found them jobs. We put their kids in school.

A decade later, a decade and a half later those Vietnamese people are among our best citizens. They are among our best students, and we would argue that the experience of having those people among Iowans has actually expanded and enhanced our State and broadened our horizons.

Actually, while they may have benefited a little, our State, and we believe our country, has benefited a great deal.

The American experience has always been one of renewal, of different cultures, of different people, of different lands coming to this country, earning their place alongside of us and benefiting all of us in the process with their ideas and their ability to be different. The American experience is based on renewal and diversity of different thoughts and different perceptions and different people from different times and different lands.

□ 1910

I would submit to you tonight that of all we have said about this, the outrage that every one of us feels towards the President's policies, which could almost be termed, if one were cruel, racist in origin and generation, political at a minimum, that maybe the real losers are not just the people on those boats in that ocean, but maybe the real loser for now and for the future is the American experience, and maybe we are losing as much as they, if not more, because we have lost their talent, their energy, their determination, and their ambition to seek a better life. There are really two groups that are losing. We are losing, as Americans, and they are obviously in great jeopardy.

I cannot tell the Members how strongly and how deeply I feel a sense of outrage about this decision by the administration. The party of Lincoln, the White House that was controlled by the Great Emancipator, today sits in isolation and in disarray, unable to even pick up the hint of the tradition of their greatest President and act in his capacity to reach out and bring America together and broaden America and renew America.

I do not know what history will write of the Presidency, of the Bush experience, but I know that if they do write, this will be seen as the most blatant, political decision the White House has ever made, one that utterly denies all of us our heritage and our tradition of this country.

I spoke with Bob White this morning. Sixteen more Haitians were killed last night. The mayor of a major city, who was once arrested and beaten, was arrested again. Still we sit here with disinterest and neglect, and pretend that this is not a political problem, that these are not political refugees, and they really do not need our help. The magnificent generosity of this country, which is our tradition and our birthright, can be extended to a few people, even to allow them to sit on an island in the Caribbean in a military base until we can restore the legitimate Government of Haiti.

Every American, irrespective of party, should take up this cause. Every American who believes that Statue of Liberty really represents the best of this country should bombard the White House and this House and the Senate with letters of outrage and frustration urging the administration to reconsider its darkest policy.

I know when the gentleman from California, ESTEBAN TORRES, spoke, he is Hispanic, I am Irish, the gentleman from Michigan is black. That is what makes this country the greatest thing possible, is the fact that different people and different ideas and different concepts can come here and mingle together, equal and free. The American experience should not be denied to the people who seek our shores. We are big enough, we are broad enough, we are generous enough to offer that to them.

I will do everything that the leader of our organization from Michigan tells me to do to reverse this policy. The gentleman [Mr. CONYERS] is a leader in this cause, and I wish to enlist in his army, and I hope every American of every heritage, of every ethnic origin, or every religion, of every color, will stand with him until those people are allowed to be safe and free, and America itself renews its dream.

Mr. CONYERS. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. NAGLE] has brought an incredible recall of an experience that many of us have forgotten, that the people of your State and its leaders at that time indulged the Vietnamese in.

We have documented over 20 instances in which safe haven has been granted by our country under far less extenuating circumstances. Here we have a country that has such a dictatorship that we refuse to recognize it; that we now find that a supersecret Pentagon commando team had spirited out many of the Aristide Haitian officials from their war-torn country, in effect, because they knew that their lives were in danger, and all we ask is what about the other Haitians seeking to flee the same violence and repression? What about the lives of those who were not senior government officials? Why are we refusing now to even listen to those who fled today and last week?

This policy cannot stand the test of legal scrutiny because it violates our immigration law and the Geneva accord treaty that we signed, ratified by the Senate in 1968, and it contradicts the lame State Department excuses that they do not know of any retaliation going on. We have affidavits and documents that have already been presented that detail people who have been repatriated and were killed, people who have been repatriated and were arrested, people who were repatriated by mistake and were subsequently murdered the first night they returned.

This evidence is growing into a pile of irrefutable documented affidavits, videos in some cases, which give lie to the pathetic assertion that we do not know what is going on.

Mr. NAGLE. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. NAGLE. Madam Speaker, I will tell the gentleman, I will bet that if that island had oil, we would be there with military force. If that island had a canal, we would be there with a military force. I even suspect that if that island had a population of whites like Granada did, we would be there with a military force. We draw our distinctions from this administration on the basis of what they can do for us, whether we have a national security interest there.

I heard the other day that they are going to say next to us, "It is okay, we will return them back, and we will determine the political refugees there on the island after we take them back." About 1 in 4 right now can actually qualify in Guantanamo Bay for political refugee status. The estimates we have from the reporters on the island itself are that 25 percent figure, when you get the Haitians back on the island, drops to 1 percent at best, the highest mark; 99 percent will not be admitted; 99 percent will be denied relief, and the hypocrisy of our policy of finding national interest when it suits our needs and denying it when it does not meet the political needs of the White House because of a county in Florida that is important in the fall election is probably one of the things about the policy that troubles me the most.

Mr. CONYERS. The gentleman has helped give all of those Americans who feel ashamed as we do an understanding that this is not a national policy that we will go quietly into the night accepting. This embarrassment grows daily. The incidents, the deaths, the contradictions in our own law, continue to mount. It seems to me that we are doing precisely what in a democratic society must be done. We must find a way to reverse the policy.

Ambassador White, who the gentleman mentioned, has done an exceedingly important service as a person who has gone back there, has seen, interviewed, been an eyewitness, has talked with citizens and officials as

well, whose background and integrity is unimpeachable, and helped add to this testament of misery and suffering and death that this immigration policy is visiting upon citizens of the poorest nation in our hemisphere.

Mr. NAGLE. If the gentleman will yield further, one of the things Ambassador White told me this morning and the thing that he asked me to emphasize today, if I had the opportunity to speak, which the gentleman has been kind enough to give to me, was that there are really two aspects of this. We have talked a bit about the inconsistencies, the hypocrisy, the outrage, as to the people in the boat. But he also spoke to me to understand the longer term solution that is needed, not just to deal with the immediate problem of the refugees, but also to deal with the problem of how we bring down that government.

Ambassador White advocated and asked me to mention this evening, and I do so with his permission, that just simply taking care of the refugees does not solve the problem. We have to remove the government. Here the administration has been as equally recalcitrant and short-sighted as it has on the policy of the former.

Ambassador White would argue, were he to have floor privileges, what we need to do is to tighten the embargo aggressively, we need to go to the European Common Market and cut off the oil supply and do so quickly, and put a real economic embargo on that country that works with the cooperation of our allies.

One of the puzzlements I have is how we could organize 101 nations to go to war in the Persian Gulf overnight and go to the United Nations with great pride and fanfare, and we cannot get the countries who are trading down there in conflict with our stated objectives to organize effective economic boycotts to bring that government down.

He argues, and I concur, that that is the second prong that is needed here, is to bring that government down, to bring it down quickly, to use every legitimate nonviolent step necessary, and to, with force if necessary, use persuasion in the strongest possible terms, convince our allies to join us in an effective embargo, and not to listen, not to listen to the handful of American companies that are still down there doing business that are lobbying the domestic policy advisers at the White House, "You really don't need to do this. It is not as bad as you are being told."

□ 1920

So I think the second thing we have to do is not only ask America to be true to its own dream and generation, but also to put in an effective policy from the White House that brings that government down and restores legitimate, freely elected democratic government that was in place until the military coup.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. CONYERS. The gentleman from Iowa has done us a service by reporting those views of Ambassador White, because they coincide with some discussions with Members on the House floor yesterday in which it has been pointed out that until we lift the OAS sanction to a United Nations sanction we cannot really affect the European nations and their corporations who are still doing business.

Until we impound the bank accounts of that part of the elite who fomented this coup, cut off their financial resources, and then suspend the foreign commercial aircraft who travel every day from Miami to Port-au-Prince, until those several things combined with the recommendations that the gentleman has reported on this floor, there is no way that the embargo can be more than a token, which gives rise to the growing suspicion about the lack of good faith that we are going about trying to close down these wagtag military thugs which are not highly organized, which do not have up-to-date weaponry, who from my reports have only a few tanks, a few trucks, different kinds of hand weapons, many operating on their own without even any military supervision. And the only thing that they can use to maintain power is the terror of the gun. The only way that they can stay in power is to continue to terrorize, kill, and intimidate people.

So what we are doing is forcing people to continue to emigrate any way they can to escape a condition that we are allowing to exist. So we have us contributing to, I hope it is inadvertently, the remaining in power of people that, considering other kinds of coups that have occurred, could be relatively easily brought down.

Mr. NAGLE. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CONYERS. With pleasure, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. NAGLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I do not mean to turn this into an intellectual argument, but an intellectual argument sometimes serves the basis for policy, and I realize we are talking about people here. But it seems to me what the gentleman has just described is a political problem in the island, a freely elected democratic government having been removed, the administration making a decision of a political solution to a political problem, that is, a limited, ineffective embargo which causes the people of the island to flee the political situation. And then we deny them admission to this country because we say they are not a political refugees, they are really economic refugees. It seems to me almost by definition in the manner in which the administration has handled it they have established the legitimate political refugees status of the Haitians that they will not now even let get off the boat at Guantanamo, if they are even able to get across the ocean, and it is incorrigible or incomprehensible that logic cannot drive a policy down there, but politics drives it, but they will not realize the political nature of the refugee situation.

Mr. CONYERS. The gentleman's analysis I think is absolutely correct. I think he gives rise to the lie that these are just poor people trying to find a job.

The truth is as the poorest nation state in the hemisphere, they have always been poor. But that did not drive them to leave their country, to risk death on the high seas. It was the political terrorism of a coup that makes them decide that notwithstanding the perils of international shark-infested waters that they will risk their lives knowing that they may be turned back, rearrested, or anything can happen to them. These are incredibly difficult decisions to be forced upon individuals who are now wreaking the terrible misdirection of American diplomatic policy.

I hope that our voices will grow. I hope that the American people will understand that his is not a politically or partisan-driven debate, that they understand that the honor of our country hangs in the balance. We who criticized the British for turning back the Vietnamese boat people, they are bringing up the White House communications and the State Department bulletins right now, reviewing how we lectured other people about the barbarity of the very policy that we have now come to adopt.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order this evening.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. UNSOELD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of family emergency.

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 Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his re-

marks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SENSENBRENNER, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. TORRES) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MOODY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCCURDY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONYERS, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. BONIOR, for 60 minutes each day, on June 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, and 11.

Mr. FAZIO, for 60 minutes each day, on June 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, and 11.

Mr. CONYERS, for 60 minutes each day, on June 2, 3, and 4.

Mr. WOLPE, for 5 minutes, on June 3.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(Mr. BROOKS, prior to vote on motion to recommit on conference report on S. 1306 in the House today.)

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. SUNDQUIST in two instances.

Mr. THOMAS of California.

Mr. GALLEGLY.

Mr. BEREUTER.

Mr. BILIRAKIS.

Mr. OXLEY.

Mr. CAMP.

Mr. MICHEL in two instances.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. GUNDERSON.

Mr. RINALDO.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas.

Mr. PACKARD.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN in 10 instances.

Mr. ZIMMER.

Ms. MOLINARI.

Mrs. ROUKEMA.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. TORRES) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CARDIN.

Mr. FAZIO in two instances.

Mr. BONIOR.

Mr. LAROCCO in two instances.

Mr. YATRON in two instances.

Mr. LEHMAN of California.

Mr. KOSTMAYER in two instances.

Mr. SCHEUER.

Ms. LONG.

Mr. LEVINE of California.

Mr. HERTEL.

Mr. REED.

Mr. SMITH of Florida.

Ms. DELAURO.

Mr. ROYBAL.

Mr. OLVER.

Mr. MANTON.

Mr. SWETT.

Mr. KENNEDY.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. NAGLE. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 1, 1992, at 12 noon.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports of committees of the U.S. House of Representatives concerning the foreign currencies used by them for official foreign travel during the first quarter of 1992 pursuant to Public Law 95-354 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1992

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem[1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]
Hon. William J. Hughes[3]	2/7	2/9	Portugal		270.00		740.00				1,010.00
	2/9	2/11	Switzerland		462.00		23.50				485.50
	2/11	2/16	France		1,365.00						1,365.00
	2/16	2/18	Ireland		630.00						630.00
Hayden Gregory[3]	2/7	2/9	Portugal		270.00		740.00				1,010.00
	2/9	2/11	Switzerland		462.00		23.50				485.50
	2/11	2/16	France		1,365.00						1,365.00
	2/16	2/18	Ireland		630.00						630.00
Committee total					5,454.00		1,527.00				6,981.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Transportation and other expenses will be reported by the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

JACK BROOKS, Chairman, May 7, 1992.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1992

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem[1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]
David Leach	2/26	3/2	Spain		850.00		3,220.00				4,070.00
Gerry Waldron	2/26	3/2	Spain		850.00		3,220.00				4,070.00
Michael Reagan	2/26	3/2	Spain		850.00		3,220.00				4,070.00
Finnegan	2/5	2/8	Switzerland		693.00		3,271.80				3,964.80
John Berner	1/24	2/3	Russia		3,550.00		3,513.50				7,063.50
Hon. Dennis Eckart	2/6	2/8	Switzerland		462.00		3,271.80				3,733.80
Hon. Bill Richardson	1/5	1/8	Russia		1,018.00						1,018.00
	1/8	1/12	Portugal		1,100.00						1,100.00
Hon. Ed Towns	11/29	12/2	Honduras		600.00		1,170.00				1,770.00
Hon. Alex McMillan	2/2	2/3	Mexico		286.50						286.50
Hon. Bill Richardson	2/2	2/3	Mexico		286.50						286.50
Committee total					10,546.00		20,887.10				31,433.10

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JOHN D. DINGELL, Chairman.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referrred as follows:

3588. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3589. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting a report required by section 918 of the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989 for 1991, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 1833; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

3590. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting notice of final priority for fiscal year 1992—Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3591. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a compilation and analysis of State activities in implementing the fourth year of the Child Abuse and Neglect Prevention Challenge Grant Program, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5116a(1), 5116g; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3592. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification of the Department of the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Korea for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 92-23), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3593. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification of the Department of the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to the Coordination Council for North American Affairs for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 92-24), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3594. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3595. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting OMB estimate of the amount of change in outlays or receipts, as the case may be, in each fiscal year through fiscal year 1997 resulting from passage of H.R. 4774 and S. 2378, pursuant to Public Law 101-508, section 13101(a) (104 Stat. 1388-582); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3596. A letter from the Director, U.S. Information Agency, transmitting the semiannual report of the inspector general covering the period October 1, 1991, through March 31, 1992, pursuant to Public Law 99-399, section 412(a); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3597. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives, transmitting the quarterly report of receipts and expenditures of appropriations and other funds for the period January 1, 1992 through March 31, 1992, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 104a (H. Doc. No. 102-336); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

3598. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting notice of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

3599. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting notice of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

3600. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting notice of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

3601. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting notice of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

3602. A letter from the Assistant Secretary (Civil Works), the Department of the Army, transmitting recommendations for the modification to the authorized flood damage reduction project for Santa Barbara County Coastal Streams, California, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1962d-5(a) (H. Doc. No. 102-337); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation and ordered to be printed.

3603. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting an informational copy of a lease prospectus, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 606(a); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

3604. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report entitled "Nuclear Waste: DOE's Repository Site Investigations, a Long and Difficult Task" (GAO/RCED-92-73); jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations, Energy and Commerce, and Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BROWN: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 3614. A bill amending the Land Remote-Sensing Commercialization Act of 1984 to secure U.S. leadership in land remote-sensing by providing data continuity for the Landsat Program and by establishing a new national land remote-sensing policy, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 102-539). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTED BILLS SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

Mr. FORD of Michigan: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 3711. A bill to authorize grants to be made to State programs designed to provide resources to persons who are nutritionally at risk in the form of fresh nutritious unprepared foods, and for other purposes; with an amendment; referred to the Committee on Agriculture for a period ending not later than June 5, 1992, for consideration of such provisions of the bill and amendment as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause 1(a)(7), rule X. (Rept. 102-540, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. TAUZIN (for himself, Mr. FIELDS, and Mr. SKELTON):

H.R. 5276. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to prohibit the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from listing used oil and affiliated materials as a hazardous waste under that act, to require the Administrator to establish cost effective management standards for generators, transporters, and recyclers of used oil, to conserve a valuable resource, and to reduce the amount of lead in used oil fuels; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ACKERMAN:

H.R. 5277. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish programs to increase the supply of professional nurses and provide educational assistance to nurses, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey:

H.R. 5278. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the amount of gain which may be excluded from gross income on the sale of the principal residence of an individual who has attained age 55 to compensate for the 50 percent increase since 1981 in the median price of a home in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5279. A bill to provide for economic growth by reducing income taxes for most Americans, by encouraging the purchase of American-made products, and by accelerating transportation-related spending, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, Public Works and Transportation, Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, Post Office and Civil Service, and Appropriations.

H.R. 5280. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Housing and Community Development Act of 1987 to provide tax incentives for investments in enterprise zone businesses and domestic businesses; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BAKER:

H.R. 5281. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1995, the duty on 2.2-Dichlorophenylacetic Acid Ethel Ester [DCPAE]; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. PENNY, and Mr. BORSKI):

H.R. 5282. A bill to restrict assistance for Russia until its Armed Forces are removed from the Baltic States; jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DYMALLY:

H.R. 5283. A bill to preempt State and local sanction measures against Namibia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 5284. A bill to amend the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights Act of 1983 to provide

an authorization of appropriations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5285. A bill to authorize appropriations to carry out the activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for fiscal year 1993, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESPY (for himself, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. PARKER, and Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi):

H.R. 5286. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Lower Mississippi River Museum and Riverfront Interpretive Site, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation and Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GEREN of Texas:

H.R. 5287. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the grade of major general for the Chief of the Dental Service of the Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GOODLING (for himself, Mr. MICHEL, and Mr. GUNDERSON):

H.R. 5288. A bill to revise the Federal vocational training system to meet the Nation's work force needs into the 21st century by establishing a network of local skill centers to serve as a common point of entry to vocational training, a certification system to ensure high quality programs, and a voucher system to enhance participant choice, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor, Agriculture, Veterans' Affairs, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDEE (for himself, Mr. EMERSON, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. COYNE, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. CLAY, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. VENTO, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. MFUME, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. COLORADO, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. REED, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. MORAN, Mr. FISH, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. STARK, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. MILLER of California):

H.R. 5289. A bill making appropriations to begin a phase in toward full funding of the special supplemental food program for women, infants, and children [WIC] and of Head Start Programs, and to expand the Job Corps Program for the year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. KOSTMAYER (for himself and Mr. BLACKWELL):

H.R. 5290. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct a pilot program to demonstrate the feasibility of installing telephones in patient rooms in Department of Veterans Affairs medical facilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MARTINEZ:

H.R. 5291. A bill to provide for the temporary use of certain lands in the city of South Gate, CA, for elementary school purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself, Mr. ROE, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, and Mr. CLINGER):

H.R. 5292. A bill to provide for the appointment of Gen. Thomas C. Richards, U.S. Air Force (retired) as Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself, Mr. MINETA, Ms. HORN, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, and Mr. VANDER JAGT):

H.R. 5293. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to enhance competition among air carriers by prohibiting an air carrier who operates a computer reservation system from discriminating against other air carriers participating in the system and among travel agents which subscribe to the system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. RAHALL:

H.R. 5294. A bill to provide assistance for environmental infrastructure facilities for economically distressed areas; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. RINALDO (for himself, Mr. ROE, Mr. GALLO, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. HUGHES):

A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration and the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to jointly conduct a research program to develop new technologies for quieter jet aircraft engines and airframes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. STARK (for himself, Mr. DICKS, and Mr. MCCURDY):

H.R. 5296. A bill to require a report on nuclear safety in Eastern Europe and the states of the former Soviet Union; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Ways and Means.

By Mr. STENHOLM (for himself, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. GREEN of New York, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MORRISON, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. NAGLE, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PENNY, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. REGULA, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. VOLKMER, and Mr. WALSH):

H.R. 5297. A bill entitled the "Animal Medicinal Drug Use Clarification Act of 1992"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STUDDS:

H.R. 5298. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to include a description of the medical assistance for Medicare cost sharing available under title XIX of such act in the annual notice of benefits provided to Medicare beneficiaries; jointly, to the Committee on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi (for himself, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. ESPY, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. WISE, Mr. PARKER, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. WALSH, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. DERRICK, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. BRYANT, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. SWETT, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BREWSTER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. SAXTON, Ms. HORN, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. LAROCCO, Mrs. MINK, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. WELDON, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. MORRISON, Mr. HOYER, and Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota):

H.R. 5299. A bill to prohibit the transfer of excess Department of Defense construction and fire equipment to foreign governments; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MFUME:

H.R. 5300. A bill to amend the Federal Transit Act to increase for 2 fiscal years the Federal share of the costs of establishing and operating a university transportation center; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

H.R. 5301. A bill to provide for a temporary partial waiver of the requirement that the States match a portion of the Federal funds provided for the job opportunities and basic skills training program of the States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. WOLF, Mr. HARRIS, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. HORN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HORTON, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. ESPY, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. BLILEY, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. RAVENEL, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. PAXON, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. FISH, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. STUMP):

H.J. Res. 495. Joint resolution designating the week beginning November 8, 1992, as "National Women Veterans Recognition Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GEPHARDT (for himself, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. OBEY, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. STARK, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ECKART, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FROST, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Ms. HORN, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. WYDEN):

H.J. Res. 496. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for a balanced budget of the United States Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. LLOYD:

H.J. Res. 497. Joint resolution commemorating the 100th anniversary of Southern College of Seventh-Day Adventists; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself, Mr. CLINGER, and Mr. INHOFE):

H.J. Res. 498. Joint resolution designating the week commencing October 4, 1992, as

"National Aviation Education Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. BILBRAY, Ms. LONG, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HORTON, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. MFUME, Mr. TANNER, Ms. WATERS, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. HORN, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. CLAY, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. MINK, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. NAGLE, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TALLON, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. SISISKY, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. KASICH, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. GORDON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. PRICE, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. ROE, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. SABO, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WEISS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WALSH, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. BONIOR, and Mr. OWENS of New York);

H.J. Res. 499. Joint resolution designating July 2, 1992, as "National Literacy Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. HOYER, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. MFUME, Mr. GILCHREST, and Mrs. BYRON):

H. Con. Res. 327. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding visionary art as a national treasure and regarding the American Visionary Art Museum as a national repository and educational center for visionary art; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GEPHARDT (for himself and Mr. MICHEL):

H. Res. 471. Resolution directing the release of certain materials relating to the inquiry of the operation of the bank of the Sergeant at Arms pursuant to House Resolution 236; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H. Res. 472. Resolution amending the rules of the House of Representatives to require that the votes of individual Members be recorded in open session when choosing a President pursuant to the 12th amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SOLARZ (for himself and Mr. LEACH):

H. Res. 473. Resolution expressing the continuing concern of the House of Representatives about the situation in Burma and its implications for the region; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

454. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Senate of the State of Hawaii, relative to proposed legislation entitled "The Earthquake Project"; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

455. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Hawaii, relative to antiprogersterone steroid mifepistone, known as RU-486; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

456. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Hawaii, relative to the U.N. Conference on Environment and Development; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

457. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Colorado, relative to global democracy; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

458. Also, memorial of the Legislature of Guam, relative to support of H.R. 4901; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

459. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina, relative to the Older Americans Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 650: Mr. SABO.

H.R. 693: Mr. MCCLOSKEY.

H.R. 766: Mrs. SCHROEDER.

H.R. 961: Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.

H.R. 1200: Mr. BARNARD.

H.R. 1218: Mr. PANETTA and Mrs. COLLINS of Michigan.

H.R. 1335: Mr. LAGOMARSINO and Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.R. 1536: Mrs. BENTLEY and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1573: Mr. DARDEN.

H.R. 1624: Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 1703: Mr. BACCHUS.

H.R. 1753: Ms. HORN.

H.R. 1820: Mr. SWETT, Mr. MILLER of California, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 2070: Mr. WHEAT and Mr. KOSTMAYER.

H.R. 2164: Mr. BROWDER, Mr. RICHARDSON, and Mr. LUKEN.

H.R. 2819: Mr. TRAXLER and Mr. JONES of Georgia.

H.R. 2966: Ms. HORN.

H.R. 3071: Mrs. BYRON and Mr. WHEAT.

H.R. 3137: Mr. BROWN and Mr. ZIMMER.

H.R. 3160: Mr. ATKINS, Mrs. COLLINS of Michigan, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. MFUME, Mr. OBEY, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SOLARZ, and Mr. WOLPE.

H.R. 3277: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. WELDON, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. MINETA, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. FISH.

H.R. 3373: Mr. WILSON, Mr. SHAW, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, and Mr. SWIFT.

H.R. 3463: Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 3486: Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.

H.R. 3516: Mr. OXLEY.

H.R. 3517: Mr. AUCOIN.

H.R. 3518: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 3535: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 3763: Mr. MORRISON.

H.R. 3878: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OLVER, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.R. 3927: Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. ECKART, and Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 3938: Mr. FROST and Mr. FISH.

H.R. 3986: Mr. KOSTMAYER.

H.R. 4008: Mr. KOLTER and Mr. SANTORUM.

H.R. 4078: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 4174: Mr. ATKINS.

H.R. 4278: Mr. TORRES.

H.R. 4304: Mr. HALL of Ohio and Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 4315: Mr. ATKINS and Mr. SUNDQUIST.

H.R. 4338: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. CARPER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. GOSS, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. REED, Mr. ROSE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WISE, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. ECKART, Mr. WEISS, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. RAY, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. PRICE, Mr. SWETT, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. PARKER, Mr. OBEY, Mr. PORTER, Mr. ESPY, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. BACCHUS, and Mrs. COLLINS of Michigan.

H.R. 4427: Mr. GILCHREST and Mr. GUARINI.

H.R. 4432: Mr. CARPER.

H.R. 4481: Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 4502: Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. WILSON, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. HORN, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. OLIN, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. COBLE, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. LUKEN, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H.R. 4550: Mr. HUGHES.

H.R. 4591: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. TOWNS, and Mrs. UNSOELD.

H.R. 4617: Mr. MCMILLAN of North Carolina.

H.R. 4618: Mr. MCMILLAN of North Carolina.

H.R. 4619: Mr. MCMILLAN of North Carolina.

H.R. 4620: Mr. MCMILLAN of North Carolina.

H.R. 4621: Mr. MCMILLAN of North Carolina.

H.R. 4622: Mr. MCMILLAN of North Carolina.

H.R. 4623: Mr. MCMILLAN of North Carolina.

H.R. 4624: Mr. MCMILLAN of North Carolina.

H.R. 4625: Mr. MCMILLAN of North Carolina.

H.R. 4626: Mr. MCMILLAN of North Carolina.

H.R. 4627: Mr. MCMILLAN of North Carolina.

H.R. 4628: Mr. MCMILLAN of North Carolina.

H.R. 4629: Mr. MCMILLAN of North Carolina.

H.R. 4630: Mr. MCMILLAN of North Carolina.

H.R. 4631: Mr. MCMILLAN of North Carolina.

H.R. 4632: Mr. MCMILLAN of North Carolina.

H.R. 4633: Mr. MCMILLAN of North Carolina.

H.R. 4655: Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina.
H.R. 4656: Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina.
H.R. 4657: Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina.
H.R. 4658: Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina.
H.R. 4659: Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina.
H.R. 4660: Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina.
H.R. 4661: Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina.
H.R. 4662: Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina.
H.R. 4663: Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina.
H.R. 4664: Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina.
H.R. 4665: Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina.
H.R. 4666: Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina.
H.R. 4667: Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina.
H.R. 4668: Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina.
H.R. 4669: Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina.
H.R. 4670: Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina.
H.R. 4671: Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina.
H.R. 4672: Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina.
H.R. 4673: Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina.
H.R. 4674: Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina.
H.R. 4675: Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina.
H.R. 4676: Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina.
H.R. 4677: Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina.
H.R. 4678: Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina.
H.R. 4679: Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina.
H.R. 4680: Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina.
H.R. 4681: Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina.
H.R. 4682: Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina.
H.R. 4683: Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina.
H.R. 4684: Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina.
H.R. 4724: Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. SWETT, and Mr. TRAFICANT.
H.R. 4725: Mr. KOSTMAYER and Mr. VENTO.
H.R. 4822: Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. WALSH, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. COYNE, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. CLAY, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. VENTO, Mr. MOODY, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. MFUME, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. COLORADO, MR. MCNULTY, Mr. REED, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. MORRISON, Mr. UPTON, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. STARK, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HENRY, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. RICHARDSON, and Mrs. UNSOELD.
H.R. 4851: Mr. PACKARD.
H.R. 4852: Mr. PACKARD.
H.R. 4853: Mr. PACKARD.
H.R. 4854: Mr. PACKARD.
H.R. 4855: Mr. PACKARD.
H.R. 4856: Mr. PACKARD.
H.R. 4857: Mr. PACKARD.
H.R. 4858: Mr. PACKARD.
H.R. 4859: Mr. PACKARD.
H.R. 4860: Mr. PACKARD.
H.R. 4861: Mr. PACKARD.
H.R. 4862: Mr. PACKARD.
H.R. 4863: Mr. PACKARD.
H.R. 4864: Mr. PACKARD.
H.R. 4865: Mr. PACKARD.
H.R. 4866: Mr. PACKARD.
H.R. 4867: Mr. PACKARD.
H.R. 4868: Mr. PACKARD.
H.R. 4869: Mr. PACKARD.
H.R. 4870: Mr. PACKARD.
H.R. 4871: Mr. PACKARD.
H.R. 4872: Mr. PACKARD.
H.R. 4873: Mr. PACKARD.
H.R. 4874: Mr. PACKARD.
H.R. 4875: Mr. PACKARD.
H.R. 4876: Mr. PACKARD.
H.R. 4877: Mr. PACKARD.
H.R. 4878: Mr. PACKARD.
H.R. 4930: Mr. DYMALLY.
H.R. 4941: Mr. SPRATT, Mr. MOODY, and Mr. FAZIO.
H.R. 4961: Mr. DOOLEY.
H.R. 5020: Mr. RAY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. LENT, and Mr. STAGGERS.
H.R. 5099: Mr. TORRES and Mr. VENTO.
H.R. 5111: Mr. KYL.
H.R. 5117: Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. HYDE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. PENNY, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BONIOR, and Mr. TRAFICANT.
H.R. 5126: Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. ECKART, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. PRICE, Mr. RHODES, Mr. SMITH of Florida, and Mr. TORRICELLI.
H.R. 5135: Mr. FROST.
H.R. 5136: Mr. SAXTON.
H.R. 5153: Mr. LIVINGSTON.
H.R. 5162: Mr. MCHUGH, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. RANGEL, and Mrs. UNSOELD.
H.R. 5191: Mr. IRELAND.
H.R. 5192: Mr. SPENCE.
H.R. 5208: Ms. WATERS, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. OLVER, Mr. YATES, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. LEVINE of California, and Mrs. COLLINS of Michigan.
H.R. 5209: Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. LUKEN, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. WASHINGTON.
H.R. 5216: Mr. WELDON.
H.R. 5237: Mr. PENNY, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. PETRI, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. WEBER.
H.R. 5238: Mr. COMBEST and Mr. STENHOLM.
H.R. 5255: Mr. HERGER and Mr. DANNEMEYER.
H.R. 5269: Ms. NORTON.
H.J. Res. 271: Mr. MOORHEAD.
H.J. Res. 351: Mr. KLECZKA.
H.J. Res. 399: Mr. EWING and Mr. WISE.
H.J. Res. 411: Mr. DUNCAN and Mr. SHAYS.
H.J. Res. 426: Mr. HAYES of Illinois.
H.J. Res. 433: Mr. ASPIN, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. CARPER, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. TALLON, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, and Mr. VANDER JAGT.
H.J. Res. 445: Mr. MURTHA, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. DIXON, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. TANNER, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. GREEN of New York, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. SCHULZE, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. MOODY, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. JONES of Georgia.
H.J. Res. 457: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. HORTON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. PORTER, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. REGULA, Mr. RITTER, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. HYDE, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. YATRON, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. FISH, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. DARDEN, and Mr. EVANS.
H.J. Res. 459: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GORDON, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MFUME, Mr. NAGLE, Mr. ROTH, Mr. SISISKY, and Mr. WELDON.
H.J. Res. 479: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. ESPY, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FISH, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.J. Res. 483: Mr. FISH.
H. Con. Res. 156: Mr. DICKS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. HERGER, Mr. CHANDLER, and Mr. RAHALL.
H. Con. Res. 192: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mrs. KENNELLY, and Mr. SAWYER.
H. Con. Res. 233: Mr. MURPHY, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mr. BARNARD, and Mr. STALLINGS.
H. Con. Res. 246: Mr. FISH and Mr. SANGMEISTER.
H. Con. Res. 276: Mr. CAMP, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. STARK, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. ATKINS, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. RHODES, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. WALSH, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. TALLON, Mr. LEVINE of California, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. TRAFICANT.
H. Con. Res. 298: Mr. MATSUI, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. WEISS, Mr. MRAZEK, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. MOODY, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. LENT, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. SWETT, Mr. YATES, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. RANGEL.
H. Con. Res. 301: Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. DARDEN, and Mr. FROST.
H. Con. Res. 309: Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.

H. Con. Res. 314: Mr. THORNTON, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. WHEAT.

H. Con. Res. 316: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. FISH.

H. Res. 448: Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. PENNY, Mr. WYLIE, and Mr. SHAYS.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1790: Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri.

H.R. 5056: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 5253: Mr. BONIOR.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITMENT TO URBAN RENEWAL

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the distasteful blame game has reared its ugly head in relation to the riots in Los Angeles. Too many have sought to blame the President or Ronald Reagan or the Rodney King trial for the Los Angeles riots. But true leaders do not assign blame, they find solutions.

The President, in his speech to the community leaders in Los Angeles, demonstrated his leadership abilities when he outlined his solutions to the causes of the riots. He did not seek to pin the blame nor did he seek to shirk responsibility. Instead, in his role as a healer and as a uniter, the President reached out to the Los Angeles community to help them through this difficult period.

We, in the Congress, should assist the President in his efforts. We should pledge to work with him to implement his strategy to revitalize our urban areas.

For those who doubt the President's commitment to urban renewal, I would like to submit for the RECORD his remarks to the community leaders in Los Angeles on May 8, 1992:

[From the Presidential Documents, May 1992]

REMARKS OF PRESIDENT GEORGE BUSH TO COMMUNITY LEADERS IN LOS ANGELES

I would get off to a bad start if I didn't say what I think everybody else is feeling, and I want to just congratulate Larisse for that marvelous rendition of the Star-Spangled Banner.

And may I first thank all of you for being here today. I think they were introduced at the very beginning, but I want to single out two members of my Cabinet, Secretary Lou Sullivan of HHS and Secretary Jack Kemp from Housing and Urban Development who are here with me. We've really had a good tour. I want to salute Senator Seymour, Governor Wilson, who's been at my side, both of them, as we've made this tour through the city. Pat Saiki of SBA, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, came out early and she is on the ground and doing a first-class job. And of course, I would like to also salute Mayor Tom Bradley who has been so extraordinarily helpful on this visit. And I'm not going to forget the inspirational leader of the Challenger, Lou Dantzler.

I would also say to the city officials that I can just imagine, given what you all have been through, the headache that this visit has caused. And I promise you we plan to leave right on schedule so things can get back to normal. But I want to thank everybody involved in facilitating this visit that came, I'm sure, at a very complicated time for the city. The Governor, the Mayor, the police, the L.A. community, everyone has been just fantastic.

And let me say I am truly heartened by the speed with which the millions of dollars of Federal relief have reached the city, from FEMA grants to the small business loans to urgent food aid. And I salute David Kearns and others who came here to coordinate not to dictate, not to try to dominate but to coordinate with the city and local officials. And I'm very please to see that there is smooth coordination, everyone pulling together on the Federal, State, and local level.

It was important I feel, that as President, I come here to Los Angeles. The community has been the site of a terrible tragedy. Not just for you who were impacted the most, but for our entire country. And everyone around the world feels this trauma, everyone who looks to us as a model of freedom and justice.

And that's why I want to say just a few things about my visit, to speak to you about what I've seen in this city and, most importantly, as I said at that marvelous ecumenical church service yesterday at Mt. Zion, we are one people, we are one family, we are one Nation under God. And so I want to speak about our course as a nation.

I can hardly imagine. I try, but I can hardly imagine the fear and the anger that people must feel to terrorize one another and burn each other's property. But I saw remarkable signs of hope right next to the tragic signs of hatred. This marvelous institution, this boys an girls club stands unscarred, facing a burned-out block. And its leader is this wonderful man next to me, Lou Dantzler. And he started it on the back of an old pickup truck with a group of kids what wanted to get off the street. And its existence proves the power of our better selves. And let's never forget it, and let's count our blessings.

Now let me personalize it a little bit and tell you why clubs like this matter. A story about a little kid, Rudy Campbell. I saw him on television. He looked about 8 years old. His father was murdered a few years back, and I didn't see his mother. Rudy is raised by his 22-year-old sister who has five kids of her own. And he lives in South Central. Think about what he has already been through. Now he says he fears that things will only get "badder and badder and badder." And it breaks your heart, and our children deserve better than that.

I talked a week ago about the law and the pursuit of justice. And today I want to talk about what went wrong in L.A. and the underlying causes of the root problems. It can all be debated, and it should be, but not to assign blame. Casting blame gets us absolutely nowhere. Honest talk and principled action can move us forward. And that's what we've got to do for Rudy; that's what we've got to do for our children, these kids right here.

This tragedy seemed to come suddenly, but I think we would all agree it's been many years in the making. I know it will take time to put things right. I could have said "put things right again," but that would miss a point I want to make: Things weren't right before a week ago Wednesday. Things aren't right in too many cities across our country. And we must not return to the status quo. Not here, not in any city where the system perpetuates failure and hatred and poverty and despair.

Most Americans now recognize some unpleasant realities. Let me just spend a minute on those. For many years we've tried many different programs. All of them, let's understand this, had noble intentions to meet the need of adequate housing or education or health care. Much of it went to construct what has been known as "the safety net," a compassionate safety net to provide security and stability for people in need. Many other programs and policies aimed at stemming the tide of urban violence and drugs and crime and social decay.

And we have spent huge sums of money. Some estimates are as high as $3 trillion over 25 years. And even in the last decade Federal spending went up for these kinds of efforts, everything from child care to welfare to health care has been the subject of some Commission or report or study.

But where this path has taken us I think we would all agree is not really where we wanted to go. Put away the studies and just look around. For anyone who cares about our young people, it is painful that in 1960 the percentage of births to unwed mothers was 5 percent, and now it is 27 percent. It's hard to read about a young black man dying when the odds are almost one out of two that he was murdered. Kids used to carry their lunches to school, and the parents that I've talked to know that today some kids carry guns. I'm afraid some of you kids, you know that, too. Everyone knows that drug and alcohol abuse are serious problems almost everywhere.

In the wake of the L.A. riots, in the wake of a lost generation of inner city lives, can any one of us argue that we have solved the problems of poverty and racism and crime? And the answer clearly is no. Some programs, ones like Head Start or Aid to the Elderly, have shown some time-tested, positive results. All programs were well-intentioned; I understand that very, very well. Many simply have not worked.

Our welfare system does not get people off of welfare, it keeps people trapped there. The statistics are sobering. The reality is sobering. The sum and substance is this: The cities are in serious trouble, and too many of our citizens are in trouble. And it doesn't really have to be this way.

Government has an absolute responsibility to solve this problem, these problems. I'm talking about all levels of government. And I've taken a hard look at what the Government can do and how it can help communities with concerns that really matter: how people can own property, own their home, start a business, create jobs, and ensure that people, not Government, make the big decisions that affect the health and the education and the care of one's own family.

Think of the way that the world looks right now to the single mother on welfare. Government provides you just enough cash for the bare necessities. Government tells you where you can live, where you kids go to school. And when you're sick, Government tells you what kind of care you get and when. And if you find a job, the Government cuts the welfare benefits. And if you save, if

you manage to put a little money away, maybe toward a home or to help your kid get through college, the Government says, hey, welfare fraud. Every one of those things happen with the system that we have in place right now. And then we wonder, why can't folks on welfare take control of their lives? Where's their sense of responsibility?

Well, if we had set out to devise a system that would perpetuate dependency, a system that would strip away dignity and personal responsibility, I guess we could hardly have done better than the system that exists today. Every American knows that it is time for a fresh approach, a radical change in the way we look at welfare and the inner city economy.

Every hour of meetings yesterday—and they were, for me, very emotional, very moving—confirmed why I believe in the plan that we have proposed for urban America. I kept hearing words like ownership, independence, dignity, enterprise, a lot of time from people who have never had a shot at dignity or enterprise or ownership. And it reinforced my belief that we must start with a set of principles and policies that foster personal responsibility, that refocus entitlement programs to serve those who are most needy, and increase the effectiveness of Government service through competition and true choice.

I believe in keeping power closer to the people, using States as laboratories for innovation. We cannot figure it all out back in Washington, DC, in some subcommittee or in the White House. And I believe in policies that encourage entrepreneurship, increase investment, create jobs.

And these form the heart of the agenda for economic opportunity that I want to mention here. Families can't thrive, children can't learn, jobs can't flourish in a climate of fear, however. And so first is our responsibility to preserve the domestic order. And a civilized society cannot tackle any of the really tough problems in the midst of chaos. And you know and I know it's just that simple. Violence and brutality destroy order, destroy the rule of law. And violence must never be rationalized. Violence must always be condemned.

We can reclaim our crime-ravaged neighborhoods through a new initiative that we call "Weed and Seed." And today, I'm announcing a $19-million "Weed and Seed" operation for the city of Los Angeles to weed out the drug dealers and career criminals and then seed those neighborhoods with expanded educational employment and social services. With safe and secure neighborhoods we can spark an economic revival in urban America.

And so, the second part of the agenda is to ask Congress to take action on enterprise zones. With a zero capital gains rate—create those zones with a zero capital gains rate for entrepreneurs and investors who locate businesses and create jobs right here in America's inner cities.

And yes, I recognize that at the same time, we must help States bring innovation to the welfare systems. And at the Federal level, we've got to reform our own AFDC rules; stop penalizing people who want to work and save. These are the people who are mustering the individual initiative to get off welfare. And we've got to pledge ourselves to, at the Federal level, change the rules that keep them from doing just that.

Three: safe, drug-free schools are places where our children can learn, but that's not enough. We've got to revolutionize our schools through community action, through competition, through innovation, through choice: principles at the heart of the strategy that we call America 2000. We must give children, these kids, these kids right here, the same opportunity as kids out in the suburbs.

And the fourth point: we must promote new hope through homeownership. People want a real stake, a real stake in their community, something of value that they can pass along to their kids. And that's what this HOPE initiative does. It turns public housing tenants into homeowners.

Now, these are just the highlight of an action agenda to bring hope and opportunity back to our inner cities. We have other ideas to try as well. Many in this room have innovative ideas they're trying right now.

My first order of business upon my return to Washington will be to build a bipartisan effort in support of immediate action on this agenda. And I know some will say, well, you've proposed all this before, and that's true, they're right. And I'm proposing it again. Because really we must try something new. We've got to try something new. It does not take a social scientist to know that we must think differently. We've tried the old ways of thinking. And now, as Lincoln says, "It is time to think anew."

And our approach is really a radical break from the policies of the past. It's new. Yes, it's new because it's never been tried before. And for the sake of the people of South Central, and the people in America's inner cities everywhere, I will work with the Congress to act now on this commonsense agenda.

You've been through an awful lot. You've been through an awful lot. And when I saw the verdict in the King case my reaction was the same as yours; I told the Nation that. But I remain confident in our system of justice. And when I saw the violence and rage erupt in your streets my reaction was the same as yours. We all knew we had to restore order. And when I saw and read about the heroic acts of firefighters and police or the selfless acts of so many citizens, my reaction was one of relief, one of hope for the future.

This morning I stopped by the hospital, Cedar, to see a young fireman who had been wantonly shot in the head as he was driving a fire truck to go out and put out fires that were ravaging somebody's neighborhood, maybe yours. The man's fighting for his life. And I think when we all go home we ought to pray for him.

In the very short time that I've been out here I could sense that the real anguish in south central L.A. is a parent's concern about the kids, neighbors' concerns about the kids. And people are worried sick about the children. All must agree that whatever we do must be about the children. These kids are our future. And our actions in the wake of the tragedy are for them, not just here in Los Angeles. This is showcased now because of what you've been through, but it's all across the country.

And so for these remarks I've mentioned what Government can do. And now let me talk just a little about what society must do. And yes, we have tried hard, spent a lot of money and haven't solved the problems. And some critics say that we are a morally, spiritually, and intellectually bankrupt nation. I don't believe that for one single minute. And, yes, we have problems. We have tough problems to solve. But we remain the freest and the fairest and the most just and the most decent country on the face of the entire Earth. And we now—I know that we have the drive and the gumption to prevail over these problems we face.

Tom Bradley, your Mayor, was among a group of mayors who came to see me last January. He and I may differ on how we approach one Federal program or another. But I've repeated often what he and others said to me that day. They said that the most important problem facing our cities is the dissolution, the decline of the American family. And they're absolutely right. He was right; a mayor from a tiny town in North Carolina, he was right. The decline of the family is something we must be concerned about. And history tells us that society cannot succeed without some fundamental building blocks in place.

The state of our Nation is the state of our communities. And good communities are safe and decent. And the young people are cared for and they're instilled with character and values and good habits for life. Good communities have good schools. And they provide opportunity and hope, rooted in the dignity of work and reward for achievement.

And that's why guaranteeing a hopeful future for the children of our cities is about a lot more than rebuilding burned-out buildings. It's about the love right here under this roof. It's about building a new American community. It's about rebuilding bonds between individuals and among ethnic groups and among races. And we must not let our diversity destroy us. It is central, you see, it is central to our strength as a nation.

Our ability to live and work together has really made America the inspiration to the entire world. Across this country tens of thousands of groups, hundreds of thousands of individuals who have never been involved before, who will never be paid one single nickel for their efforts, must become partners in solving our most serious social problems.

The people right here in this room know exactly what I'm talking about. An officer in the LAPD who's a board chairman right here, I believe, in this organization, giving of his time, he knows what I'm talking about. Government alone cannot create the scale and energy needed to transform the lives of the people in need.

And I look around this auditorium and I am preaching to the choir because you're the ones that have your sleeves rolled up in your churches and in your communities, trying to help the other guy. In my conversations with the leaders of L.A.'s many communities, I heard over and over again that L.A. has many of the answers within itself.

I see our friend Bill Milliken here. He lives halfway across the country. There are four of his Cities in School programs, helping children learn here. And many members of a group called 100 Black Men, an inspirational group, they mentor, for those not familiar with it, they mentor to the kids, the boys in south central.

Now, if instead of 4, there were 25 Cities in School programs, and instead of 100, 10,000 black men working with boys, and so on with the hundreds of people in groups that work with the kids, there is no question that what happened last week wouldn't have been as bad. And so it only makes sense that a large part of our challenge is to dramatically expand in community after community the scale of what we already know works.

The phrase that I've repeated a lot and perhaps more than any other is worth repeating: From now on in America, any definition of a successful life must include serving others. And when we look to restoring a decent and hopeful future for our children, I mean this about every community.

First, every group and institution in America, schools, businesses, churches, certainly,

must do its part. We must praise what works and share what works.

And secondly, all leaders, all leaders—must mobilize and inspire their people to take action.

And third, community centers must link those that care with those that are crying out for help.

And fourth, with respect, the media needs to show from time to time what's working, needs to cover what is working. And that way would help us share, that would really help us share and repeat these successes many times over.

And finally, this one perhaps a little technical, but we've got to change our liability laws that frighten people away from helping others. We ought to care for each other more and sue each other less.

But there's something else. There's something else that society must cultivate that Government cannot possibly provide. Something we can't legislate, something we can't establish by Government order. And I'm talking about the moral sense that must guide us all. The simplest, I guess the simplest way to put it is, I'm talking about knowing right from wrong and then trying to do what's right.

Let me come back again to the little boy I spoke about earlier, Rudy Campbell. Remember, "badder, badder, badder?" There's a lesson he learned that survived the horror and the hate. And in the midst of all the chaos, in the midst of so much that's gone wrong, he knows what's right. When he was asked about the violence, here's what he said: "They should know what's right and wrong. Because when I was four, that's what I learned."

Now, that has got to give us hope. May God bless the person who cared enough to teach that little guy right from wrong. But it's up to us to guarantee that all the millions of kids like him grow up in a better America.

And I believe we are right about family. We're right about freedom and free enterprise. And we're right with respect to the clergymen here and the church men and church women here. We are right about faith. And most of all, we are right about America's future.

You see, I fervently believe that we have the strength and the spirit in our Government. You can see it here today in our communities and in ourselves to transform America into the nation that we have dreamed of for generations.

May God bless each and every one of you in your work. And thank you very, very much.

EDITORIALS REGARDING H.R. 5100

HON. MICHAEL G. OXLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I recommend the following editorials from yesterday's Washington Post and New York Times for Members' attention regarding H.R. 5100. These editorials correctly point out that protectionism would have a negative impact on the U.S. economy at a time when job creation and economic growth are directly linked to exports:

[From the New York Times, May 27, 1992]

THE DEMOCRATS, STANDING SMALL

The European Community has taken what might be a historic step against protectionist farm policies. How are House Democratic leaders responding to this dramatic opportunity for trade? They're proposing a giant leap backward, sponsoring a bill that could victimize American workers in Japanese-owned auto factories, provoke Europe to retaliate against U.S. exports and undermine trade talks.

Dan Rostenkowski, the usually sensible chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and Richard Gephardt, the House majority leader, as they anticipate the elections, are eager to portray their party as standing tall, ready to bully trade partners into submission. That's an ignoble purpose. Protectionism would jack up car prices and shower Chrysler, Ford and General Motors with windfall profits. It won't create jobs or prosperity.

European officials last week approved far-reaching cuts in Government subsidies to farmers—a sign that they're finally listening to pleas from exporting nations to stop dumping subsidized food on international markets while keeping out foreign food imports. Yet instead of building on this opening, the Democratic bill would constrict trade—limiting imports of Japanese cars and, astonishingly, production of cars in Japanese-owned factories in this country.

Under the bill, the Japanese would be allowed to export more cars to the U.S. only if they also import more cars from American-owned—but not Japanese-owned—factories in the U.S. That would set one group of Americans against another. In effect, the Japanese would be asked to dismiss American workers in Tennessee so that workers in Detroit could keep their jobs. And the bill would raise the price of the typical car by $1,200, a stiff, regressive burden on consumers.

The bill would also target for retaliation countries that run trade surpluses with the U.S. This provision is wrong and insidious. Wrong because the U.S. trade deficit is caused by a shortfall in savings, not foreign trade barriers. Insidious because the provision will backfire. The U.S. runs huge trade surpluses, for example, with Europe. The bill thus begs protectionists there to retaliate.

The bill is so odious that General Motors, a major beneficiary, refuses to go along. Faithful to its longstanding commitment to free trade, G.M. hasn't leaped for the temporary gain offered by this unprincipled plunge. Sadly, though Mr. Rostenkowski and friends understand protectionism and principle, they are embracing the first as they flout the second.

[From the Washington Post, May 27, 1992]

MORE PROTECTION FOR AUTOS

In their latest attempt to protect the American automakers from Japanese competition, the House Democrats are now pushing a genuinely dangerous idea. The majority leader, Richard Gephardt, is the prime mover behind a bill that would put limits, tied to their imports, on auto production in the American factories owned by Japanese companies.

It is conventional, and perhaps accurate as well, to say that this trade bill is merely campaign-year posturing. Even if Congress actually passed it, President Bush would certainly veto it. But it sets a terrible precedent by treating foreign-owned factories here in the United States differently than their American-owned competitors. As for the election campaign, it reaffirms the identification of an important element of the Democratic Party with protectionism, which has yet to win the party an election.

In 1981, President Reagan negotiated "voluntary"—that is, involuntary—quotas with Japan to limit its shipments of cars to this country. If the Japanese are going to sell cars here, the American companies declared, they should build them here. Half a dozen Japanese companies are now doing exactly that. Imports from Japan have been falling recently, while production from Japanese companies' American plants has risen. In response Mr. Gephardt and the Democrats supporting him now want to extend the limits to both imports and the American factories.

The bill directs the president to negotiate a new agreement with Japan, under which each Japanese company would have a ceiling—its 1992 imports plus its 1992 production in the United States. That ceiling would remain for seven years. If a company's imports rose, it would have to cut its production here—laying off American workers. If it wanted to increase its American production, it would be required to cut its imports.

The ceilings could rise if Japan imports more American-made cars in the years ahead—but only if most of those cars are made by General Motors, Ford and Chrysler. Ford and Chrysler are both vigorously supporting this bill. GM, to its credit, is not.

Because this country needs foreign investment, legislation that treats foreign investors differently from Americans does damage to the economy. This country needs even more urgently to raise its exports, and legislation that gives other countries precedents for protectionism inflicts severe damage on the economy. The United States is now counting on exports to drive its recovery from the recession. Mr. Gephardt and his allies are once again leading their party and Congress down the wrong road.

PINE GROVE HIGH SCHOOL CLASS OF 1932 CELEBRATES 60TH YEAR REUNION

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an esteemed group of citizens, the 1932 graduating class of Pine Grove High School, of Pine Grove, PA on their 60th year reunion. I would like to honor the members of the class of 1932 and wish them a wonderful celebration of a momentous occasion in their lives. The Pine Grove High School Alumni Association gathered at the high school on May 23, 1992, and a second reunion is planned for the 1932 class on June 17, 1992, to be held in the Palmyra home of class member, Mr. Wilfred Longsderff.

The class of 1932 is a close-knit group who meet every 10 years for a class reunion and annually for luncheon meetings. Many of the class members have remained in southeastern Pennsylvania, and they continue to maintain the true and dear friendships established in their youth. Due to the unfortunate passing of the class vice president, the members will be electing a new officer.

Mr. Speaker, I offer my condolences to those class members that have passed away, and I ask all of my colleagues to join me in honoring the class of 1932 in their 60th reunion year. They are a testament to the enduring bonds of friendship and community, and I wish each class member health and happiness in the future.

TRIBUTE TO DALE FRANCIS

HON. JILL L. LONG

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Ms. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I want to comment for the RECORD today in order to honor an exceptional man, Dale Francis, Mr. Francis' contribution to northeastern Indiana through his writing lingers despite his death this year.

Mr. Francis, from Huntington, IN, served as the editor of the Troy Daily News from 1962 until 1964. He served as editor during one of the most traumatic events in our country's history, the death of John F. Kennedy. Mr. Francis' paper devoted the entire front page to Kennedy's death—all within 2½ hours before their deadline. However, Mr. Francis' dedication to journalism did not end there. The readers of the Huntington Herald-Press and Our Sunday Visitor also had the pleasure of experiencing Mr. Francis' journalistic ability. He continued to write for the Troy Daily News until his death earlier this year at the age of 75.

I have taken the liberty of submitting an editorial written about Mr. Francis for the RECORD.

[From the Troy Daily News; Mar. 24, 1992]

DALE FRANCIS: TRUE JOURNALIST

(By Joel Walker)

We stopped signing editorials a long time ago because what appears in this space is a consensus of our editorial board rather than what might seem to be one person's opinion when they contain a byline or signoff.

But today I'm making an exception. Anyway, this isn't an editorial. It's a tribute to a former TDN editor, my personal tribute to Dale Francis who died early this morning.

Some of us believe journalists are born, not made. It's in your genes, it's in your blood. You know what I mean. Dale Francis was a "journalist." And along with being "born a journalist" comes certain instincts, instincts about news coverage, instincts about how a story should be written, instincts about how a story should be presented to the readers.

What I'm about to say will explain what I'm talking about.

Dale Francis was the editor here during one of the world's most dramatic and tragic news events in our history, the assassination of President Kennedy.

News of the shooting in Dallas came across our national wire about noon, maybe a little later. Much of the work on page one had been completed, but all of us knew this news meant a remake of the page and a little later presstime than our usual 2 p.m. start.

We printed by letterpress in those days, a more cumbersome, hot metal method than the cleaner, clearer photo offset method we use today. It took longer to prepare the stories and pages for the press than it does today. We were at the mercy of the wire, and, as it turned out, Dale Francis' instincts.

I was a young sports editor at the time, just two years out of college. But I'd had experience designing pages and after we'd finish the sports pages, I'd often get involved helping Dale and others on the desk with the news pages. That was the situation that November day in 1962.

News of the president's death came over the wire about 2 p.m. From the time of the first flash of the shooting, we'd decided to wait until about 2:30 to go to press so we would have the latest story.

Given our normal 2 p.m. deadline, we'd have a pretty complete story that our afternoon rivals in the area wouldn't have because they had earlier deadlines. It was even possible that the Dayton Daily News (then an afternoon paper) wouldn't have anything because of a pre-noon deadline.

Normal procedure would be to redesign the front page, moving the stories at the top of the page to the bottom, eliminating some at the bottom and putting the major breaking story (in this case Kennedy's death) at the top of the page.

There was a chance we might get one picture from our wire to use with the story, but it wasn't likely given the time. So we'd have the Kennedy story at the top and other stories of the day below it.

As we stood around the wire machine reading the dispatches coming from Dallas, I glanced over at the filing cabinets to see Dale on his hands and knees rummaging around in a bottom drawer.

"I found it," he yelled. Those who knew Dale knew his filing skills didn't match his writing and editing skills. But with that photographic memory he had, he remembered where he put things even though it logically might not be where they belonged.

What he found was an artist's illustration of Kennedy's life that he had "filed" months before. It would take up about three-fourths of a news-paper page and was perfect to go with the story of the tragic shooting. So, not only would be have a complete story of the assassination, we'd have a perfect illustration, too.

As it turned out, we were the only newspaper in the U.S. with its front page devoted entirely to the assassination on the day that it happened November 22, 1963.

That's what journalism is all about. That's what editing is all about. And that's what Dale Francis was all about, a truly dedicated, respected, instinctive newspaperman.

GOOD THINGS ARE HAPPENING IN AMERICA'S PUBLIC SCHOOLS

HON. LARRY LaROCCO

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. LAROCCO. Mr. Speaker, contrary to what you might have heard, good things are happening in America's public schools these days. And if you want to see what educational excellence looks like, you should look to Cascade High School in Cascade, ID.

The editors of Redbook magazine, in conjunction with their "America's Best Schools" project, have recognized Cascade High School as Idaho's best in 1992.

This small high school in Idaho's central heartland is quietly demonstrating that outstanding achievement and excellence can be accomplished. In Cascade, community commitment delivers a quality experience, and provides students the opportunity to prepare for life in the 21st century.

To quote Redbook:

At this small but overachieving school for 97 students, all the seniors graduate, a third of the grads get scholarships, and many earn State awards in math, science, and choir.

This is quite an accomplishment.

I want to congratulate the students, the parents, the faculty, and the entire community of Cascade, ID. They have demonstrated what can be achieved through combined effort and commitment. Their efforts should inspire us, and we should examine their accomplishments, and their methods.

I urge all Members to visit the outstanding schools in their States, and see for themselves the good things that are happening in the public schools. Our children's schools can be excellent, and examples like Cascade High School prove that it can be done.

SUPPORT COMPETITION AND COST SAVINGS IN NAVY SHIP REPAIRS

HON. DANA ROHRABACHER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, on May 21, 1992, I and 11 of our colleagues sent a letter to House Rules Committee Chairman MOAKLEY asking that the committee make it in order to offer an amendment to the defense authorization bill that requires the Navy to study and report to Congress on the cost savings that could be achieved by creating a single San Pedro/Long Beach-San Diego homeport bidding area for short-term ship repairs.

This amendment would be offered by Congressman DYMALLY and would be a substitute for anticompetitive language added to the bill during markup in committee on a narrow 25 to 28 vote.

Mr. DYMALLY's amendment is in the best interests of both the Navy, who will save scarce financial resources in an era of shrinking defense budgets, and the taxpayer.

I urge the Committee on Rules to allow this important amendment to be offered to the DOD authorization bill.

I call to the attention of all my colleagues a letter that I received from Charles J. Shoemaker who until his retirement worked for the Long Beach Naval Shipyard for 34 years. He says that many times during his career Navy commanders asked the naval shipyard for estimates on work being performed in private shipyards "in order to keep the private contractors reasonably honest. Some of their price estimates and gouging by change orders was unconscionable."

Mr. DYMALLY's amendment will lead to the formalization of what has been the informal practice of the Navy for years. I urge all my colleagues to support this amendment if the Rules Committee allows it to be offered.

I insert Mr. Shoemaker's letter at this point in the RECORD.

SEAL BEACH, CA,
May 20, 1992.

Congressman ROHRABACHER: In the Orange County Register I read that Long Beach Naval Shipyard would not be allowed to bid against the San Diego industrial activities for naval ship repair work.

As a retired Long Beach Naval Shipyard employee for over 34 years I am well aware of what takes place when the competition is confined to the "private sector".

Many times I was involved in helping the type commanders get estimates from the

navy yard in order to keep the private contractors "reasonably honest". Some of their price estimates and gouging by "change orders" was unconscionable.

As a taxpayer, I am for open competition to keep everyone (public and private sector) "reasonable". Confining bidding to the San Diego activities *only* smacks of eliminating competition.

Are the San Diego activities afraid to compete? If Long Beach Naval Shipyard is kept out of the bidding, will ship repair costs go down?

I think the answer is obvious.

Thank you,

CHARLES J. SHOEMAKER.

FLORIDA DESIGNATES JUNE 1-6, 1992 AS MANAGEMENT WEEK IN FLORIDA

HON. JIM BACCHUS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. BACCHUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the State of Florida's proclamation designating June 1–6, 1992, as Management Week in Florida. The National Management Association is a professional, nonprofit organization with more than 68,000 members. I am proud of the public service and civic involvement of the association as it promotes and recognizes management as a profession through education and fellowship. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting Florida's proclamation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as recognition of management as a profession and hope that all concerned citizens observe June 1–6, 1992, as Management Week in Florida.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, the National Management Association is a professional, non-profit association dedicated to improve the quality and promote unity in management by education and fellowship of more than 72,000 members; and

Whereas, the members of this Association in the State of Florida desire to perform a public service by officially recognizing management as a profession; and

Whereas, during the week of June 1, 1992, these members will join management in our society and encourage the promotion of our American Enterprise System;

Now, therefore, I, Lawton Chiles, by virtue of the authority vested in me as Governor of the State of Florida, do hereby proclaim June 1-6, 1992, as "Management Week" in Florida and urge all concerned residents, industries, businesses, and professional bodies to actively and appropriately participate in its observance.

REMEMBERING SHANEY ERIN WATTERS

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that there is no greater pain than the hurt felt when a parent loses a child. In Clayton, NM, Rocky and Kathleen Watters are feeling this terrible grief. Their bright, energetic, enthusiastic and beautiful 16-year-old daughter has died after a year-and-a-half long battle fighting non-Hodgkin's lymphoma.

Despite being only 16, Shaney accomplished quite a lot and touched a considerable number of lives. In addition to being an honor roll student at Clayton High School, she excelled in sports and other extracurricular activities. Even her illness did not slow Shaney. Remarkably, at the time of her death, she was serving as president of her sophomore class and was manager of the co-State championship girls basketball team.

This country, the State of New Mexico and the town of Clayton have lost a brave young woman who did more in 16 short years than many people accomplish in a lifetime. I urge my colleagues to join me in extending our condolences to Shaney's parents, brothers, grandparents and her many friends and acquaintances. The following appeared in the Union County Leader, Shaney's hometown newspaper:

SHANEY ERIN WATTERS

Funeral services for Shaney Erin Watters, 16 of Clayton were at 2 o'clock Friday afternoon, May 15, in the First United Methodist Church with the pastor, Rev. Ran Loy, officiating. Burial was in the North Section of the Clayton Memorial Cemetery.

Born in Durango, Colorado, on December 14, 1975, she died early Tuesday morning, May 12, at the University of Nebraska Medical Center at Omaha where she was undergoing treatment for non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, which she had battled since October of 1990.

Survivors include her parents, Rocky and Kathleen Watters of Clayton; and three brothers, Jason Conrad of Eagle, Colorado, and by Lance Watters and Nolan Watters, both of Clayton. Also surviving are her grandparents, Jay and Pat Byers of Dolores, Colorado, and Bill and Betty Watters of Clayton.

A resident of Clayton since the age of three, she was a sophomore at Clayton High School listed on the "A" Honor Roll. She excelled in sports, especially track. At the time of her death, she was serving as manager of the Clayton Yellowjackettes the perennial New Mexico state championship girls basketball team coached by her uncle, Miles Watters.

During her freshman year, she was elected the freshman class representative to the Student Council. She also served as drum majorette for the CHS Marching Band.

At the time of her death, she was serving as president of the sophomore class. She was a member of the Student Council and was involved in the school's Youth-to-Youth organization.

She had served as a pioneer in innovative cancer treatment procedures, becoming involved in a new treatment program inaugurated by Texas Tech University in cooperation with local hospitals as one of 52 young cancer patients under the age of 21. Cooperating professionals with Union County General Hospital were involved in the project allowing her to receive some of her treatments in Clayton.

In addition to fighting her own battle against this disease, Shaney became involved in the lives of other young cancer patients. Last year, she served as a volunteer counselor at Camp Alphie, a summer camping program for families with children who have, or have had cancer.

When it became evident that Shaney would need a bone marrow transplant for the next phase of her therapy, she encouraged people in the Clayton area who were willing to be tested for a possible donor match to place their names on the National Bone Marrow Registry and be willing to give the gift which could save the life of some other victim elsewhere. Many were inspired to do so by her simple act of selflessness. The Veterans of Foreign Wars hosted a bingo to pay for these initial tests.

The national registry lists two persons who might have been a match for her; however, it was believed her own marrow remained free of the disease and was harvested to be replaced after intensive chemical and radiation therapy at the Nebraska facility.

It is the recommendation of the family that memorial contributions be made to the University of Nebraska Foundation, Children's Cancer Research Fund, 8712 West Dodge Rd., suite 260, Omaha, NE 68114.

A TRIBUTE TO DR. ROGER S. HERTZ

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Dr. Roger S. Hertz of Exeter Township in Berks County, PA. On June 26, 1992, there will be a ceremony held in Dr. Hertz's honor to recognize his retirement after his 44-year career in education.

I am pleased to be included in honoring Dr. Hertz. Roger and I were high school and college classmates at Reading High School and Kutztown University. We played football together at both Reading High and Kutztown. I have had the privilege to know him for over 40-years as a teammate, a fellow community activist, and friend.

Roger has spent his entire life in education. In addition to his bachelors degree from Kutztown, he also earned a masters degree and a doctorate in education from Temple University. He has spent his entire 44 years working in the Berks County schools. He spent over 10 years as a social studies teacher in the Exeter Township School District. He spent the next 10 years in administrative positions in Exeter Township, including serving as an assistant high school principal and then as an elementary school principal. In 1966, he became the assistant superintendent of the Berks County School System in charge of business management and community relations. From 1971 until 1981, he served as the assistant executive director of the Berks County Intermediate Unit. In 1981, he became the executive director of the BCIU, and has served in this role since then. The BCIU is a support agency which serves as the link between the State and Berks County schools. The intermediate unit operates training programs and assists the local school districts. In his role as director, he has expanded the services provided by the intermediate unit and has improved the relationship between the business community and the local schools. Roger has also been actively involved in a variety of community activities including professional, civic and church organizations.

Roger Hertz has been admirable in his contributions to the field of education in Berks County. His commitment and dedication to education has had a profound influence on lives of Berks County children for over 44 years. I ask all of my colleagues to join me in honoring this outstanding educator and congratulating him for 44 years of exemplary service. He will be greatly missed by his colleagues and the schools of Berks County. I wish him the greatest success and good fortune in his retirement.

DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS ENTERPRISE PROVISIONS

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4691, the Airport and Airway Safety Capacity, and Intermodal Transportation Act of 1992. In particular, I join my colleagues' support of the language in section 110 of the bill which requires disadvantaged business enterprise [DBE] participation in all airport concessions and services, specifically including ground transportation, baggage carts, automobile rentals, and other consumer services. Section 110 also permits airports to meet the minimum 10-percent goal by including management contracts, and by including goods and services purchased from DBE's by majority firms operating at the airport.

I want to make clear that my colleagues and I on the Public Works and Transportation Committee who support this language at all times have attempted to be practical and realistic about the way in which DBE's are to participate in airport business activities. For example, we did not insist that this provision apply to airlines and fixed-based operators which, unlike any other business, provide aeronautical activities at airports. Essentially, what we seek is to include minority and women-owned businesses in airport commerce, so that these traditionally excluded groups become a part of the economic mainstream, not separate from it.

For those industries and businesses who are skeptical about DBE participation in the Airport Improvement Program, I assure them that the sky is not falling, and that the DBE provision in this bill will not require them to do business in some extraordinarily different or radical way.

This is why I joined with my committee colleague, Congressman GREG LAUGHLIN of Texas, and others to fashion amendment language which explicitly states that the DBE assurance provision will not require a corporation to provide for a direct ownership arrangement in order to meet the provision's requirements. I also worked to craft report language to further clarify this point. The cooperation among members of the committee in this effort produced a strong measure we all can support.

I must note with dismay that representatives of the major car rental firms have vigorously argued, despite the clarity of Mr. LAUGHLIN's amendment, that the DBE provision will cause them to reorder their corporate structure, and that like the airlines, they too should be excluded from coverage of section 110 of the bill. I find this disappointing and want to make clear that we cannot accept a different set of rules for one business or industry. That is the end of affirmative action itself. It would be the beginning of discrimination among businesses themselves. Imagine holding some business at airports, such as duty-free shoppers, to standard affirmative action requirements, while car rental firms were immune based on a self-serving claim of uniqueness. All businesses have profoundly, widely different structures. And yet, affirmative action in this country has applied to that great diversity of business for more than 25 years. To exempt car rental firms from DBE participation would have been an unprecedented and discriminatory concession that should not enter into this legislation or any other legislation passing through this Congress.

Section 110 of the legislation leaves car rental companies able to enter into various arrangements with DBE firms, including direct ownership arrangements, if they are practical. But the provision certainly does not require them to do so, and never have they been required to do so under previous legislative enactments. In fact, there is not a single instance where a car rental company has been compelled to enter into a direct ownership arrangement. Some companies on their own, however, have incorporated DBE ownership arrangements. Provisions for direct DBE participation in the car rental business can be found at airports in Birmingham, Las Vegas, and Orlando, among others.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to state emphatically that nothing in section 110 of this bill would prevent an airport from issuing solicitations giving preferences to non-DBE firms which have direct participation arrangements with DBE firms. The statutory presumption of section 110 of this bill, as well as paramount objective of the DBE program, is to encourage direct DBE participation in order that DBE's perform commercially useful functions. The plain meaning of the language in section 110 is that purchase of DBE goods and services is an option only if direct ownership arrangements are not practicable. Accordingly, all businesses deriving a benefit from operating at airports, including car rental firms, bear the statutory burden of demonstrating that direct DBE participation is not practicable. Any other construction of this language is a diversion and flies in the face of congressional intent.

I urge your support of this measure, and thank Chairman ROBERT ROE, Congressman JAMES OBERSTAR, Congressman WILLIAM CLINGER and Congressman JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT for their work on this important act.

LOOKING BACK AT THE EVIL EMPIRE

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union is now relegated to the dustbin of history, and this body would do well to reflect back on the sordid history of this Marxist empire. Over the decades, there were many Americans who insisted on looking at the Soviet Union in a positive light. There was a predisposition by many intellectuals to view the Soviet Union as an innocent victim of circumstances, incapable of doing evil. When the state-sponsored famine in the Ukraine occurred in the 1930's, these individuals simply denied the famine had ever occurred. When evidence came to light of the Soviet gulags and slave labor practices, many Western journalists and intellectuals simply dismissed this evidence as United States propaganda. And, when Ronald Reagan stood up and correctly labeled the Soviet Union an "Evil Empire," these skeptics chose to mock the President rather than face up to the truth. These discussions had the taint of arrogant and condescending anti-Americanism, and it was most unseemly for this Member to witness.

But now, as the old Soviet archives are revealed, it has become clear that President Reagan was indeed correct. Documents now reveal that Moscow was underwriting the Communist Party in the United States, and bankrolling various subversive organizations. It is similarly clear that the Soviet Union was promoting terrorist organizations worldwide, and assisting the most radical Palestinian elements to gain control of the Palestinian movement. Far from being a paragon of virtue, it is now clear that the Soviet Communist Party was a corrupt institution that manipulated insurgent forces worldwide.

No doubt there will continue to be individuals who disbelieve this new evidence. Truth is hard to accept for those who have been apologizing for Soviet misbehavior for so many years. But the new documentation that has been released leaves no room for doubt—the Soviet Union was indeed an evil empire, and Ronald Reagan was correct in pointing that out.

Mr. Speaker, recently a very insightful editorial was published by the Omaha-World Herald. It does not reflect the conventional wisdom of the liberal intellectual establishment, but it does reflect the truth. According to the World-Herald:

> The more the picture comes into focus, the more it can be seen that Ronald Reagan was right when he described the Soviet Union as an Evil Empire. For the American public, that means it's long past time to end the guilt trip.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the May 27, 1992, editorial entitled "The Empire Was Evil, Indeed; Now the Guilt Trip Should End," into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I commend it to my colleagues.

[From the Omaha World-Herald, May 27, 1992]

THE EMPIRE WAS EVIL, INDEED; NOW THE GUILT TRIP SHOULD END

Not too many years ago, a person could get laughed off some of the more liberal U.S. college campuses for suggesting that the Soviet Union sponsored Mideast terrorism.

The campus view was that terrorist attacks were America's fault, an inevitable result of U.S. support for Israel. Palestinians, it was said, were the victims of that policy and were consequently justified in blowing up buildings, taking hostages and destroying

airplanes carrying hundreds of innocent people.

Attempts to look critically at the Soviet Union, on the other hand, were ridiculed. In the politically correct thinking of the times, the Soviet Union wasn't evil. It was just misunderstood by world leaders who had little sense of socialist destiny.

Such thinking, simplistic as it was, was repeated often enough by liberal commentators and authors to put some Americans on a guilt trip. They swallowed the line that they were morally culpable for much of what went wrong in the world. They felt that there was something wrong with being called an anti-communist. They were careful to avoid talk that could get them accused of "Red-baiting" or "Soviet-bashing."

What an embarrassment it must have been for the proponents of trendy anti-Americanism when Soviet communism collapsed and the new Russian leaders opened the files.

Recently released documents have shed more light on Moscow's attempts to destabilize democratic governments with disinformation, threats and clandestine shipments of money to communist operatives. For the first time, it was confirmed that the Soviet Communist Party bankrolled the Communist Party of the United States, which many intellectuals of the time defended as a grassroots vehicle for a legitimate American point of view.

Then, a few days ago, documents came to light proving that the Communist Party, indeed, was a financier of Mideast terrorism. The party helped to arm a radical Palestinian group and encouraged the group to carry out terrorist attacks against American and Israeli citizens. The terrorists were given foreign weapons that couldn't be traced to the Soviets.

The documents add detail to the picture of Soviet communism that has been in place for decades, although some people had trouble seeing it. The more the picture comes into focus, the more it can be seen that Ronald Reagan was right when he described the Soviet Union as the Evil Empire.

For the American public, that means it's long past time to end the guilt trip.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO ENHANCE THE ENFORCEMENT CAPABILITIES OF THE INS

HON. DANA ROHRABACHER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, last week I, and six of my colleagues introduced legislation to enhance the enforcement capabilities of the INS. That bill, H.R. 5255, will allow the transfer of information from federally funded social services agencies to the INS.

I was unaware of the ludicrous prohibition on the transfer of information between two agencies of Government until it was brought to my attention by INS field agents. So, you can imagine my surprise when, on the day this bill was introduced, INS spokesman Duke Austin told the press that: First, there is no current prohibition on the transfer of information, and; second, passage of this bill will result in a much heavier workload for the INS.

Well, today, I received a fax from the FEMA information office in Pasadena, CA, which seems to dispute Mr. Austin's first denial. FEMA tells applicants that "The privacy of the application process is protected by Federal law, officials point out." It goes on to specifically say that information is not shared with the INS.

And as for Mr. Austin's second denial, I say to him, you speak for some of the hardest working people in this country, do not imply that they are lazy or shrink from their duty. I know many fine INS agents who simply want the opportunity to do their jobs efficiently and effectively.

FEDERAL/STATE/LOCAL
COORDINATING OFFICE,
Pasadena, CA, May 27, 1992.

OFFICIALS CONCERNED THAT SOME DISASTER VICTIMS MAY NOT APPLY FOR FEDERAL/STATE AID

Officials at the disaster field office in Pasadena have expressed concern that small pockets of people who are eligible for State and Federal disaster aid may not apply for various reasons, including a reluctance to deal with the government.

The privacy of the application process is protected by federal law, officials point out. Individuals who report to the application centers have no reason to fear that the information provided with be used against them in the future. Information is not shared with any other government agency including the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) and the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS).

"We are here simply to help people whose livelihood and personal welfare have been adversely affected by the recent fires and civil unrest. The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) has no charter or interest beyond the accomplishment of this objective," said William M. Medigovich, Federal Coordinating Officer.

"We are striving to reach people who are out of the mainstream," Medigovich added. "Some have serious needs and uninsured losses, but are yet hesitant to apply for aid.

"We want to stress that the funds received through the various state and federal grant programs are tax dollars which do not require repayment by the recipients." Low interest loans provided by the Small Business Administration (SBA) do have a payback requirement similar to commercial bank loans.

Although some are reluctant to deal with government, other population segments may also lose out, officials acknowledge. These include people who are unable to read, write or comprehend well enough to use information in the media and other sources.

Shut-ins by reason of age and health are also targets of FEMA's special outreach concerns.

Available to disaster victims are grants for temporary housing and minor repairs, personal property loss, medical expenses, transportation and other disaster-related needs. Low interest loans are also available for more substantial amounts to those who qualify. Victims who are unable to manage a low interest loan are likely to qualify for grant programs.

Business owners and home owners who face financial hardship due to the fires and civil unrest may also be eligible for mortgage and rental assistance in the form of grants which require no payback.

Persons who may be reluctant to inquire about assistance available to them are urged to call the disaster hotline, 1-800-525-0321.

ST. THOMAS UNIVERSITY LAUNCHES HUMAN RIGHTS INSTITUTE

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to recognize St. Thomas University's Human Rights Institute which was inaugurated on March 18, at a special ceremony and celebration at St. Thomas' Convocation Hall.

St. Thomas University's latest addition to its academic community is designed to ensure the greatest participation of the individual human being in the process of shaping human values. The institute was proposed 2 years ago by St. Thomas University's president. Dr. Richard E. Greene, as a demonstration of its "willingness to transform its values and beliefs into action and service to the world community."

The institute will conduct scholarly research and writing in the area of human rights law, policy and ethics. It will also develop and offer courses, seminars, workshops at various levels of the educational service. Another vital function it will serve is to provide sensitivity training to law enforcement personnel and other Government officials.

One of its most important purposes will be to serve as an advocate for human rights by educating the public, and combating human rights abuses on a local, regional, and global scale. Miami is a fitting location of this institute, since it has long served as a refuge for many people who came here seeking individual freedom and human rights.

The institute's inaugural ceremony included an academic procession and inaugural welcome by Dr. Greene, who will also serve as the institute's chairman. A member and immediate past president of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, Patrick L. Robison, offered the support of his organization in the keynote address. The legal counsel to the U.S. High Commissioner for Human Rights, Fernando Chang-Muy also gave his support at the ceremony. The archdiocese of Miami's auxiliary bishop, the Most Reverend Agustin Roman gave the invocation, and Msgr. Bryan O. Walsh gave the closing remarks and benediction.

In addition to Dr. Greene, I wish to thank the members of the institute's board of directors: executive director Maria R. Dominguez; Dr. Gabrielle Berryer; Dr. Joseph A. Iannone; George F. Knox; Dade State attorney Janet Reno; Thomas E. Scott; Ambassador Dr. Andres Vargas Gomez; Msgr. Bryan O. Walsh; Prof. Siegfried Wiessner; and board of advisors chair the Most Reverend Agustin Roman. They should be very proud of their important role in creating this significant asset, which will greatly aid those fighting for human rights.

THE WASTE SITS

HON. LARRY LaROCCO

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. LAROCCO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the House passed comprehensive energy legislation, but failed to correct the problem of nuclear waste that is plaguing my State of Idaho.

Idaho continues to receive high-level, low-level, and transuranic waste from across the country and even from foreign nations.

Although Idaho does not receive the benefits of commercial nuclear power—although Idaho was not selected as a safe site for long-term nuclear waste disposal—and although Idahoans are united in their opposition to accepting continued shipments of waste—the waste still comes.

And the waste sits. It sits in containment buildings that are too unsafe for the NRC to license. It sits above one of the largest freshwater aquifers in North America. It sits upstream of the Snake and Columbia Rivers and ultimately, the Pacific Ocean.

Mr. Speaker, when Idahoans fight against nuclear waste they are not fighting to save a few pennies per kilowatthour. They are fighting for the safety of their farms, the safety of their drinking water, and the safety of their children's future.

Clearly, this issue is too important to walk away from. Although the energy bill passed by the House yesterday does not address the problem of interim storage of nuclear waste as desired by the Interior Committee, I will be back. Shortly, I will introduce legislation that will move to put an end to this crisis and protect the future of the people of my State.

HEARING AND SPEECH CENTER OPENS AT THE LONG ISLAND JEWISH MEDICAL CENTER

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the opening of the new Hearing and Speech Center at the Long Island Jewish Medical Center in New Hyde Park, NY. On June 2, 1992 the new expanded center will open and provide Long Island's oldest and largest comprehensive hearing and speech facility with the most modern technical equipment for fitting, repair, and adjustment of hearing amplification devices. The Hearing and Speech Center at LIJ serves patients from Nassau and Suffolk Counties, New York City, and parts of New Jersey and Connecticut.

The center's rehabilitation specialists and facilities are instrumental in helping patients of all ages realize their maximum hearing and speech potential. Treatment is provided for the full range of disorders for pediatric, adult, and geriatric individuals.

I wish to congratulate the LIJ on the opening of the new center and recognize the generosity of the Hearing Speech Society, its friends, and supporters. In particular I would like to recognize the foresight and leadership of the center's director Dr. Allan L. Abramson, the chairman of the Department of Otolaryngology and Communicative Disorders, as well as the president of the Hearing and Speech Society, Mr. Jonathan Leigh. I am confident that the newly expanded facility will continue the Hearing and Speech Center's national preeminence in speech and language evaluation and treatment for many years to come.

TRINITY SCHOOL: LACROSSE CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the Palmer-Trinity School and its outstanding lacrosse team which this year won the Florida Lacrosse League Championship. This team, coming from a 0 to 12 start in 1989, was able to pull together the teamwork and drive to take the league championship just 4 years later.

This result is a tribute to the leadership of the team's coach, Gary Robinson, who was able to mold a cohesive team of young men from three competing high schools: Palmer-Trinity, Coral Gables, and Ransom-Everglades. The championship also honors the teamwork and dedication of Trinity players like Bill Freyer and Robert Brawner, their teammates from Coral Gables and Ransom-Everglades, and the outstanding athletic ability of Jim Oltz. Mr. Oltz is expected to be one of two all-American lacrosse players to be named from Florida high school teams this summer. My colleague from Maryland, Congressman GILCHREST will be pleased to know that Jim Oltz is planning to attend Salisbury State in Maryland, where he will continue to play lacrosse.

The Miami Herald published an article describing the exciting finish in the second overtime of the Florida Lacrosse League Championship, and I would like to include it in the RECORD:

CHAMPS AT LAST: TRINITY LACROSSE TEAM ENVISIONED BIG SUCCESS

(By Todd Martman)

The year was 1989 and the Trinity School lacrosse team was bad. Bad as in 0–12. A rambunctious group of ninth-graders didn't know any better. Said star defenseman Jim Oltz: "Ever since I was in ninth grade we were saying this is the year."

The vibes proved accurate. Last Sunday, those former ninth-graders closed out four years of high school lacrosse with a Florida Lacrosse League championship.

"I've been dreaming of this moment ever since last season," said senior defenseman Bill Freyer. "I just sat down on the ground afterward saying, 'We won it.' I still get goose bumps talking about it."

The victory—10–9 against Boca Raton St. Andrews School—was a dramatic one, as the team, now under the banner of the recently merged Palmer-Trinity School, came back from deficits of 6–3, 8–6 and 9–8 and won it on a goal in the second overtime.

"People there, who saw it in person, said it was the most exciting thing they've seen in their lives," Freyer said.

Those were the same words spoken by senior midfielder Robert Brawner, who called the game "the most exciting of my life." He joked that two overtimes were no problem, as by then he got his "fifth wind."

A stepbrother of Freyer, Brawner was with the team since its 0–12 beginnings in 1989. "This team's like a family," Brawner said.

Palmer-Trinity's team, which also has two players from Coral Gables High and a pair from Ransom Everglades, proved to be the best of the 10 that play in the Florida Lacrosse League. The 10 come from all over South and Central Florida, and represent schools varying from 1A to 4A in size classification.

Oltz, a senior, was probably Palmer-Trinity's best player. He is one of only two athletes from Florida expected to be among the approximately 120 All-American high school lacrosse players to be named this summer. Oltz said he'll likely attend Salisbury State, an NCAA Division III school in Maryland, where he'll continue playing lacrosse.

Oltz said "there was definitely a feeling" that Palmer-Trinity would win a league title before the season started. He said teammates could see it coming as early as December, at a winter lacrosse camp. "We saw it clicking right away," he said.

Said Gary Robinson, Palmer-Trinity's coach: "We expected to be fighting for the state title. Even though we were a .500 team last year, we had played the state champ and runner-up close. And we returned 11 of 13 starters."

If Robinson and his players had one more wish, they'd ask for the sport's popularity to spread in Florida. Well-established in the Northeast, lacrosse is still unrecognized locally.

Robinson said there are more than 20 teams in the state that play, but only 10 that feel prepared to play in the Florida Lacrosse League. In Dade, there are three other teams, besides Palmer-Trinity, that play in the league. They are Gulliver Prep, Ransom Everglades, and a club team at Palmetto High.

If lacrosse continues to grow, as it slowly has, most of the Palmer-Trinity kids won't be around here to see it. "It's going to be hard to say goodbye to all of these people," Freyer said. "I'm just glad we were able to say goodbye like this."

Mr. Speaker, I commend the dedication and endurance of the Palmer-Trinity Lacrosse Team, and congratulate them on their hard-earned victory.

COPRESIDENT OF FLAAG TESTIFIES BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about the challenges facing the estimated 3,500,000 civilian Americans living abroad, especially their children's access to their basic right of citizenship. Mr. Peter C. Alegi, copresident of the Federated League of Americans Around the Globe [FLAAG], recently testified before the House Judiciary Committee Subcommittee on Immigration on behalf of FLAAG's tens of thousands of members. Mr. Alegi states that the members of

FLAAG support citizenship legislation under consideration which could help ensure this most basic right from which all our other rights spring. This legislation could offer to many children, who are strongly connected to the United States by ties of both blood and culture, the opportunity to enjoy rights which in most other industrial societies would be theirs as a matter of course.

I commend these citizenship issues to my colleagues' attention. These issues will become even more important as our citizens become increasingly involved in a global economy. I commend Mr. Alegi's testimony to my colleagues:

TESTIMONY OF PETER C. ALEGI

Mr. Chairman, I appear today on behalf of FLAAG, the Federated League of Americans Around the Globe, the largest organization dedicated solely to enhancing the interests of overseas Americans. We thank you for your invitation, which demonstrates the growing concern you and your colleagues have for the special problems of the estimated 3,500,000 civilian United States citizens who reside abroad. The interests we represent are 100% American, without need for qualification by adjective or hyphenated expressions, and we especially avoid the word "expatriate."

The original sponsors of FLAAG were Democrats Abroad (of which I am the current chairman) and Republicans Abroad. We hope that this joint effort by the two major parties will emphasize to Congress and to all Americans that the demands of overseas Americans are not for political preference, power, personal prestige, or special interest, but for our basic rights, especially citizenship. During our short lifetime, FLAAG has attracted tens of thousands of members, principally through the participation of over twenty overseas organizations as group members. Our pledge to our membership is to seek a full and informed hearing in Washington on each issue and to pursue legislative and administrative reforms that can better their lives. We thank the subcommittee and its staff for their response to these efforts and would like to express our general support for the amendments under consideration.

There is an historical background which we should consider before dealing with the specific legislative proposals. First, until relatively recent times, two separate principles of international law provided the only rules the world knew governing citizenship. The more common of which followed bloodline while the other was based upon the geography of birth. Not until after World War I did Congress address in detail the setting of standards for determining who would be considered citizens of the United States in other than a naturalization context.

While I am unaware of any statistics going back to the twenties, one may state that relatively few Americans were scattered around the globe before Colonel Lindbergh made his flight. While the original Adams family comes to mind along with Ernest Hemingway and his friend Gertrude Stein from the field of literature, American businessmen were few and far between, and the flow of professionals and their families drawn overseas by those businesses had not yet begun to build to a flood. The issues which Congress faced were those of immigration and naturalization rather than the rights of Americans living abroad. Now, however, the estimated 3.5 million civilians overseas amount to 1.4% of the population counted by the 1990 census (a census which did not attempt to count us). I suspect that this is at least ten times the percentage of Americans living abroad than at the time citizenship legislation first became a concern.

The causes of this growth are many: the explosion of international business; the development of international institutions—beginning with the United Nations and its agencies—recruiting U.S. citizens; the emergence of educational exchange programs; military marriages immediately following the Second World War; and retirements to what used to be considered less expensive overseas environments.

Looking at the question from a different perspective, with the relative ease of modern travel, both tourism and business have produced what is sometimes termed an interdependent world. Communications are instantaneous. We awake in Rome to view the morning news on CNN or to watch Dan Rather's CBS news taped a few hours earlier by our local station. The International Herald Tribune, long the only publication available to Americans overseas, is now published via satellite in many cities throughout the world besides Paris, including Rome, and even new York, where its parent newspaper has long since disappeared. Alongside the International Herald Tribune, we read USA Today, which is completing ten years of serving the American community overseas. Specialized magazines and local newspapers for overseas Americans have sprung up throughout the world. In addition, MCI and ATT compete vigorously for the vast quantity of telephone traffic back to the United States.

The upshot of this communications explosion is that those of us who live overseas have growing opportunities to inform ourselves on life in the United States, often on a real time basis. This enables us to follow cultural, economic, social and political developments and to be in a position to cast an informed ballot. As you know, a series of overseas voting acts have simplified requirements for our voting in U.S. federal elections, and proposed amendments, which FLAAG is vigorously pressing, will improve our exercise of these rights.

The sum of these changes is that an American community has been created outside the boundaries of our nation which is both able to and interested in enjoying the rights and bearing the obligations of United States citizenship. We are greater in number than the population of nearly half of the states of the Union! It is against this background that we ask this committee to consider the amendments before you, which offer so many of our people who are strongly connected to the United States by ties of both blood and culture the opportunity to enjoy rights which in most other modern industrial societies would be theirs as a matter of course.

Recent actions by member states of the European Economic Community—a common market composed of twelve nations which share much in terms of history and heritage with the United States—are especially helpful in examining this question. Many of us trace our origins to those countries, including numerous people who are in this room today. The great changes which are taking place in the EEC with respect to recognition of citizenship may be instructive. For instance, two countries with which a large number of us are familiar, Ireland and Italy, have recently made substantial amendments to their citizenship laws, which now operate basically on a grandfathering principle, that is, any person who had at least one citizen grandparent is entitled to citizenship. We here find ourselves tied to residence requirements, and not at the level of the grandparent but at the level of the parent. In our view, this wrongfully denies citizenship to dedicated, patriotic individuals and ignores the realities of American life today, which contains a substantial overseas component. The student going abroad to study and the professor going abroad to teach often stay on and marry and produce offspring who consider themselves Americans and are considered American by the society in which they find themselves. They are frequently our best ambassadors, and their desire to be recognized as citizens means more to them than to many born within the boundaries of the 50 states.

Turning to the specific provisions:

First, we welcome the recognition of the eligibility of U.S. citizens born abroad for the Office of the President, which should result from the adoption of Section 202(a)(1). The issue which was discussed several decades ago when Governor Romney sought our highest office impacts many overseas Americans, sometimes in curious ways. At the risk of over-personalizing, let me note that I have three sons. Their mother is not a U.S. citizen. Two of my sons were born in the U.S. but moved with me to Italy before they were 2 years old when my professional activity led me to transfer there "temporarily" in July of 1965. Their brother was born in Rome, educated there through high school, and graduated two days ago from a U.S. college. He is very involved politically and socially in U.S. life and will soon be joining an American group which provides teachers to the Third World, in this case, a Township in South Africa. The gap in present law creates the possibility that his career will be more limited than that of his brothers. Congress should exercise its constitutionally granted discretion to determine eligibility for the highest office in the land by defining "natural born" citizen so as to eliminate this pointless potential discrimination.

We support amendment of section 301(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act. That paragraph presently covers the citizenship of a person with one citizen parent and one alien parent who is born outside the U.S. and its possessions. Presently, the statutory rule would require the citizen parent to have been "physically present in the United States" or its outlying possessions for a period or periods totalling not less than five years, at least two of which after attaining the age of fourteen years. It is proposed to replace those burdensome requirements by instead requiring that the citizen parent shall have been physically present "one year in the aggregate". The amendment is in keeping with the changed facts of American life overseas described earlier. There are literally thousands of persons residing abroad who, in order not to avoid interruption of their educational career or because of financial circumstances, have been unable to come to the United States for the time period currently required. These individuals are functional and valuable Americans, and the interests of the United States are amply protected by the suggested amendment. Existing law presumably reflects congressional policy intending to assure that essential connections with our homeland exist so as to promote a meaningful exercise of the right to vote. Extensive U.S. educational systems overseas (which are in need of greater support) make a substantial contribution towards the realization of these civic goals, together with improved communications.

We view the one year aggregate requirement as sufficient under today's circumstances. We believe it should be passed and adequately tested over the next few years. It may well be that at some future time we will return to recommend its application at the level of grandparent rather than the parent level. It is difficult, we realize, to formulate any standard for avoiding perpetual, unlimited transmission of citizenship which will not create some unfairness. We are confident that as experience develops with these less stringent rules, the Congress will have an adequate response.

We would, however, urge reconsideration of the effective date provided for by paragraphs (3) through (5) of subsection (a) of the proposed amendment. As now drafted, it would prevent our children of more than 18 years of age from enjoying the benefits of these provisions. It is difficult to discern an appropriate rationale for discriminating among our children. There will be many families with children born one year apart whose citizenship status and ability to transmit citizenship will be different. This distinction serves no purpose but to highlight the unfair treatment presently existing. Indeed, it would create an invidious discrimination which would in many other areas of law not withstand constitutional scrutiny, although that certainly is not my principal reason for urging reconsideration. Our fundamental concern is promotion of citizenship rights. Nevertheless if a need is felt to limit the applicability of these amendments, we suggest that it would be much more appropriate to introduce a transitional provision giving affected individuals who have already reached the age of 18 a period of, say, one year in which to opt for citizenship. Wholesale disqualification is simply not justified, especially in the context of a bill intended to right existing wrongs.

We would also ask that the amendments be expanded to include a plan for naturalization of children adopted abroad. A dozen members of this House were with us in Paris two years ago when Ben Davis, a U.S. lawyer working with an international institution in Paris, described the difficulties facing him and his American-born wife in obtaining U.S. citizenship for their adopted children. As Ben Davis wept, several congressmen wept too.

The law as it reads today would require Ben Davis to abandon his work in the field of international arbitration and to take up residence in the United States to provide his children with American citizenship. No valid United States government interest is involved. Rather, a traditional reluctance even to appear to grant "easy" citizenship seems to linger on. Once more, we invite you to consider the changed world in which these issues now are raised. Is it in the interest of the United States' overseas business and broader concerns that dedicated young citizens like Ben Davis and his wife work abroad for international organizations, or should they be forced to abandon their overseas work in order to protect their rights? We strongly urge that simplified, expedited procedures for the naturalization of the minor children of U.S. citizens residing abroad be adopted.

FLAAG also recommended that the bill before us be expanded to include a provision which would enable individuals who lost their right to citizenship under the now repealed provisions of Section 301(b) to be reinstated in their citizenship in accordance with the provisions of Section 324(c). The number of persons eligible under a reopener provision is uncertain. But again we oppose the concept that citizenship should be an entitlement the right to which depends upon a few days or weeks, more or less, especially when the legislation has subsequently changed in a manner favorable to retaining citizenship. In today's world, such punishment is self-defeating. Again, FLAAG proposes a "reopener" which would provide a period of time in which eligible individuals may opt to regain their citizenship.

In conclusion, the membership of FLAAG salutes this committee, and in particular Congressman Mazzoli and Congressman Berman for their sensitivity in recognizing the need to avoid the pointless denial of citizenship to tens of thousands of your fellow Americans. We pledge to use our citizenship not as a mere personal asset, but as a means of contributing, each in our own way, to the ongoing well-being of the United States of America.

FIFTEEN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA STUDENTS COMPETE AS FINALISTS FOR ACADEMIC AWARDS

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to salute the accomplishments of 15 gifted young District of Columbia women and men who are taking their place alongside students from every part of this country as finalists for the most prestigious awards granted to graduating high school seniors—the National Merit Scholars; the National Achievement Scholars Program for Outstanding Negro Students, and the National Hispanic Scholar Awards Program. In 1989, there were no finalists from the public schools of the District in any national scholarship program, but in only 2 years, through a concerted effort organized and directed by Dr. Eugene Williams through the Test Improvement Program, our numbers are competitive with many other cities. These winnng students surely indicate that academic excellence and scholastic achievement is alive and well in our public school system, and, indeed that there is much more there.

The tribute belongs, first and foremost to the winners, but their families, their teachers, advisors and mentors must also be considered co-winners. These awards are a tribute to the goals and expectations these young people have set for themselves, and that their families, teachers and others have set for them.

I am proud to present them and their outstanding achievements to you for the RECORD:

Rebecca Altes, National Merit: Along with her academic achievements, including membership on her school's "It's Academic" team, Rebecca is devoted to the technical aspects of theater and is active in the community theater group at Wilson High School. She has studied art at the Corcoran Gallery, and has volunteered at the Corcoran as an assistant teacher of an art class. She plans on majoring in English or history, and continuing her involvement in the theater.

Jeanette Brown, National Merit: Looking to a future in the Peace Corps, Jeanette's activities range from competitive swimming for Wilson High School to running a summer playgroup for 2-year-olds. She also works for a small publishing company, plays the piano, sews, and found time last summer to live with a family in Chile. According to Jeanette, she hopes to find a career that "lets me feel good about myself by letting me aid others."

Tamara L. Carrington, National Merit: Tamara, a student at Wilson, is a cellist who plays with a string quintet; a studnet of foreign cultures who has represented her school in a citywide program that sent cultural envoys to Senegal; a tutor of physically disabled students; and a vegetarian cook. She is most of all, an award-winning scholar and school leader who plans on studying the biological science with a goal of doing something for the "national or world community, especially for African-American people"

Brian Edmonson, National Achievement: A mathematician and student at Wilson High School who has been placed in accelerated classes since eighth grade, Brian is also on both the baseball and swimming teams. A competitive person, he loves swimming, he says, because when he wins he knows both that he has done his best and that "I have done better than the rest." He plans to be a mathematics teacher at a larger university, or perhaps be a mathematician who works from home.

Eric Elsworth, National Merit: A versatile student at Wilson, Eric says his aptitude lie with the sciences, but he is also a student of international studies, history and the social science. An outdoorsman and athlete, he is on his schools swimming and rowing teams, and works as a certified soccer referee for youth leagues. He claims he "aims high in school, and elsewhere" and hopes he can make a difference in the world.

Lawana Holland, National Achievement: A teaching assistant at a school for the mentally retarded, a model, captain of Wilson High's It's Academic team, and an award-winning designed, Lawana lists her interests as art, history, reading and writing. She exemplifies the well-rounded leader of the future, whatever her career choice.

Andrea Huttinger, National Hispanic Scholar: Having promised herself that she would take on the "incredible challenge of saving the world," through a career in environmental science and, involved in her Hispanic heritage, Andrea wants to combine these interests with her concern for the people of Central and South America. A photographer and student at Wilson, her interest is in discovering the lives of people through their expressions.

Anthony Jackson, National Achievement: Anthony has been preparing for his career in mechanical engineering since junior high school, and has continued his courses in a preengineering program at Wilson High School. An intern at the Department of Commerce, he is a member of the school band who plays the tuba, saxophone, french horn, guitar and piano.

Diedre Lee, National Achievement: Diedre is president of Banneker High School's senior class, and vice president of her National Honor Society chapter. She has been an exchange student in the Cote d'Ivoire, an active member of the Youth NAACP, and winner of numerous leadership awards. Diedre is also listed in "Who's Who in American High schools."

Kedeisha, Matthews, National Merit: Kedeisha, of Banneker High School, who plans to become a pediatrician, claims to be a person who wants to "avoid other people's definitions and limitations" of her, and "form my own view of what I am and will be." For now, that means active involvement as a peer counselor, participation in the national April 1992 Citizen Bee Program, and volunteering at a homeless shelter. In preparation for her future, she is also doing volunteer work at a hospital, and lists, as one of her hobbies, "like most teenagers, shopping."

William O'Hara, National Merit: William says he loves to learn and reads "anything I can get my hands on, from astronomy to zoology." A starter on the Banneker High School Chess Team, he is a neighborhood playground basketballer. William, who plans to be a physicist, attended the National Youth Science Camp, which, he says, "opened my eyes to the scientific world."

Sala Patterson, National Achievement: "Call me a dreamer, call me an idealist, and I'll say Thank you, you are absolutely correct," writes Sala, a 16-year-old senior who volunteers as a prejudice reduction workshop leader. Sala is a science tutor for younger students at her former elementary school because "giving back is just as important, if not more important, than getting." She is president of the Wilson H.S. National Honor Society chapter, and of a group that meets hunger and homeless needs. She plans to major in American studies and air history.

Michael Winter, National Achievement: Michael is looking to a career as an international lawyer and is preparing for it by focusing on international and multicultural courses at Wilson High School. A runner and tennis player, he is also a member of his school's volleyball club. He serves as a student representative to the PTA and leads workshops to help discourage racism and prejudice.

Andy Wong, National Merit: Andy cites Washington's multicultural population as a great advantage of living in Washington. He is baseball player and a community volunteer in his neighborhood. He has spent his summers at an engineering research institute and plans on a career in banking and finance.

A TRIBUTE TO CONVAL HIGH SCHOOL—WINNERS OF THE 1992 AMERICAN TOUR DE SOL

HON. DICK SWETT

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. SWETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to the students and faculty of Conval High School in Peterborough, NH. Of particular merit is a program initiated some 4 years ago which has spawned the development of a solar-powered automobile.

With a meager budget, limited resources and very little time available, Conval students and alumni reconstructed and refitted their solar car, the "Sol Survivor II." The objective was to compete in the 1991 "Tour De Sol"—a 300-mile course between Albany, NY, and Brookline, MA. Under the guidance of Dill Bigelow and Paul Watterman, a handful of students accepted the challenges of this race against almost overwhelming odds and faced competition from major colleges and universities that have vast financial and technical resources.

When it came time for the race, the team broke into squads, each with a specific task which was essential to the overall mission. One squad had to be awake before dawn each day in order to capture the early morning sunlight for the battery packs. Another squad, in charge of maintenance and repair, was faced with locating hard-to-find spare parts along the route. Then there was the driving squad, comprised of people who could steer the course while maintaining energy efficiency with the technical elements of the car. The squads made up the team * * * and, in this case, the winning team.

In spite of the fact that they were high school students pitted against some of the top colleges and universities in the country, limited funding and fewer resources on which to draw than the other teams, Sol Survivor II and Conval High School won the 1992 American Tour De Sol. The most remarkable aspect of this win is that their efficiency rating was 20-percent higher than any of their competition, proving that ingenuity and determination are the most essential elements in overcoming objectives.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Conval High School for the outstanding winning achievement of the Sol Survivor II team. And, even more importantly, I commend the team for accepting the challenge of this race and for facing such tremendous obstacles and conquering them. It is through the fostering of new technologies that this Nation will rise to meet the challenges of the future, and the attitudes of these Conval students are a great example of what America needs to remain a technological leader.

CUSHMAN SCHOOL RECOGNIZED FOR EDUCATIONAL VISION AND CONTRIBUTION TO HISTORY

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the Cushman School of Miami which has recently been selected for inclusion in an historical tour by the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

The Cushman School was founded in 1924 by Laura Cushman, an outstanding educator who began her nonprofit school when the city was forced to close kindergartens because of population growth and lack of funds. For 68 years, the Cushman School has provided quality education for young children, based on a dedication to character development and intellectual growth.

Dr. Joan Lutton, the current principal, has continued this tradition of excellence. With Ms. Cheryl Rogers, the assistant principal, and Ms. Marsha Beisel, director of the preschool, Dr. Lutton supervises a faculty and staff of 36. Together, they teach 302 students from 32 countries the subjects of hands-on science, computer programming, and Spanish, as well as the usual required curriculum.

The school's board of trustees, chaired by Paul Buhler, carries on the tradition of excellence established by Laura Cushman nearly 70 years ago. Mr. Buhler is assisted in guiding and supporting the school by his deputy, Ron Silber, Board Secretary Grace Humbertson, Treasurer James Moore, Counsel Amy Lehman, and members Robert Baron, Dr. Loretta Ciraldo, Franklin Cushman, grandson of the founder, Beth Dunlop, Sallie Grable, Dr. Barth Green, Linda Meyers, Leah Sims, Ann Stobs, Thomas Tew, and Michael Whalen. Under the supervision of the board of trustees, and with the support of the Cushman School Parents Association and its president, Ms. Anita Grossman, Cushman School is building its first addition in 47 years.

The vision of this school and its founder were described in a recent article in the Miami Herald, which I am submitting for inclusion in the RECORD:

There are many public schools of historical importance scattered throughout Dade County, but no private school is older than the Cushman School, 592 NE 60th St. in Miami. Founded by a visionary educator in 1924, the nonprofit school continues to provide quality education for children from the ages 3 to 11.

Laura Cushman was born in Iowa in 1887 and moved to Miami with her family in 1913 to teach at Coconut Grove Elementary School. After one year, she decided to further her education and went back to college in Boston.

Upon returning to Miami in 1916, Cushman began teaching kindergarten at Riverside Elementary and organized a school to train other teachers. In 1923, the school board was forced to close the kindergartens due to lack of funds (mostly caused by the sudden increase of population at the time), but Cushman continued to teach from the front porch of her parents' home.

A year later, Cushman opened the Cushman School at 337 NE 38th St. in Miami. The school, made up of three simple bungalows, was well received due to her growing reputation as a quality educator. In 1926, the construction of Biscayne Boulevard, which cut right through the Cushman School campus, forced her to relocate.

Architect Russell Skipton, working from a plan by Cushman, designed the new two-story, V-shaped building. Although the building's exterior is plain, the courtyard formed by the inside of the "V" features examples of Mediterranean-style architecture. The school's bell, donated to Cushman by the Deering family, was used to call in the workers that built the Vizcaya estate. Originally built without windows (just screens) to benefit from the cool bay breezes, the windows used today came from the now demolished Royal Palm Hotel.

Cushman, who served as the school's principal until 1974, died in 1986 at age 99. Part of the reason the school remains so highly regarded is her teaching philosophy, which remains in effect today. "Our first aim is that all teachers and pupils in our school should preserve a happy attitude," Cushman said. "We believe that a well child whose environment is conducive to character development and intellectual growth is a happy child."

Today, 302 students representing 32 nationalities attend Cushman School, served by a faculty and staff of 36. Computer program-

ming, hands-on science, physical education and Spanish classes are part of the current curriculum. The school will be part of the National Trust for Historic Preservation Tour in October. The first addition to the school in 47 years, a one-story, two-classroom complex, is under construction.

Sources: Barbara Skigen, director of public affairs and development for Cushman School; City of Miami Designation Report; Miami Herald library.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Cushman School Board of Trustees, the Parents Association, and especially Dr. Lutton and her faculty and staff for producing one of the success stories in American education.

THE 100TH HAPPY BIRTHDAY CLARA LOUISE CAPE

HON. J.J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, recently Mrs. Ed Cape celebrated her 100th birthday in San Marcos, TX. She comes from one of the pioneer families of Hays County. Together with her husband, Ed Cape, they have been an active part of almost every civic development that took place in Hays County for nearly 100 years.

We have no more prominent citizen or one whose family has meant so much to this area. It was Mr. Ed Cape who gave leadership necessary to establish the Guadalupe Blanco River Authority. And, Ed Cape and Mrs. Cape were close confidants of former President Lyndon Johnson. Whenever Lyndon Johnson was in San Marcos, he made his home at the Cape residence. Today, Bob Thornton and his wife, Mary Louise (Cape) Thornton, are carrying out the splendid tradition of this grand family.

Mr. Speaker, I include this writeup of Mrs. Cape for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the San Marcos (TX) Daily Record, Mar. 25, 1992]

LOCAL HISTORIAN CELEBRATES 100TH BIRTHDAY

(By Kim Bradley)

Today marks the 100th birthday of Clara Louise Cape, highly regarded by her friends and family for her devotion as a wife, mother, grandmother, and great-grandmother and friend to all who surround her.

Mrs. Cape will be honored today at Hillside Nursing Home with a special party.

In her 80s, Mrs. Cape was still writing history and encouraging every young person she saw to move ahead, family friend Alice Morgan said. "Do it now. Don't wait until tomorrow, it might get away from you," she is remembered as saying.

Mrs. Cape has left an indelible mark on those who know her, Morgan said. Her longevity has been a blessing to those around here.

She has always been known by many as "Mrs. Eddie," a name that even Lyndon Baines Johnson, a long-time family friend, called her. Her husband, Edward Matthew Cape, now deceased, was known as "Mr. Eddie."

Mrs. Cape's image and that of her family plays a prominent role in the make-up of not only the city of San Marcos, but also Hays County.

A scholarship in the name of her husband, Ed Cape, has been established at Southwest Texas State University. The scholarship was developed with a view towards encouraging its recipient towards attainment of higher education.

Mrs. Cape has been honored many times throughout her life. She received a Certificate of Merit for Outstanding Civic Achievement from the San Marcos Bicentennial Commission, now known as the Heritage Association of San Marcos.

Mrs. Cape was appointed to the original commission by Mayor Luciano Flores. She was an original charter member of the Hays County Historical and Genealogical Society, and contributed to its Quarterly.

She has an empathy for other historians and has contributed generously from her extensive personal research into the background of San Marcos and Hays County, always ready to help in any way she can.

She continues to keep up her research and coordination of the records she has accumulated through the years, which will be a wealth of information for the new historical archives.

Mrs. Cape is a member of the Captain Thomas Moore Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution and the Bicentennial Commission, the forerunner of the Heritage Association of San Marcos.

Mrs. Cape's influence on San Marcos has been great. She has an interest in genealogy, having completed five books on family history.

The author of the books, "A Century with Old St. Mark's Church, San Marcos," and "Llewellyn Jones, (1760–1820) Ancestors and Descendants (1674–1974). Cape has always been proud of her family's heritage.

Mrs. Cape placed a Revolutionary marker on the grave of her great-great grandfather, Captain Louis Llewellyn Jones, who fought with George Washington at Valley Forge.

She has one daughter, Mary Louise Cape Thornton; two grandsons, Col. Robert Edward Thornton and Russell Cape Thornton; and three grandchildren, Stacy Ann, Kendall Louise, and George Thornton.

Mrs. Cape was born in Huntsville, Alabama. Her father, Kibble Johnson Harrison, was a farmer there, and her family moved to San Marcos when she was 15. She has been a life-long Episcopalian, baptized and confirmed in the Church of Nativity in Huntsville, Alabama.

Her father became a salesman, and she graduated from East End School in 1908. She studied Expression at the Coronal Institute and taught school for one year in Lockhart, where she and Ed Cape were married in 1913.

The story of their marriage is romantic. The big flood of 1913 forced Plum Creek, Purgatory Creek, and the San Marcos and Blanco Rivers out of their banks, washing away bridges, roads, and railroads. Mr. Cape went to Lockhart on a work train to help repair the railroad tracks so the train could get through.

The train reached Lockhart early in the morning, and Mr. Cape went to the courthouse and secured a marriage license. He walked to the boarding house where Clara Louise was living, and they were married in the Methodist Church.

Mrs. Cape was a strong supporter of her husband's activities. Her husband set up a law practice in San Marcos in 1913, becoming President of State Bank and Trust Company upon the death of Will Barber.

In 1947, a ten-year drought devastated the area. Mr. Cape began an effort to dam the Guadalupe and Blanco rivers to conserve water. General Omar Bradley wrote of Cape: "Our democracy is like a tall stand of timber. We cannot cut from it more than we plant in it without endangering its survival. And forests, like gardens, cannot be bought. They must be cultivated well with toil and nourished with the sweat of those that would keep them. Ed Cape has toiled hard and cultivated well on the behalf of his community, his river valley, and his state. Few men live, who are fortunate enough to bring about achievements that time can never erase. Ed Cape has."

As Mrs. Cape reflects on her long and wonderful life, she is sure to count her blessings today, when she celebrates her 100th birthday, surrounded by family and friends.

And as she reflects on a century of life, the wisdom she imparts will continue to ring true. Her encouragement and advice for young people is, as it has been for so many years, "Do it now, don't wait until tomorrow, it might get away from you!"

Happy birthday, Mrs. Cape.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT SUTTON WATT

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my constituent, Robert Sutton Watt, who retires on June 30 of this year as superintendent for the Woodland Joint Unified School District in Woodland, CA.

Bob joined the Woodland Joint Unified School District as superintendent in 1982 after having worked 4 years as superintendent for the River Delta Unified School District. Bob's career in the education profession began in 1955 as a teacher at Jefferson High School. He joined Jefferson after receiving his bachelor of arts and general secondary credential from San Francisco State College. Bob continued to teach at Jefferson while he earned his master of arts, also from San Francisco State College. In addition, Bob's credentials include a life diploma, elementary and secondary grades; a life diploma, secondary school administration; and a life diploma, general administration.

As he completed his post graduate education, Bob's career progressed. During 1960 and 1961, Bob was the Summer School principal for the Jefferson Union High School District. In 1961, he was named the dean of boys at Terra Nova High School. From 1962 to 1966, Bob worked as the assistant principal for Oceana High School, and in 1966 Oceana High selected Bob to become their principal. While fulfilling his new responsibilities as Oceana's principal, Bob received his doctorate in education from the University of California, Berkeley. In 1972, Dr. Watt returned to the Jefferson Union High School District to become the assistant superintendent, business-operations.

Bob's long and successful career in education was enhanced by his participation in a number of professional and community organizations. From 1986 to 1989, Bob was the commissioner for the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. He became the commission chairperson for this organization in

1990 and continues to hold this office in 1992. He is a member of Capitol Center Mathematics, Engineering, Science, Achievement [MESA] and has served as both co-chairperson and co-vice chairperson. He is a board member of the Woodland Health Care, Woodland Chamber of Commerce, Woodland United Way, and the Woodland Chapter of the American Heart Association. In addition, Bob has held elected offices for the Rotary Club in several cities, including Woodland, Rio Vista, and Pacifica. At his church, Woodland Presbyterian Church, he is serving as an elected member of session.

Dr. Watt's distinguished career has been acknowledged by the communities he served. Bob received the 1991–92 Golden Apple for Outstanding Administrator from the Yolo County School Boards Association as well as the 1990 Superintendent's Award for Distinguished Service to Vocational Education from the Association of California School Administrators.

In addition to his service to education and his community, Bob is a husband, father, and grandfather. Bob and his wife Darlyn have four children: Cindy Zuidema, Linda Watt, Michael Watt, and Susan Dawley; and three grandchildren: Brian, Wesley, and Hannah.

I am honored to have the opportunity to recognize Bob's outstanding career in the education profession. I join my colleagues today in wishing Bob and his family a happy and fulfilling retirement.

WHAT THE VICE PRESIDENT REALLY SAID

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, much ado has been made about Vice President DAN QUAYLE's remark concerning the television character, Murphy Brown. The media, in their rush to defend a fictional colleague, neglected to inspect the Vice President's deeper message.

Just once, I would like the media to look beyond the sound bites and delve into the real issues. The President's urban strategy includes full funding for the Home-ownership and Opportunity for People Everywhere Program, enterprise zones to create jobs in the most hard-pressed urban areas, an education strategy—America 2000—that will vastly improve education, and comprehensive welfare reform.

These were all facts mentioned in the Vice President's speech, little of which was reported by the media. I would like to submit for the RECORD the entirety of Mr. QUAYLE's speech so the American people can see what they missed:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT DAN QUAYLE

As you may know, I've just returned from a week-long trip to Japan. I was there to commemorate the 20th anniversary of the reversion of Okinawa to Japan by the United States, an act that has made a lasting impression on the Japanese.

While I was there, Japan announced its commitment to join with the United States in assisting Eastern and Central Europe with a 400 million dollar aid package. We also announced a manufacturing technology initiative that will allow American engineers to gain experience working in Japanese businesses.

Japan and the United States are allies and partners. Though we have our differences, especially in the area of trade, our two countries—with 40 percent of the world's GNP—are committed to a global partnership in behalf of peace and economic growth.

But in the midst of all of these discussions of international affairs, I was asked many times in Japan about the recent events in Los Angeles. From the perspective of many Japanese, the ethnic diversity of our culture is a weakness compared to their homogenous society. I begged to differ with my hosts. I explained that our diversity is our strength. And I explained that the immigrants who come to our shores have made, and continue to make, vast contributions to our culture and our economy.

It is wrong to imply that the Los Angeles riots were an inevitable outcome of our diversified society. But the question that I tried to answer in Japan is one that needs answering here: What happened? Why? And how do we prevent it in the future?

One response has been predictable: Instead of denouncing wrongdoing, some have shown tolerance for rioters; some have enjoyed saying "I told you so;" and some have simply made excuses for what happened. All of this has been accompanied by pleas for more money.

I'll readily accept that we need to understand what happened. But I reject the idea we should tolerate or excuse it.

When I have been asked during these last weeks who caused the riots and the killing in L.A., my answer has been direct and simple: Who is to blame for the riots? The rioters are to blame. Who is to blame for the killings? The killers are to blame. Yes, I can understand how people were shocked and outraged by the verdict in the Rodney King trial. But there is simply no excuse for the mayhem that followed. To apologize or in any way to excuse what happened is wrong. It is a betrayal of all those people equally outraged and equally disadvantaged who did not loot and did not riot—and who were in many cases victims of the rioters. No matter how much you may disagree with the verdict, the riots were wrong. And if we as a society don't condemn what is wrong, how can we teach our children what is right?

But after condemning the riots, we do need to try to understand the underlying situation.

In a nutshell: I believe the lawless social anarchy which we saw is directly related to the breakdown of family structure, personal responsibility and social order in too many areas of our society. For the poor the situation is compounded by a welfare ethos that impedes individual efforts to move ahead in society, and hampers their ability to take advantage of the opportunities America offers.

If we don't succeed in addressing these fundamental problems, and in restoring basic values, any attempt to fix what's broken will fail. But one reason I believe we won't fail is that we have come so far in the last 25 years.

There is no question that this country has had a terrible problem with race and racism. The evil of slavery has left a long legacy. But we have faced racism squarely, and we have made progress in the past quarter century. The landmark civil rights bills of the 1960's removed legal barriers to allow full participation by blacks in the economic, social and political life of the nation. By any measure the America of 1992 is more egalitarian, more integrated, and offers more opportunities to black Americans—and all other minority group members—than the America of 1964. There is more to be done. But I think that all of us can be proud of our progress.

And let's be specific about one aspect of this progress: This country now has a black middle class that barely existed a quarter century ago. Since 1967 the median income of black two parent families has risen by 60 percent in real terms. The number of black college graduates has skyrocketed. Black men and women have achieved real political power—black mayors head 48 of our largest cities, including Los Angeles. These are achievements.

But as we all know, there is another side to that bright landscape. During this period of progress, we have also developed a culture of poverty—some call it an underclass—that is far more violent and harder to escape than it was a generation ago.

The poor you always have with you, Scripture tells us. And in America we have always had poor people. But in this dynamic, prosperous nation, poverty has traditionally been a stage through which people pass on their way to joining the great middle class. And if one generation didn't get very far up the ladder—their ambitious, better-educated children would.

But the underclass seems to be a new phenomenon. It is a group whose members are dependent on welfare for very long stretches, and whose men are often drawn into lives of crime. There is far too little upward mobility, because the underclass is disconnected from the rules of American society. And these problems have, unfortunately, been particularly acute for Black Americans.

Let me share with you a few statistics on the difference between black poverty in particular in the 1960's and now.

In 1967 68% of black families were headed by married couples. In 1991, only 48% of black families were headed by both a husband and wife.

In 1965 the illegitimacy rate among black families was 28%. In 1989, 65%—two thirds—of all black children were born to never-married mothers.

In 1951 9.2% of black youth between 16–19 were unemployed. In 1965, it was 23%. In 1980 it was 35%. By 1989, the number had declined slightly, but was still 32%.

The leading cause of death of young black males today is homicide.

It would be overly simplistic to blame this social breakdown on the programs of the Great Society alone. It would be absolutely wrong to blame it on the growth and success most Americans enjoyed during the 1980's. Rather, we are in large measure reaping the whirlwind of decades of changes in social mores.

I was born in 1947, so I'm considered one of those "Baby Boomers" we keep reading about. But let's look at one unfortunate legacy of the "Boomer" generation. When we were young, it was fashionable to declare war against traditional values. Indulgence and self-gratification seemed to have no consequences. Many of our generation glamorized casual sex and drug use, evaded responsibility and trashed authority. Today the "Boomers" are middle-aged and middle class. The responsibility of having families has helped many recover traditional values. And, of course, the great majority of those in the middle class survived the turbulent leg-

acy of the 60's and 70's. But many of the poor, with less to fall back on, did not.

The intergenerational poverty that troubles us so much today is predominantly a poverty of values. Our inner cities are filled with children having children; with people who have not been able to take advantage of educational opportunities; with people who are dependent on drugs or the narcotic of welfare. To be sure, many people in the ghettos struggle very hard against these tides—and sometimes win. But too many feel they have no hope and nothing to lose. This poverty is, again, fundamentally a poverty of values.

Unless we change the basic rules of society in our inner cities, we cannot expect anything else to change. We will simply get more of what we saw weeks ago. New thinking, new ideas, new strategies are needed.

For the government, transforming underclass culture means that our policies and programs must create a different incentive system. Our policies must be premised on, and must reinforce, values such as: family, hard work, integrity and personal responsibility.

I think we can all agree that government's first obligation is to maintain order. We are a nation of laws, not looting. It has become clear that the riots were fueled by the vicious gangs that terrorize the inner cities. We are committed to breaking those gangs and restoring law and order. As James Q. Wilson has written, "Programs of economic restructuring will not work so long as gangs control the streets."

Some people say "law and order" are code words. Well, they are code words. Code words for safety, getting control of the streets, and freedom from fear. And let's not forget that, in 1990, 84 percent of the crimes committed by blacks were committed against blacks.

We are for law and order. If a single mother raising her children in the ghetto has to worry about drive-by shootings, drug deals, or whether her children will join gangs and die violently, her difficult task becomes impossible. We're for law and order because we can't expect children to learn in dangerous schools. We're for law and order because if property isn't protected, who will build businesses?

As one step on behalf of law and order—and on behalf of opportunity as well—the President has initiated the "Weed and Seed" program—to "weed out" criminals and "seed" neighborhoods with programs that address root causes of crime. And we have encouraged community-based policing, which gets the police on the street so they interact with citizens.

Safety is absolutely necessary. But it's not sufficient. Our urban strategy is to empower the poor by giving them control over their lives. To do that, our urban agenda includes:

Fully funding the Home-ownership and Opportunity for People Everywhere program. HOPE—as we call it—will help public housing residents become home-owners. Subsidized housing all too often merely made rich investors richer. Home ownership will give the poor a stake in their neighborhoods, and a chance to build equity.

Creating enterprise zones by slashing taxes in targeted areas, including a zero capital gains tax, to spur entrepreneurship, economic development, and job creation in inner cities.

Instituting our education strategy, AMERICA 2000, to raise academic standards and to give the poor the same choices about how and where to educate their children that rich people have.

Promoting welfare reform to remove the penalties for marriage, create incentives for saving, and give communities greater control over how the programs are administered.

These programs are empowerment programs. They are based on the same principles as the Job Training Partnership Act, which aimed to help disadvantaged young people and dislocated workers to develop their skills to give them an opportunity to get ahead. Empowering the poor will strengthen families. And right now, the failure of our families is hurting America deeply. When families fail, society fails. The anarchy and lack of structure in our inner cities are testament to how quickly civilization falls apart when the family foundation cracks. Children need love and discipline. They need mothers and fathers. A welfare check is not a husband. The state is not a father. It is from parents that children learn how to behave in society; it is from parents above all that children come to understand values and themselves as men and women, mothers and fathers.

And for those concerned about children growing up in poverty, we should know this: marriage is probably the best anti-poverty program of all. Among families headed by married couples today, there is a poverty rate of 5.7 percent. But 33.4 percent of families headed by a single mother are in poverty today.

Nature abhors a vacuum. Where there are no mature, responsible men around to teach boys how to be good men, gangs serve in their place. In fact, gangs have become a surrogate family for much of a generation of inner-city boys. I recently visited with some former gang members in Albuquerque, New Mexico. In a private meeting, they told me why they had joined gangs. These teenage boys said that gangs gave them a sense of security. They made them feel wanted, and useful. They got support from their friends. And, they said, "It was like having a family." "Like family"—unfortunately, that says it all.

The system perpetuates itself as these young men father children whom they have no intention of caring for, by women whose welfare checks support them. Teenage girls, mired in the same hopelessness, lack sufficient motive to say no to this trap.

Answers to our problems won't be easy.

We can start by dismantling a welfare system that encourages dependency and subsidizes broken families. We can attach conditions—such as school attendance, or work—to welfare. We can limit the time a recipient gets benefits. We can stop penalizing marriage for welfare mothers. We can enforce child support payments.

Ultimately, however, marriage is a moral issue that requires cultural consensus, and the use of social sanctions. Bearing babies irresponsibly is, simply, wrong. Failing to support children one has fathered is wrong. We must be unequivocal about this.

It doesn't help matters when prime time TV has Murphy Brown—a character who supposedly epitomizes today's intelligent, highly paid, professional woman—mocking the importance of fathers, by bearing a child alone, and calling it just another "lifestyle choice."

I know it is not fashionable to talk about moral values, but we need to do it. Even though our cultural leaders in Hollywood, network TV, the national newspapers routinely jeer at them, I think that most of us in this room know that some things are good, and other things are wrong. Now it's time to make the discussion public.

It's time to talk again about family, hard work, integrity and personal responsibility. We cannot be embarrassed out of our belief that two parents, married to each other, are better in most cases for children than one. That honest work is better than hand-outs—or crime. That we are our brothers' keepers. That it's worth making an effort, even when the rewards aren't immediate.

So I think the time has come to renew our public commitment to our Judeo-Christian values—in our churches and synagogues, our civic organizations and our schools. We are, as our children recite each morning, "one nation under God." That's a useful framework for acknowledging a duty and an authority higher than our own pleasures and personal ambitions.

If we lived more thoroughly by these values, we would live in a better society. For the poor, renewing these values will give people the strength to help themselves by acquiring the tools to achieve self-sufficiency, a good education, job training, and property. Then they will move from permanent dependence to dignified independence.

Shelby Steele, in his great book, "The Content of Our Character," writes, "Personal responsibility is the brick and mortar of power. The responsible person knows that the quality of his life is something that he will have to make inside the limits of his fate . . . The quality of his life will pretty much reflect his efforts."

I believe that the Bush Administration's empowerment agenda will help the poor gain that power, by creating opportunity, and letting people make the choices that free citizens must make.

Though our hearts have been pained by the events in Los Angeles, we should take this tragedy as an opportunity for self-examination and progress. So let the national debate roar on. I, for one, will join it. The president will lead it. The American people will participate in it. And as a result, we will become an even stronger nation.

TRIBUTE TO BRANDY WHITAKER

HON. PETE PETERSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to the unbelievable heroism of a truly remarkable young lady. Ten-year-old Brandy Whitaker, of Marianna, FL, who is partially paralyzed with cerebral palsy, risked her own life in attempting to rescue two complete strangers at the Florida Caverns State Park.

While enjoying the day at the park, the Riverside Elementary School student jumped into the water when she realized that two people were drowning. Within a short time, Brandy, despite her physical handicaps, had managed to help rescue a mother and daughter.

Brandy Whitaker has proven herself to be a credit to her family and the community. Her courageous actions will be remembered as an inspiration to us all.

I ask that the following article by Anne Spencer, which appeared in the Jackson County Floridan on Sunday, May 24, 1992, be submitted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the Jackson County Floridan, May 24, 1992]

DARING RESCUE ATTEMPT:

MARIANNA GIRL JUMPS INTO POND, PULLS 2 ABOVE WATER

(By Anne Spencer)

A 10-year-old Marianna girl with cerebral palsy rescued a drowning child and her mother Saturday at the Florida Caverns State Park swimming area, but the mother later died at Jackson Hospital.

Cindy Warren, 32, of Chattahoochee, died Saturday afternoon, a hospital spokeswoman said.

The spokeswoman would not comment on the cause of death, but nurse Benita Cooley who performed cardiopulmonary resuscitation on Warren speculated it could have been cardiac arrest.

Park officials referred all media inquiries to state park headquarters in Tallahassee, which was closed for the Memorial Day weekend.

However, Brandy's mother, Karen Whitaker, and Cooley told the Floridan that Brandy Whitaker, a Riverside Elementary School student, who has cerebral palsy and another disease that left her partially paralyzed, jumped into the swimming area and rescued the child and mother.

They said Brandy was on the park's dock when she saw a girl, about 8, jump in the water and come up, only to go under again and not emerge.

Brandy then saw Warren jump in to help the child, but Warren stayed under as well.

Cooley said the girl panicked and latched onto Warren.

Brandy dove in and got the girl's head above water. With the girl resting on her hip, Brandy reached down and pulled Warren by the hair until her head was out of the water.

Brandy began screaming and a man jumped into the pond, took Warren in his arms and pulled her to shore.

Cooley, who was with the Whitakers, started CPR, and Jackson County Fire-Rescue and park rangers were called.

The mother was under the water two minutes and had just eaten. "it could have been she was so scared," Cooley said.

"I did CPR and the Heimlich and she threw up and had very little water in her lungs."

"Brandy was kind of really upset," Whitaker said, "She was crying over people she had never met. She was blaming herself when she saw the woman not responding to the medical attention."

"We tried to explain to her she did a heroic, fantastic job, and there was nothing more she could have done. Especially with her condition, we were extremely proud," Whitaker said.

ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE ASSISTANCE ACT

HON. NICK JOE RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, today, I have introduced legislation which will assist the small communities of this Nation in meeting the environmental regulations which this Congress and the administration continue to impose upon them. It is my intention that this bill will finally focus on the financial burden placed on small communities by endless heaping on of environmental regulations.

Most small towns missed out on the grants offered until 1991 under Title II of the Clean Water Act for construction of wastewater treatment facilities, because these grants were focused on the largest cities which were also the largest polluters. Many of these small towns are also unable to take advantage of loans available through the State Revolving Fund program which has replaced the grant program because they are not financially able to pay interest on a loan, let alone repay the principal. Furthermore, there is little assistance available to communities for the construction of public water systems.

The Environmental Infrastructure Assistance Act which I have introduced takes steps to assist economically distressed areas to build environmental infrastructure facilities which they desperately need. This bill authorizes the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to assist eligible local governments in the planning, design and construction of wastewater treatment works, public water systems or solid waste management facilities. The local share of such projects would be 10 percent of the project cost, which could include provision of necessary lands, easements and right of way.

In order to be eligible, communities would have a population of 25,000 or less, and would be classified as a labor surplus area by the U.S. Department of Labor or would have a per capita income that is less than or equal to 70 percent of the national average per capita income as determined by the most recent census.

The Environmental Infrastructure Assistance Act would authorize $500 million per year for the Corps of Engineers to carry out activities under this act. While this may seem like a large amount, it is minuscule when compared with the documented need for environmental infrastructure facilities. The EPA 1991 Needs Survey for Wastewater Treatment Systems has reported that current need for these facilities alone is $138 billion. As Safe Drinking Water Act and Resource Conservation and Recovery Act regulations continue to be imposed, the need will only increase.

Furthermore, I feel that the Corps of Engineers is the correct entity to carry out these activities. The Corps has experience in the construction of environmental facilities. They were an integral part of the on the ground management of construction projects under the title II construction grant program. I feel this new program is a natural extension of the mission of the Corps of Engineers.

This program will be in addition to others, such as the FmHA Water and Water Disposal loan and grant program which is currently in effect, or the Rural Community Environmental Assistance Act which I will be introducing shortly.

It is high time that the needs of small communities be considered. We have gone on long enough piling regulation after regulation on small, rural towns while providing no financial or technical assistance for these regulations to be met. It is my hope that my colleagues will also recognize this need and join me in cosponsoring this measure.

NATIONAL AVIATION EDUCATION WEEK

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce a joint resolution to declare the week of October 4 through October 10, 1992, as National Aviation Education Week.

The purpose of this resolution is to encourage schools—at all levels and in all parts of the country—to focus on aviation and its contribution to our society, and to encourage students to consider career opportunities in this exciting field. Pilots, engineers, flight attendants, technicians, radio and radar operators, air traffic controllers and airport managers are just a few examples of the hundreds of careers in the aviation industry. This resolution also encourages educators to use aviation as a tool to promote learning in a wide range of subject areas.

This House recognizes the importance of aviation in our society. This is apparent by our overwhelming vote just last week to reauthorize $20 billion for Federal aviation programs for the next 2 years.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the aviation industry makes important contributions to the national economy and our way of life. These contributions are made by passenger, cargo, and general aviation groups as well as manufacturers of aircraft, aircraft parts, and avionics. In May 1992, our trade deficit was at its lowest level in 8 years, thanks, in large part, to aviation exports. The FAA and the commercial and general aviation industry groups project a steady growth in the aviation industry beyond the year 2000.

As a result of this projected growth, industry experts project a shortage of pilots, engineers, technicians, and other skilled workers. Also, women and minorities have, in the past, been underrepresented in technical fields such as aviation. We must find ways to continue the growth of the aviation industry as a whole and to include greater numbers of women and minorities in this industry, because they are a valuable resource that must not be neglected.

Mr. Speaker, the future contribution of aviation to the United States is dependent on an informed and educated public. Again, let me say that I believe it is important that schools at all levels, nationwide, actively pursue the advancement of education through aviation. Mr. Speaker, several of my colleagues and I support the use of aviation material, theories, and principles to excite today's youth in their learning. Be it in reading, art, math, science, history or whatever the subject matter, aviation can be a valuable tool for helping educators turn youth on to education.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this resolution to declare October 4 through 10, 1992, as National Aviation Education Week.

HARRY DELLAS: COACH OF A LIFETIME

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, at Southwest Miami High School in west Dade County, where I went to high school, there is a coach who is setting an example for educators across this Nation. Coach Harry Dellas is making a difference for young men in west Dade County.

Coach Dellas, who was a collegiate soccer star at Heidelberg College in Ohio, has persuaded his alma matter to enroll five young soccer players from Southwest and Braddock High Schools. He arranged for Heidelberg to help these young men set up Federal aid to cover their tuition costs. These five young men, Alejandro, Alberto, and Adolfo Carriles, Juan Carlos Garcia, and Thomas Hernandez, never dreamed they would get a chance to attend a 4-year college.

The Carriles brothers came to this country on a raft from Cuba 12 years ago and only dared to hope that they could attend a junior college. Thomas Hernandez and Juan Garcia who immigrated from Nicaragua as small children now have the opportunity to try for their dreams of becoming a lawyer and a doctor.

The Miami Herald published an article about this remarkable coach and his assistance to these men, which I ask to include in the RECORD:

CHANCE OF A LIFETIME

(By Todd Hartman)

Five West Dade athletes who never dreamed they would get a shot at a four-year college or play collegiate soccer are likely going to do both—and all at the same place—thanks to a persuasive coach.

The coach, Harry Dellas of Southwest High, persuaded Heidelberg College in Ohio, a private school of 1,200 students, to bring the five in to play soccer and to help set up federal aid to cover tuition costs.

The athletes say it's remarkable.

"It's a new life for me, my future," said Alejandro Carriles. "Before this I was thinking Miami-Dade, and I never thought about playing soccer after high school."

Alejandro, 19, is one of three Carriles brothers—his twin Alberto and Adolfo, 17,—who are benefiting from the deal. The two other athletes are Juan Carlos Garcia and Thomas Hernandez. All but Adolfo Cariles attend Southwest High; Adolfo goes to Braddock.

Dellas, an alumnus and former soccer star at Heidelberg, said he "had to do a lot of talking" to get the students admitted because of their average grades. "I called the coach, called the admissions director, the athletic director. The coach has taken my word on these kids."

Brian Haley, the coach at Heidelberg, said he welcomes the players, who he hopes will bring some flair to the sport. "These kids have a passion for the game," Haley said. "When Harry told me about them, I was pretty excited."

The story is a wonderful one for the players, all of whom left their home countries years ago with their families, seeking a better life in the United States. The Carriles brothers left Cuba on a raft 12 years ago, and Hernandez and Garcia both came to Miami from Nicaragua as children.

"Everything just feels great," said Hernandez, who said he wants to get a degree at Heidelberg, then return to Miami to study law. "I was planning to go to college, but my options were pretty limited."

Garcia, who still must score well enough on an SAT test before official acceptance, said he wants to study medicine. "I'm excited," he said. "This is the only chance I've had. I've got to take advantage of it.

Hernandez, 20, and Garcia, 19, were especially thankful to Dellas, who lobbied for them, though neither played on Southwest's team this season (both missed the age cutoff). "If it wasn't for him, I'd be at Miami-Dade," Garcia said.

Haley echoed the sentiment: "If someone like Harry Dellas wasn't pushing these kids, then Brian Haley wouldn't know about them."

The only unanimous concern among the fivesome was cold weather. All five are loading up on jackets and long underwear and preparing to practice in sweats for the first time in their lives. "They'll probably freeze on me," Haley said.

Mr. Speaker, this country needs more educators like Coach Harry Dellas who puts out maximum effort to give hope to the young men of his community.

TRIBUTE TO THE JOSEPH RODMAN DRAKE SCHOOL

HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay very special tribute to an institution that has prepared thousands of Bronx youths for the challenges of the future for three-quarters of a century: the Joseph Rodman Drake School, P.S. 48. On Friday, May 29, 1992, P.S. 48 will celebrate its 75th year of providing outstanding educational service to the Bronx community.

The Joseph Rodman Drake School is housed in a unique five-story light brick and limestone building rendered in the collegiate gothic style. Its external walls display stone tracery, shields, open books, bas relief heads of children, and gargoyles that stand sentry over the east and west wings. The building was designed by C.B.J. Snyder, superintendent of school buildings for the New York City Board of Education from 1893 to 1923, who is considered the dean of New York City's early school architects.

Since its inauguration in 1917, P.S. 48 has provided students from a great variety of cultural backgrounds with an encouraging atmosphere in which to learn and develop. It has achieved this through the commitment of a dedicated and competent staff that strives to motivate the students and interact closely with them. Moreover, the students' parents have always been integral members of the school community, playing an active role in the school's daily operation and acting as a supportive body.

In the difficult task of educating our youth, the Joseph Rodman Drake School has succeeded in furnishing students with the basic educational tools necessary to confront the challenges life sets before them and set out on the path to achieving their goals. Throughout its many years of existence, P.S. 48 has been a great source of pride and joy to its community.

Today, on behalf of the people of the south Bronx, I would like to salute the Joseph Rodman Drake School and express my deep appreciation for the invaluable educational service it has provided us all for the past 75 years.

TRIBUTE TO JUDGE LEONARD P. EDWARDS

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, there is no issue that we face today more important than those issues involving the education and the welfare of our children. There is not a Member of Congress who, regardless of party, regardless of philosophy, who does not recognize that one of our main objectives—the definition of the American dream—is to pass on a better country to our children.

Mr. Speaker, our children's welfare is the future of our country. Our children's welfare concerns us not only because we are legislators, but because we are parents, grandparents, or because as adults we are charged with caring for our children.

That is why I am particularly proud that Judge Leonard P. Edwards, the presiding judge of Santa Clara County, CA, has been named the Juvenile Court Judge of the Year by the National Court Appointed Special Advocates Association.

In Santa Clara County, Judge Edwards is well known not only as an outstanding jurist, but as one of the leading experts in how our society treats its children. And while Judge Edwards has the keen mind of the expert, he also possesses the heart of a compassionate advocate for our children.

Mr. Speaker, too often the systems that we set up to address the problems of society are imperfect. Too often, the systems permit children to be neglected, abused, or simply forgotten. Too often the system itself moves too slowly to correct the wrongs suffered by our children.

Mr. Speaker, Judge Edwards is a public servant who has shown that there are those individuals in the system who not only can make a difference, but who have made such a difference in helping children that the national organization that does this every day has called him the strongest voice for children in California's judiciary.

Mr. Speaker, today more than ever we are learning that much of the pain and suffering in our society today can be prevented if we spend time on people when they are young. Judge Edwards has worked hard to reunite families, preserve the family structure, stop family violence, prevent juvenile delinquency, and increase adoptions.

Judge Edwards is a worthy recipient of this important national award. He is also well deserving of the thanks of his community and

our Nation. I am proud to bring the announcement of this award as well as his work to the attention of the Congress.

He should be proud of his work. I know his community and his family, particularly his father, our colleague, Congressman DON EDWARDS are extremely proud of him. And I know, Mr. Speaker, that you and the rest of the House of Representatives join with me and our colleague, Mr. EDWARDS, in offering our congratulations and gratitude to Judge Edwards.

JIM CLAYTON SALUTED

HON. DON SUNDQUIST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. SUNDQUIST. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to salute the achievement of a man who has worked his way from humble circumstances to become America's largest retailer of manufactured homes. Jim Clayton, chairman, CEO and president of Clayton Homes in Knoxville, was honored last year by the Horatio Alger Foundation. The story of his rise from boyhood in Finger, TN to his current position is exactly the sort of American success story one associates with Horatio Alger.

But Jim Clayton has never forgotten his roots, as evidenced by his decision this year to endow a $5,000 scholarship at Chester County High School. As a result, a young man by the name of Chad Smith has the opportunity to attend college this fall.

It seems to me that Jim Clayton's example of hard work, perseverance, and civic mindedness are much to be admired. And I ask that the following profile of him, which appeared in the University of Tennessee alumni magazine, be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the University of Tennessee Alumni Magazine]

HOME, SWEET MANUFACTURED HOME

(By Diane Ballard)

Famous Amos the cookie man was there, along with flyboy Chuck Yeager, Stan "the Man" Musial, and Joint Chiefs chairman Colin Powell. And so was housing exec Jim Clayton from Knoxville, whose entrepreneurial exploits had won him the Distinguished American award of the Horatio Alger Association.

Soft lights shimmered off natty tuxedos and bejeweled gowns. The Marine Band played as 1,250 people, among them governors, members of Congress, and business tycoons, packed the Wasington, D.C., hotel ballroom anticipating the evening's main event, the presentation of 1991's ten distinguished Americans.

Each honoree, including Clayton, Powell, Musial, and McDonald's exec Fred Turner, flared larger than life on giant video screens, then made short speeches in person.

In his video, Clayton told of his dream, when he was very young and very poor in West Tennessee, of growing up to be on the Grand Ole Opry.

But, he admitted when he rose to speak, this stage was just as nice. Instead of the Opry, he chose education (two UT degrees) and a life running the entrepreneurial rapids. So what if he went under once? The ride has been well worth the dunking.

His name may not be in lights, but it's on the New York Stock Exchange.

Clayton (Knoxville '57, '64) is chairman, CEO, and president of Clayton Homes in Knoxville, the largest retailer of manufactured homes in the nation. "Manufactured" is '90s talk for what used to be mobile homes, and before that even, trailers. But selling is just part of the Clayton enterprise. The company also builds the units, finances them, and provides "communities" in which to locate them. Vertical integration, it's called; Clayton's has a handhold on every rung of the manufactured housing ladder.

Clayton stock was one of the 10 best performers on the NYSE in 1990. Revenues soared to more than $300 million last year, just as Clayton himself soars through the airways taking care of business.

"If we get a letter threatening any kind of legal action, I jump in a helicopter or on one of our planes and go knocking on the customer's door. That sends the right signals to our people that we all must be responsive."

If Clayton came knocking on your door, you would see a smallish guy, balding, with a luxuriant gray beard and (could it be any other kind) aviator glasses. He's softspoken, insatiably curious, and not in the least ashamed of his humble beginnings.

"I think we're all proud of what we build and accomplish. You have to look back and see what you started with."

In Clayton's case, it was precious little. He grew up in Finger, Tennessee, in a cabin that didn't have electricity until he was 10 or plumbing until after he left home. His first stop after leaving Finger was Memphis, where he says he "stumbled" into Memphis State University's pre-engineering program. Then it was on to Knoxville, where he worked his way to an engineering degree.

He only practiced engineering for a few months with the Tennessee Valley Authority.

"I wanted to design small, intricate electronic stuff. They had me designing conduit. It was boring."

Plus, Clayton was already involved in his first entrepreneurial venture, a used car lot.

"I became more and more involved in the automobile business. I liked selling cars. Like all those sales books say, the biggest high is making a sale. I loved the competitiveness."

But that maiden voyage into business ended in bankruptcy. Undaunted, Clayton started over and pursued a UT law degree on the side. Shortly after he got the degree, he started his first mobile home lot. Within two years, it was the largest in the world. He never practiced law, but he couldn't have gotten where he is today without his UT experience, he says.

The degrees "opened doors and increased networking ability and self-esteem." And his fraternity, Sigma Phi Epsilon, gave him friends and connections he still enjoys.

"Being able to network with people in the fraternity, in engineering, and in law has really been beneficial. Being able to call someone in a distant city and talk a little about the Vols, the Hill, Ayres Hall, Sigma Phi Epsilon, and the Smoky Mountain Market has been meaningful so many times throughout my career," he says. "The University is very dear to me."

The engineering and law degrees helped in Clayton's day-to-day business, too.

"I've designed a lot of mobile homes. And we pay out a fraction of the legal costs that other firms pay. Until about a month ago, I was in-house counsel."

He worries that his four children won't have the same desire to succeed that he has.

"Maybe I was lucky. I didn't think so; I would not want to do it again. But my children are so smart, and they've been exposed to so much. Where do they go from there?

"They have good values and a basic kind of lifestyle, though. They're great citizens."

Clayton Homes is a solid corporate citizen, supporting education, Junior Achievement, United Way, and other agencies.

Clayton says he didn't have much extra cash to give away for a lot of years.

"A business takes more capital than you ever have. I had to put every penny back in the business until 1983, when I took the company public.

"People are amazed that we grew the business on its own capital—didn't bring in any venture capital. When I took it public, I owned 100 percent. I own about one-third now."

Clayton describes his lifestyle as conservative (he claims to enjoy bargain hunting at a Knoxville wholesale house), except when it comes to airplanes.

Clayton Homes owns four airplanes and a helicopter, and Clayton himself owns a jet. He's an instrument-rated jet pilot and also holds a pilot license for helicopters and gliders.

"Sometimes I'll jump in the jet and fly to New York to do the museums or plays," he says, but quickly adds that the Clayton Homes fleet is efficiently and economically used.

His inherent curiosity inspires him to always be doing and learning.

"I play tennis. I run. I listen to bluegrass music one day and Chopin the next. I've taken dance classes and wine classes. I skied the Rockies five times last year." He enjoys learning more about art and music. On a recent trip to Europe, he visited Mozart's home and wanted to be able to stay longer and learn more. He made the largest single gift ever to the arts in Tennessee—$3.25 million to Knoxville's art museum.

But, when all is said and done, the business is his first love.

"My primary interest always has been work. It's fun. It's a privilege to build a business with good people, to be involved in engineering an environment where you see such incredible growth.

"Entrepreneurship is risky business. My timing hasn't always been good. Things haven't always happened the way I would have planned them. But I don't question God a lot. His way works out best."

TRIBUTE TO LT. DAVE DEVRIES

HON. DAVE CAMP

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to recognize an outstanding individual from mid Michigan, Lt. Dave DeVries. Dave is retiring from his position as team commander of the Michigan State Police Department in Gladwin, MI, where he has contributed numerous years of outstanding service.

Dave started his career in the Michigan Department of State Police in 1968. Throughout his career he has worked in a variety of locations which include Lansing, Ionia, Gladwin, Erie, Newberry, and Gladwin again, where he worked his way up from trooper to sergeant and finally to team commander.

Prior to his position within the Michigan State Police, Lieutenant DeVries served in the Navy for 3 years. He was stationed in the Mekong Delta area with the Navy Riverine patrols during the Vietnam war and earned several citations and awards from the Department of Defense. After his discharge he worked for the Michigan Bell Telephone Co. in Grand Rapids before joining the State Police.

Dave is an active member of several distinguished organizations including the Gladwin Lions Club, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, American Legion, Gladwin Care Committee, Gladwin Eagles Club, Gladwin 911 Steering Committee and the 911 board. Plus, he served as the chairman of the Gladwin area "Walk for Warmth," which raised funds for fuel expenses for needy families.

His unselfish commitment to the safety of his community and the citizens of Michigan is beyond the ordinary. He has been recognized by numerous organizations for his hard work and dedication. Among the awards he has received include the Meritorious Award, the Honorable Mention Award, the Professional Excellence Award and an award from the Michigan Blockade Committee for apprehending two armed felons wanted for an armed robbery.

Lieutenant DeVries family resides in Gladwin, MI. His wife, Nanette, is employed at the Gladwin Intermediate School system and also works part time at the Mid Michigan Regional Hospital in Gladwin. They have three sons, the eldest, John, served with the 1st Calvary Division in Iraq during Operation Desert Storm and is currently attending Central Michigan University. The second eldest son, Michael, has recently graduated from Navy Basic Training Command in Great Lakes, IL, and is enrolled in school for aircraft repair and maintenance. Their youngest son, Brad, is presently a junior in the Gladwin High School system.

Mr. Speaker, Lt. Dave DeVries is truly a remarkable individual. I know that you will join with me, his family, coworkers and the community of Gladwin in commending and thanking Dave for his service to mid Michigan over the past 24 years. I know he will be sorely missed by all those who worked with him.

GULLIVER PREP SCHOOL: SOFTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the Gulliver Preparatory School and its outstanding softball team which this year was able to make the transition from slow pitch to fast pitch softball and still increase its string of district softball titles to five in a row. This team, which had grown comfortable in its ability to win championships in slow pitch softball, overcame reluctance to move to a sport with different rules, a faster pace, and a need for new skills and techniques.

Five of the team members spent last summer playing for an independent fast pitch softball team, to learn the game, and communicate their skills to their teammates. These dedicated players were Tiffany Smith, Kerry Vilela, Lisa Markowitz, Dani Polley, and Jennifer Ingham. Coach Mark Schusterman is especially grateful for the sacrifice of the seniors of the team, Suzanne Parker and Chrissy Ford, who gave up their comfortable enjoyment and risked their winning streak to take on a new challenge.

The Miami Herald published an article describing the Gulliver team's remarkable transition which I would like to include in the RECORD:

PITCH SWITCH: GULLIVER GETS IN THE SWING AND WINS THE DISTRICT TITLE

(By Todd Hartman)

Mark Schusterman remembers the struggle of making the switch from slow-pitch to fast-pitch softball at Gulliver Prep.

He's the coach, and he watched painfully as his pitchers threw everywhere but over the plate: "We were playing teams who had nine runs before swinging the bat," he said.

Not all the players were sold on it, either. Juniors and seniors who had spent two or three seasons racking up district titles saw their softball careers pass before their eyes. Visions of light-speed pitches and ensuing strikeouts brought nightmares. Said senior Suzanne Parker: "It was a really big change. I couldn't hit. Everything was going wrong."

That was late February; since then, opinions have changed. Last Thursday, Gulliver capped its inaugural season of fast-pitch softball with a surprising 7-6 win against Our Lady of Lourdes in the District 8-3A championship game. With the victory, Gulliver increased its string of district softball titles to five in a row and earned a spot in Friday's Region 4-3A title game against Naples High.

"It has not been as tough as I thought it would be," said Schusterman, who is still pretty surprised. He joked that his pitchers were so wild that, at some points, "our kids were more scared of our pitchers than they were of the opponent's."

What surprised Schusterman, his players and opposing coaches the most is how quickly Gulliver players learned to hit fast pitches.

"Some players see the pitches and say, 'Oh my God,'" said junior Tiffany Smith. "But it's easy to hit fast pitches. You just swing your bat. If you hit, you hit it."

Schusterman hands a lot of credit to five players—Smith, Kerry Vilela, Lisa Markowitz, Dani Polley and Jennifer Ingham. All spent last summer playing for the South Dade Mustangs, an independent fast pitch team that plays games statewide.

"That really helped," he said. "They gave us a nucleus."

But much of Schusterman's gratitude is reserved for a handful of seniors who gave up the security and skill they had developed playing slow pitch. Two of those were Parker and Chrissy Ford, both of whom say they had heavy doubts going into the season.

"I was kind of disappointed. It was going to be my last year, and I wanted to keep things the same," Ford said. "We were winning titles, but it wasn't only that. We didn't know if it would be as fun."

Even Smith, one of the fast-pitch veterans, had her doubts. "I didn't think we could pull it off," she said. "Our first couple of games, no one left base [players weren't familiar with base-running rules]. No one knew what they were doing."

Added Parker. "We'd have games where our pitchers walked people around the bases 10 runs at a time."

Now players are thrilled, especially after beating out long-time private school softball powers St. Brendan and Lourdes for the district title. And as for the pitching, Polley and Ingham—both sophomores—are beginning to settle into the position.

"I was definitely surprised," said Ford. "Now that we've learned everything it wasn't as bad as we thought."

Added Smith: "I didn't believe we could do it, but we did."

Mr. Speaker, I commend the dedication, flexibility, and endurance of the Gulliver School team, and congratulate them on their hard-earned victory.

A CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO GTE CALIFORNIA AND ROBIN L. KOONS

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to GTE California and one of its dedicated employees, Ms. Robin L. Koons. On Thursday, May 28, 1992, the United Cambodian Community, Inc. will host a dinner to honor GTE California and Ms. Robin Koons with the Community Service Award. It is with great pleasure that I bring them to your attention.

Robin L. Koons is typical of the type of employee GTE recruits. Joining the company in 1969, Robin began her career as a cashier with the Long Beach district office. Named special services superintendent in 1983, San Gabriel Valley district manager/community relations in 1987, and Long Beach Division public affairs manager in 1989, Robin has advanced through the ranks of management positions with the company.

With her current assignment, Robin is responsible for all company related activities with respect to the Long Beach, Lakewood, Signal Hill, Cerritos, Artesia, and Hawaiian Gardens communities. Ms. Koons serves on the Chamber of Commerce board of directors for the cities of Lakewood and Signal Hill, and the board of directors and the executive council for the Long Beach area chamber. In addition, Robin serves on the board of directors for Cities in Schools, Community Family Guidance Center, American Red Cross, and United Cambodian Community Center. She is a board member and secretary for the National Conference of Christians and Jews and the Long Beach PhoneFriend.

Robin's dedication to her community is further enhanced by her involvement as a member of the Downtown Lion's Club, the SCAN Board of Governors, and as a trustee for the St. Mary's Medical Center. She is the cochairperson of the Explorer Council for the Boy Scouts of America, Long Beach and on the board of directors with the Conservation Corp of Long Beach. Her volunteer credentials is as long as it is impressive. In 1986, Robin was a loaned executive for the United Way of Orange County and the 1988 Campaign vice-chair for the Southeast Area of San Gabriel Valley.

It is because of these and the many other accomplishments Robin L. Koons has

achieved that I take great pride in joining with all those attending this special occasion in expressing the gratitude she so richly deserves.

My wife, Lee, joins me in extending this congressional salute to Ms. Koons and GTE California. We wish Robin, her son Eric, and daughter-in-law, Sydney and GTE California all the best in the years to come.

THE AFRICAN-AMERICAN LESBIAN AND GAY COMMUNITY CELEBRATES BLACK GAY PRIDE DAY

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 24, the African-American lesbian and gay community celebrated Black Gay Pride Day in Washington, DC, culminating a month-long series of fundraising entertainment and religious events that both celebrate gay pride and raise desperately needed funds for AIDS services in the African-American community. With a theme of "Pride in ourselves and our ability to accomplish what we want and need for ourselves," the celebration started with the dream of three Washingtonians, Dr. Ernest Hopkins, Mr. Theodore Kirkland, and Dr. Welmore Alfred Cook, whom many have called the father of Washington's African-American gay community.

This year's Black Lesbian and Gay Pride Day is a tribute to Welmore Cook, a person of great conviction with a dream of raising significant sums of money for African-Americans living with HIV/AIDs. Welmore Cook died of AIDS on April 22, but not before acting on his dream of increasing funds for community-based African-American AIDS service organizations and instilling a new sense of dignity in the African-American gay community.

For much of my adult life, I have been in the battle to secure and maintain fundamental rights for gays and lesbians as part of my efforts to foster civil rights that should be guaranteed to all Americans. We can all learn lessons from the African-American gay and lesbian community of Washington, which, while bearing the burden of double discrimination, can celebrate their individuality within their own community and the diversity of all Americans.

The AIDS virus is spreading among African-Americans in Washington at a rate far higher than in other communities. The sense of responsibility the participants in Black Lesbian and Gay Pride Day bring to persons who are struggling with AIDS is an example for us all to emulate.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in congratulating the organizers of this important celebration and in commending the African-American gay and lesbian community of the District of Columbia for their vital leadership on eradicating AIDS and eliminating discrimination.

SOUTHWEST HIGH STUDENTS FIGHT AIDS WITH ENGLISH CLASS PROJECT

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to a crusade against AIDS which is being conducted by four students at Southwest High School in Miami, my alma mater. Silvia Alvarez, Michelle Fonte, Robert Lopez, and Melissa Lopez began their project as a junior year English project. The assignment from their teacher, Susan Black, was a group project to write on a topic that illustrated a positive or negative aspect of the American dream. It was intended to be a research and critical thinking project.

The four students began by electing to research sexual attitudes among their classmates. They conducted a survey of 169 students on subjects including how sexually active they were to whether they used contraceptives. The results surprised the four students, and changed a project designed largely for entertainment value into a deadly serious crusade.

They discovered that many of their fellow students were sexually active, that they were not taking precautions against pregnancy or disease, and that they did not know as much as they needed to know about how easy it is to transmit AIDS. Learning this, they decided not only that action was needed, but that they would take the responsibility to help their fellow students.

To learn more about the subject, Robert, Silvia, Michelle, and Melissa obtained a video camera and interviewed a doctor, an AIDS patient, and some of their classmates, and recorded a session with the doctor in which Robert was given an AIDS test. They conducted an AIDS awareness session with 100 other students. All of this information is being assembled for their class report, but they have said that once the report is given, they will continue to work for more AIDS education in the classroom.

The Miami Herald published an article on the Southwest High School crusade which I would like to include in the RECORD:

CLASS PROJECT EVOLVES INTO ANTI-AIDS CRUSADE

(By Jon O'Neill)

Four students at Southwest have turned a half-hearted project on sexual attitudes into a serious crusade against AIDS.

The juniors, Robert Lopez, Silvia Alvarez, and Michelle Fonte, all 17; and Melissa Lopez, 18, have had an AIDS awareness meeting with 100 other students, surveyed another group of students, interviewed an AIDS patient and a doctor. They've viodetaped all the sessions, including one where Robert got an AIDS test.

"The problem is a lot of people don't know enough about it," Robert said. "We believe that when it comes to AIDS, you can never know too much."

The group plans to pass out condoms to classmates when they give their report next month, and all want to continue educating people—especially students—about the disease.

"Kids are having sex, that's fact," Michelle said. "And people are dying because of ignorance. We want to change that."

The crusade sprang from an English assignment in April. Teacher Susan Black divided the class into groups and had them pick a topic that illustrated a positive or negative aspect of "the American Dream."

"It's a critical thinking and research project," Black said. "They really got fired up over this. It's done a lot for them. It's interesting because it started off as kind of a silly thing, but it hasn't turned out that way."

The project started with a survey of 169 kids on questions ranging from how sexually active they are to how many used contraceptives. The results surprised the teenagers and moved them to action.

"We had to educate ourselves first," Robert said. "There were a lot of things we didn't know."

The students interviewed a local doctor and an AIDS patient, who told them what it was like to have the disease and how easy it was to get it.

"It only takes one night of carelessness," Siliva said. "People need to understand the chances they are taking."

"A lot of people think they know enough already, but they don't," Melissa said.

Friday, the group randomly selected 100 students for a discussion on AIDS in the school cafeteria.

"It was amazing how naive people were," said Michelle. "A lot of them were sure you couldn't get AIDS from oral sex."

The students also asked their peers about condoms.

"A lot of kids think there should be a way to get condoms in school," Melissa said. "We believe that, but we think there needs to be education, too."

The four say they will continue to work for more AIDS education in the classroom.

Teacher Black said: "I'm proud of them. They're setting an example. They made AIDS a comfortable subject to talk about in the classroom."

Mr. Speaker, I commend the work of Melissa Lopez, Michelle Fonte, Silvia Alvarez, and Robert Lopez of Southwest High School. As Melissa Lopez told the Miami Herald, "Kids are having sex, that's a fact. And people are dying because of ignorance. We want to change that."

Mr. Speaker, we in this Chamber have a duty to help them change it.

THE AIRCRAFT NOISE RESEARCH AND ABATEMENT ACT OF 1992

HON. MATTHEW J. RINALDO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Aircraft Noise Research and Abatement Act of 1992, a bill to enhance Federal research efforts to develop quieter jet aircraft engines and airframes.

Noise generated by jet aircraft represents a significant and steadily growing environmental problem in the United States. Millions of Americans living near airports across the country are subjected to a daily barrage of jet thunder, with little prospect for relief in the future.

Nowhere is the problem more severe than that in the State of New Jersey. Thousands of

New Jersey residents are subjected to a daily barrage of jet thunder as a result of the ill-conceived expanded east coast plan, which was implemented by the FAA in 1987. What is equally frustrating is the lack of effective action on the part of Federal agencies like the Federal Aviation Administration to protect residential areas from the excessive noise generated by jet aircraft.

The people of New Jersey deserve immediate relief from the noise, and I remain hopeful that the environmental impact study currently being conducted in the State will finally leverage changes to the aircraft routing structure over New York and New Jersey to vector aircraft away from residential neighborhoods.

The near-term objective of bringing about noise relief through route changes is extremely important. However, I also believe that we must begin to take a long-term view of the problem of aircraft noise, both in New Jersey and across the country. The density of the population in New Jersey and growing frequency of the air traffic overhead virtually assures that aircraft noise will continue to be a fact of life for years to come.

What is needed is a concerted effort to control noise at the source. Congress adopted this approach in part through passage of legislation in 1990 to phase out the operation of older, noisy, Stage II jet aircraft by the end of the decade. However, it is generally recognized that this is a very limited solution to the problem, and that any noise relief that is achieved will be temporary as the air transport industry continues to expand in the future to meet the growing demand for air travel.

The projected growth in air traffic through the year 2000 and beyond virtually assures a corresponding growth in the problem of aircraft noise. To solve this problem, we need to implement an aggressive, long-term research agenda to develop technologies that will permit passenger aircraft to operate at noise levels significantly below what is currently attainable.

It is for this reason that I am introducing the Aircraft Noise Research and Abatement Act of 1992. This legislation directs the Administrator of the FAA and the Administrator of NASA to jointly conduct and manage a research effort to develop new technologies for quieter jet aircraft engines and airframes. The goal of the program is to develop jet aircraft technology—ready for industry application by the year 2000—that will operate at four to six decibels below current stage III aircraft noise levels. To support this research initiative, the bill authorizes $25 million for fiscal year 1993, and such sums as necessary thereafter.

This legislation will not end the aircraft noise problem overnight. What it will do is greatly enhance the Federal commitment to aircraft noise abatement by creating a sustained and coordinated research program to expedite the availability of quieter aircraft for the future. I urge my colleagues to give this important legislation prompt and favorable consideration.

INTRODUCTION OF THE JOB TRAINING 2000 ACT

HON. STEVE GUNDERSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join today with my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] and with our honorable minority leader, Mr. MICHEL, in introducing the Job Training 2000 Act. This legislation, developed through the leadership of President Bush, has the goal of reforming our Federal job training system to meet the needs of the Nation's work force into the 21st century.

The bill that we are introducing today is similar to the Job Training 2000 Act submitted to the Congress by the President in April, with one important exception. The original proposal would have transferred postsecondary vocational education funds to private industry councils, established under the Job Training Partnership Act, to be used to provide vocational training vouchers to the economically disadvantaged. Currently, these funds, which total $396 million, are used to assist postsecondary institutions develop and improve their vocational education courses.

Mr. Speaker, this proposal to redirect vocational training funds, while well-intentioned, was one that I opposed, and has generated a great deal of controversy, diverting attention from what we believe is an excellent proposal deserving the full and immediate attention of the Congress. It is important that there be serious discussion of the four key principles underlying the Job Training 2000 Act, and it should not be weighted down by the more controversial vocational education voucher provisions. Therefore, after discussions with officials within the administration, it was agreed that in the interest of moving this important legislation forward, these controversial provisions should be eliminated from the bill. Accordingly, the legislation we are introducing today retains the current use of postsecondary vocational education funds. However, participants in programs that receive Perkins Act postsecondary funds must be referred to skill centers, and the programs of study must be certified by the State certifying agency, as provided for under the legislation.

As outlined in my remarks for the original introduction of the Job Training 2000 Act in April, the four key underlying principles of "Job Training 2000" have been retained in this bill. First, the proposal is designed to simplify and coordinate services for individuals seeking vocational training or information relating to such training. Second, it would decentralize decisionmaking and create a flexible service delivery structure for public programs that reflects local labor market conditions. Third, it would ensure high standards of quality and accountability for federally funded vocational training programs. And fourth, it would encourage greater and more effective private sector involvement in the development and implementation of vocational training programs.

Under our current Federal vocational and job training system in the United States, we have 60 training programs receiving Federal support, administered by seven different Federal agencies, at a cost of $18 billion per year. Under this system, services are disjointed and duplicative in many instances. Local providers are often unable to provide individuals in need of services with sufficient access to information on program quality, job opportunities, or even the range of services available. Eligible populations overlap, and businesses, the ultimate consumers of education and employment training programs, have only limited involvement with the system. Therefore, the ultimate goal of this legislation, that of providing a more comprehensive, coordinated, accountable, and easily utilized system, is a good and necessary one.

At the heart of Job Training 2000, is the establishment of a network of local skill centers to provide one-stop shopping or single point of entry for individuals in need of vocational and job training services. These centers would provide students, job seekers, workers and employers with needed information about the local labor market, training and vocational education programs, and related support services. Under the proposal, skill centers would coordinate local delivery of vocational and job training services currently provided through a range of programs including the Job Training Partnership Act [JTPA], Job Corps, the Employment Service, Veterans' Employment Service, Perkins postsecondary vocational education and training programs, and Federal student financial aid provided for vocational training programs. Training vouchers for programs under the Job Training Partnership Act would be provided to allow for more participant choice in training decisions. Private industry councils, which already coordinate JTPA programs at the local level, would play an expanded role under Job Training 2000, with the goal of ensuring that all vocational education and training providers meet high standards of quality as well as local labor market needs. The legislation also provides for increased coordination between the various vocational and job training programs at the Federal and State levels through the establishment of a Federal Vocational Training Council, and the establishment of State human resource investment councils in each State to oversee implementation of these programs.

I strongly support the core of the Job Training 2000 Act. I do however continue to have some concerns over specific provisions in the legislation, particularly those that deal with the certification of local vocational training programs. One of the issues that has yet to be resolved is the question on whether or not the current private industry council, as it is now established, can or even would want to have the added responsibility of being the local certifying body for all postsecondary vocational programs. My concerns can, and I am confident will, be worked out in the consideration of this bill however. And these concerns in no way erode my support for the general thrust of this measure. The eventual enactment of legislation that will ensure a comprehensive and cohesive employment and training delivery system for our Nation is imperative, particularly as we strive to meet the needs of the rapidly changing and increasingly complex workplace.

Again, I commend the President for his leadership in the area of work force prepared-

ness. I look forward to working with him, with the U.S. Departments of Labor and Education, and with my colleagues in the Congress as we consider this important legislation in the future.

THE NATION'S GREAT LOSS

HON. LAWRENCE J. SMITH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, like most south Floridians, I am terribly saddened by DANTE FASCELL's announcement that he will be retiring at the end of this term.

I knew DANTE FASCELL before I came to Congress. In fact, he is part of the reason I wanted to come to Washington. He has been both a mentor and a father figure to me and I look forward to continuing our friendship long after we leave Washington.

His sense of humor and pragmatic, common sense approach to politics will be sorely missed. For the last 38 years he has been an invaluable, well loved addition to the House of Representatives. In fact, I do not know one Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, senior or freshman, who does not like DANTE FASCELL. His friendships span his 38 years in Congress and will continue long after he returns home.

I would like to insert into the RECORD the following editorial from today's Miami Herald. I think its title, "The Nation's great loss" speaks volumes for my friend, Congressman DANTE FASCELL.

Dante Fascell retiring? Say it isn't so! But it is: Yesterday the veteran South Dade congressman announced in Washington that he won't seek a 20th term on Capitol Hill. Neither will he convert to his personal use, though legally he could, the $500,000 or so in his campaign treasury. That's fully consistent with his integrity, public and private.

Representative Fascell is a close second in seniority, but a clear first in esteem, among the members of Florida's congressional delegation. He has served with distinction as chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Never was his wisdom on better display than during 1990's congressional debate of America's role in the Persian Gulf. His reasoned support for deploying multinational forces against Saddam Hussein was pivotal to winning House approval of President Bush's policies.

Yet Mr. Fascell, 75, also knows full well that violence rarely resolves international disputes. Long before Iraq's invasion of Kuwait, for instance, he had built a solid record of support for negotiations to bring peace to the Mideast while ensuring Israel's security. He also played a key role in congressional efforts to end violence and injustice in Central America and to restore democracy and human rights in Cuba, Haiti, Nicaragua, El Salvador, and Chile.

Less visible but arguably as important was Mr. Fascell's work in concert with leading European parliamentarians on behalf of human rights behind the Iron Curtain. Their efforts to free dissidents and goad the Eastern bloc to honor the Helsinki accords may well have helped hasten tyranny's demise and the Cold War's end.

For Floridians, losing Dante Fascell—especially now—is a major blow to the state's dwindling influence on Capitol Hill. Florida's congressional delegation already had lost seniority and clout with the death in 1989 of Rules Committee Chairman Claude Pepper. This year's previous retirement announcements from Reps. William Lehman, Larry Smith, Craig James, and Andy Ireland—coupled with redistricting that pits other incumbents against each other—mean that Florida will have one of the least experienced delegations when Congress reconvenes next year. With its House delegation expanding to 23 members from 19, Florida already was guaranteed four freshmen. Now it will have at least nine and possibly several more.

Mr. Fascell says that the new district carved for him—a misshapen, elongated blob that stretches north from Key West through the Keys and South Dade to include much of West Broward—was not the determining factor in his decision.

If he says that it wasn't, then it wasn't. Among Mr. Fascell's endearing traits is one all too rare among elected officials: candor. He still has a way of cutting through baloney to get to the point. You can believe what he says.

You can also believe, however, that Mr. Fascell might leave some things unsaid in deference to his longtime colleagues and to an institution that he loves. Some retiring congressmen have spoken bitterly of their disillusionment with politics and of the "poisonous atmosphere" pervading Capitol Hill. Mr. Fascell said that it was simply time to go after nearly 38 years of service.

Even so, there's cause for concern over Mr. Fascell's departure. Granted, many term-limits advocates would argue that he had already stayed on too long. It ought to be worrisome, though, when able public servants no longer feel that serving in Congress is rewarding enough or enjoyable enough to make them want to stick around.

For the nation and for Florida, then, Mr. Fascell's retirement is a loss. Beyond that, though, the obvious erosion in public service's attractiveness to candidates of his stature is an even greater loss.

THE EARTH SUMMIT, THE ELDERLY, AND THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ON THE HUMAN AGING PROCESS

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, as the chairman of the House Select Committee on Aging, to address the agenda for the 1992 United Nations Conference on the Environment and Development. We are pleased the United States is playing a significant role in making this conference a success and we anticipate and encourage the President's participation to demonstrate this Nation's commitment to healing an ailing planet and implementing preventative measures for the health of the global community.

The reason I am standing before you today is because I want to bring your attention to what I believe is a tragic omission in the Earth Summit agenda. The elderly are not included as a major population. This is occurring in 1992, the year designated by the General Assembly of the United Nations as the 10th anniversary of the World Assembly on Aging, marking the adoption of the International Plan of Action on Aging. It is also a period when the demographics of the elderly population is expected to shift, more that doubling by the year 2030, with alarming increases anticipated in developing countries.

I believe the United States should provide the leadership in ensuring the elderly are included. We have reached a critical juncture where we must engage in international dialogue about the long-term consequences of planetary and atmospheric destruction and the associated human, financial, and environmental costs. It is clear the effects of the depleting ozone layer, increased air and noise pollution, hazardous and toxic waste dump sites, pesticides, and workplace chemicals contribute to environmental stress and accelerate the aging process.

We must also recognize the harmful effects of environmental pollutants are not limited to the elderly population. Children, women, and minorities are also victims, Unfortunately, there is a paucity of data on the cumulative effects of exposure to pollutants, toxins, and other substances. Therefore, it is urgent to conduct more research in this area, capitalizing on the present movement focusing on health care reform, prevention, and the environment. We need to recognize the possible consequences of our continued assaults on the environment.

An international effort to curtail our present course of destruction should be made a priority, because every one of us is victim of our own destruction. The international legacy of health and the environment is of the utmost importance, and we must make an investment in research and prevention today. We can start by including the elderly and the human aging process in the Earth Summit agenda, and I have included a suggested amendment for the record.

I ask my colleagues today to join me in sending a strong message to the rest of the world. This issue is critical to the success of an international environmental movement. The United States should provide the leadership, involving all populations in an international health and environmental education and prevention program. Failing to take action and what seems to be a small step will be magnified when we are faced with the long-term costs of caring for the ill elderly and a sick planet.

PROPOSED ROYBAL/MORELLA AMENDMENT TO U.N. AGENDA 21 TO RECOGNIZE THE ROLE OF THE ELDERLY

INTRODUCTION

Regrettably, a major segment of the population is not included in this document, namely the elderly. Therefore, it is recommended the following chapter be added as Chapter 10 of Section 3. This document is based on the decision of the General Assembly resolution 40/30 of 1985 as well as on the UN Plan of Action on Aging and the Principles for Older Persons agreed upon at the General Assembly meeting at its 48th session in 1991.

PROGRAMME AREA

Recognizing, Strengthening and Incorporating the Role of the Elderly.

Basis for Action

The impact of the environment on human development and the aging process is a very

important area of research. Recently more attention is being focused on this field, especially with increased life expectancy and the corresponding growth in the international elderly population, rising health and long-term care costs, prevention and the need to respect and preserve the environment. Unfortunately, there is a paucity of data on the subject of the environment and the aging process. Studies are being conducted which use a longitudinal methodology and follow the progression of the age levels from infant to the elder years. Many, however, are in the initial stages and the data will not be available for many years.

The importance of this population is found in the wealth of information, history, energy, and experience accumulated through their collective lifetimes. Given the rapidly increasing elderly population, especially in the developing world it would be advantageous to tap into this enormous potential resource. Current projections show dramatic changes in international demographics. Over the next thirty-five years, the elderly population will increase both numerically, and as a percentage of the total population in developed countries throughout the world. By the year 2025 there will be more than one billion people over the age of 60 in the world. 70% of the elderly will be living in developing countries. By 2030 the elderly population is expected to more than double globally.

Given the size and potential force of this population, we cannot afford to ignore their needs. We must capitalize on the great human resource potential this population offers. The elderly offer a generation link for humanity. They are vested with the responsibility of passing on a legacy. They are the educators, providing cultural, traditional, and familial history on the elements of their culture. Their talents, experience and advice help guide us as we choose different challenges and journeys throughout life.

This growing population provides an enormous potential resource of experienced and talented people who can contribute expertise in every aspect of environment and development. It is an exceedingly diversified pool of men and women with skills in environmental management, public policy, conservation, technology, prevention and leadership at every level. Their knowledge, wisdom and prestige can be vital to educating, organizing, and mobilizing people and communities to assume leadership responsibility and to ensure that environmentally sustainable development is practiced.

Objectives

1. Identify and utilize the skills of the elderly population which can be used to support the government, private sector, and NGO policies and actions on development, environment, and health, at the local, national, and international levels.

2. Ensure each country supports, practices and enforces the United Nations Principles for Older Persons in pursuance of the International Plan of Action on Aging adopted by the World Assembly on Aging and endorsed by the General Assembly in its resolution of 37/51 of December 1982.

3. Establish a national "bank" of senior experts in each country.

4. Utilize the history, experience, and the wealth of information elderly persons have to offer in individual cultural, familial or other settings, but also as a collective international memory or library of information which can be disseminated, shared and implemented by other individuals or countries.

5. Launch a program or campaign promoting a service similar to the Senior Environment Corps in the United States, where the elderly use their expertise and time to participate in environmental programs.

6. Promote elderly involvement, especially for those retired or working part-time, on a volunteer basis as this will allow funds to be distributed to other essential programs, especially during fiscally conservative times.

Activities

1. Involve the elderly in the education process, especially with youth on assorted environmental and developmental activities where they can be "visiting experts" in classrooms and other educational institutions and at all levels of the education system.

2. Target rural areas for educational programs and generational linkage as described under Activity Number 1.

3. Utilize the knowledge and skills of the elderly, as experts in technology, management, accounting, agriculture, medicine, and other fields, on a paid or volunteer basis, both in developing and industrialized worlds.

4. Encourage the involvement and participation of the elderly population, on an individual and collective team basis.

5. Provide information and educational material which is culturally sensitive and language appropriate to community leaders who will share it with their communities in policy and decision making to develop environmental awareness and encourage a lifestyle reinforcing these values globally.

6. Establish an International Volunteer Corps for the Elderly, and possibly (a) using the United States Senior Corps as a model; and (b) and in cooperation with the UN Volunteer programme.

7. Develop materials for the elderly, appropriate to the cultural heritage and values of that particular population, and which addresses issues for the elderly as consumers and producers.

Means of Implementation

1. Strengthen the Aging Unit of the UN Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs which acts as a focal point for interagency cooperation in the United Nations and to facilitate cooperation among countries in sharing ideas, programs and activities.

2. Ensure countries have funds to develop a database of local elderly expertise and in cases where funds are not available, provide for special funding determined by the size, facilities, and human resources of the particular country.

3. Ensure funds are available at the national level to provide the personnel necessary to make appropriate placements of volunteers, or short term experts as well as manage any necessary support services.

4. Ensure funds are available at the international level to finance international travel, information exchanges, technology maintenance, education, administration, volunteers, etc.

MARY MOSES: MIAMI DEVON AIRE ELEMENTARY'S SUPER TEACHER

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize Mary Moses, who recently was featured in the Miami Herald as one of Dade County's super teachers. The article, "Teacher's Aides" by Jon O'Neill tells how the Devon Aire Elementary School teacher goes out of her way to make learning an interesting and amusing experience:

To the fourth-graders in Mary Moses' class, school makes sense—and it's also a lot of fun.

Moses teaches at Devon Aire Elementary and for her, the kids are like part of a large family. She goes out of her way to make them relax, usually by making them laugh, and the atmosphere in her classroom is one of enthusiasm and excitement.

"I want to give the kids confidence to meet any challenge," said Moses, 39, "That includes academically, socially and emotionally. Sometimes teachers can make kids uptight, so I want them to realize I'm on their side.

Most of the kids do.

"She's different," said Joel Zusman, 10. "She's fun and she's funny and she's never boring."

Jeanine Brimo, 10, agrees.

"She helps us understand all of our work," she said, "I feel very lucky to have her."

Moses relates well to the kids because she thinks of herself as one. She is just as easily bored and distracted as they can be, so she works hard on keeping herself interested. She knows that if she's into the work, the kids will be too.

Monday, she gave a math lesson by setting up "Mrs. Moses' store" using items brought from home. The kids were given a pretend bank account, then they had to shop at the store and figure out how much they spent and how much they were owed.

Moses made up some play money for the kids to use. There was lots of laughter—and learning.

Once this year, when the class was studying fractions, Moses dressed up as a pizza maker and drew pizzas on the chalkboard. The class learned how to divvy them up, and also learned their fractions. She's also big on rewards, the most popular being the homework busters, which allow kids who have performed well to skip one homework assignment.

Moses tries to treat each student as an individual, but with 32 of them in her class, it's not always easy. At the start of the year, students make a "Me" box, a shoe box filled with things that interest them. Moses also has at least one meeting with every parent.

"My job is to give everyone a chance to shine," Moses said. "I need to know what makes each child learn and what their strengths are."

Curtis Taylor, assistant principal of the school at 10501 SW 122nd Ave., calls Moses "a terrific teacher."

"She brings out the potential in each child," he said. "And she never lets them forget that they come first."

Moses, a Miami native, graduated from Coral Gables High, has a bachelor's degree from Stetson University and a master's degree from the University of Miami. And she is devoted to the UM Hurricanes football team.

Moses started working as a kindergarten teacher at Sunset Elementary in 1974, and came to Devon Aire when it opened in 1979. She has taught fourth grade for 10 years.

"I love it," she said. "I like working with this age group, because they're independent. Plus they get most of my jokes."

I am happy to pay tribute to Ms. Moses by reprinting this article. Ms. Moses' success at motivating her students is an inspiration to those who are working for quality education.

FAIRNESS FOR AMERICAN VETERANS

HON. PETER H. KOSTMAYER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, following the Vietnam war, American soldiers returned to their country. Instead of the national outpouring of affection and thanks that soldiers from previous wars experienced, these men and women faced indifference in the best circumstances and outright hatred in others.

Even the Government who sent them to fight seemed to turn its back on the new veterans. The hospitals that injured soldiers went to were often inadequate, dirty, and poorly staffed. Those who were exposed to harmful chemicals by our own military were denied proper care and compensation.

In many ways, the recent war in the Middle East gave America the chance to change course. We agreed we would not take our policy differences out on those men and women who sacrificed their lives, left their families, and went to Saudi Arabia to answer their country's call.

Unfortunately, we have a long way to go. Our veterans hospitals are still inadequate. The U.S. Government still denies veterans the most basic of services, a bedside telephone. For a patient in one of these facilities to make a phone call, he or she must use a public phone in the hallway. For many this is simply an inconvenience, but for bedridden patients this situation effectively cuts them off from friends and family who cannot visit the hospital.

Today, I, along with my colleague Representative BLACKWELL, am introducing legislation to require the Veterans' Administration to begin putting telephones at the bedsides of patients in two of its facilities which currently have the capacity for bedside phones. Is access to a telephone too much to ask for those who have served this country in combat?

These individuals need and deserve the best possible care and the most comfortable surroundings while they recover and heal. The Congress should act now to ensure that patients in veterans hospitals are given the same conveniences that are given to patients in hospitals all over the country.

I urge all my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this important legislation to bring fairness to veterans in America.

A RIVER OF BLOOD

HON. WAYNE OWENS

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. OWENS of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the devastation in a Sarajevo marketplace yesterday was horrifying. Television newscasters had to warn their viewers that the videotape about to be aired of the scene was extremely graphic. As one journalist noted in the Washington Post, "The Street Was a River of Blood."

For my colleagues who did not see the reports, artillery shells fired by Serbian batteries tore into a crowded marketplace killing at least 20 civilians and wounding over 100.

Tragically, yesterday's carnage was just another day of Serbian brutality in the besieged town of Sarajevo, in Croatia, Slovenia or Kosovo. Only this time it was captured on film and broadcast to the world.

For the first time, the terrible war in the newly independent former Yugoslav Republics was seen in America's living rooms. For the first time, Serbian military doctrine, in all its ferocity and savagery, was witnessed by millions.

In recent days the European Community and the United States have moved toward imposing sanctions on Serbia. This is a welcome, if belated move. We must hit Serbia where it will hurt—freeze its assets, embargo its oil, deny it the international legitimacy it seeks—while protecting the civilian targets of Serbian aggression. In addition, I strongly urge the President to push for a war crimes trial against Serbia's dictator Slobodan Milosevic.

Mr. Speaker, the innocent people cannot afford to wait.

[From the New York Times, May 21, 1992]

PUNISH THE SERBS

(By William Safire)

WASHINGTON.—In the face of Serbia's bloody invasion of its neighbors, President Bush has ducked under his desk in a way that recalls Benjamin Harrison's 1888 doctrine: "We Americans have no commission from God to police the world."

Excuses for inaction range from "it's Europe's problem" to "our vital interests are not involved" to "those historic hatreds run so deep, there's nothing anybody can do."

The unspoken excuse is that in an election year, no American politician wants to commit American forces to what may be a quagmire. Yet the lack of any threat of harsh consequences encourages the aggression.

What would the other candidates do to stop the killing if they were President right now? I phoned that question to Ross Perot's spokesman and was faxed this prompt, if Carteresque, response: "I would be actively working with the United Nations in an effort to restore peace to the area." Can't get in trouble with a platitude.

Bill Clinton, after criticizing Bush "indifference," responded: "The United States and the international community must adopt immediately the kinds of tough sanctions that will make the Milosevic regime pay a heavy price for continuing its aggression, such as freezing assets, an oil embargo, and suspension or expulsion from appropriate international organizations."

That's at least a policy that offers change. Opinion makers as far apart as Anthony Lewis and Jeane Kirkpatrick agree that if collective security is to have meaning, the President of the United States must do more during mass slaughter than send Margaret Tutwiler out to wring her hands and play Benjamin Harrison.

Last year we saw how televised pictures of atrocities turned around a callous, let-it-happen policy in Iraq. After the public outcry, Mr. Bush put a protective air cap over much of Iraqi Kurdistan; as a result, this week, for the first time in a thousand years, Kurds are voting in a free, democratic election.

A Bosnia-Herzegovinan official—this year's Haile Selassie—says that if the world intervened to escort relief to starving, persecuted Kurds, why not Bosnians? "We are real people, too."

Did America set a precedent by protecting the Kurds? Or was that a special case, where our interests were at stake, where we had a moral responsibility because we had called for the anti-Saddam uprising, and where the American public supported our intervention?

Answer: both. The extent of our participation will depend on previous commitment, vital national interest and sphere of influence. But wherever in the world brutality is inflicted on millions of people, America's place is in the vanguard of marshaling civilization's response.

The Serbs have earned a reputation for ferocity. They are now represented by—and not oppressed by—their own dictator, Slobodan Milosevic. They are seizing territory they believe was stolen from them. If this causes death and desolation, they say, so be it—Serbs have suffered in the past, too.

Sorry, but the law of the jungle has been repealed. No longer should any people get away with barbarism in the name of vengeance.

How do we stop the killing? The international community—that's Germany, France, Britain, Russia and the U.S. under U.N. or regional auspices—must put an intolerable cost on continued aggression.

This does not mean Operation Balkan Storm; the Serbs, unlike the Iraqis, would fight forever. Nor would this mean namby-pamby sanctions like suspending airline landing rights.

It means, as Mr. Clinton suggests, embargoing Serbia's oil and freezing its assets. Beyond that, we should impinge on its long-sought sovereignty by seizing Serbian airspace, much as we have done in Kurdistan.

This would not immediately stop Serbian aggression, but it would be a painful and humiliating penalty. Peacemakers would have cards to play.

Harrisonism need not paralyze us. "Chronic wrongdoing," wrote Theodore Roosevelt, "or an impotence which results in a general loosening of the ties of civilized society, may . . . ultimately require intervention by some civilized nation."

Update that to "alliance of nations" and apply the responsibility to intervene to the Balkans today.

IN OBSERVANCE OF MEMORIAL DAY

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, across the Nation this past Monday, Americans of differing backgrounds and ideologies joined together to remember our fallen war heroes in observance of Memorial Day. Such observances have been an honored tradition of our Nation since the end of the Civil War.

Americans throughout the country gathered to pay their respect to all veterans. Those who journeyed to our National Cemetery in Arlington, VA, to observe the holiday could not help but be moved by the sight of the American flag gracing the grave site of each veteran buried there. It is most fitting that we take time to pause and remember those soldiers who gave the ultimate sacrifice in service to our country during wartime. These men and women made it possible for us to meet the new challenges we face today in this era of peace.

Mr. Speaker, as this Nation moves forward, we must keep the spirit of our veterans alive in both our thoughts and our actions.

ANIMAL MEDICINAL DRUG USE CLARIFICATION ACT OF 1992

HON. CHARLES W. STENHOLM

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to introduce the Animal Medicinal Drug Use Clarification Act of 1992.

This legislation will clarify the authority of the Food and Drug Administration [FDA] to establish guidelines for the Federal regulation of certain modern veterinary practices.

Since 1968, a provision of the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act—the act—has required the FDA to evaluate and approve new animal drugs being developed for the market. The basis for approval must be the directions contained on the label. The FDA's charge is to protect public health and ensure that pure and safe drugs are marketed. A company producing an animal drug must appraise that chemical compound for, among other criteria, safety to the target animal species for a particular dose, in a particular method of administration. A drug intended for use in food producing animals must also be evaluated for its ultimate effect on the food products to be derived from the treated animal, and withdrawal times and safe drug residue levels generally are established.

However, because of the extremely high cost of animal drug approval it is not cost effective to seek an approved label for all species, uses, and doses for which a drug is beneficial and safe. Mr. Speaker, in the practice of veterinary medicine there are many variables that must be considered for drug use: multiple species of animals in which a drug could be used, the specific dosage required, and the route of administration, for example under the skin, in the muscle, or orally. For example, an anesthetic which is labeled for the use in dogs and horses may be equally safe and effective in a goat and cat, but could not be used under the law by a licensed veterinarian. This provision of the act created a dilemma for veterinarians. These highly skilled and respected professionals were forced to choose between strict adherence to the law or their obligations under their professional oath to provide for the health care of animals. The law, with respect to prescription drugs, equated veterinarians with lay individuals rather than human physicians in their ability to decide on appropriate drug therapies to treat disease and alleviate pain.

The Food and Drug Administration, in implementing this provision of the act, realized this dilemma and developed an extra-label use policy designed to provide veterinarians with the necessary flexibility to practice medicine. Extra-label use refers to the use of a drug in a manner that is not in accordance with the drug label. The extra-label use policy applies only to veterinarians. It is included in FDA's compliance policy guides (CPG 7125.06 and 7125.35).

The compliance policy guide for extra-label use of animal drugs in food producing animals (CPG 7125.06) provides that such use may only be considered by a veterinarian when: First, the health of animals is immediately threatened and suffering or death would result from failure to treat the affected animals; and second when certain criteria are met and precautions observed. These precautions include the institution of procedures to assure that the identity of the treated animal is carefully maintained and that steps are taken to assure that no illegal residues occur. My amendment is intended to require the FDA to issue regulations codifying its current practice established in this compliance policy guide.

The compliance policy guide for human drugs distributed to veterinarians for animal use (CPG 7125.35) notes that most veterinary use of human drugs occurs in companion—nonfood—animal practice. For this reason, my amendment authorizes extra-label use of human drugs, with appropriate precautions, for companion animals only, not for food-producing animals.

Veterinarians need appropriate flexibility to treat animals. The FDA needs authority to develop practical and constructive regulations to enhance its ability to define violations of the act. And the amendment is important to the American public for two reasons. It will assure the safety of our food supply by strengthening the regulatory mechanism for managing prescription drugs in food producing animals, and it will help to control animal disease and suffering. Ultimately, farmers, ranchers and pet owners will continue to have available the safest and most effective treatment for their animals.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding my remarks, I would insert the text of the Animal Medicinal Drug Use Clarification Act of 1992 in the RECORD:

H.R. —

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This act may be cited as the "Animal Medicinal Drug Use Clarification Act of 1992".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act currently permits the use of animal drug, or a drug intended for human use, that is approved by the Food and Drug Administration, only in accordance with the specific labeling approved for the drug;

(2) there are not such approved animal drugs available to relieve pain and suffering, or to treat every specific disease or condition found, in each species of animal;

(3) it is sometimes necessary for veterinarians to use such an approved animal drug or approved drug intended for human use in a manner that is not in accordance with the label of the drug if—

(A) the health of an animal is immediately threatened; and

(B) suffering or death would result from failure to provide effective treatment; and

(4) duly licensed veterinarians possess the professional training and medical judgment to administer drugs in a clinically-appropriate manner that benefits animals and safeguards the public health.

SEC. 3. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to permit veterinarians to use such an approved animal drug, or approved drug intended for human use, for therapeutic purposes in animals in a manner that is not specified on the label of the drug, if a valid veterinarian-client-patient relationship exists; and

(2) to permit the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish conditions for such use as may be necessary to protect the public health.

SEC. 4. ALTERNATIVE USES.

Section 512(a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360b(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

"(4)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), if an approval of an applicant filed under subsection (b) is in effect with respect to a particular use or intended use of a new animal drug, the drug shall not be deemed unsafe for the purposes of section 501(a)(5), and shall be exempt from the requirements of section 502(f), with respect to a different use or intended use of the drug, if such use or intended use—

"(i) is by or on the lawful written or oral order of a licensed veterinarian within the context of a veterinarian-client-patient relationship, as defined by the Secretary; and

"(ii) is in compliance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary under subparagraph (C).

"(B) Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), if the use of a new animal drug results in residues in food that the Secretary has determined to be in violation of established safe levels for such drug, such drug shall then be deemed unsafe for the purposes of section 501(a)(5), and shall be subject to the requirements of section 502(f).

"(C) The Secretary shall implement final regulations that establish the conditions for the use or intended use of new animal drugs, as provided under this paragraph and as may be necessary to protect the public health, not later than one year after the enactment of this Act.

"(5)(A) If an approval of an application filed under section 505 is in effect with respect to a particular use or intended use of a drug intended for human use, the drug shall not be deemed unsafe for the purposes of section 501(a)(5), and shall be exempt from the requirements of section 502(f), with respect to a use or intended use of the drug in nonfood producing animals, if such use or intended use—

"(i) is by or on the lawful written or oral order of a licensed veterinarian within the context of a veterinarian-client-patient relationship, as defined by the Secretary; and

"(ii) is in compliance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary under subparagraph (B).

"(B) The Secretary shall implement final regulations that establish the conditions for the use or intended use of human drugs, as provided under this paragraph and as may be necessary to protect the public health, not later than one year after the enactment of this Act.".

MIAMI KIDS SPEAK WITH FIRE IN ORATORICAL CONTEST

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate Terrick Sullivan, a sixth

grader from Charles Drew Elementary School; Crystal Williams, a fourth grader from Phyllis Wheatley; and all of the 88 students who performed prose and poetry during the 15th annual Rev. Theodore R. Gibson Oratorical Contest in Miami. The Reverend Gibson Oratorical Contest allows children and young men and women in high school to develop and share their abilities in writing, reciting and performing poetry, oratory, and monologs.

Twenty one of these young people won first, second, or third place trophies. They include Travis Strowbridge, Shaka Smith, and Brittany Sharpton in the elementary school division, and Myles Battle, Wilanda Grandberry, and Shenika Williams in the middle schools.

In the high school division, Judy Barr, Yolanda Preston, and Wilda Pierre won prizes for original poetry or rap and Judy Barr, Janetha Collier, and Shaunte McClary took prizes for their recitation of published poetry. Frank Hosein and Sabine Gorges won for original oratory, and Vonette Woods, Shundra Fussell, Judith Eaton, and Lissette Labrousse won in the published speeches category. Charles Young, Shannell Deal, and Kinasha Taylor earned trophies for performance of monologs.

Through programs like this one, the continuing development of art and culture in our Nation are fostered. These young people are learning the skills necessary for communication in art, business, teaching, and yes, even politics. Their accomplishments were recounted in an article in the Miami Herald which I would like to include in the RECORD:

KIDS SAY IT WITH FIRE, FLAIR IN ORAL CONTEST

(By Charisse L. Grant)

"Justice! Justice! Oh J-u-u-stice," called Terrick Sullivan, peering around the crowded room in search of the stranger. "Has anybody here seen Justice?"

Laughter rippled as the Charles Drew Elementary sixth-grader, fell into character for the poem Justice Is in America? a satirical work about black Americans' quest for equality.

Terrick was among 88 Dade County students who showcased their best prose, poetry and passion Thursday during the 15th annual Rev. Theodore R. Gibson Oratorical contest, named for the late Miami city commissioner. From the smallest mouths came recitations with themes that ranged from black pride to frustration to pure childish comedy.

Crystal Williams, 10, recited her own composition, I'll Never Forget, recalling how she tucked her fallen tooth under her mattress one night and awoke the next morning to find $140 there.

"I was so pleased," said Crystal, a fourth-grader at Phillis Wheatley Elementary. "I went and told my aunt and she said, 'Girl, put my money back!' "

Other competitors were fiercely serious. Frank Hosein's measured words rang with fervor as he performed his original speech, What Must Be Done?

"Black people are hungry for equality in a society that has rejected us politically, economically and socially," he said.

Frank said his speech, which earned him first place in original oratory, came from the heart.

"It just comes from a deep love for my community," said the Central High senior.

Twenty-one students won first-, second- or third-place trophies. For those who didn't, it still was a chance to bask in the spotlight.

For Gigi Watson, who wrote Justice in Amercia, it meant even more.

"It makes me feel so good to see them," said Watson, a Dade teacher. "I feel like I'm igniting a writing fire and speaking fire with these kids."

THE WINNERS

Elementary

First place, Travis Strowbridge, Richmond; second place, Shaka Smith, Highland Oaks; third place, Brittany Sharpton, North Dade Center for Modern Languages.

Middle School

First place, Myles Battle, Richmond Heights; second place, Wilanda Grandberry, Hialeah; third place, Shenika Williams, Carver Middle.

High School

Original poetry: first place, Judy Barr, Carol City; second place, Wilda Pierre, Central.

Original poetry/rap: first place, Yolanda Preston, Central.

Original oratory: first place, Frank Hosein, Central High; second place, Sabine Georges, Norland.

Published poems: first place, Judy Barr, Carol City; second place, Janetha Collier, Carol City; third place, Shaunte McClary, Carol City.

Published speeches: first place, Vonette Woods, Miami Springs; second place, Shundra Fussell, Norland; third place, Judith Eaton, Norland and Lissette Labrousse, Design and Architecture High.

Monologue: first place, Charles Young, Jackson; second place, Shanell Deal, Jackson; third place, Kinshasa Taylor, Jackson.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the 88 students who participated in this contest, the contest organizers, and the teachers of these students. They are building skills that may one day be put to use by those same young people in this Chamber.

JOHNSON COMMENDS AMERICANS' WORK IN RUSSIA

HON. SAM JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present before this assembly a group of 318 fathers, mothers, and young people who traveled to Russia recently under invitation of the Moscow Department of Education.

They traveled as representatives of families to strengthen Russian families, as representatives of their churches to encourage the formerly persecuted church, and as American citizens to explain the universal Biblical principles upon which the American Founding Fathers established the ideals of liberty in our Nation.

The young people and parents visited schools, orphanages, churches, homes, and Government offices, and also conducted two training seminars especially for fathers.

Their visits to orphanages were of particular significance, affecting such a change in the orphans' attitudes that even the wife of President Yeltsin noticed a difference during one of her visits to an orphanage which had been visited. The chairman of the Department of Education further initiated an agreement to open all 53 Moscow orphanages and boarding schools for families of these Americans to live at the schools and provide leadership and training.

In recognition of the significant work of these men and women, I would like to ask that this congressional body join with me in commending those who took part in this opportunity and who are named below:

Buddy Blair (ID), Gail Blair (ID), Roger Blair (ID), Nathan Bordewich (CA), Joel Boyd (MI), Candace Boyle (CT), Thomas Boyle (CT), Ronnie Bradford (TX), Kathryn Breznik (ON), Danna Brown (TX), Denise Brown (TX), Summer Burdette (GA), Kenneth Burns (MO), Adrian Burwell (TX), Edwin Burwell (TX), Steve Byrd (TX), Edward Byrne (MI), James Byrne (MI), Mindy Calderwood (MD), Laura Call (NY), Michael Calloway (TX), Delores Carrillo (TX), Julie Cave (TX), Kristy Cave (TX), Michael Cave (TX), Sharon Cave (Mother; TX), Sharon Cave (Daughter; TX).

Harris Adams (GA), Laura Adams (GA), Raeanna Adams (GA), Ed Ahrens (OR), Julie Allen (TX), David Ameen (MI), Jeremy Ameen (MI), Harvey Amos (KS), Gavin Amrhein (IN), Helen Anderson (MN), Leon Anderson (MN), Brian Anderson (PA), Robert Armstrong (WA), Rachel Baker (OH), Kimberly Barnard (NY), Anton Bayer (IL), James Beaird (TX), Allison Behmer (AL), Edward Behmer (AL), Michael Behmer (AL), Julianne Bell (IL), Robert Ian Bell (IL), Verle L. Bell (IL), Craig Bergen (KS), Charles Berry (TX), Sarah Bingham (HI), Britney Blair (ID).

Mark Christensen (NM), Lisa Cload (OH), Robert Cload (OH), Carl Codling (MI), Carlene Codling (MI), William Coe (GA), Tiffany Cole (TX), Andrew Cornings (NY), Robert Conrad (NC), Joel Conwell (MO), Jacob Cope (SC), Marty Cope III (SC), Ruben Copico (ON), Kenneth Copley (MN), Ronald Corley (TX), Gary Cox (CO), Jennifer Cox (CO), Barry Crain (AR), David Cummings (WA), Colin Curry (TX), Benjamin Daggett (TX), John Daggett (TX), Jim Davis (MO), Ethan DeSota (MI), Karyn Dean (GA), Andrew Deister (KS), Chris Deister (KS).

Frederick Depp (MD), Jeffrey Dickerson (OR), Don Dillahunty (TX), Pete Dixon (TN), Margo Dixon (TN), Christina Domont (IL), Andrew Dosh (NC), Katy Jane Downhour (OH), Robert Dunnam (AR), William Ehnis (MI), Gary Ellison (CA), Edgar Emery (CT), Raymond English (TX), John Everson (OH), Andrew Falk (IN), Larry Falk (IN), Bill Fast (CA), Christopher Fear (FL), Peter Fear (FL), Jim Ferguson (OR), Steve Ferguson (OR), Chris Fleming (GA).

Alan Fluegge (MD), Scott Forrester (TN), Jennifer Freeman (CA), Han Frist (SC), Howard Frist (SC), Ruthie Fritsch (WA), Becky Fuhrman (IL), Caryn Fuhrman (IL), Eric Fuhrman (IL), Joyce Fuhrman (IL), Ron Fuhrman (IL), April Futhey (KS), Jeanette Gardner (GA), Curtis Gelotte (WA), Craig Gendron (MI), Gianna Geraci (OH), William Geraci (OH), Amanda Gibson (KS), John Gibson (KS), Jeffrey Gill (AZ), Wayne Glassman (ID), James Golden (TX).

Randall Golden (TX), Scott Gordon (WA), Pepper Goslin III (PA), Bill Gothard (IL), Michael Gray (TX), Jeff Grose (IL), Brian Guy (MO), Heidi Haas (OH), Kurt Haas (OH), Timothy Habermehl (MI), Susan Hall (PA), Desiree Hansen (BC), David Hardwick (OH), James Hardwick (OH), Rebecca Hardwick (OH), Sharon Hardwick (OH), Stephanie Hardwick (OH), Gayden Harrell (MS), Claire Harris (GA), Brandon Harstad (CA), Karen Hart (MI), Mary Hatmaker (AL).

Aaron Hawkins (AZ), Nathan Hawkins (AZ), Titus Heard (OK), Dean Hertzler (PA), Dean Hertzler Jr. (PA), John Hinshaw Jr. (AL), Tamra Hoagland (IL), Michael Hobbs (PA), Gerald Hood (OH), David Howlett (MI), Prem Jacob (IL), Paivi Janhunen (ON), Earl Jantz (KS), Jamie Jensen (WY), Larry Johnson (IA), George Johnston (IN), John Johston (IN), T.P. Johnston (VA), Dough Jones (MI), Joseph Jones (GA), Tim Jones (OK), Angela Keileen (MI).

Jillene Keileen (MI), Ronald Keileen (MI), Charles Kilby (CA), Laura Killingsworth (GA), Robert Kimbrough (MS), Mark Kincaid (IN), Justin King (MI), David Kinney (NY), Kirsten Kinser (MN), Stacey Kirk (FL), Gregory Koening (SD), Joseph Kress (AL), Roger Kurtz (CA), Ryan Kurtz (CA), Candy Lacey (FL), Nicholas Lancette (MT), Fritz Lang (TX), Chris Larson (VT), Richard Larson (VT), Todd Lawrence (CA), Micheal LeFebvre (OH), Lowell LeFebvre (OH).

Lisa Ledbetter (OK), Chris Ledeatt (PA), Larry Lehman (KS), William Lehman (KS), Allison Lindsey (AL), Daniel Linn (TX), James Linn (TX), James Linn IV (TX), Edna MacNoughton (OH), Harold Mally (IA), Diana Macinone (CT), George Martin (MO), Janis Martin (MO), Dewayne Martin (IN), Stephen Martz (WA), Denny Mashburn (AL), Joel Mattix (ID), George Mattix (ID), Lewis May (WA), Lori McAtee (OK), Robert McCurley (NY), Emily McDermitt (MD).

Jamie McFadin (TX), Sarah McFee (OR), Kerry McKerracher (CA), Julie McKim (TX), Kade McKim (TX), Kase McKim (TX), Keith McKim (TX), Ken McKim Jr. (TX) Kenneth McKim (TX), Kirk McKim (TX), Klayt McKim (TX), Kyle McKim (TX), Meg McKim (TX), Melisa McKim (TX), Melody McKim (TX), Millie McKim (TX), Mindy McKim (TX), Molly McKim (TX), Bennie McWha (AR), Shelby McWha (AR), Franz Menge (GA), Joshua Menge (GA).

Meg Menge (GA), Carrie Meuser (ID), Mark Meuser (ID), Rodney Miranda (MS), William Moran (NY), Helen Mordh (MN), Renee Morris (MI), Steve Nabors (GA), Amy Joy Neufeld (BC), Tony Neufeld (BC), Joseph Norris (TX), Joshua Nunez (MI), Nathan O'Bryon (WI), Ron O'Bryon (WI), Elizabeth Oldham (GA), Larry Oldham (GA), Tamara Pierce (GA), Roger Potts (MS), Bryan Pound (OR), Janet Rake (KY), Donna Reed (OH), Sharon Reeder (TX).

James Rockwell (FL), Valerie Rockwell (FL), Sharon Rogers (NY), Susan Rogers (NY), Greg Rosenquist (IL), Max Rosenquist (IL), Betty Rosenquist (IL), Peter Rumley (MI), Bob Runella (CA), Rhett Runella (CA), Ryan Runella (CA), Roxanne Santin (AB), Kent Schmidt (IL), David Schwind (CA), Elizabeth Sharp (GA), Kristine Shoemaker (IL), Carol Showalter (ON), Rachel Sias (MN), Angela Smoot (IN), Mark Stanley (MN), Dane Sternecker (WI), Margaret Swartz (MD).

Gary Swartz (MD), Grace Swartz (MD), Gretchen Swearingen (VA), John Swearingen (VA), Marian Swearingen (VA), Stephany Taylor (TX), Debra Templeton (CA), Jonathan Thorne (KS), Michael Thorne (KS), Shannon Toombs (IN), Misty Treadwell (CA), Jeanette Trebilco (CA), LaMar Troyer (WI), Vic Ullrey (CO), Tonya Ullrey (CO), Alayna Vaughn (TX), Susan Vaughn (TX), Chelsea Von Ruden (OR), Alan Von Ruden (OR), Christopher Voyer (CA).

Cynthia Voyer (CA), Jerry Voyer (CA), Jeanette Voyer (CA), Kathy Voyer (CA), Taneka Walker (MD), Bradford Wall (GA), Marilyn Walls (TX), Winston Walls (TX), Gerald Walton (PA), Jonathan Watson (WA), Pamela Watson (WA), Jeff Williams (TX), Ronny Williams (TX), Tanya Williams (TX), Courtney Worley (TX), Matthew Wright (AR), Gary Wulfekuhle (WA), David York (WI), Christine Zimmerman (NC).

DEMOCRACY FLOURISHING IN THE PHILIPPINES

HON. PETER H. KOSTMAYER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, today I offer my congratulations to the people of the Philippines on their recent elections. The fact that Imelda Marcos could run for that nation's Presidency without hesitation speaks louder than any words as to how far that country has gone down the path of democracy since the last elections and President Corazon Aquino's dramatic victory over the late dictator Ferdinand Marcos.

While the stunning democratic movements in Eastern Europe and the newly independent states of the former Soviet Union have captured the world's attention, we should not forget that similar movements are occurring throughout other parts of the world, including Southeast Asia. Only days ago we watched as the people of Thailand faced down another dictator, rejecting continued authoritarianism. It should be noted well that the peoples of the world at large owe the Filipino people and the People Power movement of 1986 a great debt of gratitude for blazing the path in that part of the world.

While all of the Filipino people share in this great victory of democracy, I would like to single out President Corazon Aquino and Fidel Ramos for particular praise. A most unlikely candidate, President Aquino has held office during the consolidation of democracy in her country. Returning to face her slain husband's nemesis in what was widely expected to be a rigged and cynical electoral process, she risked all and ultimately led her people to victory over the forces of authoritarianism.

Former Gen. Fidel Ramos has also proven his dedication to democratic principles. Instrumental in President Aquino's victory, General Ramos did not prove to be a fairweather democrat, as did others who joined him in siding with President Aquino and facing down the military forces loyal to Ferdinand Marcos. In the best tradition of a professional military officer, he chose to serve the civilian Government faithfully, and no fewer than half a dozen times played an instrumental role in saving the beleaguered Aquino administration from consecutive coup attempts.

As such, Fidel Ramos has certainly earned President Aquino's endorsement in these elections. Although the ballots in the Filipino election are still being counted, Mr. Ramos is currently the frontrunner and projected to win. While our two nations may differ on some issues, should his election come to pass, the United States certainly owes this graduate of the U.S. Military Academy our congratulations and thanks for his role in consolidating and continuing the democratic process in his country.

TRIBUTE TO CARL G. BECKER

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of May 28, Dr. Carl Becker will be honored at a special dinner at Fern Hill Country Club. I am very pleased to join the Clinton Valley Council Boy Scouts of America in commending a remarkable individual who will be receiving the Macomb County Distinguished Citizen Award.

Assuming an active role in our community is a responsibility we all share, but few of us fulfill. Dr. Becker has unfailingly devoted himself to this task. While a dedicated and thorough family physician for over 30 years, Dr. Becker has also been affiliated with many community organizations. His involvement and contributions to the Clinton Valley Council Boy Scouts demonstrate his commitment to our young leaders of tomorrow. In addition, he has volunteered long hours with Mount Clemens General Hospital, the American Cancer Society and Turning Point.

Mr. Speaker, through his hard work, Dr. Carl G. Becker has touched countless lives as a dependable, caring citizen. On this special occasion, I ask that my colleagues join me in saluting the fine accomplishments of Carl G. Becker and extended to him our best wishes for all his future endeavors.

HIALEAH-MIAMI LAKES SENIOR HIGH TEAM WINS NATION MOCK TRIAL COMPETITION

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the Hialeah-Miami Lakes Senior High School mock trial team who took top honors in the National High School Mock Trial Competition.

The team consists of five seniors, together with a 10th grader and a 9th grader. The team was lead by its captain, Raimundo Araujo, and coached by teachers Tony DeFillippo and Walt Gishler. The other team members included: Rick Gonzalez, Veronica Sanchez, Dorys Andani, Gladys Mesa, Freddy Hernandez, and Sam Maldonado. The team also had the help of volunteer coach Julie Waldman, a local attorney, who assisted in the preparation of the team.

This victory was the culmination of months of hard work by the students, their coaches, and the local attorney who volunteered to help train the students. The students and their instructors put in over 25 hours a week of after-school time researching the legal issues and honing their speaking skills. Their efforts were outlined in an article in the Miami Herald, which follows:

DEDICATION OF TEENS, COACH PAYS OFF IN LAW COMPETITION

(By Ana Acle)

The Hialeah-Miami Lakes High mock trial team members are state champions again because:

(A) The seven-student team went undefeated through 10 local and state trials;

(B) A lawyer spent 25 hours a week coaching the team after school and on weekends; or

(C) Two legal studies teachers taught them legal strategies and motivated them to compete.

The answer is all of the above.

For the second consecutive year, the Hialeah-Miami Lakes High mock trial team captured the state title March 30 in Tallahassee. They will be in Madison, Wis., May 7–10 to compete for the national title.

Last year, the team placed fifth in the national contest in New Orleans, losing to the eventual national champions from New Jersey.

THE STUDENTS

The team is a collection of high achievers: Five will go to college next year, one is a sophomore with enough credits to graduate next year and the seventh is a freshman who impressed everyone during tryouts.

The team returns three students from last year's state championship: Raimundo Araujo, the team captain who plans to attend the University of Florida; Veronica Sanchez, who has received a scholarship to attend Duke University; and Ricky Gonzalez, the school valedictorian and student body president who is going to Georgetown University.

The other two seniors are Gladys Mesa, who will attend the University of Florida and Dorys Andani, who will attend Florida International University.

Sophomore Freddy Hernandez and freshman Sam Maldonado complete the team.

"The main thing is they're all very bright, articulate, well-spoken, confident and they prepare well," said Julie Waldman, a lawyer for HRS and the team's coach. "Interestingly enough, none of their homework has suffered."

THE COACH

Waldman devotes at least 25 hours a week to the Hialeah-Miami Lakes High students—after she finishes her full-time job with the state Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services.

The team spends so much time together—four hours a day, Monday through Thursday evenings, and all day Sundays—they're like a family. Waldman even had the team members over for a Passover seder last weekend.

"In the past, I've had attorneys that have paid two to three visits to the school and that was a lot to ask of a lawyer," said HML teacher Walter Gishler. "Now we have Julie, who is always here. That tells you a lot about her dedication to the students."

In competition, students must be ready to argue for and against a case assigned to them. Waldman takes the students to the St. Thomas University law library to look up relevant cases, just like lawyers do. Then Waldman and the students discuss the case in a brainstorming session.

The team decides which students will argue each side of the case and which students will testify as witnesses.

Once each student's role is defined, Waldman coaches the team members individually: one lawyer and one witness one day, and another pair the next. Eventually, the whole team practices together.

At the competition, schools compete by arguing different sides of the case. Schools do not know ahead of time which side they'll be arguing.

For the national competition, the fictitious case is "Atalan Nation vs. Columbus State Historical Museum." The Native American nation of Atalan is suing a state museum because the museum has artifacts the Atalans believe are theirs.

THE TEACHERS

In addition to Waldman's coaching, two legal studies teachers, Gishler and Tony De Fillippo, teach law classes during regular school hours and a seventh-period class given by the Hialeah-Miami Lakes Adult Education office.

Each student must be in, or have been in, one of the law studies class to be on the mock trial team. That means that in addition to the preparation outside of class, many of the team members learn law techniques and legal strategies in class.

De Fillippo said he first started helping the mock trial team four years ago when he became a teacher at the school. "I had no idea what was going on or what I was getting into," he said. "It has been well worthwhile."

Gishler has been teaching the class and helping the team for 10 years. He is looking forward to the national competition. "I feel that there is an advantage to having been there once before," he said.

The team's record is 10–0, having won against five high school teams in the county—Central, Coral Gables, South Dade, Miami Beach and Sunset—and five teams in the state (Zephyrhills High in Pasco County came in second). The team would have to win five rounds of trials in Madison to win the national title.

"Winning state for a second time makes us feel as though it's not just luck," said Araujo.

Mr. Speaker, I commend these young people for their dedication and self-discipline. I wish them much success in their future academic and professional lives.

TRIBUTE TO FATHER BYRON

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure this morning to join with my other colleagues here in paying tribute to our guest chaplain. Father Byron, who is stepping down as president of the Catholic University of America, has a lot of friends and admirers in this body and I am happy to count myself among that number.

This year marks Father Byron's 10th year at Catholic University, a decade of notable service and great achievement. I am not alone in my high and enthusiastic regard for Father Byron. Just 5½ years ago, he was selected as one of the most effective college presidents in a survey of his peers. A little over 3 years ago, Washingtonian Magazine named him Washingtonian of the Year. And today, he is recognized by everyone as a great spiritual, academic, and community leader.

During his tenure as president, Catholic University has been literally transformed with the addition of a new athletic complex, a new science center, and—beginning this month—the groundbreaking for a new Columbus School of Law.

But Father Byron's legacy at Catholic University is a great deal more than mere bricks and mortar. He has, during his tenure, set a moral and spiritual tone that has helped establish Catholic University as a leading institution of higher learning.

I am thrilled that he has been able to join us here today and I know I speak for all of us in wishing him the very best in all his future endeavors.

TEHACHAPI WATERSHED PROJECT COMPLETED

HON. WILLIAM M. THOMAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, in 1982, I first won approval to fund an important water control project in my district to ensure the safety of my constituents, their homes, their farms and their businesses. Ten years later, I am proud to say the project has been fully completed.

On May 15, 1992, I was pleased to visit the city of Tehachapi to attend groundbreaking ceremonies for the completed Tehachapi Watershed project. This area, located in Kern County, 25 miles from Bakersfield, has been subjected to severe flooding from intense rainfall in the past. Following periods of intense rainfall, flood waters creep up mountain canyons along the south side of the watershed.

Damaging flows, primarily from the Antelope and Blackburn canyons, originate in the steeper reaches of those areas and move across farmland, depositing sediment and boulders and ravaging crops.

The watershed project was a top priority for the California Soil Conservation Service, will protect more than 3,000 acres of farmland, including the City of Tehachapi and will ameliorate water and land management as well as reduce soil erosion. This project was not only necessary and useful, but timely as well. I am pleased that the final phase of the project, the Blackburn Dam, has been completed, and that the people of Tehachapi can feel safe from the uncertainties of nature.

For more than 30 years, from the first feasibility study in 1950 to the vision and hard work of Fred Jasper, Bob Patterson, Karl Backes, Darrell Sorenson and Stuart Pyle, and Bob Cree, the president of the Tehachapi Resources Conservation District, this project has moved forward to the groundbreaking at the Blackburn Dam. This is a historic moment for the people of Tehachapi, and I am proud to see this project through its completion.

HARDING ACADEMY CHORUS NOTED

HON. DON SUNDQUIST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. SUNDQUIST. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the pleasure of hosting in Washington the Harding Academy Acappella Chorus from my hometown of Memphis. As some of my colleagues will recall, the 64-member chorus under the direction of Jim Chester performed

a 15-minute patriotic concert on the steps of the Capitol.

I know that others enjoyed the performance as much as I did, and I simply wanted to commend the Harding Academy Acappella Chorus and note their fine work in the RECORD.

PRIDE INDUSTRIES

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the contributions of PRIDE Industries of Roseville, CA. Established in 1966, PRIDE is the sixth largest manufacturer in the area. It employs nearly 1,100 residents of Placer, Sacramento, Nevada, Yolo, Solano and Monterey counties in a variety of business and service units, including electronics, custodial services, grounds maintenance and warehousing and delivery.

What makes PRIDE unique, however, and the reason why its contributions need to be acknowledged here on the floor of the House of Representatives today, is the fact that 70 percent of PRIDE's employees—over 750 people—are disabled. PRIDE has created an environment in which physically and developmentally disabled members of our communities are able to perform meaningful, productive, satisfying work for a company that is employee-oriented, committed to community and—last, but not least—extremely successful.

And tomorrow, President Bush will be acknowledging PRIDE Industries' contributions when he presents them with the Chairman's Award of the President's Committee on Employment of People with Disabilities in recognition of PRIDE's contributions to the quality of life and independence of Americans with disabilities.

The committee has singled out PRIDE's creative program of rehabilitation assistance, including vocational assessment, job placement and follow-through, and supported employment, as well as its emphasis on "choice," noting that this combination of services has "significantly advanced the independence, productivity, and personal empowerment of individuals with disabilities, including persons with severe disabilities."

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have PRIDE Industries in my district. I wish to acknowledge PRIDE Industries and its achievements, and to commend its chief executive officer, Michael Ziegler, and board chairman, Michael Snegg, for their leadership, for their business acumen, and for their commitment to their people and to our communities.

BARBARA HARKINS BRINGS OUT THE BEST AT OLIVER HOOVER KINDERGARTEN

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to the work of Barbara Seniors Harkins, an outstanding teacher. Barbara Harkins believes that students, including her kindergarten kids at Oliver Hoover Elementary School in Miami, should read and write every day. She has them record their daily experiences in journals, and then act them out on the class puppet stage. She gets help when she needs it, from parents whom she encourages to volunteer to work in her class.

Barbara Harkins believes every student has tremendous potential, and that it is her responsibility and the responsibility of the parents to unlock it. She actively encourages parents of children who are having problems to help out in class, even if only for a few minutes. Just that much involvement can make a major difference in the child's involvement and success.

The Miami Herald published an article about this outstanding educator, which I would like to include in the RECORD:

TEACHER THRIVES ON COAXING OUT KIDS' BEST

(By Jon O'Neill)

Barbara Seniors Harkins believes every student has tremendous potential. It's her job to unlock it.

Harkins teaches an active group of kindergarten kids at Oliver Hoover Elementary, and makes things happen in her classroom. She's the kind of teacher who sets high standards for her students, but never lets them forget she is there to help them.

"It's great to have teachers like her," said Sam Jerkins, principal of the school at 9050 Hammocks Blvd. "She is probably the most giving person I have ever worked with, and she get people involved in what she's doing. She feels a real obligation to her kids, her school and the community."

Harkins makes things work in several ways. First, she tries to expose her students to as many different experiences as possible, and she has them act out what they learn. Monday, the kids staged a little play about black history, using characters that ranged from themselves to principal Jerkins to Martin Luther King Jr.

The play ends with the kids yelling: "Read, read, read." That's something else Harkins believes in. The kids read every day; they also write every day, using their own journals to document experiences, which they act out on the class puppet stage.

It's important to Harkins that her students know she cares about them, which is why there is lots of laughter and hugs between the work. She admits she gets very attached to her kids. But they get attached to her, too.

"I like her because she's nice, first of all," said Sofia Kehyanian, 6. "But she always shows us how to do things and it's fun to come here. There are hundreds of things to do."

"I push them," said Harkins. "I want them to be creative and I try to keep things hopping in the classroom."

Sometimes it seems there is more going than any one person could keep up with, but Harkins has boundless energy.

"I think she's hyperactive," Jerkins said.

Harkins also has help when she needs it from parents who volunteer to work in her class, something she encourages.

"I want them involved with us," she said. "Especially if there is a child who is having some problems. I try to have that parent come in, even if it's only for five minutes to read some flash cards or something. It's amazing the difference it makes. The kids really respond to it and everyone feels good."

Harkins, who was born in Homestead, graduated from Mays High School, got her bachelor's degree from Florida A&M University and studied for a while in Greece. Later, she got her master's degree from Nova University.

"I always wanted to help kids learn," she said. "When I was growing up, I just thought there wasn't enough caring and concern in school. I wanted to change that."

Her first teaching job was at R.R. Moton Elementary in 1969. After several years in the classroom. Harkins became a reading coordinator and later an assistant principal. But, she said, she missed the classroom.

In 1989, she started working at Hoover.

"I love doing this," she said. "It's always such a thrill to see the kids growing and grasping a concept they didn't understand before."

Mr. Speaker, I commend the work of Barbara Seniors Harkins and the sense of accountability for teachers, and responsibility for parents that she stands for. Our country needs more teachers of her high quality.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE RETIREMENT OF THOMAS J. BENSON, SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, UPPER SADDLE RIVER SCHOOL SYSTEM, UPPER SADDLE RIVER, NJ

HON. MARGE ROUKEMA

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute today to one of northern New Jersey's most distinguished citizens, Mr. Thomas J. Benson, superintendent of the Upper Saddle River School District, Upper Saddle River, NJ. Mr. Benson will be retiring effective August 1, 1992 after serving in his present position for 18 years.

While our community has benefited by his 18 years of innovative work, allow me to chronicle his career for my colleagues:

In 1944, Thomas Benson answered his country's call to duty in the U.S. Navy. Through 1946, Mr. Benson was a pilot and involved with radar operations. After his tour of duty, Mr. Benson returned to his education.

He received his B.A. degree from Central Connecticut University majoring in mathematics, his M.A. in secondary education from the University of Bridgeport. Mr. Benson continued his education with a sixth-year professional diploma from the University of Connecticut in elementary education. During this time, Mr. Benson taught in the Darien, CT School System and served on the Darien Board of Education. After several years in the private sector, Mr. Benson returned to work with the Greenwich Board of Education as the assistant principal of Central Junior High School from 1961–64.

During the summer of 1969, Mr. Benson launched an international educational career. He was one of three administrators who ran a school for American students at Cambridge University in England, sponsored by the Amer-

ican Institute for Foreign Study. In the summer of 1970, Thomas Benson was a principal of a traveling contemporary Europe school for American students also run by the American Institute of Foreign Study. He would continue to serve as the principal of similar schools through 1979.

In 1974, Thomas Benson joined us in Bergen County as superintendent of the Upper Saddle River School System. During his noteworthy tenure, he has provided leadership on many creative levels. Among his accomplishments is a well-respected program for gifted and talented students which was recognized by WOR Channel 9 in 1980–81. He also is responsible for the Micro-Computer Program which Channel 3 and Channel 68 carried in 1982. As of 1991, there are 110 micro units for a 53-classroom complex! Mr. Benson is to be commended for his innovation and sponsorship of such pioneering programs.

Thomas Benson is an accomplished author in the field of mathematics and title 1 programs and guidance counseling. Mr. Benson received a National Science Foundation grant where he studied mathematics and science at Yeshiva University.

Of course, Mr. Benson's influence is felt well beyond the classroom. He is active in many professional education associations, including the National Association of Secondary School Principals, National Association of Elementary School Principals, and the American Association of School Administrators.

In addition to his innumerable contributions to the educational field, Mr. Benson has found the time over many years to donate his talents for the benefit of the community. He is a trustee of the Upper Saddle River Library and a chairman of the Bergen County Superintendent's Association of Gifted Education. He has served as president of the Darien Babe Ruth Baseball League, commander of the Darien Catholic War Veterans, and the vice chairman of the Darien Boy Scout Committee.

Without a doubt, our community is a better place to learn and live for his efforts. Thomas Benson has made important contributions to the lives of many of our friends and neighbors. I urge my colleagues to join me in saluting this outstanding individual and wishing him well as he moves into retirement.

THE HOSTAGE CRISIS IS NOT OVER

HON. DICK ZIMMER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Speaker, for the first time since Israel came into existence, the Israeli Government has been able to sit down in direct talks with most of its Arab neighbors. However, there are still many difficult matters that need to be resolved to ensure the success of these historic negotiations.

Among the most important of these issues is the need for all parties involved to respect the human rights of everyone in the region. While all of the American hostages are now free, it is possible that as many as four Israeli soldiers are being held outside the normal legal process.

Yehuda Katz, Zachary Baumel, and Zvi Feldman have been missing since June 11, 1982. There is little information about whether these men are even alive. The fourth, Ron Arad, has been missing since October 16, 1986. Officials have more evidence about him than the others indicating that he is still alive.

The families of the Americans held in the Middle East suffered the agony of having nothing more than hope to get them from one day to the next. The same is true for the Israeli families who still do not know if their loved ones will be home soon—or even if they are still alive.

Mr. Speaker, we must not ignore the fact that the hostage crisis is still not over in the Middle East. And we must realize that, as long as the fate of these men is still unknown, this situation will be a major impediment to achieving peace in the region.

TRIBUTE TO JULIA BRESSLER—WINNER OF THE CABLE IN THE CLASSROOM AWARD

HON. DICK SWETT

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. SWETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the achievements of an outstanding educator from my home State of New Hampshire, Ms. Julia Bressler, a Spanish teacher at Nashua Senior High School. She was recently selected as a recipient of the 1992 Cable in the Classroom Educator Award presented by Warner Cable Communications of Nashua, NH. She is among a select group of 10 people nationwide chosen this year to receive the award.

Students from grades 10 to 12 at Nashua Senior High School participated in a conversational Spanish course under the guidance of Ms. Bressler and her assistants, Silvia Abelleira, Norman Ducas, Irene Oliveira, and Robert Schultz. This course was a new project designed to introduce students to many of the different Spanish dialects spoken by native speakers by viewing a variety of programs on the cable network Univision. Four separate television programs selected by Ms. Bressler and her staff presented several different Spanish dialects for the young students trying to expand their language skills. Traditional quizzes accompanied the viewing of the television programming in order to ensure that the students were learning and retaining the information.

Under the direction of Ms. Bressler and her staff, the students developed greater listening comprehension by hearing dialects from several Latin American nations as well as Spain. As a result, those involved in this creative learning environment have dramatically improved their foreign language skills. This program has established remarkable results in a time when traditional learning in the United States is not standing up to the standards established by the other countries of this world. It is an alarming statistic that only one-third of our high school students are studying a foreign language. Additionally, many of those who do study a foreign language are not reaching a high level of language competency. English has become the universal language in today's world, while we Americans in turn have neglected our responsibility of learning the languages of the nations with whom we associate.

Mr. Speaker, our country desperately needs outstanding educators like Julia Bressler to initiate innovative programs designed to aid students to recognize and reach their full academic potential. Creative programs in education will help students to develop greater self-confidence and challenge them to expand their minds and abilities. Each day we are becoming increasingly aware of the value found in hands-on programs such as these which encourage students to stay in school and also to excel in their studies.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Julia Bressler on receiving this important award which recognizes her accomplishments in the teaching profession. Julia Bressler, her staff, and her students have come together to join a nationwide movement to make the educational process more enlightening, relevant, and enjoyable. It is refreshing to know that even though our Nation's educational system has faltered at times, there are people like Ms. Bressler who are effectively teaching our students in creative ways that will ultimately make a difference, not only in the lives of our children, but also in the future of our country.

A TRIBUTE TO FALLEN POLICE OFFICERS

HON. THOMAS J. MANTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to two men who gave their lives in service to the city of New York, Officer Michael Buczek and Officer Anthony Dwyer of the New York City police force. Both men were killed in the line of duty on October 18, 1988. While almost 4 years has passed since their tragic murders, I believe it is important to take a moment to reflect on their valor to keep their memory alive.

Mr. Speaker, when a young person joins the New York City police force, they know their job will be a dangerous one. As a former New York City policeman, I know the kind of sober commitment this job requires. However, police work has changed dramatically since I left the force in 1960. Today, in addition to the kind of crimes I dealt with, New York City police officers must deal with persistent drug and gang related criminal behavior. The men and women of the New York City police force risk their lives every day to ensure safety for the people of New York, for little personal gain. They are true public servants. Thus, when one of them dies, all New York feels the loss. Today, I want to tell the friends and family of Officer Buczek and Officer Dwyer that the people of New York are grateful for their efforts and have not forgotten the bravery and personal sacrifice of these fine young men.

Officer Michael Buczek was only 24 years old when he was killed. He was shot by one

of two suspects he had encountered in the hallway of a building of W. 161 Street where he had just answered a call for assistance. After a chase, one of the suspects turned and shot Officer Buczek with a semiautomatic weapon. Although Officer Buczek had served only 3 years on the force, he had already earned more than 40 police awards for meritorious service. Mike Buczek was a young man just beginning his life. He had been married just 1 year to his wife Christine. That gunshot 4 years ago, put an end to all their hopes and dreams for the future.

Officer Anthony Dwyer was also a young police force veteran. Tony, as he was known to family and friends, was just 23 but had served on the force for 2 years. He also served as a volunteer fireman with Engine Company No. 2 in Elmont. Tony will be remembered as a dedicated young man who was committed to serving and helping others. Officer Dwyer was murdered when a robbery suspect he had been pursuing pushed him off the roof of a building in Times Square. He died of the massive internal injuries he suffered as a result of the fall. Officer Dwyer was a young man with a bright future. Tragically, we will never know what promise the future would have held for Tony Dwyer. His murderers robbed the citizens of New York of a fine public servant. The city is less than it could be as a result.

Mr. Speaker, although Officer Buczek's and Officer Dwyer's lives were brief, they are examples of lives well lived. These were young men who sacrificed their lives for their fellow men, who wanted to make the world a better place. It is important that their families and friends know that the people of New York are eternally grateful for their bravery.

IN HONOR OF PETER ABLONDI

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer a tribute to Peter Ablondi, whose lifetime of public service serves as an outstanding example to his fellow Americans. A lifelong resident of Branford, CT, he has devoted more than two decades to his community.

Peter's personal dedication and strong leadership have made a tremendous difference in the lives of countless individuals and our entire community. Throughout his long tenure as town clerk and his 3 years as first selectman, Peter has shown a remarkable dedication to his civic responsibilities. With scrupulous attention to detail and unflagging personal integrity, Peter Ablondi proved to be a skilled leader during a difficult time in Branford.

Peter has also contributed enormously to Branford's community spirit through his support of Branford's athletic programs. His instrumental role in establishing the Branford Sports Hall of Fame is typical of the many ways he has enriched the lives of Branford families. From baseball games to golf tournaments, he has consistently brought families and individuals together, uniting them in a common love of sports and good sportsmanship.

Peter's efforts have truly enhanced life in his community. As a public official and as a volunteer, he has richly served his town, and brought pleasure to its people. Combining political and civic activism with a warm, enthusiastic personality, this caring individual has made many friends. As Peter battles cancer, I would like to join his friends and family in expressing my fondness and admiration for him, and my gratitude for all that he has done.

CAROLE MCARTHUR HELPS SPECIAL KIDS AT CUTLER RIDGE MIDDLE SCHOOL

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to the work of Carole McArthur, a very special teacher. Teaching physical education to the disabled students at Cutler Ridge Middle School is work that takes a lot of patience and dedication. Carole McArthur not only loves her work, but carries it on into her own time by coaching the school's Special Olympics team.

John Williams, assistant principal of Cutler Ridge, and Anne Wheeldon, her co-coach, both praise her energy and dedication for going way beyond the call of duty, spending her personal time and money helping her special students learn coordination and develop strength.

Carole McArthur says her job is the best job in the world. She loves the students and loves seeing them learn to accomplish new feats. But she says the social skills and self-confidence they achieve are even more important.

The Miami Herald published an article about this outstanding educator, which I would like to include in the RECORD.

GREATEST JOB IN THE WORLD

(By Jon O'Neill)

Although a lot of people might not think so, Carole McArthur believes she has the best job in the world.

McArthur teachs physical education to disabled students at Cutler Ridge Middle School, and also coaches the school's Special Olympics team. It's work that takes a big heart and lots of patience, too. But McArthur loves it.

"How could you not?" she asks. "These kids are so special. They're responsive and they appreciate everything we do with them. I'm very happy here."

Thursday, McArthur and her co-coach Anne Wheeldon showed the class how to run a relay race. The kids, basking in the sun, were loving it. McArthur also spent part of the morning getting another group of kids ready for a Friday square dance at Cutler Ridge Mall and still another group ready to go skating Friday night.

"She's amazing, just wonderful," Wheeldon said. "She really taught me everything I know."

McArthur, 52, is well-known around the school for her energy and dedication.

"A normal day doing what she does is a load," said John Williams, assistant principal of the school at 19400 SW 97th Ave. "But she goes way beyond that. She spends a lot of her personal time and money helping the kids."

With her kids, McArthur works on the basics, things such as coordination and strength. The students run, do push-ups and jumps and record their progress on charts in the classroom.

"They love to improve, even in small ways," McArthur said. "They end up pushing themselves to get better."

There are other benefits.

"It also helps build up their social skills, and that's important," McArthur said. "It teaches them how to work as a team and gives them things that carry with them always."

Special Olympics is another important part of McArthur's life. She has been involved with the games for more than 10 years and believes in them. She and Wheeldon had a team of 63 kids at a recent competition at Tropical Park, playing tennis, riding horses and participating in track and field sports.

Last year, one of their students won a silver medal in gymnastics. They also took a basketball team to the state finals in Tallahassee.

"The Special Olympics gives the kids a chance to perform," McArthur said. "They can also see and be around other kids who are just like them. It helps their self-esteem in so many ways."

McArthur took the long road to "the best job in the world." Born in Waycross, Ga., she graduated from Florida State University with a degree in physical education.

She taught in schools in Georgia, Alabama and North Carolina before coming to Palmetto Middle School in 1972 as a regular physical education teacher. She later worked at Riviera Middle before coming to Cutler Ridge Middle in 1978.

At the time, the exceptional education program was small. Today, it has more than 90 kids from all over South Dade and McArthur works with most of them—including her son Drew, who is 15.

"I'm a happy camper," McArthur said. "So many people feel sorry for these kids, but you can't change the way they are. They're all wonderful and they all can learn. I love being with them."

Mr. Speaker, I commend the work of Carole McArthur and the enthusiasm and dedication she brings to teaching her very special students. Our country needs more teachers of her high quality.

A TRIBUTE TO CLARKE SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF IN RECOGNITION OF THEIR 125TH ANNIVERSARY, SERVING THE HEARING IMPAIRED

HON. JOHN W. OLVER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce the 125th anniversary of the Clarke School for the Deaf, in Northampton, MA. The school was established in 1867 by Gardiner Greene Hubbard, after Gov. Alex Bullock signed legislation to incorporate the school.

Throughout the past 125 years, the school has been responsible for numerous breakthroughs in the education of the hearing impaired. The Clarke School boast the reputation of being the first school to prepare the deaf for life in the world of the hearing, through speech

the lip reading. The first to educate teachers of the deaf in the oral method, and the first to offer a master of the deaf degree, through it's teacher education department.

The Clarke School has gone far beyond education, and into the future with research. The use of computers and television have been introduced into the curriculum. Clarke is also conducting studies in psychology, mainstreaming, curriculum development, and language acquisition.

Over the years, the Clarke School has been affiliated with many famous people. Gardiner Greene Hubbard, the founder of Clarke, was also the first president of the Bell Telephone Co., and the National Geographic Society.

Alexander Graham Bell taught visible speech at Clarke for 51 years, and was a researcher and consultant. Between 1917 and 1922, Mr. Bell was president of the school board. President Calvin Coolidge served on the board of education from 1920 until 1933. President Coolidge also married a Clarke schoolteacher, Ms. Grace Goodhue. After the presidency, Mrs. Coolidge returned to Clarke where she served as board president from 1935 until 1952.

President John F. Kennedy participated in Clarke's activities as a member of the national committee of sponsors from 1955 until his death in 1963. President Kennedy also signed legislation which provided Federal assistance for those who wished to pursue a career in educating the deaf.

The Clarke School for the Deaf has helped in unlocking doors which were once closed to the hearing impaired. Not only is the Clarke School an asset to my district, but to people throughout the world. Graduates of Clarke have gone on to teach the hearing impaired in 45 States and 33 foreign countries.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of our colleagues in the House to join me in honoring the Clarke School for the Deaf. For 125 years Clarke has enlightened the lives of others. With the recent passage of the Americans With Disabilities Act, deafness has been put on the national agenda, and I am certain Clarke will be there to pass on the gift of knowledge.

TRIBUTE TO GEORGE MANGIARACINA

HON. SUSAN MOLINARI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of June 3, 1992, a very special event will take place in the Bay Ridge community of Brooklyn. There will be a reception in honor of a very special person, the outgoing president of the Bay Ridge Community Council, George Mangiaracina.

George has devoted his time and energy for many years by actively participating in community service organizations, as a Boy Scout Explorer adviser and a Little League coach. He also has held various positions and been an active member in many important organizations including the Police Athletic League, the Hamilton Harbor Association, the Knights of Columbus, the Catholic Youth Organization, and the Metropolitan Funeral Directors Association. He has worked on the Committee for Immigrant Registration and is actively involved as promoter for the Jesuit's Loyola Retreat House and as a Release Time teacher at St. Patrick's CCD program. I am personally grateful for the time George has contributed as a member of my Health Care Task Force. I must acknowledge George's leadership and commitment helped us realize the Homeport as well as the successful opening of Dayton Manor.

Because of the active role George has taken, he has been honored with many rewards. He received the Thomas Quinn Award in recognition of his leadership, scholastic achievement, and service in the funeral industry and was bestowed with the honor of St. Patrick's Man of the Year for his commitment and service to his church and his community. Most recently, he received the distinguished International Brotherhood Award in recognition for outstanding service to the community.

The Bay Ridge Community Council has been well served by George Mangiaracina. He has been the senior delegate from St. Patrick's Holy Name Society, the council's treasurer, the first vice-president, and has cochaired the police liaison committee and chaired the photography and dinner dance committees. For the past year he has served as president of the council and once again has shown everyone his commitment to improving the Brooklyn community.

Mr. Speaker, George Mangiaracina has an unselfish devotion to his family, friends, and community. Those who know him personally, and I am one of the fortunate, have a loyal friend who can always be counted on when needed. It is a privilege for me to be able to honor a man who has committed so much of his time and himself to our community. On behalf of the residents of Bay Ridge, Dyker Heights, and Fort Hamilton, I would like to congratulate George for serving as president of the Bay Ridge Community Council this past year, and to thank him for his commitment to our community.

USED OIL RECYCLING ACT OF 1992

HON. W.J. (BILLY) TAUZIN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, before the end of today, do-it-yourself oil changers will needlessly flush down storm sewers, dump into rivers and streams, and pour on the ground more than 2 million gallons of used motor oil.

This will occur again tomorrow, the next day, and every day after. By the end of the year, according to EPA, some 175 million gallons of used motor oil will have been improperly disposed of in this way.

The dumping of this oil is both a tragedy and an opportunity. It is a tragedy because of the tremendous shock to the environment—the equivalent of an *Exxon Valdez* accident every 3 weeks, year in and year out.

It is an opportunity because we can stop it. Used oil is a resource. It can easily be recycled—rerefined into new motor oil, gasoline, diesel fuel or burned as fuel oil. We can and should drastically expand recycling and keep more used motor oil out of the environment.

The reason so much used motor oil is not now recycled—only about 10 percent of the total generated—is largely because of years of regulatory uncertainty, which have discouraged many private organizations from collecting and recycling used motor oil. Hanging over the heads of potential used oil collectors and recyclers is the threat that used motor oil destined for recycling could be listed as a hazardous waste under EPA regulations.

If that happened, the cost of recycling would rise dramatically. Listing would increase potential legal liabilities and drastically increase the cost of liability insurance. It would cause zoning and lease problems for potential collection facilities.

These looming costs have scared away people who might have established used oil collection facilities. Fewer collection centers are available to do-it-yourself oil changers. Fewer recycling programs put used oil to good use. In short, our current laws and regulations have effectively discouraged the proper recycling of used oil.

That is why I am introducing the Used Oil Recycling Act of 1992. The legislation would remove obstacles to used oil recycling by explicitly prohibiting listing of used oil as hazardous waste.

It would also establish a comprehensive used oil management system—the foundation of which is a set of management standards that protect the environment without placing unnecessary and costly burdens on handlers of used oil.

The standards require generators, collectors and transporters of used motor oil to properly handle, label, and store it. Standards exist for facility maintenance and operation, record keeping, contingency plans, release detection and response, financial responsibility, class permitting, closure and response to past practices that may have harmed the environment, and reduction in lead content of used oil to be burned as a fuel.

The standard for lead content is important because much used oil that is recycled is burned as fuel. EPA currently authorizes burning used oil as a valid and environmentally protective form of energy recovery, and the current EPA lead standard for on-specification used oil fuel is 100 ppm. This bill would reduce that to 10 ppm—just 10 percent of the current level.

The bill would also substantially reduce lead content in industrial specification fuels and subject burning of off-specification fuels to stringent air emission limits.

Dumping of used motor oil is one of the Nation's most serious environmental problems. It is also a problem for which a ready solution exists.

My bill helps pave the way for implementation of that solution. It is an environmentally responsible way to encourage the recycling of millions of gallons of used motor oil each year that now wreak havoc on our environment.

I invite my colleagues to join me in supporting this critically needed legislation, and I urge the House to give consideration to its early passage.

THE JOB TRAINING 2000 ACT

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, today my distinguished colleague from Illinois, Mr. MICHEL, my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin, Mr. GUNDERSON, and I are introducing the Job Training 2000 Act. This proposal is very similar to one we introduced by request last month. We are reintroducing this bill with the one modification because of our belief in the importance of the overall approach proposed by this bill.

Unfortunately, the change to the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act proposed in H.R. 5038 detracted from the goals of that bill. Hence, eliminating that proposed change will allow for thoughtful discussion of the more important provisions and purposes of this proposal and merits our support.

With these changes, I believe this bill will improve the capability of our country's employment training and vocational education system to serve all Americans. If we want the United States to remain a competitive world leader, we must recognize we are dependent on a well-trained, well-educated work force. I wish to commend the President for his leadership in bringing forth this legislation, and as proposed, it merits our hearty support. I strongly support the goals set forth in this bill of coordinating the education and training system, encouraging greater and more effective private sector involvement, simplifying program services, decentralizing decisionmaking, creating a flexible delivery structure, and ensuring high standards of accountability.

I agree with the goals of this proposal for more local control and for better coordination; however, we will need to consider carefully the ability of the current private industry council to fulfill this role and the certification procedures outlined need careful consideration program by program.

Again, I am in strong support of the Job Training 2000 Act and I hope you will join me in supporting this legislation.

TRIBUTE TO WALTER "SALTY" BRINE

HON. JACK REED

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a Rhode Island institution, Mr. Walter "Salty" Brine. For five decades Salty has graced the airwaves as Rhode Island's premiere radio/television celebrity. Today, I am pleased and honored to join with my fellow residents of the Ocean State in celebrating the occasion of Salty's 50th anniversary in broadcasting.

Since his earnest beginnings in 1942 as a news announcer, Salty has made a lasting impression on generations of Rhode Islanders. From Salty's Shack, to his home on WPRO, to no school announcements, Salty's leadership, professionalism, and affable personality has made a lasting mark in the fabric of our community.

Rhode Islanders have literally grown up with Salty and his melodious voice. During his career he has seen the world change, and reported the news, and commented on current events, both joyful and tragic. He has been a stable and calming institution and our community has benefited deeply from his personal example. He is an extraordinary symbol of integrity, goodness, and geniality.

Through the years, Salty and his wife Mickey have gained a special place in our hearts. For my generation and for young, and old like, Salty and Mickey are symbolic parents—kind, strong, decent, caring, inspiring.

On the occasion of his anniversary, I proudly join with my fellow Rhode Islanders in paying tribute to Salty. As we celebrate this milestone, we pause to remember fondly all the memories he has made for us in Rhode Island broadcast history. Mr. Speaker, I am honored that this wonderful man and his family make their home here in Rhode Island, and I am proud to be their Congressman.

SOUTH MIAMI HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS SHARE WITH "ABUELITOS"

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to the work and learning being shared by students at South Miami High School and their adopted grandparents at the Little Havana Activities Center in Miami.

Three hundred South Miami High students and about 500 older people are involved in the Youth and Elderly Against Crime project which brings young and old together to discuss community issues. Among their activities this year was a trip by 40 of the students to the Little Havana Center to present skits, which they wrote themselves, showing how crimes can take place and explaining how to avoid them.

The Miami Herald published an article about this outstanding program, which I would like to include in the RECORD:

STUDENTS TAKE THE STAGE TO OFFER ANTI-CRIME TIPS

(By Jon O'Neill)

A group of kids from South Miami High School brought a lesson to their adopted grandparents at the Little Havana Activities & Nutrition Centers on Tuesday.

The students used short skits to show their abuelitos how to avoid becoming crime statistics. And they had a good time doing it.

"They relate to us like grandchildren," student Ayetzsha Garay, 18, said of the 500 people who gathered at the center, 700 SW Eighth St. to watch the kids. "We enjoy coming here because we have fun with them. One of them told me that after our last visit, she was so excited she couldn't sleep."

The visit was sponsored by the Youth and Elderly Against Crime Project, which was cited this week as one of President Bush's Points of Light. It's part of a larger school system-sponsored program called the Intergenerational Law Advocacy Program, and it brings young and old together to discuss community issues and learn from each other.

South Miami High, 6856 SW 53rd St., has about 300 students involved in the program. Almost 40 made the trip to Little Havana. The school and the centers adopted each other several years ago, and they take turns visiting each other for breakfasts, lunches and other get-togethers.

"The last time we came here we played dominoes and danced," student Raymond Blanco, 18, said. "They can dance a lot more than we can."

Tuesday, the kids performed three skits they wrote themselves. One depicted a credit card scam, another a home invasion and the third a robbery at an automatic teller machine.

"We're trying to give them some hints about what they should and shouldn't do," said Richard Vera, 19, who portrayed a robber.

The kids did the skits in Spanglish and had the audience laughing and learning at the same time.

"We want to keep them from being conned or deceived," said student Jennifer Noll, 18. "A lot of times, it seems like they have nobody to help them, and they seem to like what we do."

"It's a very important learning experience for the students," teacher Patricia Coyle said. "It helps them develop sensitivity toward the elderly."

Elisa M. Juara, nutrition director of the center, said the visits are just as important for the elderly.

"The kids bring them energy," she said. "It makes them feel so special and they can share so much with each other. The people here may be a little older, but they still have a lot to give."

Mr. Speaker, I commend the students of South Miami High School for their spirit of service, and for their recognition that older people not only can learn from them, but also have a great deal to teach them. They are a point of light illuminating the way for all of us.

RONALD K. MACHTLEY AWARD WINNER

HON. RONALD K. MACHTLEY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. MACHTLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct pleasure to congratulate Jacki Johnson of Providence, as this year's recipient of the Congressman Ronald K. Machtley Academic and Leadership Excellence Award for Mount Pleasant High School in Providence, RI.

This award is presented to the student, chosen by Mount Pleasant High School, who demonstrates a mature blend of academic achievement, community involvement and leadership qualities.

Jackie Johnson has more than fulfilled this criteria. While being named to the honor roll, Jackie served her school as a member of the Senior Social Committee and as a member of the executive board of M.P. for Peace, a service group. She also plays softball and works at a part-time job in her community.

I commend Jacki Johnson for her outstanding achievements and wish her all the best in her future endeavors.

QMB NOTIFICATION LEGISLATION

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to include a description of the Qualified Medicare Beneficiary [QMB] Program in the annual notice HHS mails each year to all Medicare beneficiaries.

As you know, Congress created the QMB Program in 1988 for Medicare recipients who earn too much to qualify for Medicaid yet are unable to pay their Medicare out-of-pocket expenses. QMB was designed to aid our Nation's neediest seniors—seniors whose earnings and assets meet the Federal poverty limits. Under the QMB Program, qualified Medicare beneficiaries are eligible to receive Medicaid coverage of Medicare's premiums, deductibles and coinsurance costs.

The tragedy, Mr. Speaker, is that the vast majority of senior citizens that QMB was created to serve do not even know that it exists. Hundreds of thousands of our Nation's neediest seniors who qualify for QMB coverage are unaware, for example, that they are entitled to the $31.80 that is deducted each month from their Social Security checks.

Thirty-one dollars and eighty cents a month. It may not seem like a lot to an administration intent on keeping the QMB Program a closely guarded secret. But $31.80 each month cap mean an awful lot to a senior citizen living on the edge of poverty, $31.80 is a week's worth of groceries, a month's utility bill, or the cost of traveling to church, to the store and to the doctor each month.

The legislation I am introducing today would require that the Secretary of Health and Human Services include an easy-to-understand description of the QMB Program in the annual notice mailed to all Medicare beneficiaries. It is a simple bill, it is an inexpensive bill, but it is an urgently needed bill. I encourage my colleagues to review it, and I hope they will support it.

ETHNIC ALBANIANS IN KOSOVO HOLD HISTORIC VOTE

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the ethnic Albanians in the former semiautonomous province of Kosovo in what was Yugoslavia for their recent brave decision to freely express their political desires.

On Sunday, overwhelming numbers of ethnic Albanians in Kosovo elected Ibrahim Rugova to be President and selected a legislative assembly. Dr. Rugova, who heads the Democratic League of Kosovo, is strongly committed to democracy and the restoration of the semiautonomous status of Kosovo. He also supports the eventual independence of the region through nonviolent means. Before the elections, which were monitored by international observers, 23 political parties declared their intention to participate and over 500 candidates registered for the 100 parliamentary seats.

Kosovo lost its semiautonomous status in 1990 following a brutal crackdown by Serbian authorities which killed scores of demonstrating Albanians. Since then, Kosovo has been a police state, under martial law, and totally occupied by Serbian security forces. Ethnic Albanians are routinely denied basic liberties, including freedom of assembly, speech, and press, and ethnic Albanian political activists are often beaten, harassed, and sometimes killed. Even though ethnic Albanians represent 90 percent of the population of Kosovo, Serbia dissolved the province's parliament and sacked more than 85,000 ethnic Albanian doctors, teachers, and workers for refusing to sign a loyalty oath. Serbian officials control Kosovo's police, media, hospitals, hotels, and even schools.

Before the elections, which Serbian authorities opposed and described as illegal, Serbian security personnel sealed off the headquarters of the Democratic League of Kosovo and seized election materials. I am particularly disturbed by unconfirmed reports that one of the key ethnic Albanian organizers of the election was brutally killed after the election.

In the aftermath of the cold war, the desires of the ethnic Albanian community in Kosovo for self-determination, freedom, and democracy strike a chord with a growing number of nations around the world. I only hope that the Serbian strongman, Slobodan Milosevic, will see the writing on the wall and resist any temptation to direct aggression against the freedom-loving ethnic Albanian community there. Even with all of his military power and horrible brutality, the Serbian madman cannot stop the tide of democracy that is surging through former Yugoslavia.

TRIBUTE TO UNCLE SAM ROUNSEVILLE

HON. JOSEPH P. KENNEDY II

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I include the following resolution:

Whereas, the strongest asset of the United States of America is the talent, energy and drive of the citizens of our great country, and

Whereas, each citizen has a unique opportunity to make our nation stronger and greater through their individual effort, and

Whereas, each time an individual makes a small or large contribution to benefit his or her fellow citizen, we become a stronger and better nation as a whole, and

Whereas, in the course of human events, all citizens benefit from the individual and collective efforts of others who foster better education, volunteerism, pride in America, and freedom and peace throughout the world.

Now therefore, on behalf of the people of the United States of America, we pause to pay special recognition to such an individual, "Uncle Sam Rounseville", who has distinguished himself by his many civic and charitable endeavors, namely, promoting volunteerism, helping the United States Government in its Savings Bond Drive, helping to raise funds for the Heroes Welcome Home for the Gulf War Veterans, visiting schools to promote reading and scholastic activities by students, visiting nursing homes and hospitals to cheer up the less fortunate, raising funds for the U.S. Olympic Team, and personally going to Albertsville, France, in support of our Olympic Team, together with many other civic and charitable events too numerous to mention. In appreciation and in recognition of your volunteer efforts, we salute and commend you, "Uncle Sam".

NATIONAL WOMEN VETERANS RECOGNITION WEEK

HON. MICHAEL BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, in 1984, I sponsored the first piece of legislation introduced in Congress that called for national recognition of women veterans. The VA estimates that there are more than 1.2 million women veterans in this country, representing 4.2 percent of the total veteran population. Approximately 88,000 women veterans reside in my home State of Florida.

While I was pleased to be the originator of this worthwhile endeavor, I was surprised and disappointed that such recognition had not been given before. I am proud to say that ever since, Congress and the President have approved National Women Veterans Recognition Week.

One reason I sponsored National Women Veterans Recognition Week is to honor the women who have served in the Armed Forces and to increase the public awareness of their significant contributions to the defense of this great Nation.

Although official military participation began with the formation of the Army Nurse Corps in 1901, followed by the Navy Nurse Corps in 1903, women have served in and with the military services since our country was founded.

During World War I, the Army held fast to its prohibition against enlisted women, but the Navy Department took advantage of the clerical skills women offered by signing up 13,000 women in the Navy and the Marine Corps. These women—who worked as telephone operators, clerical workers, typists and stenographers—were the first to be accorded full military rank and status. When World War I ended, however, they were demobilized, and except for the Nurse Corps, the American armed services were once again all-male institutions.

World War II marked a turning point in the history of women in the military. On May 14, 1942, the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, or WAACs, was created, followed 2 months later by the WAVES, which stands for "Women Accepted for Voluntary Emergency Service."

A total of 350,000 women served in the four services during World War II and their con-

tribution to the war effort was invaluable. Perhaps the greatest compliment paid to the American women who served came from Albert Speer, Adolf Hilter's weapons production chief. Speer is reported to have said:

How wise you were to bring your women into your military and into your labor force. Had we done that initially, as you did, it could well have affected the whole course of the war. We would have found out, as you did, that women were equally effective, and for some skills, superior to males.

In 1947–48, Congress recognized the valuable service of women during World War II by granting them active duty status in the regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps and Air Force. Women continued to play an active role in Korea and Vietnam. In 1975, Congress further recognized the important contributions of women by requiring the service academies to admit women. In 1980, the first women were graduated.

Whether women served as nurses, clerical support, mechanics, technicians, pilots, cryptographers or one of the many other positions of service, they have contributed and continue to contribute mightily to our defense in times of both war and peace. And despite the fact that women are officially excluded from combat duty, we all know that many women veterans served under very difficult and dangerous circumstances—some even gave their lives for their country.

In fact, in every war before the 20th century in which the United States was involved, small numbers of women disguised themselves as men in order to serve in combat roles. Among the most famous of these were Deborah Sampson, alias Robert Shurtleff in the Revolutionary War; Lucy Brewer, alias George Baker, in the War of 1812; and Loretta Vasquez, alias Harry T. Buford, in the Civil War.

Despite the continuous service of women throughout the history of our Nation, we have not always recognized their tremendous contributions, nor have we paid attention to their needs as veterans.

It is my hope that "National Women Veterans Recognition Week" will highlight the special needs of women veterans, particularly in the areas of health care, employment, and readjustment problems. Of greatest importance is to increase women veterans' awareness of the availability of VA benefits and services for which they are eligible. Although much has been accomplished in the past several years, women veterans are less likely than their male counterparts to use veterans benefits such as VA health care and the home loan guarantee program.

"National Women Veterans Recognition Week" is a time for the country to become better acquainted with the service of women veterans and to express our gratitude to them for that service. However, it is also a time for women veterans themselves to remember their years in uniform and take pride in the many contributions they have made to the security and well-being of our great country.

As new windows of opportunities open for women in the military, there will be an increasing number of female veterans eligible for health care and other benefits. It is incumbent upon us to see that those services are available to them.

Today, I have once again introduced "National Women Veterans Recognition Week," and I hope my colleagues will support this important resolution.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF LEONARD RAMIREZ

HON. RICHARD H. LEHMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. LEHMAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise before my colleagues today to honor and congratulate Mr. Leonard Ramirez for receiving Continental Cablevision's Cable in the Classroom Educator Award. Each year 15 such awards are given to outstanding educators and media specialists from across the country who have developed innovative ways to use cable educational programs enhance classroom curriculum.

Mr. Ramirez is a media technician at the Instructional Media Center of the Fresco Unified School District. In his position, Mr. Ramirez has profoundly affected the quality of education in the Fresno Unified School District. Mr. Ramirez has used his technical expertise and creativity to utilize local cable services by developing a complete media facility at Fresno Unified. He records Assignment Discovery, Arts & Entertainment classroom programs and C–SPAN short subject programs, making these programs available to teachers through a centralized audio visual circulation department. Teachers are then able to access any type of cable programming for use in their classroom.

Not only has Mr. Ramirez developed this video facility within the Fresco Unified School, but he also facilitated communication between the local cable company and his children's Kingsbury School District. As a result of his efforts, the school district and cable company now have a strong working relationship.

At a time when school budgets are severely constrained, and many educational systems are under much criticism, Mr. Ramirez took the time and the initiative to enhance Fresno Unified's educational curriculum. Because of his concern, the children of Fresno and Kingsbury Counties have the opportunity to be exposed to top quality, up-to-the-minute cable programming. Teachers also now have the resources and opportunities to develop the most creative and informative lesson plans for their students.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and pleasure that I take this opportunity to congratulate and honor Mr. Leonard Ramirez on the floor of the House of Representatives. His ability and devotion to improving the quality of education is both inspirational and admirable. I am very fortunate to have someone like Leonard Ramirez in my district, and I am confident that he will continue to use his skill and creativity to further enhance the curriculum of the schools he works with.

FRANK V. MEEHAN, CHIEF OF POLICE FOR EL SEGUNDO, RETIRES AFTER 34 YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to salute Frank V. Meehan, chief of police for the city of El Segundo. Chief Meehan will be honored on June 12, 1992, on the occasion of his retirement from the law enforcement field after an impressive 34 years of dedicated service.

As chief of police, he applied his vast experience in law enforcement and his dedication to assist our neighboring communities with innovative projects. From 1988–92, he launched the Westnet Task Force which became the Los Angeles Inter-Metropolitan Policy Agency Crime Team, as well as L.A. Impact, a countywide drug enforcement team. He also established the Reach Out Against Drugs Organization [ROAD] to interact directly with the youth of the city in a fight against drug and alcohol use. During his tenure as chief of police for the nearby city of Redondo Beach, he initiated a regional 19-member burglary apprehension team that served as a model for numerous teams still operating today statewide.

The same innate talents Chief Meehan brought to the police departments that he served faithfully, he brought to other projects. He served as a senior associate for Triton Corp. in Washington, DC, from 1983 to 1985. In this position, he was responsible for the structure and presentation of the Federal Emergency Management Agency's integrated emergency management course. He also served as law enforcement liaison for the district attorney of Los Angeles County from May to November 1983.

Despite the enormous responsibilities of guiding a police department, Chief Meehan has also been active in many professional associations such as: The California Peace Officer's Association; the International Association of Chiefs of Police; the Police Management Association, Washington, DC; the Los Angeles County Peace Officers' Association; the police chiefs' section, the League of California Cities; the Los Angeles County Police Chiefs' Association; and the South Bay Police Chiefs' Association.

Among his many accomplishments Chief Meehan is a veteran of the U.S. Army where he served in the Far East theater of operations prior to being discharged in December 1947. While serving the city of Chino, he earned his bachelor of science degree from the California State University of Los Angeles in June of 1970, and later earned his master of public administration from the University of Southern California in 1975.

Throughout his endeavors, Chief Meehan has enjoyed the love and support of his family, including his wife of 42 years, Marie, his daughter, Lisa, and his two sons, Sean and Joseph.

El Segundo is extremely fortunate to have had the leadership of an individual as dedicated, experienced, and successful as Frank V. Meehan. I ask that my colleagues join me

in saluting Chief Meehan on the occasion of his retirement from the law enforcement field, and to wish him and his family continued success.

SALUTE TO ROBERT OWENS

HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of the giants of California law enforcement as he retires after more than 38 years of service.

Oxnard Police Chief Robert Owens has earned national recognition for his innovative and effective ideas in combating crime. During his 22 years as Oxnard's chief, he has established his department as one of the best in the State, and has worked especially hard—and successfully—to maintain strong support from all segments of the community.

Bob began his career with the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, where he served for 13 years and rose to the rank of lieutenant before leaving to become the San Fernando police chief for 3 years. In 1970, he was named chief in Oxnard, and began the innovative approach that has been his hallmark.

For example, Bob launched the serious habitual offender program in 1979 to keep track of criminals in and outside of the corrections system. In an effort to reduce recidivism, criminals receive job training, counseling, job referrals and, if necessary, even clothes for job interviews. The program has worked so well that last year the department received a Federal grant to create a similar program for gang members.

Bob also has long been a supporter of community policing, the concept that is now gaining popularity in a number of big city departments. Bringing together city agencies and community groups, police spearheaded urban renewal programs and gained support by increased foot patrols and other measures.

Mr. Speaker, Ventura County District Attorney Michael Bradbury perhaps best summed up Bob's career when he called Chief Owens "the Renaissance man of law enforcement." Bob formally retires on June 15, and his many friends will honor him at a retirement dinner on June 5. I urge my colleagues to join me in saluting him as well for an outstanding career, and in wishing him and his wife, Linda, well.

EFFECTS OF PRORATIONING EVEN GREATER

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, last week when the House considered the Markey-Scheuer natural gas prorationing amendment, I stated that gas prices had gone up 32 cents per thousand cubic feet at the well-head in the 6 weeks since Texas and Oklahoma adopted their prorationing regulations.

I was wrong, and for this I humbly apologize to my colleagues. As it turns out, the price of gas has gone up more than 50 cents per thousand cubic feet and experts are saying that part of that increase is due to prorationing. Prorationing and the recent increase in natural gas prices would not cost American gas consumers $6 billion, it will cost them nearly twice that.

When the Congress passed the Markey-Scheuer amendment last week, with a majority of both Democrats and Republicans voting "aye," it did the right thing. We made it clear that we will not allow States to use prorationing policies to restrict output and raise prices.

TRIBUTE TO S. SGT. FREDERICK GRIMES

HON. CLYDE C. HOLLOWAY

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. HOLLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to salute my constituent, S. Sgt. Frederick Grimes of Alexandria, LA, who was recently honored as the "United States Air Forces in Europe Medical Technician of the Year." This recognition, Mr. Speaker, is not something which the Air Force grants lightly or without reason. On the contrary, naming Sergeant Grimes as "Technician of the Year" represents the Air Force's confirmation of his professional skill, value, and management and leadership ability. Mr. Speaker, Sergeant Grimes is richly deserving of this award. I commend his selection. He is a credit to his family, his community, his State, and our Nation.

TRIBUTE TO STEWART H. GAMAGE

HON. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge and thank a member of my staff, Stewart H. Gamage, who is leaving the Hill to pursue other interests. Ms. Gamage served as floor assistant and policy director on my majority leader staff. In both of those capacities, her quick intelligence, wide range of interests, and commitment made her an effective and valued aide. I know that these qualities will ensure her success in her future endeavors. I also know that she will be missed by her many friends and colleagues in the Congress. I thank her for her good work and wish her the best of luck.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT GAINER

HON. DENNIS M. HERTEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. HERTEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an old friend, Robert Gainer, a valued member of the Capitol Hill Police force whose last day of work is tomorrow, Friday, May 29, 1992. Bob has been with the force for 21 years and will be retiring in October. In June 1971, Bob began his career with the patrol division where he directed traffic, walked foot patrol and worked in a scout car. While directing traffic he could often be seen in an intersection pleading with people to come on through. He transferred after 9 years to the House division. Here, many of us have been greeted by his friendly face in the mornings as we enter the Longworth garage.

Prior to coming to Capitol Hill, Bob had a distinguished career in the U.S. Army. He is a veteran of both the Korean and Vietnam wars. In Korea, Bob was wounded and was then sent to Japan where he was stationed for 3 years with the military police and ordnance. In addition to his service in Korea and Japan, he also served from 1967 to 1968 in Vietnam as a supply officer. Throughout Bob's 20 year career in the military he served in many parts of the United States starting at Fort Knox, KY and ending at Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD. During his career, he received the Korean Service Medal, Japan Occupation Ribbon, Vietnam Service Ribbon with Accommodation, U.N. Defense Ribbon and was awarded the good conduct medal numerous times.

Bob is a West Virginia native and is proud of his Preston County roots and their famous buckwheat cakes. He is an avid sports fan and continues to root for the West Virginia Mountaineers as well as the Washington Redskins and the Pittsburgh Pirates. There are probably no stronger Redskins' fans than Bob and his family. Often, on the day after the game, you could find Bob replaying it play by play with his colleagues. As a young man he tried out for the Pittsburgh Pirates and even though he was cut from the team, he still enjoys following "his team", the Pirates.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me, Bob's wife, Celia and his children, Janice, Sharon and Rick, and of course his many friends in recognizing the numerous contributions of this fine man. I ask that my fellow colleagues join me in congratulating him on a job well done. I wish him continued success and happiness.

INTRODUCTION OF THE AMERICAN VISIONARY ART MUSEUM RECOGNITION ACT

HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1992

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, today I, joined with colleagues from the Maryland delegation, am introducing the American Visionary Art Museum Recognition Act. This legislation expresses the sense of Congress regarding visionary art as a national treasure and regarding the American Visionary Art Museum as a national repository and educational center for visionary art.

Visionary art is produced by individuals independent of the influence of mainstream art. The visionary artist is driven by his or her own internal impulses to create. Prominent among the creators of visionary art are the

mentally ill, the disabled, and the elderly. Their work exemplifies the human capacity to overcome difficulty through creative response.

The American Visionary Art Museum, which will be located in Baltimore's Inner Harbor, is the only visionary art museum in the United States. The legislation we are introducing in the House as a companion to legislation introduced by Senator MIKULSKI in the Senate will regard visionary art as a national treasure and proclaim the American Visionary Art Museum a national repository and educational center for visionary art.

The primary vision of the museum is to increase public awareness of America's rich heritage of uncommon art produced by common people in response to extraordinary circumstances. It also seeks to provide educational outreach to the public, especially school-age children and the elderly, by exposing them through art, film, and special events to new ideas about the value of individual and creative, self-reliant expression.

I would ask my colleagues to join me in sponsoring this very important legislation.