

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, January 27, 1993

The House met at 12 noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

As we have received the many gifts of life, we pray, gracious God, that we will begin each day with an attitude of thanksgiving for the opportunities before us. In spite of problems and tension, there is still celebration and reconciliation; in spite of wars and pain, there is also faith and hope and love. May Your blessing, O God, that is new every morning, be with each person, this day and every day. 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.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. KYL. 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 246, nays 146, answered "present" 1, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 11]
YEAS—246

Ackerman	Browder	Darden
Andrews (ME)	Brown (FL)	de la Garza
Andrews (NJ)	Brown (OH)	Deal
Andrews (TX)	Bryant	DeFazio
Applegate	Buyer	DeLauro
Archer	Byrne	Dellums
Bacchus (FL)	Cantwell	Derrick
Baesler	Cardin	Deutsch
Barlow	Carr	Dicks
Barrett (WI)	Chapman	Dingell
Bateman	Clement	Dixon
Becerra	Clyburn	Dooley
Bellenson	Coleman	Dunn
Berman	Collins (IL)	Durbin
Bevill	Collins (MI)	Edwards (CA)
Bilbray	Combest	Edwards (TX)
Bishop	Condit	Engel
Blackwell	Cooper	English (AZ)
Bonior	Coppersmith	English (OK)
Borski	Costello	Eshoo
Boucher	Coyne	Evans
Brewster	Cramer	Fazio
Brooks	Danner	Fields (LA)

Filner	Lowey	Rostenkowski
Fingerhut	Mann	Rowland
Fish	Manton	Roybal-Allard
Foglietta	Margolies-	Rush
Foley	Mezvinsky	Sabo
Frost	Markey	Sangmeister
Furse	Martinez	Santorum
Gejdenson	Matsui	Sarpalius
Gephardt	Mazzoli	Sawyer
Geren	McCloskey	Schenk
Gibbons	McCrery	Schumer
Gillmor	McCurdy	Scott
Gilman	McDermott	Serrano
Glickman	McHale	Sharp
Gonzalez	McKinney	Shaw
Gordon	McNulty	Shepherd
Green	Meehan	Sisisky
Gunderson	Meek	Skaggs
Hall (OH)	Menendez	Skeen
Hall (TX)	Mfume	Skelton
Hamilton	Miller (CA)	Slattery
Hansen	Mineta	Slaughter
Harman	Minge	Spratt
Hayes	Mink	Stark
Hefner	Moakley	Stenholm
Hinchey	Mollohan	Stokes
Hoagland	Montgomery	Strickland
Hochbrueckner	Murtha	Studds
Holden	Natcher	Stupak
Houghton	Neal (MA)	Swett
Hoyer	Neal (NC)	Swift
Hughes	Oberstar	Synar
Hutto	Olver	Tanner
Hyde	Ortiz	Taylor (MS)
Insole	Orton	Tejeda
Johnson (GA)	Owens	Thornton
Johnson (SD)	Packard	Torres
Kanjorski	Pallone	Torricelli
Kaptur	Pastor	Towns
Kennedy	Payne (NJ)	Traffiant
Kennelly	Payne (VA)	Tucker
Kildee	Pelosi	Unsoeld
Kingston	Penny	Valentine
Klecza	Peterson (FL)	Velazquez
Klein	Peterson (MN)	Vento
Klink	Pickett	Vislosky
Kopetski	Pomeroy	Volkmmer
Kreidler	Poshard	Walsh
LaFalce	Price (NC)	Washington
Lambert	Pryce (OH)	Waters
Lancaster	Quillen	Watt
Lantos	Rahall	Waxman
LaRocco	Rangel	Wheat
Laughlin	Ravenel	Williams
Lehman	Reed	Wise
Levin	Reynolds	Wyden
Lewis (GA)	Richardson	Wynn
Lipinski	Roemer	Yates
Lloyd	Rose	
Loy		

NAYS—146

Allard	Coble	Gilchrest
Armey	Collins (GA)	Gingrich
Bachus (AL)	Cox	Goodlatte
Baker (CA)	Crapo	Goodling
Baker (LA)	Cunningham	Goss
Ballenger	DeLay	Gradison
Barrett (NE)	Diaz-Balart	Grams
Bartlett	Dickey	Grandy
Bentley	Doolittle	Greenwood
Bereuter	Dornan	Hancock
Bilirakis	Dreier	Hastert
Bliley	Duncan	Hefley
Blute	Emerson	Heger
Boehert	Everett	Hobson
Boehner	Ewing	Hoekstra
Bonilla	Fawell	Hoke
Bunning	Fowler	Horn
Callahan	Franks (CT)	Huffington
Camp	Franks (NJ)	Hunter
Candady	Gallegly	Hutchinson
Castle	Gallo	Inglis
Clay	Gekas	Inhofe

Istook	McMillan	Schroeder
Jacobs	Meyers	Sensenbrenner
Johnson (CT)	Mica	Shays
Johnson, Sam	Michel	Shuster
Kasich	Miller (FL)	Smith (MI)
Kim	Molinari	Smith (NJ)
King	Moorhead	Smith (TX)
Klug	Morella	Snowe
Knollenberg	Murphy	Solomon
Kolbe	Myers	Spence
Kyl	Nussle	Stearns
Lazio	Oxley	Stump
Leach	Paxon	Sundquist
Levy	Petri	Talent
Lewis (CA)	Pombo	Taylor (NC)
Lewis (FL)	Quinn	Thomas (CA)
Lightfoot	Ramstad	Thomas (WY)
Linder	Regula	Torkildsen
Livingston	Ridge	Upton
Machtley	Roberts	Vucanovich
Manzullo	Rogers	Walker
McCandless	Ros-Lehtinen	Weldon
McCollum	Roukema	Wolf
McDade	Royce	Young (AK)
McHugh	Saxton	Young (FL)
McInnis	Schaefer	Zeliff
McKeon	Schiff	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Thurman

NOT VOTING—39

Abercrombie	Ford (TN)	Parker
Barcia	Frank (MA)	Pickle
Barton	Gutierrez	Porter
Brown (CA)	Hamburg	Rohrabacher
Burton	Hastings	Roth
Calvert	Henry	Sanders
Clayton	Hilliard	Smith (IA)
Clinger	Jefferson	Smith (OR)
Conyers	Johnson, E.B.	Tauzin
Crane	Johnston	Whitten
Fields (TX)	Maloney	Wilson
Flake	Nadler	Woolsey
Ford (MI)	Obey	Zimmer

□ 1227

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

So the journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SWIFT). Will the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] please come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CALLAHAN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 23. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to

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

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

transfer the catafalque to the Supreme Court for a funeral service.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 202. An act to designate the Federal Judiciary Building in Washington, DC, as the "Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building."

ADJOURNMENT FROM WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 27, 1993, TO TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1993

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 27) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 27

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on Wednesday, January 27, 1993, it stand adjourned until noon on Tuesday, February 2, 1993.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic caucus, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 51) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 51

Resolved, That the following named Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates, be, and they are hereby, elected as chairman and Members, as the case maybe to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Armed Services: Ronald V. Dellums, California, chairman; Pete Geren, Texas; Elizabeth Furse, Oregon; vacancy.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries: Gary L. Ackerman, New York.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: Greg Laughlin, Texas; Sanford D. Bishop, Jr., Georgia; Sherrod Brown, Ohio; Alcee L. Hastings, Florida.

Committee on District of Columbia: Fortney Pete Stark, California, chairman.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1230

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SWIFT). Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of 15 U.S.C. 1024(a), the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Economic Committee the following Members on the part of the House:

Mr. HAMILTON of Indiana;
Mr. OBEY of Wisconsin;
Mr. STARK of California;
Mr. MFUME of Maryland;
Mr. WYDEN of Oregon; and
Mr. ANDREWS of Texas.

THURGOOD MARSHALL FEDERAL JUDICIARY BUILDING

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 202) to designate the Federal Judiciary Building in Washington, DC, as the "Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building," and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not intend to object, but I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA] to explain the bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support for S. 202, to designate the Federal Judiciary Building in Washington, DC, as the "Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building."

This is a fitting tribute to a giant, great jurist who was a relentless voice for minorities and whose six-decade legal career was emblematic of the civil rights revolution.

Thurgood Marshall's roots were unlike those of any Justice before him.

He was born in Baltimore, MD, on July 2, 1908. The son of an elementary schoolteacher and yacht club steward, and the great-grandson of a slave brought to America from Africa's Congo region, Marshall was named after his paternal grandfather, who had chosen the name "through good" for himself when enlisting in the Union Army during the Civil War.

In his youth, Marshall attended Douglas High School in Baltimore, and worked as a delivery boy for a women's store. He also attended the all-black Lincoln University in Pennsylvania and earned money for tuition by waiting tables.

He obtained his law degree from Howard University in 1933, graduating first in his class.

Before he joined the Supreme Court, Marshall distinguished himself as our country's first black Solicitor General. He served in that post from 1965 to 1967 and took the lead in promoting the Johnson administration's civil and constitutional rights agenda.

He came to national prominence as the chief lawyer for the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund when he argued a series of 1954 school desegregation cases known collectively as Brown versus Board of Education. The

Supreme Court ruled in those cases that segregation in public schools was unconstitutional.

Marshall also spearheaded litigation that ended white-only primary elections and explicit racial discrimination in housing contracts.

In 1967, President Johnson appointed Thurgood Marshall to the Supreme Court. During his 24-year tenure, he was the only black Justice.

Marshall's record on the Supreme Court was consistent: He defended individual rights, he sided with minorities and the underprivileged; he favored affirmative action and he always opposed the death penalty.

In a recent statement, President Clinton said Marshall was one of the giants "in the quest for human rights and equal opportunity in the whole history of our country."

A genuine, sincere individual, Marshall said he wanted to be remembered this way: "That he did what he could with what he had."

Mr. Speaker, it is especially appropriate that we consider this bill on the very day that Justice Marshall lies in state in the great hall of the Supreme Court—an honor bestowed on few.

Naming the Federal Judiciary Building after Thurgood Marshall will serve as a lasting memory to one whose commitment to and reverence for the American justice system were second to none.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of S. 202, and again thank my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, Justice Marshall was a pioneer in breaking down racial barriers in our country, and he did so with remarkable vigor and tremendous success.

Even before his selection to the high court, Thurgood Marshall had a very successful career as a civil rights attorney, appeals court judge, and U.S. Solicitor General.

Thurgood Marshall graduated at the top of his law school class at Howard University, and he continued his dominant force in the legal profession throughout his career. Amazingly, he won all but 3 of the 32 cases he argued before the Supreme Court. And he will be especially remembered for his role as the attorney for the NAACP in the landmark Brown versus Board of Education desegregation case.

Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that the Federal Judiciary Building in the Nation's Capital bear the name of Thurgood Marshall as a monument to the historic contributions made by this great jurist, and I urge its approval.

Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I yield to the former great quarterback of the University of Pittsburgh, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I, too, rise in support of S. 202 to designate the Federal Judiciary Building as the Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building.

I would like to say that some people will remember Thurgood Marshall as a greater parent. Some people will remember him as an excellent attorney. Some will remember him as a superb Supreme Court Justice, and many others will remember him as a fearless fighter who stood up for what he believed was right and took no quarters.

But I think what is most important, and something that may be more important than that is Thurgood Marshall taught us how to fight, and he taught us how to win. He set an example. He was truly a David among a whole group of Goliaths. But he won. And I say that the legacy of Thurgood Marshall should not fall on deaf ears in the Congress.

If the rights of the American people will not be defended in the Congress and in the courts of our country, the rights of the American people will be pursued and defended on the streets of America. And Thurgood Marshall set an example of what was the right way, the American way to fight and to protect our system.

What is actually ironic also is that the Justice Department of America that so vigorously opposed Thurgood Marshall now is prepared and poised to honor him with real sincerity and real respect. That is a tremendous tribute to this fearless fighter.

So I am very proud that our subcommittee is involved with the process, and we look forward to Members' support.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds I am honored to speak in support of this legislation, which would designate the Federal Judiciary Building in Washington, DC, as the "Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building."

Thurgood Marshall was a giant in this Nation's civil rights movement. His lifelong commitment to civil rights and his unbending efforts to end discrimination and ensure equal justice for all Americans, has left a lasting impression on our legal system and our society.

Born in Baltimore on July 2, 1908, Marshall began his legal career in 1933 after graduating first in his class at Howard University Law School. Almost immediately Thurgood Marshall began chipping away at the barriers—both legal and social—that prevented African-Americans and other minorities from enjoying the full civil rights granted under the Constitution.

In one of his first civil rights cases, Marshall successfully gained admission for a young African-American man to the University of Maryland Law School. Three years later, he was hired by the NAACP and in 1939 he founded the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund.

From 1940 to 1961 Thurgood Marshall traveled the country defending the rights of minorities and challenging the status quo. He won

dozens of important civil rights victories, prevailing in 29 of the 32 cases he argued before the Supreme Court—including the landmark 1954 *Brown versus The Board of Education* case. That case ended "separate but equal" school systems and led to the eventual integration of America's schools.

During his tenure at the NAACP, Thurgood Marshall methodically worked to break down the longstanding foundations of segregation and discrimination in American society.

In 1961, President Kennedy appointed Marshall to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second District. Several months later his nomination was approved by the Senate, making him the second African-American judge to sit on the second circuit.

In 1965, President Johnson appointed Thurgood Marshall Solicitor General of the United States. As Solicitor General, Marshall gained several important civil rights victories at the Supreme Court—including High Court approval of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

In 1967, President Johnson nominated Marshall to the Supreme Court. On August 30, 1967, the Senate confirmed Marshall, making him the first African-American Justice in the Court's 178-year history.

Throughout his tenure on the Supreme Court, Thurgood Marshall was a powerful voice and untiring advocate for civil rights and equal justice under the law. His life's work and the legacy he left will have a lasting impact on all Americans.

Thurgood Marshall will be remembered not only as a brilliant civil rights leader, and an outstanding and dedicated jurist. Most importantly, he will be remembered as a great American.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I join Chairman MINETA in support of S. 202, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I yield to the distinguished ranking member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 202, as passed by the other body, to name the Federal Judiciary Building in Washington, DC, the "Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building."

Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues, the distinguished gentleman from California and chairman of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, NORMAN MINETA, and the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania and ranking minority member on the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, BUD SHUSTER. S. 202 will designate the newly completed Federal Judiciary Building after the late Thurgood Marshall. Justice Marshall, who died last Sunday, was a pioneer in civil rights law and our Nation's first black Justice of the Supreme Court.

Born in 1908 in Baltimore, MD, Justice Marshall attended Howard Law School after being denied admittance to the University of Maryland Law

School. Following law school, where he graduated first in his class, Justice Marshall became counsel for the Baltimore branch of the National Association for Advancement of Colored People [NAACP], where he successfully desegregated the law school that denied him admittance. For 21 years, he served as director/counsel of the NAACP, where in 1954 he successfully argued the case of *Brown versus The Board of Education*, calling for desegregation of public schools.

In 1961, he was appointed to the Second Circuit Court of Appeals, and in 1965 was appointed Solicitor General. In 1967, he was appointed Associate Justice to the Supreme Court where he served with distinction until his retirement in 1991.

Mr. Speaker, the country has lost a true champion of civil rights. He will be missed.

□ 1240

As the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] has pointed out, Thurgood Marshall was a fighter for the little man and taught lessons that all of us hopefully should learn.

I was a lawyer and a circuit court judge before coming to Congress, and I can say that Thurgood Marshall was respected and admired by the legal profession all over this Nation.

I think it is very appropriate that we should name this particular building the Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building, and I am pleased to lend my support to this effort.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to rise in support of Senate bill 202, to designate the newly completed Federal Judiciary Building in Washington, DC, as the "Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building."

Justice Marshall represented the very best of the American tradition. He was a source of inspiration to millions of Americans. He was a pioneer in the civil rights movement of this Nation. He was a protector of civil rights, civil liberties, our Constitution, our Nation, and the freedom and democracy for which our Nation stands.

As a Supreme Court Justice, Thurgood Marshall brought tremendous dignity and compassion to the Supreme Court. His years on the bench will be remembered as years of great change in our country. Justice Marshall served as a guiding light and an outstanding leader.

Thurgood Marshall laid the foundation, in the legal sense, of the modern civil rights movement. I would go far enough to say that he must be considered a founding father of the new America. The civil rights movement would not be what it is today, we would

not have made the progress we have made, without the leadership and ability of a man like Thurgood Marshall.

We must recognize the great role Thurgood Marshall has played in the history of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support this bill.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON].

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the ranking member [Mr. SHUSTER], and also the ranking member of the subcommittee [Mr. DUNCAN], and the chairman [Mr. MINETA], and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT], for your sponsorship of S. 202.

No monument, no building, indeed, no words seem adequate to the memory of Justice Thurgood Marshall. But the man who wanted to be remembered, in his own words as one who "did the best he could with what he had" would understand. The Federal Judiciary Building is the best we can do today. It is surely the first of the courthouses, boulevards, and other monuments that will seek distinction by bearing his name.

The elegant, spacious new Federal Judiciary Building at Second and Massachusetts Avenues NE., just three blocks from the Supreme Court where Marshall sat for 24 years, is a good place to begin. Indeed, the Federal Judiciary Building includes chambers for retired Supreme Court Justices.

Marshall's service to his country was unique. In many ways, his determination to win equality through the rule of law saved his country. So profound a revolution has rarely been made without great bloodshed.

The success of his civil rights legal strategy was such an extraordinary achievement that it would be impossible to surpass.

Thurgood Marshall probably is the first person in our history whose greatest service came before he served on the Second Circuit Court of Appeals, before he became Solicitor General of the United States, before he became a Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court. After *Brown versus Board of Education*, Justice Marshall became official, and began a new career of firsts. This building surely commemorates the unofficial Marshall as well, the man whose brilliant legal strategy had to change the Court before he could sit there.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. CLYBURN].

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, let me say to my distinguished colleagues that I can think of nothing more appropriate than the naming of this judicial center in honor of the late Justice Thurgood Marshall. He was a man who,

for many years, took us on a journey of courage into every sector of this Nation.

One of the stopoffs in his journey was a small, rural school district in South Carolina. It was a place where the separate and unequal public education system had reached an intolerable level. Justice Marshall, then an attorney for the NAACP, came to Scotts Branch School in Clarendon County in 1950. His courage ignited a flame in people such as the Reverend J.A. Delaine and Henry Briggs and attorney Harold Boulware and a hundred other families who risked their safety and security to join Thurgood Marshall in resisting the system.

The South Carolina lawsuit was named *Briggs versus Elliott* and it was joined with the *Topeka, KS, case, Brown versus Board of Education* and others to become a landmark Supreme Court case. We all know the outcome of the 1954 decision, and we know the enormous impact it has had on virtually every aspect of American life.

I join you today with great joy in recognizing what the life and accomplishments of Thurgood Marshall have meant to all of us. I am not certain that I—and many of my colleagues—would even be here today were it not for him.

It is particularly fitting that his name be linked to the values of a lawful society in America. He once said, "Lawlessness is lawlessness. Anarchy is anarchy. Neither race nor color nor frustration is an excuse for either lawlessness or anarchy." This center bearing his name will help to carry out his beliefs. It is for us here today in many ways to carry out the dreams and wishes of people such as Thurgood Marshall.

Clarendon County is in South Carolina's Sixth Congressional District, the district I am proud to represent in this House of Representatives. Scotts Branch School is still in operation, and still—for the most part—segregated. The surrounding countryside is still an area of economic hardship.

The lives and the community touched by Thurgood Marshall four decades ago in this small South Carolina setting are still in need of our serious attention. The hope he gave us must not be extinguished. The descendants of those people whom he joined in a journey of courage must realize that the journey is still underway. They must know that there are those willing and able to continue the journey and to take up the challenge Thurgood Marshall has left to us. We are doing his memory and work great honor with this designation.

For the people of the Sixth District in South Carolina, I thank you.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. TUCKER].

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Speaker, first of all, to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER], thank you so much for yielding. Mr. Speaker, thank you for this opportunity to speak to this august body.

I rise in support unequivocally of S. 202, and that is to designate the Federal Judiciary Building in Washington, DC, as the "Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building."

I thank and highly commend the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA], my chairman, for bringing this to the attention of this House, as well as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT], who is my chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

I am happy to see that this body is moving expeditiously to address this matter, because it is an exceptional matter for an exceptional human being.

I would join in many of the comments of my colleagues, but particularly the comments of the gentleman who preceded me, when the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. CLYBURN] said that but for Thurgood Marshall, I, WALTER TUCKER, as an African-American, would perhaps not be here in these august Halls of Congress. So to me, Thurgood Marshall is a very special individual, indeed. As an African-American, to my community, he is a role model among role models.

But Thurgood Marshall and the greatness of this man does not stop with just being a great African-American, for if the truth be known and the record be replete, Thurgood Marshall is a great American among Americans. In fact, his work over the many, many years has become a part of the wonderful historic fabric of this country, a wonderful quilt woven together with stripes of courage, patches of patriotism, stars of unselfishness, and pieces of principled persistence.

□ 1250

That is what Thurgood Marshall has meant to this country. A great, great American, a great advocate, of course highlighted by his career with *Brown versus Board of Education*, a great jurist over 24 years and, most certainly, a great civil rights leader.

Thurgood Marshall has over his lifetime represented the best this country has to offer. His quote that many who preceded me have alluded to, that he did the best with what he had to work with, showed that he truly did the best with what he had to work with because he was the best that this country has to offer.

He offered us hope, he offered us a way to overcome the sometimes schism and dividing lines of race, creed, and color. He was a crusader for the oppressed, for the disenfranchised, truly a role model for all of us to emulate.

If you want to understand what revolution really means in this country, I

do not think we have to look to those in the streets with Molotov cocktails, those in the Los Angeles riots; we should look to a man like Thurgood Marshall, who knew that the pen was mightier than the sword.

So I say I stand in total support, unequivocal support, of S. 202, and I look forward to the day that it is official that we have the Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. COLLINS].

Mrs. COLLINS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, what would the civil rights movement have been without Thurgood Marshall?

What would the Supreme Court have been without Thurgood Marshall?

What would America have been without Thurgood Marshall?

For he took the civil rights movement to new heights, he pushed the Supreme Court farther than they wanted to go, and he opened the eyes of America to a new way of living.

Thurgood Marshall was what a former Harvard Law School professor, Milton Katz, called a level-three lawyer. He not only wanted to practice law, he wanted to win cases; he not only wanted to win cases, he wanted to change the law.

Yes, it is only fitting that we change the name of the Judiciary Building to the Thurgood Marshall Judiciary Building. When compared to his deeds and accomplishments, he will never be repaid.

For Thurgood Marshall flew when others had no wings, ran when all were out of breath, and glowed when the lights were out.

Thurgood Marshall was a giant of a man, lawyer, and judge.

We love you, Thurgood.

I strongly urge your support for passage of S. 202.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS].

Mr. CONYERS. I thank my colleague for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary I want to congratulate this committee and my colleague from Michigan for her remarks. Thurgood Marshall was not only a great legal mind, but he was a great presence. In a way, he was the conscience for this country in the many years during his great service as a Supreme Court jurist.

The only thing that I might add is that, as a lawyer, he began the legacy that he completed as a jurist, because by handling the case, Brown versus Board of Education, in 1954, which overturned Plessy versus Ferguson, we were able to move into an entirely new phase of democratizing America.

So I am very, very pleased that this committee and this Congress have chosen to follow the great lead of yourself.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. BROWN].

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, my heart, like that of others here today, is heavy, like a heavy fog or a thick cloud of sadness suspended over the entire Nation and the world as we say "shalom" to one of the most gifted and talented statesmen—and I want to emphasize statesman, not politician.

Mr. Speaker, I feel privileged to have benefited in my lifetime from Justice Marshall's endeavors. His efforts were largely responsible for my achievement.

Today, we will honor him, and we will miss him because he succeeded in his performance on the stage of life. Clearly he was a role model for all. He will be missed by all.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BISHOP].

Mr. BISHOP. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I am pleased to stand before you and I am grateful to the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding and allowing me this opportunity to speak about a man who is one of the giants in our legal field and in the history of this country.

In this century he is perhaps one of the stalwarts.

I can only think of the words of Longfellow when he wrote:

Lives of great men all remind us we can make our life sublime and, departing, leave behind us footprints on the sands of time.

In his life, in the period of time that I like to call the dash, that is the period between birth and death that you find on an epitaph, that dash, Thurgood Marshall has truly made a difference. He has left footprints on the sands of time that we must, indeed, take note of in the struggle for human rights, for equal opportunity and the dignity for all mankind.

So I would like to salute my colleagues, salute the committee for taking this bold step in offering S. 202. I support it. The people of Georgia in the Congressional Second District support it because it certainly gives the signal to the world that we recognize the great contribution that Thurgood Marshall has made to this country.

Lives of great men all remind us we can make our life sublime and, departing, leave behind us footprints on the sands of time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished Republican Whip, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH].

Mr. GINGRICH. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank my colleagues, Mr. MINETA and Mr. SHUSTER, for bringing this to the floor at such an appropriate time and with such speed and decisiveness.

I want to follow up my colleague from Georgia to say that Thurgood Marshall was a great America. We on our side my have at times disagreed with some of his comments, we may have disagreed with some of his votes on the Court, but the real lesson for everyone who loves freedom is that you can dedicate your life to helping others, you can rise in America, you can work, you can take on the system and, within the system, you can improve it and expand upon it.

Justice Marshall's entire life was a dedication to helping other human beings and helping them within the framework of America.

I hope that every young American who has an opportunity to study Thurgood Marshall's life will come to realize that whatever your background, whatever your race, whether you are a male or female, whatever the problems you are faced with, you can do better, you can rise in America and someday you too could make the kind of contributions that Justice Thurgood Marshall has made.

I thank my colleagues. I warmly support this legislation and hope it will pass.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I support this bill.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Chairman MINETA and Mr. SHUSTER for expeditiously bringing legislation to the floor to designate the new Federal Judiciary Building in Washington, DC, as the Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building. This is a fitting honor for one of our Nation's finest public servants.

Representing Baltimoreans in Congress I cannot let the occasion pass without stating how proud we have always were to have a Marylander of Marshall's stature on the national stage. In addition to growing up in Baltimore, one of the first and most important victories in Marshall's long career was his successful litigation on behalf of the NAACP to integrate the University of Maryland Law School. After Marshall applied to Maryland's Law School and was rejected as an African-American, he attended the Howard University Law School to begin his distinguished legal career.

Today the University of Maryland Law School's Library is dedicated to Thurgood Marshall. We in Maryland, as well as all those across the Nation, have many reasons to thank and honor Thurgood Marshall.

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

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 202

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The Federal Judiciary Building in Washington, DC, shall be known and designated as

the "Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building".

SEC. 2. LEGAL REFERENCES.

Any reference in any law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Federal Judiciary Building referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building".

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on S. 202, the Senate bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1300

AN END TO GRIDLOCK ON HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, even though the media focuses on the gaps in the military issue, the President and the Congress are moving on a number of fronts that deserve attention; namely, on the economy and health care.

Next week the House will pass two important pieces of legislation, the family and medical leave bill and motor-voter registration.

Shortly thereafter, we will deal with campaign finance reform.

In the next couple days, the House Democrats will meet to discuss our economic plan, the economic options for a stimulus package.

President Clinton this weekend is at Camp David with his advisers to talk about his economic plan, which will be a joint effort with the congressional plan.

On health care, the President has announced that he hopes to have a health care package by May and he has appointed the First Lady to coordinate all these efforts.

Mr. Speaker, the President and Congress are moving. The days of gridlock are over.

Mr. Speaker, I recently returned from a series of town meetings in northern New Mexico in which discussion repeatedly turned to the need for national health care solutions.

By now we are all well-versed in the disheartening statistics: Nearly 37 million Americans do not have health insurance and 60 million are underinsured. In the State of New Mexico, with a population of 1.5 million, 420,000

New Mexicans do not have health insurance. A recent survey of northern New Mexicans ranked the affordability of care and cost of insurance as the top two areas in need of improvement in our health care system. Clearly, Congress has no time to waste in addressing the demand for dramatic reform.

I wish to applaud the President's recent actions in the area of health care reform. As a result of his contacts with thousands of Americans during the Presidential campaign, the President has heard the call for health care reform and has taken promising initiatives. President Clinton's selection of the First Lady to head up the Presidential health care task force reflects his commitment to this issue. During the past decade, Hillary Clinton has demonstrated her ability to work effectively with State legislatures and will undoubtedly serve as a leader in health care reform and an able partner with Members of Congress.

IN SUPPORT OF SEXUAL ASSAULT PREVENTION ACT OF 1993

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

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, according to the Department of Justice, 1 out of every 500 women will be a victim of rape by a stranger in her lifetime and 1 forcible rape is reported to police every 5 minutes. These sad statistics make it clear that it is time to get tough on crimes of domestic and sexual violence to women.

Next week, my friends, the gentleman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI] and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL] will be introducing a bill to do just that. Their bill, the Sexual Assault Prevention Act of 1993, will focus on new tools for fighting sexual violence, such as new rules of evidence and conduct for trial lawyers. No longer will a defense attorney be able to discredit evidence he knows to be true, unduly delay proceedings or cause the victim frustration and trauma in the hope that the case will be dropped.

It is bad enough that a rape victim was attacked in the first place. Then she takes the stand and gets worked over and attacked by the rapist's lawyer, and that is two attacks too many.

It will also strengthen the Federal response to domestic violence and to parents who do not meet their child support obligations.

We must give the victims of sexual and domestic violence a greater sense of control, protection, respect, and empowerment within the criminal justice system.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to cosponsor and support this important legislation.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend President Clinton for naming First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton as the chair of his administration's health care task force. This appointment shows the President's commitment to health care reform.

On this end of Pennsylvania Avenue, we also need to demonstrate our commitment to health care reform. The issue is crucial to our constituents, our communities, and our national social and economic well-being.

Any reform measure must include universal access to health care. Of course, as many people argue, we already have universal health care—it's called the emergency room.

The emergency room is where a poor mother with a 2-year-old sick baby is going to sit until her child receives care, and I don't blame her.

Unfortunately, this sad reality represents the most inefficient and expensive approach to health care—but for millions of Americans without health insurance, there are few alternatives.

We must assure that health care is fairly distributed to all segments of the population, otherwise, we will continue to pay for high-cost, Cadillac emergency care that is often too little, too late.

It is time to provide the American people the health care system they deserve. One that is affordable, accessible, and cost effective.

COSPONSOR SEXUAL ASSAULT PREVENTION ACT OF 1993

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

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, while 1992 brought many women to the House of Representatives, it also brought too many women to the hospitals, police stations, and to the morgue. Last year, over 700,000 women were raped. Last year, 3 million women were abused by their spouse and partner.

Last year, AIDS became one of the leading causes of death in women in America between the ages of 15 to 24.

Last year we did nothing. This year Senator DOLE, Congressman KYL, and myself are reintroducing the Sexual Assault Prevention Act. This act consists of desperately needed reforms to deal toughly with the growing trend of violence, whether it occurs on the street or behind closed doors. Penalties are restructured. Court conduct is revamped and education is emphasized.

Most important of these overhauls, Mr. Speaker, is the message that Congress will send to victims and their as-

sallants. It is the message that in 1993 this will not stand.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join with us in cosponsoring the Sexual Assault Prevention Act of 1993.

CUTTING HEALTH CARE COSTS AND TAMING THE DEFICIT

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, we begin this Congress faced with tremendous challenges and little time to prepare to meet them. Problems that have been building for 12 years must now be faced in a matter of months. We have two choices: we can move boldly to meet them, or act timidly and pay the price.

Two of the biggest challenges we face are taming health care costs and cutting the deficit. There is a close connection between them, and in moving aggressively to deal with one we help solve the other. Health care costs represent \$1 in every \$7 spent by the average American. That is only the beginning. The cost of Federal health care programs alone is expected to double in 6 years.

Meanwhile, the budget deficit, which was \$210 billion in 1992, is expected to explode to \$357 billion by 1998. These twin pressures could crush economic growth and end any hopes of reviving the American dream.

The President must act boldly and now to bring health care costs down—a move that will help cut the budget deficit and give our economy a chance to improve. He will have to make tough—sometimes unpopular—choices. But neither he nor we can be swayed by the daunting size of this task. To turn away from our responsibility is to sacrifice our future.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA'S 12TH NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, anyone who was in the Superdome in New Orleans, LA, on January 1, 1993, or was watching the Sugar Bowl on television that night, witnessed one of the most amazing college football victories in recent memory. The University of Alabama Crimson Tide overcame great odds, silenced most sports analysts, and stomped the Miami Hurricanes right into the turf, acquiring a 13-0 record and winning the national championship with relative ease.

The Crimson Tide football team quietly and aggressively crawled through the 1992 season conquering opponents each week with a dominating defense and a get-the-job done offense.

They won the first ever SEC championship game by beating the University of Florida, which sent them to New Orleans for the Sugar Bowl against Miami and a chance for the university's 12th national championship, the first since 1979.

The tradition of winning national championships now continues in Alabama, a State where Alabama football rises and sets with the Sun and is the passion of young and old alike. Coach Paul "Bear" Bryant left a legacy at Alabama that will surely last a lifetime. He can finally look down from the heavens and smile with satisfaction now that the Tide performed the ultimate task.

The game was unforgettable. By the middle of the fourth quarter, over 76,000 mostly Tide fans, screaming at the top of their lungs, knew their team was going to be No. 1. The noise in the Superdome and on every television set in the State of Alabama that joyous night was enough to send chills down a camel's back, or in this case, a Hurricane's back.

I must commend the Miami Hurricanes for a valiant effort under the direction of Coach Dennis Erickson. They once boasted the Nation's longest winning streak, and I mean they really boasted it. However, all good things must come to an end, including Miami's winning streak, along with their hopes for a national title, which also came to a screeching halt.

As for Alabama, what more can be said of a team who, at the beginning of the year, was never really considered to contend for the national championship, much less winning it with flying colors. The lone journalistic believer in the Crimson Tide from the start was a reporter from Phoenix, AZ, named Corky Simpson, who was the only sportswriter to predict Alabama as the No. 1 team in the Nation week after week. The people of Alabama salute Mr. Simpson for his incessant belief in the Tide.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to salute and honor Coach Gene Stallings, the Crimson Tide football players, and the University of Alabama for the triumphant Sugar Bowl victory and an unprecedented 12th national championship. They have made our State very proud. Roll Tide.

COMPETITIVENESS COUNCIL— GOODBYE AND GOOD RIDDANCE

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

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I want to praise President Clinton for taking swift action to dissolve the White House Council on Competitiveness.

His quick action to terminate this rogue agency on his second day in office shows a strong commitment to

making the Government work for all the people—open to all, accessible to all, accountable to all.

Throughout his campaign, Bill Clinton promised voters that he would take the Government out of the hands of special interests, and put it back into the hands of the people. He is following through on this promise by axing the Competitiveness Council.

The real mission of the Competitiveness Council was to circumvent the regulatory process, giving the Bush administration's powerful big business friends a place to go to get special treatment—breaks that they could never have gotten through an open rulemaking process.

The Competitiveness Council had a sordid history of blocking regulations designed to protect the environment, and the health and safety of the American people. All of this was done out of public view, behind closed doors. Council staff even bragged that the Council liked to leave no fingerprints. That is not the way our democratic Government is supposed to work.

The end of the Competitiveness Council is the end of a shameful system of special favors in the regulatory process. I commend President Clinton for his swift action and for the new tone he is setting with his administration—returning our Government to the people it represents.

THE ECONOMY, STUPID

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, much was made of the strategy slogan of the Clinton-GORE campaign—the now famous sign that read: "The economy, stupid." The new President has issued Executive orders and made pronouncements on many social issues, including homosexuals in the military and Federal abortion policy. The majority congressional leadership is hard at work on its highest priority items, including family leave, motor-voter, Hatch Act, and campaign finance. But I rise today to urge the President and the majority leaders to remember their own campaign's credo: "The Economy, Stupid." The American people eagerly await concrete action on reducing the deficit, creating jobs, and boosting our national productivity and competitiveness. If there was a mandate in the November elections it was for making government more responsive to the people it serves and strengthening our economy to improve the quality of all peoples lives. Today we have a window of opportunity to demonstrate that the Federal Government is not stupid—let us get on with the major task at hand, and get to work on economic reform.

□ 1310

INVITATION TO SUBCOMMITTEE
ON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT'S
SECOND HEARING

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

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, in keeping with the previous gentleman's remarks, I want to talk about the economy because a lot of people are, I think, failing to keep their eye on the ball, and that is the issue that is so crucial, particularly when Boeing is announcing thousands of layoffs, IBM and others.

As my colleagues know, Bill Clinton walked into Washington with a \$4 trillion deficit overhanging, as well as a 7½-percent unemployment rate, and clearly it is time to act. The time to act is here and a time to see an end to gridlock.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to invite the previous speaker, as well as anyone who wishes to attend, to the second hearing that the Economic Development Subcommittee will be holding next week. I am talking about an economic stimulus package based on infrastructure and what needs to be done, the need for a deficit reduction package and what ought to be in it coupled with an economic growth package.

I say to my colleagues, "Folks, you're not going to cut your way out of this one, and you're not going to tax your way out of it. There has to be a long-range, strategic plan developed, and it's important we're all involved, and, of course, an integral part of that plan has to be health care, and I'm happy to see that the President has appointed someone to coordinate that, someone that's very able, Hillary Rodham Clinton who certainly, I think, brings a lot to this."

So, Mr. Speaker, I see the beginnings happening here, the foundation being laid. It is time to move forward.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON HUNGER
NEEDS TO BE PUT ON A DIET

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

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, I represent one of the more impoverished districts in this country. It includes 600 miles of the Texas-Mexico border. My people sent me here to cut waste and bureaucracy.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I oppose the continued funding of the Select Committee on Hunger. I find the majority's blatant waste of Federal funds disturbing; 8 of the 22 standing committees, and who knows how many subcommittees, have jurisdiction over hunger-related issues. At what point is there enough Government redtape and bu-

reaucracy? No wonder it is so hard to come up with any solutions or programs to help alleviate the problems of the hungry.

Mr. Speaker, select committees have had an habitual tendency of duplicating efforts. For example, the Select Committee on Hunger has held hearings on infant mortality. Of course so has the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families. Much like the Select Committee on Aging, the Select Committee on Hunger is now advocating national health insurance, and not just for the hungry. The Select Committee on Hunger also advocates more environmental regulation, more housing, more education.

Mr. Speaker, the Select Committee on Hunger has an insatiable appetite for Federal funds and boondoggles. Later today let us put it on a permanent diet and put it out of its misery for the benefit of all taxpayers.

TIME TO GET TO WORK ON OUR
HEALTH CARE CRISIS

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

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the first time as a proud Member of this great institution.

The past few weeks have been ceremonial, but the time has come to accomplish the work our constituents have sent us here to do.

There are many problems facing us—none more serious than our health care crisis.

There seem to be two extremely different proposals in this Congress regarding health care. Some are in favor of a one-payee system funded by the Government. That would be ideal and wonderful, but we cannot afford such a system.

Others believe that free market reform will solve the Nation's health care problem. That system has already failed us.

We are all practical men and women, and we surely understand the art of compromise or we would not be here.

Our time is now. We must find the middle ground. What is right with the system, and works, should be preserved. What is wasteful must be eliminated. Those who abuse the system for large profit must be identified and stopped.

Mr. Speaker, we must begin the process now and not in the waning days of this Congress. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to begin negotiations immediately.

CLINTON ALREADY HURTING OUR
ECONOMY WITH TWO BAD DECISIONS

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, in less than 2 weeks in office, President Clinton has already made two decisions which will negatively affect the Nation's economy.

First, President Clinton abolished the White House Council on Competitiveness which did their best to keep in check over 122,000 Federal regulators. The Council was successful in slowing or stopping expensive and unnecessary Federal regulations and mandates. It is obvious the President has not properly judged the concerns of businessowners about overregulation.

Next, the compromise regulations negotiated by President Bush to allow ethanol to participate in the Clean Air Act reformulated fuels program was apparently put on hold by the Clinton administration, a bad decision we now hope will be lifted. Rejecting this compromise would mean lost income for farmers and lost jobs in the ethanol industry.

In his haste to reverse President Bush's policies, President Clinton must exercise care or he will hurt the national economy and the farm economy for years to come.

CONGRATULATIONS, RON DEL-
LUMS, CHAIRMAN OF THE COM-
MITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

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

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, this is a historic day for America. We bury one great African-American, and we elevate another great African-American to the high position of chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

Twelve years ago, I became acquainted with a young man named RON DELLUMS with whom I was quite in tune philosophically. He was bright, articulate, and unwavering in his love and support for our country and the liberty and freedom for which it stands. While the President was talking about a military buildup, RON DELLUMS was advocating a national defense which was economically compatible with saving our country from the ravages of hunger, poverty, and economic despair.

RON and I chaired the congressional coalition against the Persian Gulf war, for we both believed in the fourth century principle of St. Augustine: That war and its devastation should only be used as the ultimate last resort. Although we knew the odds were overwhelming, we took our case to the floor of the House and took part in one of this body's most historic debates.

There is nobody on this Earth that I respect more for his views, his character, and his integrity than RON DELLUMS.

This year I left the Armed Services Committee, but RON DELLUMS will always be my chairman. Congratulations RON.

STANDING ON OUR OWN

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

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a remarkable and extraordinarily encouraging thing happened on the floor of this House. We gave the American people the first sign that maybe—just maybe—the 103d Congress is committed to the reform agenda for which we were elected and in which the American people have invested so much hope.

Yesterday the House membership finally stood up for the politics of principle over the politics of party.

This was a vote for common sense, a vote for reduced spending, and a vote against sham, artifice, and waste. In short, it was just the kind of vote the American people have been hoping against hope we might have the courage to make—and we did.

This vote so confounded the leadership of both parties that neither was prepared for it. The House was adjourned summarily so that both sides could try to figure out what it meant, and what to do next.

Well, here is what it means—it means that principle is more important than party. It means reformers will be heard from, and it means the American people should not give up hope on this Congress.

And what should we do next? We should remember the passionate intensity of all those individuals who said to us after we won last November, "Believe in yourself; don't get distracted by partisan bickering; remember that you have been elected to reform this Congress and to get this country back on the right track."

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have finally begun.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO ACCELERATE INVESTMENT IN RECYCLING EQUIPMENT

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to eliminate a bottleneck which is preventing the recycling of millions of tons of glass, plastic, paper, and metal cans which are filling our Nation's landfills.

The two bills I am introducing provide for matching grants for communities and others interested in purchasing equipment to sort and prepare solid waste for recycling, as well as an investment tax credit for businesses interested in purchasing recycling equip-

ment to make their businesses compatible to accept and use recyclable materials.

Too much waste is being generated by Americans and too little recycling is taking place. For example, the demand for plastic packaging products will increase by a rate of 15 billion pounds by 1996 with only 2.6 billion pounds, or 4 percent of these products, being recycled. This trend is also occurring with all other recyclable materials. We must accelerate our Nation's investment in recycling equipment in order to keep pace with our consumption.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this legislation as it will benefit our communities by helping to alleviate the strain on our already bulging landfills and make it possible for the private sector to be able to purchase recycling equipment they sorely need in order to modernize and make profitable the recycling process.

□ 1320

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM MUST CONTINUE

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

Mr. BACHUS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, my fellow Alabamian, Mr. SONNY CALLAHAN, has addressed the House this morning about the University of Alabama championship football team. So the gentleman taking that subject, I am left to address the subject of congressional reform and our vote yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, the time for congressional reform is now. Yesterday's elimination of the Select Committee on Narcotics was just the beginning. It showed that Congress is willing to make changes, but we need to go much further. Let us keep the momentum going.

Now more than ever Congress is subject to public scrutiny. In fact, many of us, the 110 new Members of Congress, were voted into office because we pledged to shake up and reform this Congress. Was this just lip service? Or are we willing to have discipline, be responsible, and make sacrifices to see that these campaign promises become reality?

This can be a turning point for the American people and for Congress. To do so it is now critical that we streamline our operations to solve the problems that face this Nation. The complexity and magnitude of the issues at hand require a more responsive, efficient Congress, a Congress that does what the Founding Fathers designed it to do—serve the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud my 45 fellow freshman Republicans who voted yesterday for a better, more responsive

Congress. I applaud my 20 fellow Democratic colleagues who joined with us and voted yesterday for this positive change of Congress which has been demanded by the American people.

Now I conclude by asking and appealing to the 45 other Members of the freshman class to join with us 66 in this much needed, much delayed, bipartisan change and reform of Congress.

To the freshman class, let us stick together, all 110, and complete the job we started yesterday.

LEGISLATION IN THE WAR AGAINST THE DEFICIT

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

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing two bills in the war against the deficit: No. 1, recorded votes on all appropriations bills; and, No. 2, a line-item veto.

First, I am introducing legislation to require a recorded veto on appropriation bills. In 1991, 33 percent of the votes on appropriation bills were approved by voice vote. For the 102d Congress we appropriated \$680 billion for which there were no recorded votes.

The second bill I am introducing is a resolution proposing a constitutional amendment giving the President line-item veto. I was for it under the Republican administration and I am for it under the Democratic administration.

Mr. Speaker, the most urgent task we face during the 103d Congress is making the Federal budget an instrument of economic growth and fiscal discipline. The legislation I am proposing today will be a powerful weapon in our fight to control the deficit and regain control of the economy.

Mr. Speaker, many of us in the U.S. Congress, and I know the American people, are sick and tired of the fingerpointing. It is unbelievable the number of votes that we have cast on voice votes. I can say to you, well, I do not know how you voted. You can say to me you do not know how I voted. Yet we do business as usual.

It is time in the 103d Congress to change that. We have an opportunity. I hope all Members will sign on as cosponsors of this legislation on recorded votes on appropriation bills and the line-item veto.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL, SELECT COMMITTEE ON AGING, SELECT COMMITTEE ON HUNGER, AND SELECT COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN, YOUTH, AND FAMILIES

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report

(Rept. No. 103-6) on the resolution (H. Res. 52) to establish the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, the Select Committee on Aging, the Select Committee on Hunger, and the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

INSTANT REPLAY BUDGET REFORM ACT

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

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, every year the Congress of the United States fails to meet its own deadlines to obey its own law requiring a completed budget by September 30, the end of the fiscal year. What happens is on October 1 we venture into continuing appropriations, temporary funding, which has the effect of many times bringing the Government to a halt, of shutting down Government.

We have introduced and we will introduce in this session the Instant Replay Budget Reform Act, which in effect says if on September 30 Congress fails to meet its own law of completing the budget, that the next day, October 1, there will be an instant replay, a re-enactment automatically of last year's budget.

In this way we will prevent forever the spectacle of shutting down the Government, which happened during Desert Shield, as I recall, and we will prevent the mischief that is always created by the continuing resolutions to which we have become, unfortunately, accustomed.

SANCTIONS AGAINST ISRAEL ARE TOTALLY INAPPROPRIATE

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, U.N. Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali should be ashamed of his outrageous call for sanctions against the State of Israel.

Once again, the dangerous double standard in the Middle East has reared its ugly head.

Where was the United Nations when Kuwait expelled 400,000 Palestinians?

Where was the United Nations when Saudi Arabia deported hundreds of thousands of Yemeni workers?

Where was the United Nations when Hafez Al-Assad murdered 10,000 Syrians?

Where was the United Nations when Saddam Hussein gased thousands of Kurds in Northern Iraq?

Of course, the United Nations was silent on these and other outrageous abuses in Arab nations where individ-

uals do not enjoy the individual rights that are commonly extended to all Israeli citizens.

Faced with the daily threat of extreme violence perpetrated by some of the most dangerous terrorist organizations in the world, Israel nevertheless remains the only oasis of democracy in a desert of repression.

To impose sanctions on Israel is to sanction violence in the Middle East. It is clear that the U.N. leader and many members of the world community need to learn more about the importance of our precious democracies in the post-cold war era.

SEXUAL ASSAULT PREVENTION ACT OF 1993

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

Mr. MACHTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Sexual Assault Prevention Act of 1993 and commend my colleague, the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI], for its authorship.

Mr. Speaker, it is a tragedy that we need such legislation, but the horrifying reality is that in this country every 6 minutes a woman is raped, and every 15 seconds a woman is beaten, either by her boyfriend or her husband. During this speech four women somewhere in this country will be beaten. One out of every seven college graduates will be raped before she graduates.

The Sexual Assault Prevention Act is more than a step in the right direction. It is a giant leap forward for women in the ongoing effort to end violence. Not only does this bill make the laws stronger, but it makes the penalties tougher.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to show their bipartisan support to stopping this crime by supporting this bill. The present and future victims of sexual and domestic violence deserves our support.

FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE ACT

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton in his inaugural message just last week to the people of this country said that this Nation should invest in its people as a family invests in its children. Right now in the Committee on Education and Labor we are marking up the Family and Medical Leave Act. This act puts families and children, and ultimately this Nation, first.

□ 1330

This act says that we can grant to the working people, the middle class of

this country, up to 12 weeks of unpaid leave for a newborn baby, an adopted baby, or when a member of our family gets sick.

I think this is much needed legislation, putting value on families and putting our middle class people first.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion let me just say, when we have situations of people like Zoe Baird, who was tripped up over ultimately an issue dealing with children, that we need to pass this legislation because middle class people across America are also dealing with this issue every single day.

THE FRESHMAN CLASS DOES THE RIGHT THING

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

Mr. HUFFINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the freshman class of 101 Members ran on the platform of cutting spending. Before we cut programs that directly affect the people of this country, before we raise another dollar of taxes, it is imperative that we cut back on our own staffs.

Yesterday we did the right thing. We eliminated one select committee, a temporary committee that has been around since 1975.

I understand there is a movement afoot today to get that committee back and reinstate it. These four committees spend \$4 million a year. They employ 91 people.

It is time to put an end to them. Their work can be carried out by other standing committees, and it is time for the freshmen, all of us, to stand together.

We had two-thirds of the freshman class that voted to eliminate one committee, and I ask my fellow freshmen Members to join me to do the right thing next week and eliminate all four select committees.

THE LEGACY OF JOSE MARTI

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, on January 28, Cuban-Americans throughout the Nation celebrate the 140th birthday of their beloved poet, independence hero, and intellectual leader, Jose Marti.

But sadly, Cuban dictator Fidel Castro, has cynically misused Marti's name in order to validate his tyranny. For 34 years, Castro has served as the sole authority in Cuba—the maximum leader as he so fondly refers to himself. Yet, his regime is ironic testimony to one of Marti's truisms: "Only oppression should fear the full exercise of freedom."

I bear personal witness to the men and women, black and white, who I have welcomed to freedom: ex-political prisoners who languished for 10, 15, or 20 years of their lives in Castro's jails. Their crime was simple—they spoke against Castro's dictatorship.

What I say here today would land me in a Cuban jail, and that is only one of the truths that I intend to reveal in the days ahead as a Member of this House.

THE STATUS OF SELECT COMMITTEES

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

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, after yesterday's vote to kill the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control surprised a few folks, a decision was made to package that select committee along with the three others, on Aging, on Hunger, on Children, Youth, and Families into one vote next week that we are going to have up or down on whether to keep these select committees alive for a year and allow a committee that is studying reorganization of Congress to determine whether or not they should be kept alive or continued or not.

I would submit to my colleagues that there is no question in our minds and there should not be any that these select committees should be done away with. They all should be killed. There is no reason for us to be studying that fact for a year.

That does not mean these select committees did not have a purpose when they were created or that they have not done a good job. But they are duplicative of what the work of standing committees do. Every one of the subject matters is covered by a standing committee. We cannot afford, with the budget deficits what they are, to be having select committees out there doing duplicative things, the same things our regular committees are doing. We cannot afford to do that. Now is the time, as many freshmen are saying, one after another coming up here, for us to take action. We do not need to wait a year to do it. Let us vote next week to kill all four of these committees, save the more than 90 staff positions and save a lot of money for the American taxpayers.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute that I might inquire of the distinguished majority leader of the program for next week.

I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

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

Obviously, business is nearly finished today. There will not be other votes today. Tomorrow and Friday the House Democratic caucus will be having a meeting in Baltimore, and we will not be in session.

Monday we will not be in session, February 1.

On Tuesday, February 2, the House will meet at noon to consider a resolution reauthorizing select committees. Wednesday, February 3, and the balance of the week, we will meet at 2 p.m. on Wednesday and 11 a.m. on Thursday on H.R. 1, Family and Medical Leave Act, subject to a rule, and H.R. 2, the National Voter Registration Act, again subject to a rule.

It is my understanding that amendments need to be filed by Monday at noon.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I was going to underscore that point, particularly for Members on our side. What that means is if they have any idea of any amendments they would like to file on the two pieces of legislation, like family leave, medical leave, and national voter registration, that means they have to be filed by noon on Monday.

I thank the distinguished majority leader.

Is that 2 o'clock meeting on Wednesday hard and fast or is it subject maybe to a possible revision, when we get there?

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, we will consult with the leadership on his side about that question.

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

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER AND THE MINORITY LEADER TO ACCEPT RESIGNATIONS AND MAKE APPOINTMENTS AUTHORIZED BY LAW OR THE HOUSE, NOTWITHSTANDING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until Tuesday, February 2, 1993, the Speaker and the minority leader be authorized to accept resignations and to make appointments authorized by law or by the House.

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

There was no objection.

THE SITUATION IN SOMALIA

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

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I am becoming increasingly uneasy about what is happening in Somalia.

On Monday of this week, a U.S. marine was shot and killed. That is the second U.S. marine who has been killed and the third American who has been killed in that venture which, of course, began as a purely humanitarian venture.

Coinciding with the death of this third U.S. person is the fact that, for the first time, U.S. troops took part in a clan skirmish, took sides in a clan battle. Of course, there was not meant to be, in the original Somalian plan, any sides taken by the United States military. Our role was simply to protect the delivery of food to the starving people.

Last but not least, the cost of our activities in Somalia, so far, is over a half a billion dollars, and we are hearing increasing reports that our allies are hesitant and circumspect about how they will pay for their share of the relief effort.

I would certainly urge the Clinton administration to be careful to see that we, the United States, do not get mired down in Somalia, and, in fact, very quickly turn the relief effort over to the United Nations or to a multinational organization of some kind. We can easily slip into a war if we are not very, very careful.

THE WAR IN BOSNIA

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, despite a myriad of diplomatic efforts and entreaties by the United Nations, European Community, and the United States, the war in Bosnia shows few signs of abatement. Reports of deaths attributable to the war range between 100,000 and 200,000. The wounded, starving, and emotionally scarred put the casualty count well into the millions. The savage intensity of the war has forced 3 million Bosnians from their homes and the number of refugees, put at 1.5 million, is staggering.

Last week the U.S. Department of State estimated that 70,000 people are being held in detention camps. As reliable reports of massive atrocities, including rape, torture, and ethnic cleansing have become known, the moral imperative to act and to take effective action intensifies.

We have a moral obligation, Mr. Speaker, to do more. Last week, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] and I introduced House Resolution 35 to press for United States action to uphold Bosnia's right of self-defense by lifting the arms embargo on Bosnia, by enforcing the no fly zone over that country, ensuring the delivery of humanitarian assistance, by force, if necessary, and to aggressively press for unimpeded access to all camps, prisons,

and detention centers by the ICRC and other organizations.

The resolution states that the United States should work to ensure that those responsible for war crimes and crimes against humanity be held accountable and that Europe and the United States allow more refugees to enter.

□ 1340

House Resolution 35 is a call to action. I ask my colleagues to join on as cosponsors.

SEMATECH, A SUCCESS STORY

(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, I wish to remind my colleagues of the nationwide praise garnered by a project that this body initiated and has supported for the past 5 years. I am, of course, referring to the Sematech research project that has proven such a remarkable success.

As I reported recently to this honorable institution, Sematech has realized achievements beyond our wildest expectations when, a half decade ago, we undertook to develop a public/private partnership to restore the American semiconductor industry to its rightful place as world pacesetter.

In a mere 5 years, the Sematech research consortium has emerged victorious, creating semiconductor components 0.35 micron small. That is half the size of the smallest that the Japanese competition has been able to develop. This major milestone has been compared by some in the press as having the same significance as putting a human on the Moon.

Of course, this is just the latest in a series of major advances coming out of the Sematech laboratories. As a direct result of the consortium, we have been able to increase American control of the \$10 billion semiconductor industry from 40 percent and shrinking, to 53 percent and growing.

Mr. Speaker, I want to share with you some of the accolades from around the Nation that our efforts have won and ask that the quotes be printed in the RECORD.

"SEMATECH CELEBRATES TINY MILESTONE IN MICROCHIP RACE

"The next generation of ultra-complex microchips moved a step closer to reality Thursday when the Sematech research consortium announced it has proved that the tools needed to build those tools work well and are all made in America."—Austin American Statesman.

"ADVANCE TO SPEED UP U.S. CHIPS

"Chalk up another one for the USA's chipmakers. Sematech *** announced a key breakthrough ***".

"EXPLOSIVE GROWTH AHEAD FOR INDUSTRY

"Sematech has helped U.S. chipmakers dramatically improve production techniques."—USA Today.

"CONSORTIUM SEES BREAKTHROUGH IN CHIPPING AWAY AT THE CHIP

"The Defense Department has supported Sematech because semiconductors are critical components of modern weapons.

"Increasing miniaturization is expected to lead to breakthroughs in defense, medicine, communications, and space exploration."—Washington Post.

"CHIP CONSORTIUM ACHIEVES A MADE-IN-THE-U.S.A. FEAT

"After five years and \$500 million of public and private money, Sematech, the consortium of United States computer chip companies, said yesterday that it had accomplished the first of its goals: using American-made equipment to produce a chip with ultra-thin circuitry."—New York Times.

"Sematech, in its most important technical achievement so far, said it has produced computer chips with circuits half the size of the industry's current state-of-the-art product."—Wall Street Journal.

"U.S. Industry has regained the lead in a key technology area once thought lost to the Japanese; the equipment used to make advance semiconductors.

"For the first time in a decade, U.S. chip makers possess the ability to build cutting edge computer chip factories furnished entirely with American-made machinery."—San Jose Mercury News.

TRUE CONGRESSIONAL REFORM INCLUDES ELIMINATING SELECT COMMITTEES

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

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, today's Washington Post contains an article, "A Waive of Change Sweeps U.S. Firms," and above that, "IBM Chairman To Resign on Heels of Massive Loss." It turns out that IBM has just posted the largest corporate loss in history, \$5 billion. Since 1985 IBM has eliminated 100,000 jobs.

This same article today explains that United Technologies will lay off more than 11,000, Boeing Corp. 10,000, McDonnell Douglas 8,700, and ARMCO 1,400; oh, yes, and Sears Roebuck, 50,000 people will be let go.

We have an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, in the House of Representatives to take one small step in the direction of reform by eliminating the four select committees that have no legislative authority, duplicate jurisdiction, and cost the taxpayers nearly \$4 million and employ 91 people.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, when we come to a vote on this next Tuesday that we will put our words into action. We claim around here that we are for reform. Let us begin by demonstrating that next Tuesday by voting to eliminate these select committees.

TIME FOR CONGRESS TO DO ITS JOB AND REFORM TRADE AND TAX POLICIES

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

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, IBM fired the boss; Sears laid off 50,000 workers, like we just heard; United Tech, 11,000 workers gone; Boeing, 10,000 workers gone; McDonnell Douglas, 9,000 workers gone, on, and on, and on, and on, most of it due to illegal trade from overseas and a stupid trade policy from this Congress.

However, guess what? The American Chamber of Commerce in Japan said that, "The Japanese economy is underpenetrated by American companies." What a revelation. What a discovery. They finally realize after 25 years what the American worker knew from day one.

Now Japan is threatening to retaliate if President Clinton takes a hard stand. Let me say this, I stand with President Clinton, and if he does not take a strong stand there is something wrong in America, because the Constitution does not afford Japan a joy ride across the Pacific and, on the other hand, put a toll road in for American companies.

It is time Congress addresses itself to jobs. We will find it in the trade and tax policies. We have not changed a damn thing for 40 years.

STATE SOURCE INCOME TAX

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

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, today I am again introducing my bill prohibiting State source income tax. I was encouraged in the 102d Congress by the fact that my bill, H.R. 431, had over 200 cosponsors and that last year's tax bill, H.R. 11, contained language which addressed the source tax issue.

In addition, Chairman BROOKS has given me his personal assurance that the Judiciary Committee will hold hearings on the source tax issue during the early part of the 103d Congress.

This year my bill will exempt a distribution from a qualified pension plan from State income tax if the individual receiving the distribution is not a resident of the State. In addition, it will preclude a State from taxing pension income of a nonresident only if that pension income is in a plan defined in the bill, in order to close any loopholes for the very wealthy to avoid paying State income taxes.

The source tax is unjust and amounts to taxation without representation. Thousands of senior citizens and retirees across the country are being sent tax bills by States whose intent is to aid their own failing budgets.

This bill will not place any cost on the Federal Government. I hope that my colleagues will once again support me in this cause.

A WORD OF CAUTION TO THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, last night one of the television newscasts reported that the Clinton Cabinet is a Cabinet of millionaires. I am glad they have had good fortune, but one of them is about to potentially profit at a big expense to the U.S. taxpayers.

The new Secretary of Interior, Bruce Babbitt, has apparently been trying to sell his family ranch in Arizona for years. The Washington Times reported yesterday that the Babbitt family ranch is about to now be sold to the Federal Government for \$12 million. Dayle Henson, cochairman of the Arizona Coalition for Public Lands, calls the deal "a definite conflict of interest." Mr. Henson said, "His family stands to make \$12 million on the ranch. I don't see how he can be neutral about this."

There is plenty of other land the Government could buy in Arizona, probably cheaper than \$12 million. Actually the Federal Government owns too much land in Arizona as it is. This looks bad. This smells. Has the wheeling and dealing already started?

Mr. Babbitt should disavow this whole deal, since it is too closely tied to matters over which his own department has jurisdiction.

ELIMINATION OF RURAL AGRICULTURE OFFICES WILL ONLY HARM THE AMERICAN FARMER

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to address the proposal of the USDA to close and consolidate many of the ASCS and Soil Conservation offices, but before discussing that let me say that I, and most farmers, support President Clinton's promise to cut the deficit in half. I want to do everything I can to help him fulfill this important campaign promise.

The majority constantly reminds us, "Gridlock is over," and I say that that's great. So are the days of blaming things on the White House. Let us balance the budget and eliminate the deficit. Therefore, I support any type of consolidation, eliminations, and reductions in the Federal Government.

There are, however, some specifics about the ASCS proposal that do cause an undue hardship on the farmers, not only in Georgia but all over America. For example, in Macon, Montgomery, Candler, and Bryan Counties, GA, they have ongoing agrarian economies and yet they are subject to being closed. This would cause the farmers to have to drive many counties away to get their services taken care of.

I support Secretary Espy's idea that we start at the top. Next, we should close obsolete offices. Many of them, for example, are in Atlanta. They should have been closed many years ago. They are in that metropolitan area.

A WELCOME TO HILLARY CLINTON AS CHAIR AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE TASK FORCE ON NATIONAL HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome President Clinton's appointment of Hillary Rodham Clinton to head the task force on national health care reform.

We all agree that it is time to make sense of our health care system. It is time to make sure that health care is available, affordable, and accessible to all.

As the task force looks at reform options it is imperative that the special needs of rural Americans be carefully considered. Specifically, we should:

Expand funding for rural hospitals and community health centers;

Improve transportation services for rural residents who must travel great distances to obtain care;

Develop programs that train and encourage health professionals to practice in rural areas; and

Provide preventive services to all rural residents.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with the task force and my colleagues in the Congress to find solutions to our health care crisis. There can be no higher domestic priority.

□ 1350

RESOLUTION TO REAUTHORIZE SELECT COMMITTEES

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

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. Speaker, as a freshman Member of Congress, I was elected by the people of my district to fight for change, and for an end to business as usual.

The people of my district are tired of a bloated Congress that spends millions of dollars on redundant, unnecessary, overly staffed committees which exist more to reelect and inflate the résumés of their members than to deal with our Nation's very real problems.

Yesterday, I felt good about this Congress. When the House voted to cut one of the select committees, I was encouraged that maybe—just maybe—Congress had heard the message of the American people and was ready to heed their will.

But now, it looks like nothing has changed. At this moment, around the Capitol, in the back rooms, hallways, and byways, the majority leaders of this House are meeting to thwart the will of the American people, and save the select committees.

Mr. Speaker, we as new Members have a special obligation to fight for change.

Therefore, I urge all Members who had the courage to stand up yesterday and say "no" to politics as usual, to stand firm, to hold their votes, and to win this fight for the American people.

TRIBUTE TO THURGOOD MARSHALL

(Ms. E.B. JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. E.B. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to pay my respect to a giant among men. This man experienced the injustice and inequality inflicted upon a race and then set a course to correct it. That man is Thurgood Marshall.

Though he was stymied when he started out in law school, he overcame that and became a real fighter for principles and a real commitment, a deep commitment to fairness.

Many thought his cause could never be a victory, but I can name many victories. I stand here as an example.

I am a native Texan. Black Texans could not vote in primaries, so a suit was filed in 1927. He acted as the attorney, and in 1944, finally the right to vote for black Texans in primaries became a reality. I could name many more because of his deep commitment to fairness. He was the person who acted as the attorney in Brown versus the Board of Education and many others.

Leadership and the accomplishments of Justice Marshall and the legal team provided a spark which ignited a movement and galvanized the world's attention as a race of people rose and demanded equality and justice. We thank this giant of a man.

SOON-TO-BE SUPER BOWL CHAMPION BUFFALO BILLS

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

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a representative of the great State of New York, and more specifically western New York, and maybe this weekend even more importantly, Buffalo, NY, the home of the Buffalo Bills.

As a freshman Member of this august body, and especially as a Republican Member, I know firsthand what it means to be the underdog, just like the Buffalo Bills know what it means to be the underdog. But when the going got

tough, the Buffalo Bills showed their perseverance and their character were qualities that made for winners. That is why I look forward, Mr. Speaker, to reporting a victory for the Bills this Sunday in their third straight Super Bowl appearance.

More importantly, when the NFL Super Bowl Champion Buffalo Bills accept an invitation from our President, President Clinton, to visit the White House, I will be sure to send along good old-fashioned-style buffalo wings.

IT'S THE ECONOMY, STUPID

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

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, during the 1992 Presidential campaign, we all heard about the now famous sign in the Clinton campaign war room that read: "It's the economy, Stupid."

Well, judging from how this President is spending his time, that sign could have read: "It's the Haitian boat people, Stupid, or 'It's the gays in the military, Stupid,' or maybe, 'It's Nannies from Peru, Stupid.'"

This is from the President who promised to focus on the economy like a laser beam. This President promised an economic recovery plan on day one, but, Mr. Speaker, this is day seven. We have not yet seen anything, although we do know what will not be in the plan.

There will not be a middle-class tax cut that the American people were promised, and oh, yes, we know that there will be new consumption taxes, new carbon taxes, and increased gasoline taxes.

Mr. Speaker, we are ready to talk about the economy, and so are the American people. We want enterprise zones to bring jobs to the inner city. We want investment tax credits to help businesses expand. We want tax credits for first-time home buyers and an increase in the personal exemption for children.

Let us listen to the voters, Mr. Speaker, who in the November election said to us that, "It's the economy, Stupid." Let's activate that laser beam and stop the pandering to special interests.

MILITARY LEADERS AGREE—HOMOSEXUALITY INCOMPATIBLE WITH MILITARY SERVICE

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton has announced his intention to repeal the longstanding ban on gays in the military. He seems intent on forcing this unwise and unpopular position on the armed services, the Congress, and the American people.

He says he is flexible on how to implement this order, yet he has made it clear that the ban will be reversed. We must be equally clear—there is no middle ground on this issue.

Virtually every knowledgeable source on military matters has said this action would undermine military discipline, morale, and combat effectiveness.

Senator SAM NUNN said yesterday:

I think something is fundamentally flawed when men and women in the military have an issue that is vital to them and they have never been heard from.

Our distinguished Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Colin Powell has testified that "homosexual behavior is inconsistent with maintaining good order and discipline."

Serving in the military is a privilege, not a right. Mr. President, listen to these voices of wisdom and the American people.

NO LONGER BUSINESS AS USUAL

(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. Mr. Speaker, it clearly is a new day in the U.S. Congress. Many of us did not believe it would happen, but with what we have witnessed just here today and yesterday with the tremendous speeches that have been made by freshmen from both sides of the aisle here in the well, and that history-making vote yesterday which for the first time is seeing the U.S. Congress actually pare back some of its bureaucracy, is—I think—a very encouraging indicator for the American people.

We are not going to see business as usual continue in the House of Representatives, and I hope that these freshmen do not change. I hope that their spirit of enthusiasm and upbeat optimism continues.

THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PARIS PEACE ACCORDS

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

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 20th anniversary of what fortunately did not become the beginning of the end for democracy around the globe and the escalation of communism worldwide. Rather, today marks the 20th anniversary of the signing of the Paris peace accords with the totalitarian war lords of North Vietnam. That infamous document promised more than just a ceasefire in South Vietnam, a withdrawal of all United States forces from that divided country, and a release of all, repeat all, American POW's and an honest accounting of all MIA's [missing-in-

action] in hindsight we know that none of the major provisions of the ceasefire agreement were implemented.

In fact, within a brief passage of time, the North Vietnamese Communist forces would invade the south again, but this time with Hitler-like blitzkrieg tactics and Russian-made tanks intended to remove any chance of peaceful democracy developing in that country. The rest of the story, after the signing of these accords, include the brutal so-called reeducation concentration camps. They, of course, were killing hundreds of thousands of desperate refugees—known as the boat people—more losing their lives than surviving. And hundreds of forgotten names and faces of real American heroes, like, I repeat, our colleague SAM JOHNSON of Texas, a 7-year POW, who accepted the call to arms and then fell into the torturous hands of the enemy as POW's or MIA's.

Mr. Speaker, the agreement we signed 20 years ago was not about peace, but was instead about ignoring responsibility. Let's make sure that as a nation, we never again forget our duty and responsibility to our oppressed allies abroad or to the brave servicemen and women who carry out our foreign policy.

We must remember that peace in our time was achieved not through useless accords, but instead through global responsibility, military strength, and moral courage. It was peace through strength, and let's not forget that.

□ 1400

In fact, in a brief passage of time, the Communist forces of North Vietnam would invade the south, this time again with Hitler-like blitzkrieg tactics, even using Soviet-made tanks. It was all intended to remove any chance of peaceful democracy in that war-torn little country.

The rest of the story, after the signing of these accords, included the brutal reeducation—so-called—but they were concentration camps, hundreds of thousands of desperate refugees, a death list with 68,000 people who were executed for even talking with us let alone working with us in South Vietnam, and hundreds of thousands more drowned on the high seas—raped, shark victims, and those survivors who came to this country as great, now American, citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD my passionate close, and I will continue to talk about this over the upcoming 2 years.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOAGLAND). The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the Chair as to

whether or not it is proper for Members to read in the well of the House now. I understand that they have changed the rules to allow Members to read from the well of the House without asking special permission.

Mr. Speaker, am I correct in that?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is the Chair's understanding that the House rules pose no obstacle to a Member reading a speech.

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

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

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, the leadership does encourage Members, though, to keep their chin up, not mumble. And if they are allowed to read now, to go back to the first great two centuries of this Nation and try and get a little oratory like my good friend, the gentleman from the great North of this country is about to do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a parliamentary inquiry.

INVITATION TO DISCUSS CIRCUMSTANCES SURROUNDING NOMINATION OF MARIO BAEZA

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we heard from one of the great new freshman Members of this House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART]. And he made a very impassioned series of comments about something that he had heard another Member of this body, the distinguished gentleman from New York, make with reference to a nomination of a gentleman named attorney Mario Baeza, who has been nominated for the Secretaryship of Inter-American Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, it is my intention that we continue this discourse under as reasonable circumstances as possible, and to that extent, I have called the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] to invite him to sit with me as the dean of the Congressional Black Caucus to discuss the circumstances, pro and con, surrounding the nomination of Mr. Mario Baeza.

This is a very important nomination, and it involves a Cuban-American, and it would seem that both he and I should be very interested in that nomination.

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS,
Washington, DC, January 22, 1993.

Hon. WARREN CHRISTOPHER,
Secretary of State, U.S. Department of State,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I write to strongly endorse the selection of Mario Baeza to be Assistant Secretary of State for American Regional Affairs (ARA). We believe this is an excellent appointment of a tremendously

qualified attorney and regional specialist with impeccable credentials for the challenge of managing U.S. policy toward our dynamic and vital neighboring region.

This communication expressly reflects the recommendation of the Caucus Task Force on the Caribbean. Chaired by Cong. Charles Rangel with CBC Members seated on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Cong. Donald Payne and Cong. Alcee Hastings. As African American members of Congress we are especially proud that Mario Baeza is a Cuban American of African heritage. We regard his race as an important added dimension to his credentials for this position. It is a powerful symbol to those of African heritage who populate every nation in the region in significant number, often in the majority, but are rarely recognized. Mr. Baeza's heritage and connection with the Caribbean serves to highlight this region that is so often overlooked by policymakers in this country, yet one that is extremely important to us economically and in our ongoing efforts to interdict dangerous narcotic drugs.

As we approach consideration of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) to secure the significant economic benefit of free trade and pursue policies to promote private sector led development and growth in the region, Mario Baeza is particularly, and perhaps uniquely, qualified to implement our policies toward the region. He is an accomplished attorney, a senior partner of the firm of Debevoise and Plimpton, where he has developed a significant legal practice in the region and broad experience in finance and investment.

Mario Baeza is fluent in English and Spanish and has travelled in, and written about, the region extensively. He is a noted scholar, and a man of extraordinary achievement and intellect. It is difficult to imagine a better selection for this position and we therefore fully endorse him and give him our enthusiastic support.

Sincerely,

KWEISI MFUME,

Chairman, Congressional Black Caucus.

ILLEGAL EXPORTS FROM CHINA

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, a great many Americans are unaware of the tremendous influence the Peoples' Republic of China [PRC] has on the economy of the United States, but ask United States textile manufacturers, workers, and Customs officials, and they will tell you that the PRC fosters a \$5-billion fraudulent industry in textile and garment exports to the United States.

Unknowingly, Americans are buying an unprecedented amount of clothes manufactured in China. Shirts may be marked, "Made in the Philippines," but frequently these items are produced in China and illegally marked or transhipped to the United States where they replace United States produced garments and textile manufacturing jobs.

Mr. Speaker, this serious problem presents a difficult solution, but step one must be a strong commitment

from the PRC to police, enforce, and prosecute the illegal transshipment and fraudulent mislabeling of Chinese textile exports. Second, U.S. Customs officials must drastically increase their efforts to detect and seize illegal shipments. Third—and perhaps most importantly—strong efforts must be made here at home to ensure that U.S. importers who violate U.S. trade laws will be quickly and effectively prosecuted.

Mr. Speaker, recently, after bowing to direct pressure and legal action from United States officials, China has agreed to cooperate with United States officials to halt these illegal shipments. In October, United States attorneys indicted the United States-based subsidiary of a Chinese textile company for violating United States trade laws, and Customs officials plan to establish a permanent office in Beijing.

Mr. Speaker, clearly, these efforts are encouraging, but they will have to be dramatically increased to address this mammoth problem. This Member encourages the new administration and fellow Members of Congress to insist that China fully cooperate and adhere to its trade agreements with the United States.

SUPPORT URGED FOR THE SEXUAL ASSAULT PREVENTION ACT OF 1993

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

Ms. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, each year, 3 to 4 million women are battered by their husbands or partners. This frightening statistic compels us to support the Sexual Assault Prevention Act of 1993. It is time to protect and empower the victims of sexual and domestic violence, prosecute their aggressors, and put an end to the pain and suffering caused by criminals who, too often, get away with murder.

This legislation provides badly needed funding for women and children's programs. Comprehensive grant programs to assist local efforts to combat sexual and domestic violence and to enforce child support obligations are imperative.

In Florida's Fourth Congressional District, the Hubbard House provides an alternative for battered women. It is a full service domestic violence center which provides a safe, nonviolent place for women to plan their futures.

Our country needs more Hubbard Houses. The services this refuge provides are critical to empowering victims of domestic violence and rehabilitating their partners. Supporting the Sexual Assault Prevention Act of 1993 will give battered women and children the chance they deserve.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks and to include therein extraneous material on the special order taken today by the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

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

There was no objection.

ELIMINATION OF SELECT COMMITTEES

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

Mr. KIM. While I am encouraged that the House has moved to limit the reauthorization of select committees to only 1 year, I am disappointed that we stopped here. I strongly support the elimination of these nonlegislative, duplicative committees.

When initially created, these select committees were designed to be temporary. They were supposed to study an urgent issue, then make recommendations for action by various permanent, standing committees. Now, some 10 to 20 years later, they have taken on bureaucratic lives of their own.

I strongly support the important issues these select committees claim to assist. Senior citizens concerns, the plight of families, drug control, and hunger remain a top priority of mine. Americans can be assured these issues are already being fully addressed by already existing standing committees in Congress spending tens of millions of dollars. We already have more than 300 committees and subcommittees doing the same thing. These issues are not being ignored, and will never be ignored.

For example, the key issues facing America's senior citizens including Social Security and health care are handled by the powerful Ways and Means Committee through its dedicated subcommittees on health and Social Security. Oversight of pension funds and savings is handled by the Banking Committee.

Another example. Issues before the Select Committee on Narcotics are also under the direct jurisdiction of the Judiciary and Foreign Affairs Committees.

Issues on hunger have been already handled by the Hunger Subcommittee under the Agriculture Committee.

Unfortunately, this duplication has fostered gridlock. In an effort to justify their existence, the select committees have studied the issues to death, delaying needed action by the standing committees. The answer to this gridlock is streamlining the process by eliminating the wasteful, do-nothing select

committees and instead of improving the efficiency of the standing committees.

Unlike the select committees, which have no legislative power and, therefore, can actually do nothing, the already existing standing committees can report bills and create programs that offer real solutions. They provide genuine action, not just talk.

Since their creation, the select committees have cost the taxpayer over \$45 million. Yet, they have very few results to show. Just lots of expensive staff and traveling all over the world to generate more fancy reports. Instead of spending more money on do-nothing select committees that merely sound impressive and caring, we should more wisely redirect those resources into real programs that help senior citizens and needy families with actions, not just more studies.

The elimination of these wasteful congressional select committees is an early test of just how committed to congressional reform the Members of the House really are.

I gave up my own business and came to Congress in order to help fight for reform and against wasteful government spending. Reauthorizing the unnecessary select committees is not real congressional reform. It is business as usual.

It takes courage to stand up here as a freshman in one of the first weeks of legislative session and oppose business as usual and the special interests that support the no longer warranted fancy committees. I'm serious about reforming Congress and protecting the taxpayers' hard earned dollars. I strongly believe that is why the voters of the 41st District sent me to Washington—to make the tough decisions and do what is best for the country. I'm proud to be here doing just that.

I want to commend our leader, congressmen BOB MICHEL, NEWT GINGRICH, and the rest of the Republican leadership for bringing this important reform issue to the floor.

Based on yesterday's minimal first step of curtailing the authorization of one of these committees from 2 years to 1, I am encouraged that we can do much more next week when we revisit this issue.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the next needed step of sunseting them for good—in other words, eliminating them all together.

□ 1410

Let us cut wasteful spending. Let us start right here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

Mr. DREIER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to extend my congratulations to my friend from Diamond Bar, CA, for his excellent statement. He has worked

diligently on pursuing the issue of the select committees. I believe he has come up with a very good conclusion that we should eliminate them.

I thank my friend for yielding.

IN MEMORY OF JAKE MILLIONES

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

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a fallen hero of the African-American community in Pittsburgh: Councilman Jake Milliones. Councilman Milliones died from a heart attack at the age of 52 earlier this month.

Jake Milliones was one of the brightest stars among community leaders in Pittsburgh and an outspoken representative of the Hill District, Strip District, and parts of the North Side. He poured his life's energy into active campaigns to improve the quality of life in Pittsburgh. He fought on behalf of all the disadvantaged, dispossessed, and disenfranchised. His life was one of unending struggle to lift up and expand the horizons of African-Americans in Pittsburgh, our country, and the world.

Jake Milliones got things done. His accomplishments are recorded in the concrete and steel of homes built, schools improved, drug rehabilitation programs created, senior citizens served, and young people provided opportunities.

Jake Milliones was a dedicated public servant. He was a dynamic leader on the Pittsburgh City Council where he represented the sixth council district. He was also president of the Pittsburgh Board of Education, where he labored successfully to improve the quality of our community's public schools. His efforts as board of education president were key to the nationally recognized success of elementary schools like Vann and Madison.

Jake Milliones was also a man of outstanding educational accomplishments who was willing and able to put his skills to work on finding effective solutions to public problems. His academic accomplishments, including a doctorate in psychology, sharpened his ability to study a problem and craft an effective response. A perfect example is the weeks he spent studying firsthand drug treatment programs in New York City in order to determine what would be the best drug rehabilitation program for Pittsburgh. He volunteered his skills and his labor to making Pittsburgh's House of the Crossroads Drug Rehabilitation Program an effective center for helping people escape drug addiction and drug abuse.

Jake Milliones worked as chairman of the urban redevelopment authority to reinvigorate the neighborhoods of Pittsburgh. He also worked to improve community life at the grassroots level with groups like the Hill District Community Development Corp. and the project area committee. He led the effort to break ground for the Crawford-Roberts Housing Development, helped provide single mothers with decent housing by converting an old firehouse into an apartment building, helped establish the four-building western restoration housing and health complex for senior citizens, and revitalized the Ammon Recreation

Center on Bedford Avenue as one of the city's best youth recreation facilities. The list could go on and on.

Councilman Milliones possessed a rare skill in breaking down the walls of bureaucracy that all too often separate the people from their elected government. His priorities were the priorities of his constituents: jobs, housing, crime, and quality education. Jake Milliones never hid his impatience with the rate of progress that was made on these issues, but he also never lost his commitment to moving forward to address the basic needs of our community.

The city of Pittsburgh and all of its citizens will miss Jake Milliones and his selfless devotion to making our community a better place. I know that African-Americans in our city will also mourn the loss of one of their most ardent champions. Still, I know that the most fitting tribute to Jake Milliones is for all of us to carry on his struggle to lift up the lives of our fellow citizens. We can best memorialize the premature passing of Jake Milliones by following his example of public service.

A TRIBUTE TO AKEBONO, HAWAII'S OWN CHAD ROWAN, WHO TODAY BECOMES SUMO WRESTLING'S NEW GRAND CHAMPION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Akebono, who we have known in Hawaii as Chad Rowan, as he today accepts Japanese Sumo wrestling's highest honor when he assumes the title of yokozuna, or grand champion. This is the second time that one of Hawaii's people has fulfilled the requirements for this award, but Akebono is only the first to receive it. Last year, Konishiki-Salevaa Atisanoe—was denied promotion to Yokozuna even though his record was comparable to that of Japanese wrestlers who had won the title. I am gratified that Japan has finally overcome this racial barrier and seen fit to award this rank to those who deserve it, regardless of their nationality.

Japanese Sumo wrestling is not just a competitive sport, it is a drama and ritual deeply rooted in the long Japanese tradition. It demands the utmost in strength and grace from its participants, and few who compete are able to withstand the rigors required of the Sumo champions. Akebono has. And last Sunday he won his second straight tournament, the exalted 15-day New Year's tournament, with an overpowering victory over Japan's most popular sumoist that took just 5 seconds. In this convincing manner Akebono fulfilled the final requirement for the title of Yokozuna. He is just the 64th person to achieve this in the history of the sport, and he is now the only active Sumo wrestler who holds this honor.

This is a dramatic moment in Sumo wrestling because it is the first time that Japan has allowed this honor to be bestowed on a foreigner—a position so revered that its holder undergoes a 3½-hour ceremony at a venerable Tokyo shrine. This is a sensitive moment for the Japanese people, but it is eased by the respect and dignity with which Akebono ap-

proaches the history and ritual of Sumo wrestling. The compliments he has received in Japan reflect this. Yoshihisa Shimoie, the editor of Sumo magazine, articulated perhaps the best testament to Akebono's character when he said that "he makes me forget he is a foreigner because of his earnest attitude toward Sumo."

In an interview about his prospective promotion to Yokozuna Akebono said "I will do my best to live up to the title, not only in the Sumo ring, but in my daily life." We are quite sure that he will, and I know that I speak for my State and this House when I say to Akebono that we are proud to have you representing the United States when you today become known to the world as a yokozuna, grand champion of Sumo.

LET US SPEED UP REVIEW OF THE ETHANOL REGULATIONS

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

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my concern for action taken last week by the new head of the Office of Management and Budget to delay crucial regulations affecting ethanol.

Last year, President Bush brokered a compromise that revised proposed regulations allowing ethanol to participate in the summer and winter program of the Clean Air Act. The compromise was an important step in ensuring that this domestic, renewable fuel play a key role in meeting the environmental goals of the act. The ethanol compromise goes a long way toward reducing America's dangerous dependence on foreign oil, and expanding markets for our Nation's farmers.

Now, we hear that this compromise is to be reviewed by agency heads. Mr. Speaker this action does one thing and one thing only, it casts a pall over the ethanol industry and the millions of farmers who grow corn for ethanol.

Illinois is the Nation's top producer of corn and corn ethanol, it accounts for 60 percent of the 1-billion-gallon-a-year ethanol market. In the Midwest, one out of every five rows of corn goes toward the production of ethanol. That is about 600 million bushels of corn. Ethanol to the Midwest means jobs; it means adding value to a product that we grow ourselves.

As our economy begins to grow and issues of investment become important, Mr. Panetta's actions have the perverse result of delaying investment in ethanol plants all across the Midwest.

I urge Mr. Clinton to complete the review of this important regulation as quickly as possible to ensure that the stability of the ethanol industry and the livelihoods of American farmers are not adversely affected.

I want Members to know that I am sending a letter to President Clinton to

urge him to complete this review as quick as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I really request that Members join me on signing this letter to the President asking him to expedite this review and to move that program along as quickly as possible. It is ironic that here, 2 years after our soldiers sacrificed their lives and their families and their time to the Desert Storm issue, an issue that was to protect our interests in the Middle East, in some respects for the oil interests and energy interests in this country, that here we have a chance to produce our own home grown energy, a renewable fuel, and fuel grown by farmers in the Midwest and other parts of this Nation and a fuel manufactured by American workers.

Why would we want to cancel out a program that creates these types of jobs, American jobs for American workers, by canceling out this Executive order?

□ 1420

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTERT. I am happy to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and bringing the matter to the attention of the House.

What has happened in the delay of 120-plus regulations I think should be of great concern to Members of the Congress, to farmers, to environmentalists, to agribusiness people all over the country. I do hope that it is not an intentional delay of this particular regulation. It may well be to put the best construction on it that we have a permanent corps of bureaucrats in OMB who saw this as a chance to subvert a program that had broad support among Members of Congress.

As the gentleman points out, this was an important compromise in moving ahead on the use of alternative fuels, environmentally safe fuels. We went through a long controversy. Scientific facts were presented. A compromise was reached. The results could mean an additional 1 billion dollars' worth of corn sales per year in addition to major impact on agribusiness.

So I have also already sent a letter to President Clinton urging that this matter be unstuck, that we move ahead with implementation of this carefully crafted compromise.

I would be pleased to join the gentleman in signing his letter and urging all Members of the House to contact the OMB, our former colleague, the new Director, the President, and the Governors of their States, because in many cases the Governors themselves have been strong proponents of ethanol and alcohol-based fuel activities.

I hope that our colleagues will listen to this and take that kind of action.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Nebraska.

I would like our colleagues to join with me.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 27. Concurrent resolution providing for an adjournment of the House from Wednesday, January 27, 1993 to Tuesday, February 2, 1993.

REGULATORY BURDEN RELIEF FOR FINANCIALLY HEALTHY BANKS

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this special order today to call the attention of my colleagues to legislation I introduced on January 5, to reduce the increasing amount of regulatory red tape facing our Nation's financial institutions. I do this to encourage their support and their cosponsorship.

The legislation, H.R. 59, grants regulatory burden relief to healthy, profitable and well-managed institutions. To qualify, a financial institution, for example, a commercial bank, must meet the test of adequate capitalization—that is a carefully defined term as part of our statute already, and they also must be well-managed.

Legislation is needed since, regulators are now directed by statute to impose a massive amount of additional and unnecessary regulations on an institution's day-to-day business decisions, regardless of their capitalization and management. This, in turn, is distracting them from examining the overall financial condition of the institution. This bureaucratic overreach has resulted in literally tons of needless paperwork for banks, particularly for small banks that cannot afford to hire additional employees.

I would stress that H.R. 59 is a cost-saver not only for banks and other financial institutions, but also for the bank customers and taxpayers. The banking industry reports that 59 percent of its profits for last year were eaten up by compliance costs, that is money which could have been reinvested in new products and services for customers, and been available for loan purposes in the community.

The impact on excessive and inappropriate regulations and paperwork on consumers comes in two forms: either a reduction in the number of services of-

fered, or in higher fees for those services. A reduction in services is a very real concern for rural areas. For example, we have already seen small, community banks discontinue offering adjustable rate mortgages, simply because of the number of regulations dictating how that product is to be offered.

According to a recent survey conducted by the American Bankers Association, banks could support an additional \$20-\$30 billion of additional lending each year if only 25 percent of the resources banks now spend on compliance could be redirected to bank capital.

This is also a costly exercise for the Federal Government, since it is not just the banks, but also the Federal banking agencies that bear expenses associated with unnecessary reporting and regulatory examinations.

Provisions of H.R. 59 were drawn from recommendations found in the recently released Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council report, the FDIC's 1992 regulatory burden report, a list of recommendations issued by the banking industry, and in consultation with the other regulatory agencies.

Included in the bill's regulatory reduction measures are provisions to provide regulatory relief for institutions that are "adequately-capitalized" as required by FDICIA and maintain a CAMEL or MACRO rating of 1 or 2; require more coordination between Federal and State regulators with respect to examinations and reporting requirements; streamline and reduce requirements associated with forms and applications that banks must regularly submit to a regulator; establish an Office of Regulatory Quality to serve as an ombudsman for individual banks to allow them to comment on the quality of an examination and to raise questions about a particular regulation; provide a self-certification process to relieve small banks from reporting and examination requirements imposed by the regulators as a result of the Community Reinvestment Act; put teeth into the Paperwork Reduction Act by requiring the regulators to conduct an economic analysis of certain bank regulations—for example, how many institutions would be affected, the cost of implementing the regulation to the Government.

This Member urges support for H.R. 59. The legislation will make regulation more efficient for financially healthy institutions, not easier for the weaker ones.

GALLEGLY'S DISLOCATED DEFENSE WORKERS' JOB ASSISTANCE ACT TO HELP DEFENSE WORKERS HURT BY DEFENSE CUTBACKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce today a bill to make dislocated defense workers eligible for the targeted jobs tax credit.

We are fortunate to be living at a time when there are few serious threats to world peace, thanks in large part to the determination and military strength of the United States. We have heard repeatedly the promise of some sort of peace dividend as a result of the planned reductions in our defense spending and downsizing of our military forces. The sad truth is that, thanks to the huge budget deficit and outstanding domestic spending programs, whatever peace dividend there might be from projected defense cutbacks has already been committed. Moreover, as a consequence of cutbacks, many of our best trained, most productive, and most patriotic citizens are already paying a steep price for this dividend.

Over the next 5 years, one-quarter of our Armed Forces—approximately 450,000 active duty personnel—is scheduled for displacement. In addition, some 150,000 civilians will be let go from their military jobs. According to Business Week magazine, if defense spending is slashed by \$150 billion over the next 5 years, as proposed, over 3.3 million private-sector jobs will be lost.

The Federal Government has an obligation to try to help the millions of Americans who will lose their jobs through no fault of their own, but as a direct result of reductions in defense expenditures that their own contributions to winning the cold war helped make possible. Americans from all walks of life have served their country with pride and distinction, out of patriotic duty and a commitment to fight for peace and freedom and to protect America from the threat of world communism. Many of them have come to look upon military service as a career. Despite promises of promotion and adventure, thousands of men and women in uniform are suddenly facing forced separation. Their dreams for the future have been dashed in our rush to downsize our military forces to fit the demands of a new world order and meet the needs of a peacetime defense.

Our Nation's defenses include not only the military services, the officers and enlisted men and women on active duty and in the National Guard and the Reserves. They also include the many industries and large and small businesses employing millions of civilian workers who produce the planes, ships, and weaponry, the machines and materials, and the aerospace and electric tools that have enabled America to remain No. 1 in the world and meet its cold war defense needs. In our eagerness to cut back the defense budget overnight, we are contributing to the current economic recession by pushing many firms into bankruptcy and by throwing their employees out of work, into unemployment lines and onto welfare and forcing their families into anxiety and despair.

Under the circumstances, I believe that we have an obligation to help these victims of demobilization. These men and women have already paid their dues. They have proven that they can hold down a job and carry responsibility; that they have the education, training, experience and the desire to make a positive

contribution to work force productivity and to our Nation's global competitiveness. What these people need most of all is a new job, the opportunity to prove themselves and be productive members of society again. What I propose is the incentive for an employer to hire them and train them for that new job.

I propose that the targeted jobs tax credit [TJTC] be extended to cover dislocated defense workers who, because of reductions in defense expenditures, have lost their jobs through no fault of their own. The new members of this targeted group are all victims of defense cutbacks—those military personnel who are involuntarily separated, but honorably discharged; Defense Department civilian employees involuntarily terminated; and employees involuntarily terminated from defense-related jobs in the private sector. The credit would be available to an employer who hires a dislocated worker within 1 year of his or her separation from a previous defense-related job.

Under the Dislocated Defense Workers' Job Assistance Act, employers would be offered a tax incentive to hire and retrain dislocated defense workers within 1 year from their dismissal or discharge. Thus, an employer could claim a credit equal to 40 percent of the first \$6,000 earned by the eligible newly hired worker during the first year on the job. This bill is identical to H.R. 5108, which I offered in the last Congress. Unfortunately, the problem of high unemployment in defense-related fields has not lessened, especially in California.

TJTC is a program that has already proven successful in promoting employment opportunities for economically disadvantaged youth, Vietnam-era veterans, cooperative education teenagers, ex-offenders, vocational rehabilitation referrals, and persons on AFDC, SSI, and other general assistance programs. The targeted jobs credit relies on the private sector, rather than government, using a simple, straightforward fiscal mechanism now available to business. It requires no new Federal bureaucracy nor a welfare handout.

This legislation provides a practical, cost-effective approach to a pressing problem. Given the uncertain state of our economy and the lives that are involved, I urge immediate congressional consideration of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to offer the Dislocated Defense Workers' Job Assistance Act on behalf of myself, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. GINGRICH, and Mr. DORNAN. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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 "Dislocated Defense Workers' Job Assistance Act".

SEC. 2. DISLOCATED DEFENSE WORKERS TREATED AS MEMBERS OF TARGETED GROUP.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—Paragraph (1) of section 51(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (defining members of a targeted group) is amended by striking "or" at the end of subparagraph (I), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (J), and inserting ", or", and by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(K) a dislocated defense workers."

(b) DISLOCATED DEFENSE WORKER.—Subsection (d) of section 51 of such Code is amended by redesignating paragraphs (13), (14), (15), and (16), as paragraphs (14), (15), (16), and (17), respectively, and by inserting after paragraph (12) the following new paragraph:

"(13) DISLOCATED DEFENSE WORKER.—The term 'dislocated defense worker' means any individual—

"(A) if—

"(i) the Secretary of Defense certifies that—

"(I) such individual had been involuntarily separated (within the meaning of section 1141 of title 10, United States Code) from the Armed Forces as the result of reductions in defense expenditures, or

"(II) such individual had been involuntarily terminated from civilian employment in the Defense Department as the result of reductions in defense expenditures, or

"(ii) the designated local agency certified that such individual was involuntarily terminated from employment by an employer (other than a governmental body) as the result of reductions in such employer's business caused by reductions in defense expenditures, and

"(B) if the hiring date is during the 1-year period beginning on the date of the involuntary separation or termination (as the case may be) referred to in subparagraph (A).

For purposes of paragraph (17), any reference to the designated local agency shall, in the case of individuals referred to in subparagraph (A)(i), include a reference to the Secretary of Defense."

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to individuals who begin work for the employer after the date of the enactment of this Act.

TEMPORARY INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT RESTORATION ACT OF 1993

Mr. Speaker, in order to spur industrial growth and expansion and produce an early turnaround in our stagnant economy, I introduce today the Temporary Investment Tax Credit Restoration Act of 1993. This legislation will reinstate the 10-percent investment tax credit on an incremental basis for 2 years, retroactive to January 1, 1993. In offering this proposal on behalf of myself and Representatives BAKER of Louisiana, HUNTER, SOLOMON, LIGHTFOOT, LEVY, SAXTON, DOOLITTLE, FAWELL, ROHRBACHER, EMERSON, STUMP, and PACKARD, I join many economists and businessmen—even then-Presidential candidate Bill Clinton—in urging an immediate, short-term stimulus to the economy that will encourage American industry and agriculture to build for the future and enable this country to compete better in the global economy.

With our economy still sluggish, we must take prompt and sensible measures to stimulate national recovery and improve our competitive position in world trade. Insufficient investment is certainly one underlying cause for our economy's sluggish productivity growth and declining competitiveness. Investment spending in Japan, for example, where the economy is just over one-half that of the United States, is a much greater share of that Nation's GNP than investment spending in the United States. U.S. investment in productive manufacturing equipment has fallen from an average increase of 4 to 5 percent during the 1950's, 1960's and 1970's to just 1.6 percent for the 1980's. American industry must retool

now for the technology explosion, job growth and competitive global expansion of the 90's and beyond.

Evidence shows that the investment credit does indeed raise investment spending. According to the American Council for Capital Formation, purchases of equipment by industry have grown far faster during periods when the credit was in effect than when it wasn't. An investment tax credit has been enacted three times since January 1962. It was initiated under the Kennedy administration as a means of sparking economic recovery after a recession, and it worked. As a permanent credit, it was eliminated finally in the 1986 tax reform effort amidst criticisms that it created distortions in investment decisions. During that period, however, the credit was an effective cyclical stabilizer and a powerful investment stimulus.

I proposed that the credit be revived for 2 years so that it will provide what economist Robert Eisner calls "a big bang for the buck" without excessive costs or long-term distortions. Companies will be encouraged to accelerate their spending, rather than to put off plans for industrial expansion, thereby giving the economy a quick start and wage-earners and consumers a psychological boost. Although estimates of its immediate costs vary, its intermediate-range impact will be to produce millions in tax revenues emanating from the recovery it helps to engender and the additional jobs it will spawn. Moreover, the cost of the credit will be reduced by making it apply only to a company's investment in manufacturing and other productive equipment properties, including farm equipment, computer software, and used equipment, that exceeds its previous spending on such equipment over the previous 4-year base amount. If in 2 years the economy still needs a strong shot in the arm, the credit can be extended or again be made permanent as it was until 1986.

Mr. Speaker, our economy is in trouble, and the American people remain pessimistic about it and their future. A temporary incremental investment tax credit will provide the push that industry and consumers need. The time for action, rather than partisan politics, is long overdue. I urge my colleagues to support this bill and the House to approve the 10-percent investment tax credit now.

Let's make the investment tax credit part of our campaign to jump start America.

I request that the full text of this bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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 "Temporary Investment Tax Credit Restoration Act of 1993".

SEC. 2. INVESTMENT CREDIT FOR NEW MANUFACTURING AND OTHER PRODUCTIVE EQUIPMENT.

(a) ALLOWANCE OF CREDIT.—Section 46 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to amount of investment credit) is amended by striking "and" at the end of paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting ", and", and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph.

"(4) the manufacturing and other productive equipment credit."

(b) AMOUNT OF CREDIT.—Section 48 of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) MANUFACTURING AND OTHER PRODUCTIVE EQUIPMENT CREDIT.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Four purposes of section 46, the manufacturing and other productive equipment credit for any taxable year is an amount equal to 10 percent of the excess (if any) of—

"(A) the aggregate bases of qualified manufacturing and productive equipment properties placed in service by the taxpayer during such taxable year, over

"(B) the base amount.

"(2) QUALIFIED MANUFACTURING AND PRODUCTIVE EQUIPMENT PROPERTY.—For purposes of this subsection—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified manufacturing and productive equipment property' means any property—

"(i) which is used—

"(I) as an integral part of the manufacture or production of tangible personal property, or

"(II) in farming,

"(ii) which is tangible property to which section 168 applies, and

"(iii) which is section 1245 property (as defined in section 1245(a)(3)).

"(B) SPECIAL RULE FOR COMPUTER SOFTWARE.—In the case of any computer software which is used to control or monitor a manufacturing or production process and with respect to which depreciation (or amortization in lieu of depreciation) is allowable, such software shall be treated as qualified manufacturing and productive equipment property.

"(3) BASE AMOUNT.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(B)—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'base amount' means the product of—

"(i) the fixed-base percentage, and

"(ii) the average annual gross receipts of the taxpayer for the 4 taxable years preceding the taxable year for which the credit is being determined (hereafter in this subsection referred to as the 'credit year').

"(B) MINIMUM BASE AMOUNT.—In no event shall the base amount be less than 50 percent of the amount determined under paragraph (1)(A).

"(C) FIXED-BASE PERCENTAGE.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—The fixed-base percentage is the percentage which the aggregate amounts described in paragraph (1)(A) for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1987, and before January 1, 1993, is of the aggregate gross receipts of the taxpayer for such taxable years.

"(ii) ROUNDING.—The percentages determined under clause (i) shall be rounded to the nearest $\frac{1}{100}$ of 1 percent.

"(D) OTHER RULES.—Rules similar to the rules of paragraphs (4) and (5) of section 41(c) shall apply for purposes of this paragraph.

"(4) ALLOCATION OF BASIS ADJUSTMENT.—The reduction required by section 50(c) for any taxable year shall be allocated among the qualified manufacturing and productive equipment property placed in service by the taxpayer during such year in proportion to the respective bases of such property.

"(5) RECAPTURE.—In applying section 50(a) to any property which ceases to be qualified manufacturing and productive equipment property, the credit determined under this subsection with respect to such property shall be treated as being equal to 10 percent of the lesser of—

"(A) the excess referred to in paragraph (1) for the taxable year in which such property was placed in service, or

"(B) the basis of such property which was taken into account under paragraph (1).

"(6) CONTROLLED GROUPS.—Rules similar to the rules of paragraph (1) of section 41(f) shall apply for purposes of this subsection.

"(7) COORDINATION WITH OTHER CREDITS.—This subsection shall not apply to any property to which the energy credit or rehabilitation credit would apply unless the taxpayer elects to waive the application of such credits to such property.

"(8) CERTAIN PROGRESS EXPENDITURE RULES MADE APPLICABLE.—Rules similar to rules of subsection (c)(4) and (d) of section 46 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Revenue Reconciliation Act of 1990) shall apply for purposes of this subsection.

"(9) APPLICATION OF SUBSECTION.—This subsection shall apply to periods after December 31, 1992, and before January 1, 1995, under rules similar to the rules of section 48(m) (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Revenue Reconciliation Act of 1990)."

(c) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Clause (ii) of section 49(a)(1)(C) so such Code is amended by inserting "or qualified manufacturing and productive equipment property" after "energy property".

(2) Subparagraph (E) of section 50(a)(2) of such Code is amended by inserting "or 48(c)(5)" before the period at the end thereof.

(3) Paragraph (5) of section 50(a) of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(D) SPECIAL RULES FOR CERTAIN PROPERTY.—In the case of any qualified manufacturing and productive equipment property which is 3-year property (within the meaning of section 168(e))—

"(i) the percentage set forth in clause (ii) of the table contained in paragraph (1)(B) shall be 66 percent,

"(ii) the percentage set forth in clause (iii) of such table shall be 33 percent, and

"(iii) clauses (iv) and (v) of such table shall not apply."

(4)(A) The section heading for section 48 of such Code is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 48. OTHER CREDITS."

(b) The table of sections for subpart E of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by striking the item relating to section 48 and inserting the following: "Sec. 48. Other credits."

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years ending after December 31, 1992.

THE GROWING URBAN CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in order to speak plainly about the difficulties and opportunities that await us in the coming year as we in the Congress work together with this new administration to address our growing urban crisis.

I would begin today with an overview of the present situation, then address the issue of joblessness. Subsequent speeches in this series will deal in depth with such concerns as education, the need for a national health care system, welfare reform, housing, and community development.

One week ago, just outside this Capitol Building, we inaugurated the 42d President of these United States amid much deserved fanfare and celebration. President Clinton and Vice President GORE were elected on a platform of change, of renewal, of no business as usual.

"There is nothing wrong with America that cannot be cured by what is right with America," said the President.

We know that this is not empty boosterism or mere rhetoric. We know that the problems that afflict us, that tear at our beloved community are not acts of God, but rather those of man and manmade structures, and manmade systems that have not delivered life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness to all our people.

For too many Americans who live in our cities, whose ever-so-sweet words and the traditional American promise of opportunity clash harshly with their daily experience.

We have seen the passing of a dozen-year period where our leaders blithely assured us that the common good could be arrived at by each of 250-odd million Americans all pursuing their own selfish interests. Now, of course, some folks were better positioned to pursue their interests than others.

We needed, in the words of abolitionist leader Frances Ellen Watkins Harper, "the sentiment that justice, simple justice, is the right not simply of the strong and powerful but of the weakest and feeblest."

Instead, the rich got richer, the poor got poorer, and the folks in the middle all went to work longer hours for less money in order to barely hold their ground.

When things soured for everyone, in the past couple years, then blow-dried commentators started taking our country's distress seriously. Suddenly, the kind of folks they knew—restauranters, money market managers, lawyers, engineers—started getting pink slips. No one, it seemed, was immune—that was news.

But hey, this was old news to the proud steelworker in Mahoning Valley, OH who now is delivering pizzas.

It was old news to the North Carolina textile worker whose company moved south of the border where it could pay workers \$5 a day instead of \$5 an hour. And it was old news to a lot of my constituents in South-Central LA, laid off at the Goodyear plant, trying to keep body and soul and family together amidst crime and drugs and with damn little opportunity to earn a decent living.

But if America has, to use a medical analogy, come down with a bad cold over the past 2 years, then America's cities are suffering from chronic pneumonia.

In 1971, the first African-American mayor of a major U.S. city, my friend

Carl Stokes, told a congressional hearing, "we need help and we need it yesterday." That was in 1971.

Before the full force of the heroin and cocaine epidemics raked our cities.

Before changes in the national and international economy and misguided fiscal policies shrunk our urban manufacturing base and our tax base.

Before the deadly virus AIDS struck at our communities and threatened to overwhelm available health care facilities.

Before the decade of the 1980's where 1 percent of American taxpayers reaped 80 percent of income gains.

At a time when cities needed more help, in the early 1980's, the Federal Government offered less and less. It wasn't benign neglect. It was outright abandonment.

Between 1980 and 1992, according to studies by the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, a total of \$231 billion—in 1992 dollars—was cut from social programs in this country. That averages out to a 15-percent across-the-board reduction.

That figure included: a \$10.2 billion reduction in education funds; \$79.7 billion in employment and training; \$68.9 billion from health; \$18.1 billion from housing and homelessness; and \$32.6 billion in infrastructure.

The Reagan and Bush administrations especially targeted their cuts on cities: General revenue sharing was eliminated; urban development action grants were eliminated; community development block grants were reduced by \$15.6 billion; clean water construction funds were reduced by 56.7 percent; assisted housing moneys were cut by 66.8 percent; soil services block grants were reduced by \$4.25 billion; and urban mass transit funding was cut by \$7.8 billion.

And these are the cuts that the Congress approved. If the Republicans had had their way entirely then, heaven knows, the consequences would have been even more severe. They wanted to eliminate the Job Corps, the VISTA volunteer program, and trade adjustment assistance for workers displaced by foreign imports, among other worthy programs.

According to a study released by the U.S. Conference of Mayors, Federal aid as a percentage of city budgets was reduced by nearly 64 percent between 1980 and 1990—from 17.7 percent in 1980 to 6.4 percent. In response to these cuts, 72 percent of cities elected to raise taxes, 42 percent raised taxes and cut services, and 32 percent raised taxes, cut services, reduced city employment and raised revenues through other sources. In a follow up survey of 62 cities in October 1991, 74 percent of cities are postponing needed capital improvements.

At the same time that this was happening, changes in Federal tax policy made collecting taxes and selling bonds

more difficult for State and local governments. Add to this the costs to cities of complying with Federal mandates.

If it is sometimes true that you cannot solve problems just by throwing money at them—as conservatives are so fond of telling us—then it is also true that you can't solve intractable urban problems by not investing money to solve them. Good intentions are not nearly enough.

A recent study by the Economic Policy Institute entitled "Does America Need Cities?" says it well:

No great nation allows its cities to deteriorate. Our competitor nations in the rest of the advanced industrialized world recognize the importance of cities to their economic prosperity. They do not allow their roads, bridges, subways, and other infrastructure to crumble. They do not permit the level of sheer destitution—homelessness, hunger, poverty, and slums—found in America's cities.

America's cities are the spoke of a wheel that includes neighboring suburbs and smaller cities in tightly-woven metropolitan economies. Seventy-five percent of Americans live in urban areas, earning 83 percent of our national income. So, too, do half the Nation's poor—twice the percentage of 30 years ago. Cities provide high-paying jobs for their surrounding metro areas. They stand as centers of education, culture, medicine, and commerce.

Our challenge in the coming period is to identify the root causes of our urban crises—economic, social, cultural, and political. Our challenge is to invest in our cities and their people and in approaches that will expand opportunities in our urban areas and enable our workers to compete in a 21st century global marketplace.

Plainly put, we have to help people to help themselves—there is nothing more American, nothing more necessary. President Clinton still believes in a place called Hope. But in many cities—and in districts like mine in South-Central Los Angeles—there is precious little hope.

That has to change. And I believe, in the end, we shall measure whatever progress we may make in our urban agenda not just by bars and graphs and thickets of numbers in reports we wave around on this floor, but rather by whether we've given some hope for a better life to those who now have so little.

UNEMPLOYMENT

If we are serious about tackling our urban ills, we've got to start with joblessness. The best social program is a job.

When most of us strike up conversations with people we don't know, pretty early on will come the question, "So what do you do?" Not surprisingly, most people's identity is wrapped up—to some degree—in how they earn a living.

That's why being without a job is particularly wrenching. Unemployment

takes a toll not only on the pocket-book but also on a man or woman's self-respect. What is in fact a social disease—there is not enough work to go around or folks aren't trained for the jobs available—is seen as a personal disease. People think, "I am economically worthless."

The most recent figures from the Bureau of Labor Statistics tell us that 7.3 percent of our work force is without jobs—nearly 9½ million Americans out of work. Jobless rates in our cities run up to 20 percent. People of color are unemployed at twice the rate of whites and half or more of all African-American youth are jobless. Ten percent of the labor force in my district of South-Central Los Angeles is officially out of work.

However, these numbers don't include those Americans who are discouraged and have given up looking for work. It doesn't reflect those working in temporary or part-time jobs who want full-time work. It says nothing about the expansion of underpaid self-employment or about the 1 in 20 Americans who hold down two or more jobs.

Taking all this into account, we can talk about upward of 20 percent of the work force in labor market distress—and up to twice that in some urban areas.

In addition, only 35 percent of even those officially unemployed actually received unemployment benefits during December. As recently as the late seventies, fully 75 percent of the jobless received benefits—before Reagan and Bush's so-called reforms that tightened eligibility standards and qualifying triggers.

High rates of joblessness cost the American taxpayer plenty. Every 1 percent rise in unemployment costs \$25 billion in taxes the jobless aren't paying and benefits that they are receiving. The hopelessness and despair that result from chronic joblessness take their toll in crime, broken families, ill health, and drug and alcohol abuse.

We have a practical obligation—but more than that a moral obligation—to promote full employment as one goal of an American economic strategy for the 1990's and beyond. This commitment was articulated by President Franklin Delano Roosevelt in his 1945 Economic Bill of Rights—the right of every American to a useful and remunerative job. It was championed by Senator Hubert Humphrey and by my predecessor in this seat Congressman Augustus Hawkins in their Humphrey-Hawkins full employment bill of the late 1970's. That bill, as you may remember, was watered down, passed, signed into law, and then consigned to the dead letter file.

I tell you that unless we are willing to tackle joblessness—through economic stimulus, job training, education, and a more active labor market policy of the sort employed by our

global competitors—then there will be more rebellions like the one in Los Angeles and we shouldn't be surprised.

President Bill Clinton has eloquently expressed his belief that, "we haven't got a single American to waste." I agree. And yet, we risk wasting a significant strata of a whole generation by inaction.

I am developing a full urban agenda that will address joblessness and the urban crises on a number of fronts. Today, though, I'd like to talk about two initiatives I'm proposing that concern unemployment and job skills.

My Job and Life Skills Improvement Act is based on a successful program already underway at the Maxine Waters Employment Preparation Center in south-central Los Angeles. The center, founded in 1966 as the Watts Skills Center, was renamed by the Los Angeles Unified School District Board of Education in 1989.

The center offers short-term skills-training—12-24 weeks—job counseling and placement to 2,200 students who are economically disadvantaged adults and youth, displaced workers and homemakers, dropouts, and limited English speakers. Vocational offerings include auto and diesel mechanics, nursing, welding, computer occupations, bank telling, telecommunications, and electronics assembly.

Support for the center comes from businesses and trade unions, community service agencies and area schools. Funding comes from the Los Angeles Unified School District and the city and county Job Training Partnership Act.

This center is an innovative experiment in teaching job skills to folks without other avenues of opportunity. The students are motivated to learn and the instructors—many of them volunteer tradespeople—are proud to do the teaching. It gets a lot of bang for the buck. Still, we've had to turn away—did you hear me, turn away—community folks who want those skills and need them, for lack of funds.

My Job and Life Skills Improvement Act would appropriate \$10 billion to establish a stipend-based job training program for people ages 14 through 30. Students would be paid for up to 1 year for 20 hours of job training weekly.

This program is based on last year's urban aid legislation which passed both the House and Senate but that ultimately was vetoed by President Bush. That bill would have established similar job training programs in every enterprise zone. This bill would not be limited to enterprise zones and would train upward of 1 million youth and young adults.

Funds made available under this program must meet one basic criterion: The grants can be given only in areas where the poverty rate exceeds 30 percent of the population. The grants would be used in small geographic

areas and would fuel a broad array of social services, counseling, and basic training for program participants. Cities, nonprofit organizations, and community organizations with a proven record of serving particular communities could qualify for multiple grants.

This targeted one-stop program allows participants maximum flexibility. Small stipends make a big difference in making the training accessible to many older young adults who otherwise would not be financially able to commit themselves to such a program.

A second plank in my urban agenda is the Neighborhood Infrastructure Improvement and Inner-City Job Creation Act. This bill is a \$5 billion public works/infrastructure bill focusing on low-skilled workers. Rather than working on roads, bridges, and sewers as with most public works projects, this effort will center more on rehabilitation of deteriorated public buildings and facilities and playgrounds and parks facilities.

The idea is to involve low-skilled workers in rebuilding and rehabbing their own neighborhoods. This will mean fairly strict criteria to assure that funds go to low-income areas and that low-income folks do the work.

Mr. Speaker, the Scriptures say that "by your deeds they shall know ye." Well, by our deeds, our boldness, our imagination shall the ordinary working people of America judge us. Only by aggressively moving ahead on an activist agenda for America's cities will we demonstrate our commitment to economic opportunity for all Americans.

□ 1450

HAITI WATCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. POMEROY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, last February the first duly elected President of Haiti was violently deposed, and he had to flee his country. The priest, Jean Bertrand Aristide, has continued to serve his people in exile, in attempting to rally support and understanding for the incredible violent and illegitimate government that has assassinated in a ruthless way thousands of his people so far.

He was here, when President Clinton was sworn in on inauguration day. He has visited the Congress and has been a guest of mine on more than one occasion.

His valiant struggle has become noticed by freedom lovers around the world. I am very pleased with the large number of Members in the Congress who have joined with me in a variety of proposals that would attempt to ameliorate and, indeed, bring to an end this

tragic episode in Haitian history in which we attempt to restore democracy to that presently war-torn country.

This week, Rev. Jesse Louis Jackson returned from Haiti and had an incredible report to make to the American people. He met immediately with the Secretary of State, Warren Christopher, where he was debriefed. And we will hear more about that report this week.

Now, the current circumstances in Haiti are these: The Organization of American States has imposed an embargo in an attempt to economically deprive Haiti of the resources that are needed in an attempt to topple this military junta who rule from the barrels of guns.

The embargo has been less than effective because, first of all, it does not exclude states, nation states that are not members of the OAS.

Second, unfortunately, it is my duty to report that some of the members of the OAS are not observing the embargo. In the next instance, it has to be duly noted that the representatives of this illegal government meet freely with the former members of the State Department.

Further, the airlines between Miami and Haiti run regularly. The wealthy are, in fact, completely untouched by this embargo. As a matter of fact, some say the embargo is impacting more on the poor than it is on those who are in government control.

So the question comes up, how can we restore an embargo and put some teeth in it, if this is, indeed, a powerful way of bringing the illegitimate Government of Haiti to the bargaining table?

In the United Nations, Mr. Caputo has been designated by the Secretary of that august body to attempt to negotiate a settlement between the legal and the illegal parties governing Haiti, and so we are hoping that several things will occur relatively soon.

First, that the OAS embargo be extended to U.N. sanctions. After all, we have imposed sanctions on Iraq. We have imposed sanctions on Cuba. There is no more fitting nation to have sanctions added by the United Nations than the country of Haiti, under their present illegal government.

The next thing we must do is to negotiate some settlement that will lead to the restoration of democracy in Haiti. That negotiated settlement and the attempts of it are presently under way, but if there were to be a United Nations sanction, I think that that would operate as an incredibly important leverage upon these entire proceedings.

Finally, of course, there is the U.N. Security Council that will meet in February and that could take up the question of sanctions. As we approach the time appropriate for such a United Na-

tions Security Council meeting, it is absolutely imperative that our new officials in the State Department make it perfectly clear that it is our intention to move toward a United Nations sanction and that we demand expedited, negotiated settlement attempts so that we can close out February 1993 by setting into motion the means that will restore the first democratically elected President in the history of Haiti, the Honorable Reverend Jean Bertrand Aristide.

□ 1500

GOVERNMENT REFORM SHOULD BEGIN WITH ELIMINATION OF SELECT COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POMEROY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I hope some of the other Members with whom I have spoken will take note and join me on the floor here. To the viewing audience, I would note, as I always do, we are in an empty Chamber. This Chamber is frequently populated by a few number of Members, but when the House is in regular session that is never made known to the public because the camera is always on the speaker. I think the disparity between treatment of the cameras in the House in regular session versus how it is treated during special orders is unfair, and I think it creates the impression that there is a lack of interest, but I think we are all aware that there are a number of people who follow C-SPAN and the proceedings of the House, and I think it is an important way to discuss issues of interest to Americans.

I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, in the 1 minute, I commented upon the opportunity we have for change this year; next week, as a matter of fact, when we have presented before us the proposal to eliminate the four select committees within the House of Representatives.

The public may not be aware, but we have a number of standing committees, each of which has a certain area of jurisdiction. In fact, this whole Congress needs substantial reform to reduce areas of conflicting jurisdiction, such as we have. Such as it may be, these are standing committees. The power to hold hearings they possess, the power to initiate and to consider legislation, the full range of legislative opportunities.

The select committees, which are going to be before us, basically are redundant. They are redundant at tremendous cost, at a cost of, I believe it is about \$3.8 million per year, and 91 employees.

I am given to understand that the total number of employees on Capitol

Hill has now grown to nearly 40,000, with an annual budget of \$3 billion, if we can imagine that. We read in today's newspapers that the chairman of IBM is resigning on the heels of a massive loss. Indeed, this represents a record in world corporation history; \$5 billion was lost by IBM. The result of this is that they are going to scale back even further.

I think it is noteworthy that since Mr. Akers, the chairman of IBM, took office as chairman in 1985, this company, which is the bluest of the blue chip companies, has lost or has scaled back 100,000 employees. Imagine that, 100,000 employees have been reduced over the 7 years by IBM.

Today in the Washington Post, in an article called "A Wave Of Change Sweeps U.S. Firms," we read about the various forces upon private companies today that are compelling them to become more competitive, and they are responding in all the ways that they know how. Unfortunately, but nevertheless by necessity, one of those ways is by job cutbacks. This is just very surprising. I would like to quote briefly from today's front page story in the Washington Post:

Five years ago, if you asked for an example of a world class U.S. company capable of standing up to the Japanese, one that was tops in service, loyalty to its employees, invested heavily in new products, and had a brisk business overseas, International Business Machines Corporation would surely have come out on top. Today the same IBM is in full retreat, a symbol of the furious pace of restructuring now occurring in American business in response to a worldwide recession, increased competition at home and abroad, and technology that becomes obsolete almost overnight.

I might inject parenthetically, anybody who follows the personal computer industry, I think, is impressed with how this technology is changing and how quickly it is possible for the equipment and the software to become obsolete.

Now back to the article:

And not just IBM. In the last 2 days, Sears, Roebuck & Company has closed down its century-old general merchandise catalog and said it will trim 50,000 people from its payroll. United Technologies Corp. announced it would lay off more than 11,000 workers; Boeing Company, 10,000 or more; McDonnell Douglas Corporation, 8,700; and Armco, Inc., 1,400, and so it has gone for the past month.

Xerox Corp., Eastman Kodak Co., General Motors Corp. the bluest of the blue chips, all of these companies, many of which, I might add, are located in California, are cutting back by the thousands of jobs. I am told in the last 2 years in southern California alone we have lost 500,000 jobs. We still have a depression in California, and it is not optimistic for getting out of it.

What comes to my mind as I reflect upon this article and upon the realization that our private companies are trimming down, getting lean and mean, and a lot of Americans who had jobs

are already out of them or will be out of them, the realization comes to mind, what is government doing? If this is what is impacting the private sector, what is going to be the response of government?

The response has been very interesting. With a handful of exceptions, the governments across this country at the State and national level have all hired more employees, so while people in the private sector are losing their jobs, these same people, through the taxes they pay, are having to support their governments, which are hiring more people. It is absolutely incredible.

The State of Pennsylvania stands out as one good example out of a handful where it has gone just the opposite direction. I read that they have had a 9-percent reduction in their State employment work force. But with the exception of a handful, including Pennsylvania, almost every other State in this recession has increased the number of people on the Government payroll and the Federal Government, unfortunately, since Ronald Reagan has also increased the number of people on the payroll.

Look at the Congress of the United States. We have an opportunity to reduce these four select committees. Let us face it, this is largely symbolic. We are talking \$3.8 million out of a \$3 billion budget, annual budget for the Congress of the United States. We are talking about a reduction of 91 personnel out of an employment force that is near 40,000, so it is small, but it sets us off in the right direction. It sets an example.

I just hope that when we come to the floor next Tuesday, that the 237 people who had the courage to vote against the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control will take the same actions with regard to the other three select committees; the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, the Select Committee on Hunger, and the Select Committee on Aging, those three in addition to narcotics.

Why? I believe that hunger is a problem. Certainly our families and our youth are terribly and very negatively impacted by these governmental policies that have been in force for some time now. Certainly the aged have numerous problems that merit concern, and we are all aware of the problem of hunger in this country; but I would just observe, Mr. Speaker, that all of those subject areas—narcotics, we know the threat that faces the people of this country by the trade in narcotics—all of those areas are already addressed by the standing committees, for which we have thousands of well-paid staff people whose job it is to track these issues and develop legislation.

□ 1510

So this is clearly an example of bureaucratic redundancy. The House of

Representatives, without injuring one iota of the major issues to which those select committees have devoted themselves, could scale back. We could eliminate these four select committees and set a wonderful precedent, something that almost is never done in Government. We could set this precedent and use it to build upon and to take the ideas that have been advanced by our new President in terms of making Government more accountable and more efficient, getting control over the deficit.

We could actually, as the House of Representatives, set that example next Tuesday and match in some small manner, at least in terms of symbolism, match what the private sector, the sector that employs most of the people of this country, is having to do; namely, get more competitive.

The State of California is in a tremendous financial bind right now. Last year in their fiscal year, and this does not sound like much considering the figures that we deal with; but it is a very, very substantial sum, it is the largest State in the Union, they had a \$13 billion budget deficit last year. And this year they are now projecting a \$9 billion budget deficit. They are going to have to make some hard decisions.

The State senate commission on cost control, which is dominated by Democrats, that State senate cost control commission is now actively considering various ideas relating to privatization of all things, something that most Democrats have traditionally resisted because their constituencies demand that we have more government and keep a high government payroll. But now when the question is are we going to meet the needs of our children and the schools, are we going to meet the needs of our senior citizens who are receiving the benefits of special State programs, are we going to make sure we keep the people in prison that have to be there so they are not out injuring other people, or are we going to keep a fat Government payroll in order to continue business as usual. And sometimes, not sometimes, but I frankly think almost all of the time anymore, we have to have a crisis to get real reform anymore in Government. The State of California has that crisis, and it is now responding when Democrats are even now, with that commission they control, directing cost-cutting measures, looking at where we can privatize, what services we can consolidate, how we can become lean and mean, and make all of this tax money that we collect and spend be more effective, more efficient, bottom line, more productive.

For years the Republicans have tried to get a cost accounting method imposed upon the operation of the Government and that has always been resisted by the Democrats, because that would point out the glaring holes in

the bureaucracy. It would immediately reveal the waste of taxpayer funds for regulatory agencies that almost no one has ever heard of, or governmental programs that long since have outlived their usefulness. And it would actually put tremendous pressure upon the Government to reform itself. And so we continue to hold ourselves apart from that cost accounting type of approach that is used in all of the private businesses and that some State governments use. And I think the time is now. My word, I told you that IBM had a \$5 billion loss, the largest of any corporation in history. We are going to have a \$300 billion shortfall. That is what is projected for the Government of the United States in this fiscal year, a \$300 billion shortfall, the largest in history.

I think we have to take note of this, and we have to do something about it. And more governmental programs, and more spending, and more governmental regulation is not the answer.

I think the Clinton administration is going to have to come to terms with itself. It cannot continue to speak out of both sides of its mouth and tell us how, on the one hand, we are going to reduce the size of Government, and on the other hand how we are going to institute all kinds of new regulations in the name of the environment or whatever other good cause they can think of; vast taxing and spending proposals. We have got to come to terms as a country and recognize that the problem in this country is not insufficient amounts of tax revenue.

Everyone must know surely by talking to others, from your own experience or by talking to family and friends and neighbors, that the poor American family in this country is just about ready to drown with the taxes that they have got and the job loss that is coming about, not only as a result of the recession but of the bloated Government and the overregulation that we have that destroys our opportunity to become productive. And global competition is what is really putting the knives to our throats as we get these other countries with cheap labor that are now able to really put pressure on U.S. businesses.

That is why IBM, Sears, General Motors, Boeing, McDonnell Douglas, and so forth, are having all of these problems. And we as governmental leaders have got to take the bit in our teeth and do something responsive other than the same old failed and tried formulas used in the past. We are talking about a \$300 billion annual deficit. We have a cumulative deficit now of \$4 trillion.

For heaven's sake, is our approach to the deficit going to be some new, ridiculous procedural spending restraint like we have had in the past, and then every time it gets time to bite the bullet and actually make the spending re-

ductions, we throw it out and start over again? I mean, Gramm-Rudman was a joke. Then they gave us a reformulated Gramm-Rudman, and that was a joke. And then we had the disastrous 1990 budget summit accord, the very thing that destroyed the presidency of George Bush and ushered in the Clinton administration, because people resented the promise being broken about no new taxes. And people frankly resented their own high level of taxes and their own job losses occasioned by the imposition of these taxes, and they were fed up with an apparently do-nothing House of Representatives and Senate that was basically unresponsive to their needs.

Now we have a Clinton administration and they have given us a lot of promises. And I am disturbed, Mr. Speaker, to see already, after just a few days, reneging on those promises. Oh, they have kept some of their promises, yes. To the far leftwing fringe in this country they have honored their promises scrupulously. We heard the diatribes today about the Council on Competitiveness. That in my mind was almost the one bright spot. Maybe there were two or three, but the one that sticks out in my mind was the Council on Competitiveness, a very efficient organization. I think it had eight staff members, chaired by the Vice President. Its job was to serve as a funnel so that all of these regulations imposed by the various agencies of Government had to funnel through this Council, and this Council would review them to make sure they were consistent, to make sure they were not unduly onerous. I mean it was a very, very well-run Council. And here the President beats his breast, and in less than a week's time has announced that it is going to be abolished. Perhaps it was the Vice President that announced that, but the Clinton administration announced it.

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

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

□ 1520

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to break the gentleman's train of thought, because the gentleman has taken this time to talk about reform in the House and is eloquently presenting his case against reauthorizing the select committees.

If I might just take a moment to express myself on my position on this issue and try to walk through why I feel very strongly that next Tuesday when we bring the resolution to the floor of the House that will extend the existence of these four select committees for another year while the Hamilton-Gradison, or now the Hamilton-Dreier Committee on House Organization, on Congressional Organization, does its work, and I want the Members

to understand that many of us are going to call very strongly that if you really are for reform, if you really believe in reform, that the vote for reform will be a no vote for that privileged resolution.

Let me just say, in the beginning, I believe very strongly in this institution. I believe in what it stands for. I believe in the genius of our Founding Fathers when they organized this Government and designed the House of Representatives. I believe in what they were trying to accomplish in creating an institution that was a deliberative body, that would speak the will of the people at that particular moment with a check on the House by the Senate, but more importantly, how this institution was set up and envisioned, that at no time would the will be the House be thwarted.

I strongly believe that the reason that the House of Representatives in particular, and Congress in general, is held in such low esteem by the American people today is that the institution itself has lost its discipline, has lost its understanding of the rules, because anytime a rule gets in the way of the majority party, they change the rules through the Committee on Rules. The strangulation of deliberation in committees and in the House through oppressive rules, particularly those rules that were passed at the beginning of this Congress, and it seems that every year, or every new Congress that convenes we have more restrictive rules limiting the deliberation of the House and thereby limiting the expression of the will of the House, not the will of the Democrat Party, but the will of the total House. We saw an example, a bright light, yesterday where the will of the House, despite shenanigans by the majority leadership, despite shenanigans was expressed. Sometimes the will of the House is expressed, and we saw that happening yesterday.

I think the will of the House is in reform, particularly in this small area of eliminating select committees, the four select committees that were brought before the House yesterday. Unfortunately, the will of the House was expressed, and the leadership immediately pulled down their schedule and tried to figure out a way where they could manipulate the process so that the select committees could survive, thereby again attempting to thwart the will of the House.

What is happening here, Mr. Speaker, is really unfortunate, because what we have done, we have seen our esteem in the eyes of the American people diminish over many of the scandals of the last Congress. And what was our action? We create a committee, give them a year to work. We know what needs to be done in this House. We do not need any sort of fashioning or posturing or public relations operations

with the American people. The American people are fed up. They want this House reformed. They want this House, the deliberative body, to be a deliberative body, and they want their will expressed through their Representatives represented on the floor of this House, and whatever the vote of this House, the will of the House be the ultimate outcome.

Now, what has happened? We started out this year, as we do the beginning of every Congress, with a proposed rules change. Now, we have had many months, many weeks and many months, to fashion the rules change to reform the House. Instead of actually reforming the House in the way that many of us in the House understand true reform, we had a package presented by the majority that did not reform the House but constricted the will of the House and the action of the House.

The Republican leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], presented the Republican offering of reforming the House through his rules package, his rules presentation, and there were some true reforms in there.

To give you a couple of examples, we feel very strongly that a Member of Congress should vote and be present when he is voting in committee, and many people understand that this place allows proxy voting so that you can give your proxy to the chairman or the ranking member, that allows another member to vote for you.

That disgusts the American people. That small thing is no small thing in the eyes of the American people. Yet that was rejected.

Now, we came in with our package, and in the package offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], the suggestion was, along with many other suggestions to reform the House, the suggestion that we immediately abolish all four nonlegislative select committees. As it so happens, quite interestingly, the Democrat caucus had a Committee on Organization, and they recommended back in October that, No. 1, the Select Committee on Aging be removed as a permanent standing committee from the House rules, that Rules Committee Democrats be instructed not to extend the life of the four nonlegislative select committees for more than a year, and that the Joint Committee on Organization of the Congress study and make recommendations to the House on the future of select committees. The Democrat caucus adopted removing the Committee on Aging as a permanent standing committee from House rules and adopted that the Committee on Organization of Congress study and make recommendations to the House on the future of select committees.

But they were silent on the Committee on Rules Democrats being instructed not to extend this life of the

four nonlegislative committees, as to what their fate would be in the interim, but we came to yesterday with the proposal, not as one proposal, voting up or down on all four committees, but cleverly dividing the question, and not so cleverly putting up the Select Committee on Narcotics, as, I guess, they felt that was the safest one, and that would pass and start a snowball so that the rest of them passed.

But they were surprised that the will of the House did work, and the House rejected reauthorizing the Select Committee on Narcotics, and they immediately wanted to adjourn the House, stop any more consideration on the other three committees.

Now, what is coming back Tuesday is a proposal that supposedly was worked out with the Republican leadership, along with the Democrat leadership, that, indeed, a compromise would be struck, and we would give these committees 1 year's extension, and let the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress study this and make their recommendations.

That is not the point. What happens if this goes on is one of two things: We either give 1 year for people to make agreements to keep these select committees, or the joint committee makes a recommendation that we do away with them, one of two ways. I think the vast majority of this House understands that the select committees have done a pretty good job, but their job could be handled just as well with reorganization of the standing committees.

So I do not understand why Members are starting to say, well, let us give it 1 more year, let us let it drag this process out again; let us spend those millions of dollars keeping these committees afloat, and let us study it.

Well, we have studied this issue to death. I will tell you what will happen. What will happen is deals will be cut, as the Hamilton-Dreier committee makes its deliberations, and you will have the chairman and the ranking member of these four select committees go to the members of the Joint Committee on Organization of Congress. They will make a plea. They will have a whole year to make their plea. They have a whole year to make some sort of deals or some sort of compromises or come up with some sort of cute little way of keeping the select committees going, and we will be right back here once again with the same issue of whether we keep the select committees or not.

It also gives them, by the way, a year to get their votes, to energize the special-interest groups that have particular interests in these four committees, to gather the votes to maintain these committees in operation. I think what we are running the risk of is continuing these committees in the future when we all know that this is an expense, and this is a reform that needs to be taken.

□ 1530

I understand the problems that some of the Members are having. Some of the Members are having real problems with the staffs on these committees. The gentleman knows what happens around here, the gentleman well knows that any time we talk about reform or cutting back on the size of the committees or the size of the staff, personalities come in. You have special interests energized in the staffs themselves who have direct contact with the Members and start working the Members as if they were some sort of lobbyists standing here on the steps of the House working the Members to get their votes to maintain their jobs.

When I was in business—and I am still in business, I own a business in Houston—it was the worst time in my business career when I have to let somebody go. That is a gut-wrenching decision that you have to make, and it is a terrible thing to go face an employee who has served your company for a long time and face reality and let them know that they are no longer working for the company. That is an excruciating thing. But the pressure of losing the company, the pressure of going bankrupt dictates that you have to make those hard decisions and disappoint some people and really hurt some people in letting them go. We do not have that pressure in this Congress, we just keep people on, we never let them go, because we are not spending our own money, we are spending the taxpayers' money.

Now, the other issue, either deals are going to be cut or we know how this place works around here, where you fashion all kinds of deals and agreements and you end up keeping the force of staffs and committees, or we do away with them.

So we wait a year, we spend the money and we either keep them or do away with them.

The same issue, the same vote that we will take on next Tuesday will come in 1 year from now.

So why does not the House come together and look at this issue that we all know—we do not have to investigate it anymore, we have either served on these committees or watched these committees, and we understand the issues at hand—and take a vote? Let me tell you something, as a warning to the Members of the House: You cannot hide behind the reform by extending the select committees for another year. That is not reform. That is postponing a tough decision that has to be made.

As far as this Member is concerned, and many other Members will point this out during the debate, as far as I am concerned the vote on Tuesday, up or down, is to reform the House. If you want to send a message that you are reforming the House, then you have to vote "no" against the resolution to ex-

tend the life of these subcommittees for another year. That is a vote. You cannot vote "yes," extend them another year and go back and tell people, "I have reformed the House." All you have done is extend the committees for another year and probably, the odds are 9 to 1 you extend them on ad infinitum because you have given the committees and staffs of the committees a whole year along with the special interest groups that work with these committees, a whole year to work the membership and extend the life of these committees.

So a "yes" vote is not reform, a "no" vote on these resolutions on Tuesday is reform.

We are going to try to make that case to the Members as we go along.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I appreciate the gentleman's insightful comments on this important issue. It truly is. It is going to be one of the real opportunities that we definitely have to make a difference.

Personally I think the people, the viewers who are looking at this debate in this empty Chamber but who nevertheless are perhaps listening to these issues being discussed, I think that they understand that this is something that has to be done, and I think they are very frustrated with this Government.

If IBM and Sears—my word, Sears is letting loose 50,000 people; obviously they think we have got a problem. We have an even worse problem in the U.S. Government, but we act as if it is somebody else's problem. As the gentleman just pointed out—and I just want to observe that that is why I sought to interrupt the gentleman, to talk on that one point for a minute—when these staff members begin to lobby Members of Congress, the public's interest really is kind of lost because they are more remote and they are more diffused.

The only constituents, really, that the elected Members are going to be focused on is going to be this person who is presently employed by the committee.

As the gentleman from Texas observed, I thought he recounted very poignantly and accurately the process, the mental process that the owner of a business goes through. The owner of a business is well aware of what it means to the employees who have to be discharged because their jobs have to be eliminated because of financial necessity. The owner of that business is well aware of what that means to the employee's family. It is not a decision that is made lightly. It is taken very seriously, but it reflects reality.

Well, Mr. Speaker, those same types of pressures are upon us, and we are hurting the whole American public by not making these sorts of tough decisions.

Oh, we may not see immediately the consequences of our actions, but when we pick up the newspaper and we read that we are not doing like we should in terms of productivity gains, when we read that growth in the economy is too slow, when we read that inflation is too high, and, yes, when interest rates get back up there as they surely will once things pick up a little in this economy, due to slow recovery, then we will see the direct impact that years and years and years of deficit spending have had upon this country; the years and years and years of more and more Federal regulation has had upon this country. I think we need to get to the point in this country where every time we consider some new governmental regulation or some new bit of deficit spending, we ought to have an economic analysis: What does this mean in terms of cost of living for Americans, in terms of growth in the economy, in terms of the quality of life?

Mr. DELAY. And lost jobs, if I may interject.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. And lost jobs. And nothing relates more directly to the quality of life than whether or not one has a job.

I will tell you, when I heard over the news and read about the 50,000 jobs from Sears alone, I thought, how in the world are we going to sustain an economic recovery when we see this kind of cutback in our employment base?

Mr. DELAY. I want to make another point about what Members of this House are thinking when they go to vote on this particular issue. I know one Member to whom I talked, he said, "Oh, look, we can put this off for a year and we can think about it and we can come to a decision." And we have had many Members who serve on these select committees come down and defend the work of the committee. No one is degrading the work of the committees. The committees have done exemplary work, especially the Committee on Hunger, the Committee on Narcotics, the Select Committee on Aging. They have done some good work. But if we continue—or if we do away with these committees, none of that will change.

I had one ranking member get up in conference, and I noticed he was talking about all the good things that came from the committee and that he was able to get certain legislation done and amendments passed. That would not change without the committees. He is still a Member of Congress. He can, No. 1, try to get on the committee of jurisdiction who have interest in the Select Committee on Aging; of course, he can introduce legislation, he can bring amendments, talk to the committees. If he is not on the Committee on Ways and Means, for example, he can go to the members of the Committee on Ways and Means and lobby them for his issues. He can even form, on his own

initiative, his own task force on that particular issue.

□ 1540

We can work all this out. If it is so important to focus on a particular issue like hunger or the aging or narcotics, then we ought to stop multiple referrals of bills, or we ought to reform the way our committee structures are set up so that one committee has jurisdiction over all aging issues. Those are the real reforms that ought to come, but we ought to say in this House once and for all that we are going to do away with these select committees. They have served their function. We no longer need to spend this kind of money and we are going to look at how we can address aging, hunger, children and families, narcotics and drug abuse in the substantive committees.

If I were serving on one of these substantive committees that deals with these particular issues right now, I would vote against that resolution, because what you are saying if you vote for the resolution, what you are saying is, "My committee doesn't matter. We are not doing our job. If we were doing our job, we wouldn't need these select committees."

But coming down on the floor of the House, Members defend these select committees saying we have to have the select committees because the standing committees are not doing their job or the House is not doing its job, I find a little insulting to the standing committees that have jurisdiction over these particular issues.

So if I were the chairman of a standing committee or the ranking member of a standing committee with jurisdiction over these particular issues, or I was a member of the committees that have jurisdiction over these particular issues, I would vote against that resolution. I may offend or hurt the feelings of the Members who serve on these select committees, but I will tell you what, it is time that we have to consider what the American people want and what this House needs over hurting another Member's feelings or hurting a staffer or having to do those things that we do not want to do in eliminating or laying off the staffs that work for these committees. We have got to make those decisions. We have to be strong about it.

I hope Members who are on the standing committees with jurisdiction over these issues will vote for reform by voting no on the resolution that comes before the House on Tuesday.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's observations. It reminds me of a statement made by a prominent preacher in my district and the talk that he gave on sacrifice. I think sometimes we get the idea that sacrifice involves giving up something good for something bad. That would imply that these select committees are

bad, although perhaps because they do sap the taxpayers' money unnecessarily. They actually are bad. Indeed, they may be bad in this instance, but certainly the subject areas that they deal with, narcotics, youth and family, the aged or the hungry, certainly those are very legitimate issues that we need to be concerned with and that concern is good.

But here is what this preacher said. He said:

Sacrifice is not giving up something good for something that is bad. Sacrifice is giving up something good for something better.

And the something better is a more productive America, is an America where the economy grows faster.

Mr. Speaker, to the average person in this country, that means more money in his or her pocket. That means a higher quality of life.

I will tell you, I am getting mighty concerned as I see what is happening to the family in this great country. The family is under tremendous stress.

I mean, in the decade of the seventies and throughout the eighties, we saw a trend in force where we had to go from a one-income earning household to a two-income earning household in this country. We are paying tremendous tolls as a result of that.

We wonder why we have so many broken homes, so many destroyed marriages, so many women and children who cannot fend adequately for themselves, why there is so much spousal abuse, child abuse, drug abuse, abuse of alcohol, promiscuous sex which leads to either children born out of wedlock or to the enormous blight on our country of abortion.

Oh, and the thing perhaps more than anything that we all worry about because we are all impacted by it and that is the enormous profusion of crime in this country.

I mean, California, to digress for a minute, if you can believe this, now has incarcerated 120,000 people, that is a lot of people, at enormous cost to the taxpayers of the State.

How much better an approach it would be to the people of our country if we could strengthen the family. We do not need any new governmental programs. We do not need any more spending. We do not need any more tax hikes to support the spending. What we need is a healthy economy. That is going to take a few specific things to get there. Perhaps one of us will discuss those in the time remaining. When we get there, and I am an optimist because I said when and not if, when we get there we have got to index for inflation the standard deduction on personal income taxes. That will mean the present \$2,200 exemption per dependent is going to go up to about \$6,600 per dependent. You talk about a middle-class tax cut that helps people, that will help people. It will not be some paltry little \$400 a year, like the President proposed and

which he is now backing away from. It will be substantial and meaningful. We need to do something to help families help themselves.

It was terrible to take away the deduction for investments into an individual retirement account. We have to restore those.

I will tell you, as the quality of our public schools continues to decline, which I am sorry to say seems to be happening, they cannot cope with all the tremendous social forces in play today, brought about by the destruction of the family, in large part, I might add.

We therefore need to give people other avenues to help themselves. If they are having problems with the proper education for their children, they need to have enough income to go to a private school. It seems to me really tragic that only the well to do are afforded this luxury, and everybody else is going to be stuck with whatever is there, and whatever is there unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, is not a very happy picture anymore.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman started with the premise that sacrifice sometimes is trading good for better.

Let me just add one more thing to that list of examples the gentleman gave.

One thing, eliminating the four select committees that we have been talking about, which a lot of Members think did good work, for better, I think the better is an institution of the House of Representatives that has the confidence of the American people restored in it.

It is so vital to keep this democracy going, to have the confidence of the American people in their Government that we have lost. We have shirked our responsibility in maintaining the integrity of this institution so that we can hold on to the confidence of the American people, and when they see what is happening here, when they see that we are protecting the expenditures of moneys for committees that have no legislative jurisdiction, that cannot pass a bill, that can suggest bills to be passed and they can point to certain bills that have passed because of their suggestion, but cannot pass a bill on their own, and all they can do is make suggestions, when they see that we cannot even eliminate four select committees that spend \$4 million, then once again they have every right to hold us in low esteem and in disgust.

We have to face the American people sooner or later. We have to go to the American people and say, look, when it came time to reform the House, this Member is going to say I took the opportunity to reform the House, but there will be some Members who have to go home and face their constituents and say, "When it came time to reform

the House, I put the interests of Washington first and not the people first."

□ 1550

I think there is an article, or a book or a position paper written by the now President of the United States, President Bill Clinton, called, Putting People First, and it seems to me that what this House is doing is putting Washington first, putting the staffs of these select committees first, putting the Members' membership on these committees first, and no one is thinking about the taxpayer and, as important, the taxpayer and the way we spend the taxpayers' money, but, maybe even more important, the integrity of this institution, the confidence of the American people in this institution that has to be restored, that has to be restored or we will see a decline of this Nation.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Well, frankly, as the gentleman observes, I think we are seeing a decline of this Nation. That is why this is so troubling. It is truly shocking that the people's own Government does not respond to the clear demand of the people, which is to get lean and mean, trim down, do more with the hard earned taxpayer dollars.

I mean this elimination of these four select committees is easy to do. It really is easy to do in the sense that they are completely duplicative and unnecessary, and I think that, if Members and the public scrutinize very closely the votes of their Members and Representatives next Tuesday to see what they do—

Mr. DELAY. If the gentleman will yield, talk about easy to do. Some Members might say, "Well, it's not easy to fire or lay off these 91 people that have families that they have to take care of," and that is unfortunate, and we spoke to that. But I might submit to my colleague that I do not know the ratio. I have been looking to see how many of those 91 are the staffs of Democrats and how many of the 91 are staffs of Republicans, and I am willing to promise the Members that we will work very diligently to find other employment for the Republicans on these four select committees, and I guarantee that there are plenty of jobs out there now that there is a Democrat in the White House and that the other, the Democrat, staff would not have any problem whatsoever in finding jobs in the Democrat administration.

So, even though it is unsettling to lose a job where those people start worrying about how to take care of their family, I think there are plenty of jobs in this town that experienced people in these particular areas, if they do not go to work for the Clinton administration, there are plenty of organizations in this town that would want to hire them for their expertise in a minute.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is not a matter of putting them out on the street. I think

they would find a job and the American people will find confidence in this body. And we get to save \$4 million a year.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Well, the gentleman is absolutely right, and, beyond that, that is just the tip of the iceberg, the very top of the tip.

What we need to do is I am really quite convinced that we could take all the employees in this Congress, and reduce it by half and get the essential work done of the Congress of the United States.

Now imagine the savings that would accrue to the people of this country, and imagine the message that would be sent to all 50 State governments and all the local governments located within each State if the Government of the United States, which is the worst offender of all, all of a sudden set the example. I am convinced investors would take note of that, that the whole economic community would perk up. I think it would make quite a difference.

And, Mr. Speaker, it would result in less government, less staffers having to sit around and think up new ways to justify their existence, less time at government expense for them to be creative in fighting out how to extend the reach of the Federal Government into some new untapped area, how to make the taxpayers the beneficiary of some new group that has not gotten in on the action.

I think that this committee vote next Tuesday should be very important for the people of this country, Republicans and Democrats alike, because whatever party we are from, frankly whatever political philosophy we have, we should all be agreed that this is one area, through the cutting back of completely superfluous and duplicative bureaucracies, that that is something we ought to be able to agree on and set the proper tone.

I see my colleagues to the south of my district, the gentleman from California. Is he desiring recognition?

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield a couple of minutes for me, please?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO].

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I am a new Member to this body, and I, like the vast majority of the new Members who came here, ran on a campaign of change and reform of Congress. One of the things that I noticed most greatly during my time on the campaign trail was the great need for congressional reform. It was an almost overwhelming response that I got from my constituents. I feel that this is one of the most important votes as a freshman that I will be able to place.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, it is the first vote to effect real change and real reform of our Congress and the way that we do business here, and it is also im-

portant as far as cutting spending. It is to me a big step and a first step in cutting the spending that is so needed to bring down the budget deficit to effect a more balanced budget in this year.

I feel it is very important that we cut these committees as they are in many respects a waste of money in that their work is duplicated in other committees. Even though these committees do do work on extremely important areas, I feel that the authority is already in the standing committees to take care of that, and, if the Members of Congress are doing their job and are responsible, we can take care of the problems that, in effect, are under these committees.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to sustain and to hold the line, cut these committees. I feel it is very important.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I would just like to say that the gentleman has already distinguished himself as a new Member of this House, and we are very glad to have him join us from the great State of California. But maybe the gentleman might want to speak; he may not want to, to the fact that I was under the impression when the 110 freshmen came to this House for this 103d Congress that the message that they were sending, at least the message that I was hearing them say over television, and talk shows and everything else, was that every one of them came here with the same idea that the freshman gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO] was just so eloquently espousing.

And I was looking for the vote, and I evidently lost it, but, out of the vast majority of every one of these freshmen, I think two freshmen—two or three freshmen Republicans voted to keep the select committees on the Republican side of the House, and I do not know exactly the numbers, but very few of the Democrat freshmen voted against the select committees. The gentleman may know how many those were, but we went over the list today.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Eighteen. Eighteen Democrat freshmen voted to abolish.

Mr. DELAY. Eighteen?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Eighteen.

Mr. DELAY. Out of how many Democrat freshmen?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Let me see.

Mr. DELAY. There are 46 Republicans.

Mr. POMBO. Forty-seven.

Mr. DELAY. Forty-seven Republicans?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. So, 63 Democrats.

Mr. DELAY. And only 18 out of the 63 that came here to change this place voted to change this place?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. That is what happened.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I believe that is an important matter in this new Congress

and in this new era with the 110 new freshmen, the idea that the country is demanding change and reform, and this is an extremely important vote in changing and reforming, controlling the costs of our Federal Government.

Mr. DELAY. Does my colleague think that those 63 Democrat freshmen all of a sudden met the Democrat leadership? Because, I say to the gentleman, they better think very seriously that they came here to vote for their district, not for the Speaker of the House, not to vote how they are told by the majority leader, not how they are told by the majority whip. They came here to speak for the people they represent, and, if I campaign on change and reform as a new Member of Congress, and I came up here and the first chance I got was the rules package that was brought here, and I voted for that which was not change and reform, and then the second vote I got for reform I did not vote for reform, I think I might have a little problem when I go back home and face my constituents as a new Member.

□ 1600

Mr. DOOLITTLE. We look forward to what happens next Tuesday. There are so many important issues that we did not have time to discuss, but I would urge all who may be looking to pay close attention to what your Representative does next Tuesday on an opportunity to shrink down a little bit the size of the Government within the House of Representatives.

MOTOR-VOTER REGISTRATION IS BAD FOR AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POMEROY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to explain both personally and for the record to my colleagues what I believe to be gross deficiencies in the bill that is running through this Congress and is expected to be on the President's desk within the next 2 weeks, and that is the bill intended to make it easier to register to vote and which is commonly known as the motor-voter bill.

It was called the motor-voter bill because it allows people to register to vote when they go to get their driver's licenses, and that was the original concept. It has been bandied around this Congress for many years. It has not successfully made it all the way through, although in the last couple of years it did get to the President's desk and he vetoed it.

But we have a new administration, and it is expected to pass. It is expected to pass the other body, it is expected to pass here, it is expected to go to President Clinton, and it is expected that he will sign it and that it will come into law.

If it comes into law, if it becomes law, there are such gross deficiencies with this bill that I predict to my colleagues that this program, once enacted, is going to present more headaches for the various agency heads, Federal, State, and local, for the Federal Election Commission, for the Justice Department at the Federal level, for the State secretaries of state, for the registrars of voters, for the county, and in Louisiana parish, representatives, for the precinct leaders, it is going to be mind-boggling, because they do not even begin to know how many regulations and how many hoops that they have to jump through in order to comply with this terribly onerous bill without any money to provide them that compliance.

That is, this bill provides no money at all. It just gives them a lot of things that they must do, a lot of mandates.

When President Clinton spoke in his Inaugural Address about change, he said he was going to reinvent America.

Now, most Americans though did not know that he meant to change by fiat the very nature of American culture and the very essence of what it means to be an American. When it is not President Clinton ignoring the Nation's top military advisers and destroying troop cohesiveness and discipline by forcing open homosexuality on the military, then it is President Clinton's liberal Democratic allies in Congress cheapening the very basis of American democracy through the right and privilege of citizens to vote.

The tyrannical majority of the other party in this body seems determined to give the vote to people who are not even American citizens for purely partisan political purposes I suppose.

The first instance, editorialized against even by the liberal New York Times, occurred when delegates of U.S. territories representing Samoans and Guam residents and others who do not even pay American taxes, and who in some instances are not even American citizens, were given the right to vote on this House floor equal to the vote of the Representatives of the real American States.

Forty-seven thousand Samoans now have the same representation in Congress that 800,000 real Americans from Montana have, or 630,000 people in the First Congressional District of Louisiana, the district that I represent. That is a bastardization of democracy, and I call it alien vote No. 1.

But now we have another problem, and here is the point I have been building to. Now they are going one step further.

Under the guise of voting rights, they want to make it easier to do the great wrong of giving illegal aliens greater opportunity to vote in every American election through this motor-voter bill making its way through Congress.

Now, one provision of the motor-voter bill would force States to accept

what we call same day registration. That is that you register and you vote on the same day, based only on the requirement that you have a driver's license.

Well, as everybody knows, the single easiest piece of identification for an illegal alien or for anybody else to obtain is a driver's license. You sail in from Haiti, finagle a driver's license, and vote, even though you are an illegal alien. Sneak in from Mexico, finagle a driver's license and vote, even though you are an illegal alien.

Drop in from anywhere. Finagle a driver's license and vote. Even if, especially, you are an illegal alien who will vote with one party, presumably because they are pushing it, the Democrat Party.

Now, while you are at it, use your voting card to qualify for welfare benefits, paid for by the American taxpayer, whose votes against high taxes and big government are effectively canceled out by your illegal vote.

The only way the tyrannical majority can force this injustice is by trampling the U.S. Constitution and legitimate State prerogatives, and that is what they do with this bill.

James Madison, in Federalist Paper No. 10, the single greatest explication of American political theory, warns directly against the tyranny of such a majority.

I quote Mr. Madison when he said:

When a majority is included in a faction, then the very form of popular government enables that majority to sacrifice to its ruling passionate interest both the public good and the rights of other citizens.

I submit to you that in the Democratic majority, which has controlled Congress for these last many years, close to 50 years, a faction has developed which is so interested in maintaining its own power that it is trampling the Constitution, trampling on the principle of federalism, trampling upon the very notion of American citizenship to accomplish its own political ends.

Motor-voter means forced voter registration at the welfare offices, at the unemployment offices, at the driver's license bureau. It means an inability to purge the people who are dead, who cannot vote, or who have not voted in 4 or 10 or 100 years. It means eliminating the possibility that people would be taken off the rolls if they are simply not voting. It means an open invitation to vote fraud by prohibiting notarization of identification papers and other antifraud devices that States have implemented over the years to make sure that the right people are registered, the right people vote, but that the wrong people cannot. It prohibits that.

This motor-voter, auto-fraudo, democracy for the dead law could well mean that high election day turnout by illegal aliens exercising the citizenship rights which middle America does

not even realize are slipping inexorably away. I think that is a tragedy.

Now, I would like to examine in detail the provisions of the motor-voter bill. So that my colleagues will understand, we are going to go through this debate next week and my colleagues need to understand the deficiencies of this bill.

First of all, it is not just a motor-voter bill. It does not just provide for registration at the driver's license bureau. That is just one thing.

We can already register if we want to at our election board. Whatever the State or the precinct or the county calls it, there is a secretary of state, there is a commissioner for elections, there is all these officials entrusted with registering people who want to register and who want to vote. The process is there.

But we are going to duplicate that process by putting it in the driver's license bureau. Moreover, we are going to put it into the welfare offices and we are going to put it into the unemployment offices.

This bill would require those offices to provide registration. So in addition to the duties that they already have, they have got to provide registration services, which means that the little money that they have to run their own shows has to be stretched out and they have to become miniregistrars of voters, in addition to what they already do, remember with no extra Federal money to pay the bill.

□ 1610

Now, it is our position that these ideas, first of all, promote an inoperable bureaucracy. The thing cannot work, but even if it did work, it promotes fraud at the polls. It allows people who should not vote to vote, if they want to.

For example, it provides for mail registration, which prohibits verification. You want to send in a postcard, say I want to be registered on a postcard, you want to do it over here, and then change your name a little bit and do it over there, in the next neighborhood or in the next town, next precinct, go ahead. Mail in a card and see where you go. So conceivably, you could mail in cards from every little borough in New York or every little ward or precinct in Louisiana or California, and a single person could be registered to vote 5, 6, 10, 100 times, if he is a very ingenious person.

Some folks say, "Well, they are not going to do that. There is no such thing as voter fraud." Folks, the guy that beat me in 1976 went to prison in 1977 for voter fraud. I think that history is replete with evidence in this country that voter fraud exists and people want to take advantage of the political process for their own purposes. And the worst thing you could do is make the processes available to them. Yet this

bill, the motor-voter bill, does exactly that. It makes it available to them to pervert, to pervert the political process for their own purposes.

It provides for mail registration, as I have indicated, without verification that the person is who he says he is. It provides for registration at the welfare offices, meaning that applicants who go for welfare benefits will probably be intimidated and certainly not say anything like, "Well, I am an illegal alien and even though I want welfare benefits, I am really an illegal alien and I shouldn't vote." That is not likely.

What is likely is that an illegal alien goes in for welfare benefits and signs up to vote, too. So why not? He is here.

It also provides for same-day registration; in fact, it encourages same-day registration. There are lots of costs attendant to the rest of this bill. It is a prohibitively costly bill. We will get to that later on.

But this bill says you do not have to change your laws. You do not have to change to go to all the expense of this bill, just have same-day registration. And frankly, what that simply means is you walk in, you say, "Look, here I am. I am ready to vote. Here is my driver's license. Let me vote." And they let you vote, and they register you, and you vote all at the same time. If you want to do that, in 1 precinct, in a 2d precinct, in the 3d precinct, in a 4th precinct, and a 5th precinct and a 10th precinct and the 50th precinct, you can keep on doing it.

Members, that is voter fraud. That demeans the vote of each and every American citizen who is rightfully entitled to one vote and one vote only.

Well, what else does this bill do? It is H.R. 2, rushing through Congress. That is the number of the bill. The motor-voter bill.

It is conducive to automatic enrollment of ineligibles. We have talked about that. Ineligibles being people who should not vote. Since they are voting at the driver's license bureau in some instances, in my State, you can get a driver's license at 15, at 16, at 17 years of age. You are not supposed to vote though. You are supposed to only vote from the time that you are 18 years of age or older.

If a kid wanted to take advantage of it and go ahead and vote, chances are that he would be able to under this statute.

An illegal alien, Zoe Baird's chauffeur, what have we heard the most about over the last week? The Attorney General-designate sent in, nominated by the President of the United States had to withdraw from her nomination because she had hired illegal aliens. One of them was her chauffeur. He had a driver's license. Under this law Zoe Baird's chauffeur would be entitled to vote, unless he said to the driver's license bureau, "No, I can't vote because I am an illegal alien." How likely is that? Not very.

What we have is a bill that provides that you will be registered unless you say you do not want to. That is a unique provision here. There is not a State in the Union that currently says, "You will be registered unless you say you don't want to." But under the provisions of this bill, when you sign your driver's license, there is a form on the bottom of the driver's license application that says, to the effect that, "Yes, I want to be registered to vote," or you actually have to sign your name and say, "No, I don't want to be registered to vote." You do not have an election unless you sign "No, I don't want to be registered to vote." You are going to be registered.

Again, how likely is it that an illegal alien is going to say, "Wait, I can't vote because I am an illegal alien"? Again, not likely.

As to sameday registration, the Justice Department has come out very, very strongly about that. They have said that:

Sameday registration would greatly impair the ability of the department and the State to combat voting and election fraud and would totally preclude meaningful verification of voter eligibility; thus, allow easy corruption of the election process by the unscrupulous.

That is from the Justice Department. In a letter to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration last year, the Attorney General, I suppose, said:

Of all the registration reforms which Congress has covered over the recent years, from a law enforcement perspective, this idea is far the most troubling.

In fact, talking about mail-in registration, the postcard registration, in 1982, a New York grand jury reviewed widespread voter fraud charges in Kings County from 1968 to 1982 and observed, and I quote:

The advent of mail-in registration in 1976 made the creation of bogus registration cards even easier and less subject to detection. According to the testimony, mail-in registration has become the principal means of perpetrating election fraud and has apparently resulted in the abandonment of a pre-1976 election fraud method.

Well, all this says is, in effect, election fraud is made easy, pure and simple. Here is how to do it. And we are going to make it as easy on you as possible. Cheat the system and make sure that people get elected who do not deserve to be elected. To me, that is frightening.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING].

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, this only applies to Federal elections? Does this bother the States?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, this is an imposition of Federal mandate governing Federal and State elections.

Mr. EWING. The question was rhetorical, but what I am trying to get at is that. And we may disagree on that, if this does cover Federal elections, but if

the State does not want to follow this rule, then they have to have a whole other set of elections for State issues; is that correct?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. The gentleman is absolutely right.

What we are talking about, I will get into the cost of this thing, it is estimated that the cost of this thing could run anywhere from \$200 million to \$1 billion around the country. It would cost States and agencies, remember, unemployment offices, welfare offices, driver's license bureaus, secretaries of state, registrars of voters, it would cost them untold money to implement this process and also hire the computers necessary to keep up with what each other is doing. And they could do that for just Federal elections, but it is highly doubtful that they are going to do it for just Federal elections. So what the gentleman is saying is right.

They are going to do it for the States, too. What we are doing is telling each and every one of the 50 States, "You have got to change your election laws to suit our purposes."

Mr. EWING. I know in my home State of Illinois, we have some training for registrars. There is some knowledge that is required to carry out that duty. I assume every State employee who would be doing this in public aid offices, in driver's license offices, and other places would have that training.

□ 1620

Mr. LIVINGSTON. They would have to get the training. Right now they don't. I can assure you a welfare social worker is trained at welfare social work. The last thing that he or she wants to do is all of a sudden become an expert on election law, but every one of them in the welfare offices all around this country, every one of the people administering the processes of the employment offices, every one of the people administering the driver's license bureaus, are going to have to become experts in election law in order to make sure that all of the little ramifications of this goofy law are imposed and properly followed through.

Do you know what happens if they don't do it properly? They can be sued. If you feel as an aggrieved citizen that your rights under this bill are not acceded to, you can sue your secretary of state or your elections commissioner or your precinct captain or your welfare board person, and should you prevail you get attorney's fees. The State has to pay you attorney's fees.

Of course, we don't put up any money for that. The State has to come up with the money. But under this, anybody can file suit, and what is more, the State has to answer your complaint within 90 days, except when you have an election pending, and then they have to answer within 30 days, and can you imagine, the city of New York, for example, you are bound to have at

least 200 to maybe 500 disgruntled people who would love to file suit under this provision and get their attorney's fees just to see their name in the paper.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman knows well, as he is the ranking member on that committee, that two of my clerks came out from Illinois, a Republican and a Democrat clerk. Our County Clerks Association, which is involved with registration or responsible for registration at the local level of Illinois, outside of Cook County, is almost completely opposed to these changes. It is a bipartisan opposition.

They were telling me, to go right along with what you are saying, that they could be responsible for what a clerk did in the driver's license bureau.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. That is exactly right.

Mr. EWING. They would be responsible and could be sued for someone who did not do a good job of registering somebody in a driver's license bureau.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I want to thank him for bringing the Republican and the Democrat clerk to the hearing that we had in the subcommittee yesterday. By the way, even though this bill has been pending for several years, we have finally—the gentleman who is the chairman of the committee finally provided us with the opportunity to have witnesses, and he was very fair, I might add. We had Republican and Democrat witnesses.

The gentleman was industrious enough to go find some county clerks who would testify about the impact, and from Illinois we had three representatives. We had one from Cook County, who for some reason fell in love with the bill but he didn't exactly know what the provisions were, but he did say something interesting, that Cook County clerk. He said, "What we need is for the Government to force the States to comply with this provision."

That bothers me. Aside from that, the two clerks, Republican and Democrat, that the gentleman in the well has referred to, did come before us and testify that there was no feasible way that they could coordinate the activities of the various county agencies under their domain; that within one single district you might have six or seven welfare offices, six or seven unemployment offices, six or seven driver's bureau offices, six or seven registrar voter offices, and how in the world if a person has to go from here to there to everywhere else, to all these offices and register for their various benefits, could you end up bringing together the net product of the voter registration rules?

They said they didn't have the capacity to do it, they didn't have the money to do it, they didn't know how they would do it, and frankly, they didn't think it would work.

Mr. EWING. There is no Federal money to defray the cost to the locals or the States in that, is that correct?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. No Federal money. We have to underscore that. The gentleman is absolutely right. There is no Federal money in this bill whatsoever for the State commissioners or any of these office agencies to pay for all this extra flurry of activity that they are going to have to engage in.

Mr. EWING. If the gentleman would allow me for a moment, I would like to refer to the testimony of Mr. Ron Rasmus, who is the county clerk in Ford County, the smallest county in Illinois, a rural county. He gave an example I thought was very meaningful. He said if a resident lives in rural Paxton, which is the county seat of Ford County, and this individual applies for assistance at the closest Veterans' Administration Hospital, which is in Danville, IL, in Vermilion County, then he would get registered when he went to the veterans hospital.

On his way home he decides to stop in Rantoul, which is in Champaign County, and get his driver's license renewed, and he will get registered there again, or have to sign a form saying he does not want to get registered.

When he gets back to Paxton in Ford County, he decides that he had better pick up some food stamps, and he goes to the public aid office and he gets registered a third time. Now, this could happen.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. And this is the smallest county.

Mr. EWING. The smallest county in Illinois. The point is that people cross county lines. They cross county lines very quickly to do business, in rural areas particularly, and what he is saying here is a very good example. If somebody either was not cognizant of the responsibility or thought "Well, when it gets to the clerk's office, he will straighten it out, he will throw out two of my registrations," that is not possible under this law. The clerk has to keep them on the books for 4 years.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Actually, they have to keep them on the books for 4 years, but there is no provision in this bill to purge them even after 4 years. What they are saying is, "The District of Columbia has worked out a nice situation where they compare their notes with the post office." Now we are talking about a whole other agency infused with their records into all of these welfare, unemployment, driver's license, registrar of voters offices all around the country, and if you think you can get quick information out of the post office, I just would suspect that whoever says they can is wrong.

What I am concerned about is that what may even work well in the District of Columbia now is going to cost enormous amounts of money projected

throughout the rest of the country, and we have not even begun to imagine the cost.

The gentleman has other points, and I will be happy to go to them, but I do have a number of other items in the bill that I need to address.

Mr. EWING. I just want to thank you for allowing me to take a little part in this, and I think there are, very quickly, about three things we could do. We could make this a decent bill. The fact is that they don't seem to want to have any amendments, which really disturbs me. However, we could eliminate the overall registration card, we could eliminate the attorney's fees and costs that could be applied to local units of government, and we could request that voter registration be the result of a deliberate action rather than automatically produced or mandated. I think we could make this a pretty good bill.

I really congratulate you, Congressman, for your work and for your allowing me to participate a little bit in bringing this to the attention of the American people.

While I strongly support efforts to increase voter registration, this legislation would place another expensive, unfunded mandate on the States and would drastically increase the chances of voter fraud and could actually cause the percentage of voter turnout to decrease.

Earlier this week, two county clerks representing the Illinois Association of County Clerks and Recorders testified at my request before the House Subcommittee on Elections to share their concerns about H.R. 2. In Illinois, the county clerks are responsible for administering registration and elections in all 102 counties. They are the best qualified to assess the impact this legislation would have in my State. I would like to submit for the RECORD their testimony which outlines the serious flaws in this legislation, which would increase the likelihood of inadvertent and deliberate voter fraud.

I have very serious concerns that, after this bill is passed and the percentage of voter participation actually decreases, Congress will revisit this issue to try and push for even more drastic and far-reaching changes in the registration system. Same-day registration or the elimination of registration altogether cannot be far behind.

In Illinois, it takes approximately 4 or 5 minutes to register to vote. Is asking a citizen to spend 4 or 5 minutes of their time to preserve the integrity of our voting process really such an unfair burden? Is removing the so-called burden worth the costs States and counties will incur to administer the new law and more importantly, is saving our citizens 4 or 5 minutes worth the price of degrading all citizens' votes by this open encouragement to voter fraud?

Rather than putting this legislation on the fast track, Mr. Speaker, we should be taking the time to create reforms which, while increasing voter participation, preserve the accuracy and integrity of the election process.

TESTIMONY OF RONALD A. RASMUS, COUNTY CLERK/RECORDER, FORD COUNTY, IL, REGARDING NATIONAL VOTER REGISTRATION ACT OF 1993

I am Ronald Rasmus, County Clerk/Recorder of Ford County, Illinois. Richard Leibovitz, County Clerk of Rock Island County, Illinois, and I, are representing the membership of the Illinois County Clerk and Recorder's Association. Members of this association represent all 102 counties in the state and have many years experience in elections and voter registration. Our membership includes both major political parties and represent both the large metropolitan and small rural counties in Illinois.

The members of our association are proud of the effort made in Illinois to register voters and the interest shown by our citizens in the electoral process. The members of our association clearly appreciate and support the concept of equitable and convenient voter registration.

The members of our association overwhelmingly do not support House Resolution 2 as it is currently written. As election officials we are concerned not only with enabling the citizens of our State the opportunity to register and vote, but we are also concerned with the accuracy and integrity of the election process.

It is quite possible that other states can implement this bill with much less difficulty than we can in the State of Illinois. The State of Illinois is unique in the fact that we are a highly populated state but still have many rural areas which only have rural route and box numbers. Additionally, Illinois has the highest number of local governmental units in the United States by far.

In Illinois there are over 6,400 units of local government which may put questions and/or candidates on the ballot in any one of five consolidated elections which are conducted over a two year span. These elections are administered by 111 different offices using the same polling places, the same poll watchers and the same ballots.

In most cases these units of local government cover an extremely diverse geographical area. This creates a complicated and often overlapping intertwining of many different voter entitlements. This configuration often causes the need for many different ballot combinations to be prepared and available at each of our polling places. This very process of many and varied types of voter entitlements, which is based entirely on the exact location of residency, is the only way of ensuring that all the voters in Illinois are given the opportunity of voting on all the issues that directly affect them.

For example, Ford County is a small sized rural county in East Central Illinois. It has a total population of 14,280 people, of which more than 7,800 are registered to vote. In addition to the county, there are twelve township, twelve township road, nine municipal, three cemetery, thirteen fire protection, six multi-township assessment, one park, one hospital, four Jr. College, three county board, seventy-five drainage, eight school districts, three State Representative, two State Senator, and one Congressional district within its jurisdiction.

Most of these districts do not fall within precinct boundaries. With respect to library, Jr. College, school, drainage, and fire protection districts, none of these are wholly contained within a single township or even within the county borders. It is for that reason, an exact location of a voter's residence is critical to establishing a voter's entitlements. This same situation exists in every other county in the state of Illinois.

Driver's license, mail in, and agency based registration, as defined in this legislation, will not give us enough information to properly register a voter. It is this very problem that makes it very difficult, if not impossible, for anyone that registers either by mail, or at an agency based and/or driver's license facility, that would be doing registration under the language of this bill, to collect enough or know what information is needed for us as the election officials to determine what entitlement this person is eligible. Only with this proper determination, will the voter be given a ballot on the correct issues and candidates.

For example, in Ford County, a rural route Gibson City address will only tell me that this voter lives in one of three counties, one of 11 possible precincts, and in one of 52 possible different precinct splits.

It is our desire to make certain a voter is properly allowed to vote on all the issues that will directly affect that voter. Such issues would include county board, school board, municipal, and township elections, along with various referendums where the voter is going to be paying the taxes that are established through the election process.

Even making a space available on the proposed forms for a physical description of their location is not enough. An example of this would be a voter with a rural route Cabery address, or even a 911 numbering address, that describes their address as follows: . . . "I live in the seventh house east of the city limits on Main Street of Cabery, Illinois" . . . While this appears to be a pretty well defined description of where this person lives, this still will not give enough information to the election office to properly define the ballot entitlement for this voter. Geographically, the centerline of the highway, that is also Main Street Cabery, Illinois, is the county line between Kankakee and Ford county. This voter could very well be a Kankakee County resident.

This situation I have described is not unique to Ford County, but because of the large number of local governmental units in the State of Illinois, it is unique to all the counties in Illinois. I have been advised by members of the U.S. Postal Service that in some areas rural route addresses actually cross the state line. This creates an even more difficult problem for the border counties. At a very minimum, the universal registration card should be eliminated.

The following example will help to explain why our association is concerned with other provisions of this bill. An individual lives at a residence in the rural area north and east of the city of Paxton. This individual applies for assistance at the closest Veterans Administration Hospital in Danville, Illinois. On their way home they stop in Rantoul, Illinois to renew their drivers license. They then arrive home back in Paxton and stop for food stamps at the local public aid office. A registration to vote could be taken in each of these locations which lie in three different counties. Under the language of this bill the voter would specifically have to fill out and sign something (which is not clearly defined in this bill) in order not to be registered.

It is the language of this part of the bill that needs to be changed to allow the voter the right to request voter's registration rather than forcing the voter to deny registration.

Should this person inadvertently sign his drivers license as John David Jones, at the veterans administration as J. David Jones, and at the public aid office as J. D. Jones, I could very easily end up with three different

registrations for the same voter in my voter's registration file. This creates two very major problems. First, under the language of this bill I would not be able to purge these registrations for possibly up to four years.

Secondly, a rural route Paxton address could be in any one of 12 possible precincts, located in any one of three counties and has a possibility of 67 different entitlements. In fact, this voter could live in Iroquois County, which was not one of the above three locations where registration was taken. The county clerk in the other two jurisdictions where this took place could have the same problems with the same registration of the same voter.

While it is not the intent of this bill to create this type of problem, in Illinois, as currently written, this bill opens the door to the probability of inadvertent fraud, as well as the distinct possibility of deliberate fraud.

Under the current language of this bill, there is another and very distinct danger. Should this same voter described above arrive at the proper precinct to vote, and find that he is not registered to vote, this individual could automatically sue the county clerk for damages and collect possibly exorbitant attorney's fees.

The major problem here is that the county clerk becomes responsible for the actions of the employees of the driver's license station, agency based registration centers, the actions of employees of other county clerk's offices and members of the U.S. Postal Service. In a very real respect, this bill makes the county clerk "guilty" until proven innocent.

In the first place, it will be very difficult for the agencies involved to know from the address involved where to send the registration. In the second place, there is no guarantee that it would arrive through the mail. The election office involved will have to make a determination where this registration belongs and then possibly transfer this registration on to a second election office.

Even if the law suit filed against the county clerk failed, the local taxpayers of the county will have to pay for the cost of defending the county clerk for an event that the county clerk, the county board, and the taxpayers of that county had no control over. For this reason our association would like to see the language addressing attorneys fees removed from this bill.

This problem is compounded in Illinois because of the physical layout of the state. We have a large metropolitan area in the northern part of the state and several large major universities in the southern part of the state. The possibility of many transfers of registrations and duplicated registrations created by the mandatory agency based and drivers license provisions of this bill magnifies the problem greatly.

In addition, the language of this bill involving what amounts to automatic registration through agency based and motor vehicle facilities creates, at least in Illinois, a legislated methodology for both inadvertent and deliberate fraud. Our association hopes that consideration will be given to changing the specific provisions of this bill. Our association cannot support legislation that even inadvertently will create a situation where, either a person under the age of 18 or a non-citizen, who forgets, cannot read, or does not understand that he must sign a waiver in order not to be automatically registered to vote would, in effect, automatically committing perjury.

As currently written, there is no provision in this bill for purging erroneous or deliberately false registrations. In fact, the lan-

guage of this bill specifically prohibits the county clerk from purging the voter's registration roles for what could be almost four years.

The members of the Illinois County Clerk's Association deeply appreciate, respect, and support the concept of, and the desire to ensure the right of every citizen of our country to vote. We are also aware that language written to address specific problems in one area can have a considerably different effect in another area. This is the case with the State of Illinois. With our large number of overlapping units of local government and the mixture of large metropolitan and rural areas, Illinois is unique.

We thank you for the opportunity to address our concerns to you, and ask that you give your thoughtful consideration to amending those portions of this bill that have negative and costly repercussions to the voters, the taxpayers and all the election officials in the State of Illinois.

In summary, the members of our association specifically seek the following amendments:

1. We request the elimination of a universal registration card;
2. We request the elimination of attorney's fees associated with the result of any court action and any liability which may be incurred by our office as a result of negligence by any registration agent over which we have no authority;
3. We request that voter registration be the result of a deliberate application rather than the automatic by-product of other activity.

TESTIMONY OF DICK LEIBOVITZ, COUNTY CLERK ROCK ISLAND COUNTY, IL, REGARDING NATIONAL VOTER REGISTRATION ACT OF 1993

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Dick Leibovitz, Rock Island County Clerk, along with Ron Rasmus, Ford County Clerk, we are here representing the Illinois Association of County Clerks and Recorders who are charged with the responsibility of overseeing elections and registration for 102 counties in Illinois.

The members of our association feel that voter registration is the backbone of our election process. In Rock Island County with a population of 148,000 people we have 96,000 registered voters which is over 80% of those eligible. We have accomplished this through a registration system of precinct committeemen going door to door, banks and credit unions, libraries, drivers license facilities, local clerks, my office, and many other people who have specific interests in the political process.

All of these registrars have gone through a training program as specified by Illinois law and taught by my office. They are trained to capture the information needed, as prescribed by the state of Illinois, to verify that only persons who are eligible to register are registered and that sufficient and correct information is available to code the voter for proper ballot entitlements. This program is accomplished as a completely passive service on a prescribed registration form which insures the collection of accurate information.

As the Election Authority in Rock Island County I applaud any legislation that will remove barriers to voter participation in our democratic process and still protect our right to free and honest elections. Specifically, I agree with the concept of "simplified voter registration", but because of the uniqueness of the State of Illinois some simplified systems may be very difficult to implement.

The State of Illinois is a highly populated state but still has many rural areas which

have only route and box numbers for mailing addresses. Illinois has over 6,400 units of government. All of these units of government may put questions and/or candidates on the ballot in any one of only five consolidated elections over a two year period using the same polling places and poll workers and all elections administered by only the one hundred eleven (111) Illinois Election authorities. In most cases these units of government cover diverse geographical areas and this causes the intertwining of many different voter entitlements, in turn causing the need for many and varied ballot styles at our polling places. It would be impossible for Illinois election officials to determine the correct ballot entitlement for each voter without knowing the exact geographical location of each voter, which a rural route address does not accomplish. This same dilemma faces our poll workers. The need for exact residency location is crucial to insure the integrity of all elections. This requirement makes it very difficult to implement some provisions in H.R. 2.

Specifically, it would be very difficult, if not impossible, for anyone who registers either by mail or at the various government agencies given responsibility for voter registration as provided by this Bill, to provide all the information necessary for the election office to determine what entitlement this person should receive.

For example if we were to receive a Rural Route for an East Moline address, as we presently do, without knowing the exact location of residency of this voter it could be any one of four precincts, six school systems, two fire protection districts or two different city fire districts, one of three cities, in unincorporated Rock Island County, either in or out of a portion of Rock Island Transit Authority, one of three County Board Districts and one of three Library Districts.

Another concern arises from the provision in H.R. 2 that an aggrieved person has a right for damages plus attorney's fees. This lends itself to the possibility of the County Clerk being sued for a document that may have been completed incorrectly, may have been sent to the wrong election authority, may have gotten lost in the mail, or a myriad of other problems for which the County Clerk has no control. Even if the lawsuit failed, the taxpayers of the county will have to pay for the cost of defending the County Clerk for an event that the County Clerk, the County Board, and the taxpayers of the county have had no control.

Our other concerns fall in the area of passive versus active participation by the registrant with other government agencies which would be responsible for voter registration as stated in H.R. 2.

The Bill is very clear, as written, that the act of voter registration will be active on the part of the agencies doing voter registration and passive on the part of the person being registered. This Bill would make it mandatory for all government agencies to automatically register each person the agency assists, unless the person declines to be registered in writing. This would cause a very large duplication of effort, paper work and confusion in the Election offices. Automatic registration also increases the opportunity for voter fraud by allowing a person the possibility of being registered several times. A person might mail in a voter registration application, under the name of William John Smith; he might then go to renew his drivers license and, intentionally or unintentionally, be registered as William Smith and could be registered by any of the other agen-

cies involved in voter registration using the name W.J. Smith. As the bill is written Mr. Smith would be registered three times and all three would remain on the voter list for up to four years. This is a crude illustration, of the problem that the election office faces today with many people having identical names, using differing portions of their names and in other cases, having the suffix of Jr. or Sr. This problem would be greatly multiplied when the voter registration is put in the hands of more and more agencies that are mandated to automatically register everyone unless the person specifically refuses the service in writing.

If the act of registering to vote becomes automatic and the person registering is not asked up front if he wishes to register and/or if it is made more difficult to decline to register than to register, confusion, unneeded expense and the possibility for vote fraud would result.

Another concern is the length of time during which a voter who had moved from an address to another which is in the same congressional district being permitted to choose which polling place they will use to vote. This seems to ignore the importance of the other issues and candidates on the ballot and would again certainly enhance the opportunity for vote fraud.

If the motor voter provisions of this bill were adopted, voting in the previous polling place would seem to be a mute point. A change of residence should give rise for the need to change an address on the drivers license, which would automatically update the registration and thus eliminate the confusion or need to return to the old polling place. The only time this would not be possible is the short period of time that registration is closed before an election. Illinois law provides that a person that moves during this time may return to his old polling place where his records are secured and vote by affidavit. Shortening the length of time for voting in the old polling place would cut back greatly on confusion and the possibility of voter fraud.

The members of the Illinois Association of County Clerks and Recorders, express our appreciation for allowing us to testify today and support the deed and concept to insure that every citizen of our country has the right to register and vote in the simplest and most expedient manner possible. As the people responsible for the implementation of this law if passed, at a minimum we would greatly appreciate your consideration on the following amendments to H.R. 2 to insure free and honest elections.

1. Elimination of the universal registration card for mail registration;
2. Elimination of the payment of attorneys fees in any court action resulting from this legislation;
3. Make registering at any of the agencies designated in H.R. 2 the result of the positive action of the applicant;
4. Eliminate the opportunity for confusion and fraud by allowing only voters, who have moved, during the period that registration has closed, eligible to return to their old polling place and vote by affidavit.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I want to thank my friend from Illinois for not only participating in this debate but also for having the foresight to bring representatives of his home State to the committee so they can testify to the real world impact of this bill, because he has shed a great deal of light on the problems.

The gentleman is absolutely right about those amendments. They would drastically improve the bill, and I think what he has raised is the fact that we tried some 20 amendments in subcommittee. Every one of them was rejected. We just tried 10 of those 20 in the full committee and every one of them was rejected.

As I came down here, the full committee was still deliberating, but I suspect that we are going to have the same luck with the other amendments that are going to be proposed, even as I left, as we already have. In other words, the leadership and the majority party in this Congress, in this body, does not want any amendments to this bill, while they will not acknowledge that this is a terribly deficient bill and an inoperative bill, and one that is going to be incredibly costly to all the little offices all throughout this country who deal with not only voting rights but welfare and unemployment and driver's licenses. The fact is that this simply cannot work. This bill is a bad bill.

□ 1630

And not only will they not acknowledge that fact, but they will not allow any amendments to it. They will not allow us to make it better. The gentleman's amendments are perfectly reasonable amendments, and it is incredible to me that they want to jam through, for the sake of politics to show that President Clinton can get something done in his first few days, a bill that could be as onerous and overwhelmingly bad, and which could authorize and entitle illegal aliens to participate in our electoral process so that people totally lose confidence in the electoral system of this country. And it is frightening. It is absolutely mindboggling and frightening.

But let me address just a few more problems with this bill. Yes, it puts all sorts of mandates on the States to comply, very costly ones. Ten of the States in this country have estimated that the mandates in the bill could cost them \$87.5 million. We have other estimates that range much higher. The cost estimates of some people actually go very widely from that estimate.

The Congressional Budget Office, the CBO, first said well, this bill will cost the country \$25 million each year for 5 years, a mere \$125 million. Well folks, that is a gross understatement. The one-time cost of the bill amounts to \$60 to \$70 million just to computerize the registration lists around the country, and that is a very conservative cost estimate.

Tony Barnhardt, the county clerk of Yolo County, CA, has estimated that the bill would cost California alone some \$26 million just to start. Then again, as I said, 10 States have estimated a cost of \$687 million. When you tie all the costs of compliance with the

costs of regulation, with the costs of computerization where most States and counties and localities do not have the computers, it goes into the hundreds of millions of dollars, certainly anywhere from \$200 million, perhaps even as high as \$2 billion. So the cost is unbelievable.

Now, who is responsible for the regulation of this law? Is it the county commissioner? No. Well, indirectly. He has to do all of the work. Is it the secretary of state? No. He has to do the work too, but he is not ultimately responsible. The Federal Election Commission is ultimately responsible. What that means is the Federal Election Commission, which is relatively small today, will become a bloated and overwhelming megapolis of bureaucracy, and will have to look down the throats of every elected official in every State, in every county, in every city, in every precinct of this country. This means the Federal Election Commission, folks, is going to be your next Big Brother. They are going to be in charge of the computers, and watch out for them.

In addition to that, this bill again restricts the removal of voters from the voter lists. It knocks out any verification that you are who you say you are. It omits that. It says that is not permitted, and even if you have a bunch of dead wood on the voter rolls, you cannot remove them, you cannot do it. Many States have that law in effect today. If a guy has not voted in 4 years, they can remove him today. But if this law passes, they will not be able to remove the dead people, and the people that have not voted in 4 years, or 10 years, or whatever.

The motor-voter bill in states where it already exists really does not increase turnout. That is the big argument for this thing. Oh, we'll get more people participating in the process. That is not true. Where they have had motor voter over the last 10 or so years, actually 10 States that have gotten it, of those 10, 8 displayed declines in voting rates over the last 10 years, declines in the percentage of voting age population voting in the elections after the adoption of the motor-voter registration.

The motor vehicle licensing provision becomes, by the way, subject to the Voting Rights Act. And for those people that live in Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and all of the nine States covered by the Voting Rights Act of 1965, those people may or may not know that the election representatives in all of their counties already have to report to the Justice Department to preclear any changes, any changes that they have to their election laws with the Justice Department before those laws can go into effect. That is because of the discrimination problems that we experienced prior to 1965. That became unlawful, and those

States had to go through that very expensive and cumbersome preclearance procedure.

What this means is that they are also going to have to check out all of their changes with the Justice Department once this law is passed. And in order to comply with this law they are going to have to make massive changes, so we are talking about untold bureaucratic hours, manhours wasted and just thrown away because of compliance with this unnecessary and terribly expensive and terribly burdensome law.

In addition to that, of course, we mentioned that welfare providers and unemployment administrators are going to have to be trained as registrars. The bill requires the welfare agencies to provide the same degree of assistance to voter registration applicants that they provide to welfare applicants. In other words, they have to wear two hats. The unemployment bureau clerks are going to have to put on their unemployment hat and fill out those forms, and then their registrar of voters hat and fill out those forms. It is going to take money, time, and resources away from those agencies, away from all of those offices throughout America in order to do something they never even envisioned that they were supposed to do because the Congress has said it is the new law.

What it really comes down to is that H.R. 2, the motor-voter, auto-fraud bill tramples on States' rights. It just says to the States we do not care how you want to run your election laws; we have a better system. And you have to spend all kinds of dollars, millions of dollars to comply with our system or else you can be sued. And if somebody successfully sues you, you have to pay the attorneys' fees. And oh, by the way, we are not going to give you any dollars or any money to comply with this mess.

That is what it comes to. We talked about the costs. Anybody that examines this law comes to the conclusion that this is really one of the dumbest ideas that has hit the pike in a long time.

George Will in his September 5, 1991, syndicated column wrote about this bill. He did not write about the current provisions, and he does not know that the current provisions are worse than the bill about which he wrote back in 1991. But this is what he said about the bill back then, and I quote:

In 1963 President Kennedy appointed a commission to suggest reforms to increase voter turnout. Seventeen of its 18 recommendations to make voting easier were fully or partially adopted. Since then, turnout has declined steadily.

Now in another exercise in missing the point, reformers are trying to pass what was then S. 250 and has become H.R. 2, the motor-voter bill, to require States to ease, still further, voter registration. States would be required to register to vote anyone applying for or renewing a driver's license. Or to

mail registration forms requiring neither notarization nor other formal witness. Or to have registration available at all offices that provide public assistance, unemployment compensation, or related services and through State-funded programs to the disabled and to designate some other registration agencies, which may include libraries, schools, fishing, hunting and marriage license bureaus, revenue offices, and some private sector locations.

Well, we have not gone that far yet. That is not in there yet, Lord knows.

Now, says George Will, he goes on and he says:

Most States are running deficits and raising taxes. Another unfunded mandate from Washington will require still more cuts in education, health, and other programs.

In 27 States it is possible to choose to register through driver's license offices. In 7 of the 10 States that have made that possible since 1972, voter turnout had declined.

In other words, it did not do any good.

What has increased is voter fraud. Let me rescore that, George Will says, "What has increased [through motor-voter] is fraud."

And he goes on to decry fraud, and we have talked about that at length. But fraud means people voting who should not be voting, or voting too many times who should not have that opportunity, people trying to steal elections, which is done in America, folks. It is done repeatedly. And he decries that, and I think that speaks for itself.

But then he goes on to talk about low turnouts. Is that so bad? Yes, admittedly in the last election, the Presidential election, some 62 percent of Americans did go to the polls and cast ballots for either Bill Clinton, George Bush, Ross Perot, or one of the various other third party candidates.

□ 1640

Frankly, 62 percent, in my mind, was pretty good, but a lot of people say, well, we should have 100-percent voting; it is horrible that only 62 percent voted.

Here is what George Will says about that:

Low turnouts often are signs of social health. Low political energy can be a consequence of consensus about basics. When society is not riven by deep fissures about fundamental questions, nonvoting may be passive consent reflecting contentment.

What he is saying is that if people are not going to the polls, maybe they do not want to. Maybe they are satisfied with the way things are.

I think he has probably got a point. I think the only reason we got 62 percent this time was because those 62 percent were not satisfied, but the rest of them obviously were, or they would have gone to the polls, and they would have voted.

My goodness, if you did not go to the polls and vote for George Bush, Ross Perot, or Bill Clinton or one of the various other candidates, well then, by gum, you did not want to vote. I do not

see that anybody should be forcing you to go to the polls to vote.

George Will says:

You want high turnouts? Try 86.2 percent, 83.5 percent, and 88.8 percent. Those are good turnouts, those were the rates in the three elections in Germany 1932 to 1933 when elections were literally matters of life and death.

Today, happy, well-governed Switzerland has turnouts lower than America.

So a low voter turnout is not necessarily a symptom that the world is coming apart at the seams.

I talked about the deficiencies of the bill, but I have not mentioned other than what the gentleman from Illinois pointed out a few minutes ago that we have tried all sorts of ways to amend this bill and to make it better. We said, If you are going to pass motor-voter, at least make it workable, at least make sure that it is a bill that we can live with. And so I offered the following amendments. Every one of them were voted down in subcommittee. Ten of them were voted down in full committee, and, Lord knows, we are not going to have any amendments to this bill. It is going to come to the floor intact. The majority is going to vote for it as a partisan issue. It is going to sail through. It is going to go through the Senate. It is going to sail through. It is going to the President for his signature, and he is going to sign it, and we will all live happily ever after, except that anybody who has anything to do with voter registration, anybody who cares that voter fraud is wrong is going to be horribly upset.

What did we do? We came up with a number of amendments. Let me discuss them. First of all, we moved to strike voter registration by mail. We said that lends itself to fraud. I have talked about how it did. They said, No. We want to keep it in.

We moved to strike voter registration at public-assistance and unemployment-compensation offices. We said that welfare offices and unemployment offices do not have anything to do with the elections, and they do not want to have anything to do with elections. Get rid of that. They said, "No."

We moved to strike the provision that says you have to register at the polling place at the same day that you are going to vote. Now, I say that with some correction. It does not say that you have to do that. The bill says, "We encourage you to do that. You do not have to spend any of the money on all the rest of the stuff if you do that." I already read the grand jury of New York and the Justice Department think that is terribly conducive to fraud. People can go to various precincts and vote several times. But the leadership and majority of the House of Representatives have said, "No. We do not want to knock that out." So that is still in the bill.

We came up with an amendment to say, "Well, at least, for crying out

loud, if you are going to let everybody register all the time, let us verify that they are a citizen and that they are eligible to vote, that they are of a proper age, and let us make them notarize their signature so that you know they are who they say they are."

The majority said, "No," and they voted that down both in subcommittee and full committee.

We went on. We said that there should be a public corruption title which would significantly cut down on the degree of fraud. Now, this title was agreed to by various people who promoted this bill in years past, and yet it was struck when this bill was put together this year for some reason. The Justice Department wanted this provision, because they felt they could get at least some handle on the fraud, and the majority said, "No. It is not going to be in there."

We went on, and we said, "Give us an amendment that if you are going to comply, if you are going to force every State, every secretary of state, every registrar of voters, every unemployment office, every welfare office, every driver's license bureau to comply with all of these exhausting regulations, at least we will give you a full subsidy, a postal subsidy, for mailed election materials that will cover a little bit of the costs."

They said, "No."

We went beyond that. We tried to give them an amendment that would allow the bill to be voluntary until the Federal Government picked up all the costs, the additional costs imposed on the States. They said, "No." They voted that down.

We came up with an amendment that said that it would insert a paragraph for the purposes to discourage ineligible voters, illegal aliens, people under age, convicted felons. They said, "No." They would not allow us to put that in.

We came up with an amendment that would strike a provision that would forbid States from requiring any notarization, again related to the authentication that I spoke to before. They said, "No."

We offered an amendment that would allow first-time voters, well, that would say that first-time voters, if they are sending in, if they are registering by mail or some other process, at least they have to go and vote in person and not vote by absentee ballot so at least you get an idea that they are who they say they are one time, and that is the instance, that is the case right now in current law. Handicapped people do not have to go to the polls even if they register for the first time, for obvious reasons. They can do it by absentee ballot. People overseas do not have to go to the polls under current election laws. They can do it by absentee ballot. We are not trying to change that law.

The provisions of this bill exempt those people, handicapped and people overseas, and then say, "or if they are subject to some other law, they do not have to show up at the polls. They can vote by absentee." We think that is wrong. We tried to straighten that out. They said, "No."

We tried to offer an amendment that would strike a provision that says the welfare clerk has to give the same degree of assistance of a person for the voter registration as he does for welfare registration. Now, we say, you know, look, he is the welfare guy or the unemployment guy, the driver's license guy, and he is there for a purpose. Do not make him spend the same amount of time or provide the same amount of assistance on voter registration, but that is what the bill says, and they said, "No." They said, "Leave it in. They have got to spend an equal amount of time on welfare or on voter registration as they do their other functions," and they would not allow to amend that.

We had an amendment that would make the bill voluntary.

We had an amendment to strike that provision about attorney's fees. You want to sue your registrar because he did not give you the rights and so you take him to court and you win? The State has got to pay your attorney's fees. The Federal Government is not going to pay any of that, so the State or the country or the city or whatever has to pay your attorney's fees. We tried to strike that. The majority said, "No." They would not allow us to.

We offered an amendment, and here is a great one. This really gets me. The bill, H.R. 2 as proposed, says that a State or locality is prohibited, is prohibited from purging or striking a person off the rolls if he has not voted in any amount of years, that that is not permissible; you have got to leave those names on that, that not voting is not a reason to be stricken from the rolls. I offered an amendment which said that if they had not voted in 4 years they could be stricken from the rolls. They said, "No." I offered an amendment that said if they had not voted in 10 years, they could be stricken from the rolls, and they said, "No."

Mr. Speaker, I am astounded to be able to stand here before you and tell you that in the subcommittee and in full committee, I offered an amendment to allow the voter registrar to strike the name of a person if they determined that he had not voted in 100 years, and they said, "No." They said that he could not be stricken if he had not voted in 100 years. That is ludicrous, mind-boggling, and I think it demonstrates adequately that this is an incredible piece of legislation.

Now, just quickly, and then I will be delighted to yield to my friend from Georgia. There is a provision in this bill that says not that you walk up to

the driver's license bureau, the welfare office, or the unemployment office and say, "I want to register to vote." It does not say that. It says you have to walk up to them and say, "I do not want to vote." Now, there is a big difference there. What that says is you are registered unless you sign a document that says you do not want to be registered.

□ 1650

And again I have to ask you—and I think the gentleman from Georgia may be ready to talk about this issue—that is, how likely is it that an illegal alien, a person in here illegally, should not be, or does not comply with our immigration laws, who wants a drivers license in order to support himself or his family, goes and gets his drivers license or welfare benefits or unemployment benefits, if he can find himself entitled, how likely is that person to tell that clerk, oh, by the way, I am an illegal alien, and I know I can't register to vote, so I am going to sign that little provision that says I don't want to register to vote.

That is ludicrous. That is insane. But that is in this bill. And we offered an amendment to strike that provision, and they said "No."

Finally, we offered an amendment that says for those States like Georgia and Louisiana that are subject to the Voting Rights Act of 1965, nine States, and maybe some sectors of various other States, but nine full States are covered by the Voting Rights Act, which means that the election officials of each of those States have to check with the Justice Department any time they want to amend, any time they want to change, any time they want to do anything different with their election laws. And that is the law today.

What we are talking about here is a major, major change, not only in every State but every county, every city, every locality, every precinct. There are hundreds of thousands of precincts throughout America. There are tens of thousands of precincts in just those 9 States. But this bill, through the Voting Rights Act, will single out those 9 States and say that only those 9 States have to check out their stuff. And what my last two amendments would have done was to say that that is discriminatory in itself. Either we make every State comply with the 1965 Voting Rights Act for the purposes of this act, or we make no State do it. Both of those amendments were rejected, which means that degree of discrimination against those particular States is acceptable.

Mr. Speaker, I have to tell you that this is extraordinary, this bill. It is just astronomical. The imposition of costs, as I say, can run into hundreds of millions of dollars, \$1 billion, \$2 billion, who knows? But the trouble, the bureaucracy, the time wasted and the en-

ergy that all of these various officials are going to have to spend on voter registration for the sake of a political agenda put out by the majority of this body or the other in order to give Bill Clinton something to crow about, I think is going to have a reverse impact. When the people of this country fully appreciate that each of you who vote for this bill, when they understand what you voted for, I guarantee they are going to remember it and they are going to make sure that you remember it come election time.

I would be delighted to yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. GINGRICH. I thank my friend, who has been a real leader on this issue and has done very important work both in the subcommittee and full committee. I was with him up in the Committee on House Administration a little while ago when he attempted to offer his amendments. I just want to focus on a couple of points.

First of all, it was very obvious to anybody who was there and saw, that in a sense the fix is in; the Democratic leadership has decided to ram this through the House. My hope is that it will be amended in the Senate. But literally on party line vote after party line vote, it did not matter the merit, things were just going to basically go through the way the Democratic leadership wanted it to.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. If the gentleman would yield, what the gentleman perceived in full committee is absolutely right. I might add, it was equally right in subcommittee. We went through the same process yesterday, and it was a party line vote on each and every one of these amendments.

Mr. GINGRICH. And I want to make just three points that I hope all of my colleagues will think about and I hope the Committee on Rules would make in order amendments that would give us a chance on the House floor. We have heard a lot of talk about bipartisanship, we heard a lot of talk about a new sense of comity in the House and a new effort to work together. So I would appeal to the Democratic leadership to make in order a number of amendments to allow every individual Member, Republican or Democrat, a chance to get a look at the bill, which after all is a national voting bill. So I cannot imagine at the heart of a democracy something more important than establishing the basic principles under which we vote and on which we base our voting bills.

First, I want to say: In a year when President Clinton and a lot of other people were emphasizing the deficit, there is in fact going to be a significant increase in the total cost. In fact, by federalizing a number of things, U.S. attorneys offices are going to be doing more, States are going to be doing more, locals are going to be doing more. The net effect is going to be

more expensive Government at a time when we are talking about cutting deficits.

Second, I believe that if most colleagues are like I am, I have been approached by the National School Board Association, our school board representatives in Georgia, I have been approached by mayors and city councils, I have been approached by the county commissioners, and every group has said to me, "No more unfunded mandates." Well, this is going to be specific for every politician back home, saying, "I am with you. I am sure tired of unfunded mandates."

Next week, in its current form, this is an unfunded mandate bill. The numbers I heard were a minimum of \$26 million a year for California, \$5.5 million a year for Los Angeles alone, \$37 million for Illinois the first year, an estimate by a California voter registrar of \$200 million a year national cost, when you go through item after item.

So, No. 1, at a point where we are saying let us control the deficit, this is more spending; at a point where we are saying to our cities and State legislators and city councilmen and county commissioners, "We don't want any more Federal mandates unpaid for," here is a Federal mandate.

But let me go to another point because I think it is so fascinating the way in which the Democratic leadership decided to write this: There are a lot of places you could go and get registered that would be permissive. That a State could decide and may include State and local government offices, public libraries, public schools, fishing and hunting license bureaus, which by the way in most States is in a K-Mart or a Wal-Mart, not an office, but they say specifically, "You must provide this where they provide public assistance." I just want to get one fact in here which our colleague, PAT ROBERTS, brought up from the Department of Agriculture today: As of today the Department of Agriculture's estimate is that there are 300,000 illegal aliens getting food stamps and 700,000 legal aliens getting food stamps. So the people who provide for a million non-American citizens are now going to be in a position to say, "By the way, would you like to register?"

I just want to pose: For a House that recently, the Democratic Party, which recently allowed the delegates who do not pay taxes, to vote, now adding an opportunity for a million aliens, 300,000 of them illegal, to register, strikes me as a very strange phenomenon and one that I cannot imagine most Americans favor.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I think the gentleman, if he would remain a second, has really put his finger on the major problem with this bill. It has an incredible number of problems. It is too costly, it is too burdensome, it is riddled with mandates to the States that we do

not pay for. But most importantly, it provides for voter fraud and, more significantly than that, in effect it is flying in the face of the fundamental concept of democracy wherein you are entitled as a citizen of this country to choose your own leaders.

Each person in this Nation is entitled to one vote. What we are saying is that vote is worth less, if the Representatives of Guam, American Samoa, Puerto Rico, and various other places are entitled to cast their ballots here on the floor of the House of Representatives; but it is even worse, it is even more diluted with the passage of this bill that says, "Your one vote at the polling place is only worth 0.8 because we are going to allow illegal aliens to vote." In fact, we are going to encourage them to vote. And when they walk into a welfare office and say they want welfare benefits and the welfare clerk says, "Well, by the way, I suppose you want to register to vote," they are hardly going to say, "Well, I can't vote because I am an illegal alien." What that means is that we are going to have lots of people on the rolls who should not be there and, worse, because of the provisions of this bill, the registrar of voters is not capable of striking their names off. If they do not vote, he cannot take them off.

Mr. GINGRICH. I had not thought of it. I do not think there is a provision in here for taking them off if they are on by fraud.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. If the gentleman would yield, I would tell the gentleman it is worse. The officials who are in charge of the elections are prohibited from striking their names from the rolls for that purpose, prohibited.

□ 1700

They are prohibited. When the American people get wind of this bill, they are going to walk around and shudder. They are going to yell and scream. They are going to get on the talk shows, if you will, and then they are going to contact their Congressman and say, "If you vote for this, I'll definitely vote against you."

Mr. GINGRICH. I hope the gentleman is right.

DIRECTING IRS TO MODIFY PURCHASE PRICE LIMITS IN WESTCHESTER COUNTY, NY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to introduce legislation to enable more first-time homebuyers in Westchester County to obtain low-interest mortgages under the Federal Mortgage Revenue Bond [MRB] Program. The bill would raise the maximum purchase price that low- and moderate-income homebuyers in Westchester County can pay for homes financed through the MRB Program to a level

that more accurately reflects housing costs in Westchester County. Only with this change can Westchester residents have an opportunity to participate fully in the MRB Program.

This legislation will help make the American dream a reality for more Westchester residents. During this recession, too many families are having to forgo home ownership, because they cannot afford to finance a home. This bill will give Westchester residents an equal opportunity to participate in this successful program by adjusting it to market conditions in our community.

The MRB Program allows States and municipalities to sell tax-free municipal bonds and to use the proceeds to offer below-market rate mortgages to qualified first-time homebuyers. The program targets low- and moderate-income people through caps on the incomes of participants and on the price of homes that can be purchased. Unfortunately, in Westchester County, the Federal Government sets maximum purchase price limits so low that they severely inhibit participation in the program.

In calculating these limits, the Internal Revenue Service [IRS] groups Westchester together with New York City where average housing costs are significantly lower. The average cost of a three-bedroom home in Westchester County is over \$312,000—\$115,000 more than a similar residence in New York City. Not surprisingly, Westchester's housing prices are not reflected in overall metropolitan figures. Consequently, statistics for the regional MSA do not accurately represent conditions in Westchester.

Westchester residents participating in the MRB Program, as it is currently structured, must buy a house valued at less than \$145,000. The supply of single-family homes in this price range is extremely small. This naturally restricts the number of homes that qualified homebuyers in Westchester can choose. As a result, Westchester County's participation in the program is very limited.

Other communities in New York State and the Nation, which have purchase price limits geared to their own markets, are participating in the MRB Program at a much higher rate than Westchester County. Suffolk County, for example, which has its own purchase price limits and is similar to Westchester in many respects, participates in the MRB Program 10 times as much as Westchester County. Raising Westchester's purchase price limit to a level that reflects the Westchester market would help more low- and moderate-income people in our area purchase homes through the program.

The bill which I am introducing today mirrors legislation enacted in 1990 to correct a similar problem in Federal housing programs. The National Affordable Housing Act of 1990 included language which I wrote to separate Westchester County from New York City's MSA for the purpose of calculating Westchester's median income. Previously, the income figures for the New York City MSA were so low that Westchester was being short-changed on housing assistance, because eligibility for such programs is usually tied to median income levels.

My amendment to the National Affordable Housing Act solved that problem without alter-

ing New York City's income calculation. The language directed the Department of Housing and Urban Development [HUD], when measuring New York City's median income, to keep Westchester in New York City's MSA. This ensures that Westchester receives its fair share of housing assistance based on its own income figures, without adversely affecting New York City's housing programs.

This change also corrected a similar flaw in the way Westchester County's median income levels are calculated under the MRB Program, because State mortgage agencies follow HUD's procedures in setting income limits. But the benefits of the MRB Program will not be available to Westchester residents unless a parallel change is made to the procedures for calculating purchase price limits.

Buying a first home has never been easy for people with limited resources. But year after year, generation after generation, people struggle and save in order to buy into the American dream. We do this because home ownership offers, perhaps, the greatest guarantee of long-term financial stability available.

The Mortgage Revenue Bond Program is a valuable tool for helping low- and moderate-income people overcome barriers to home ownership. But current law unnecessarily restricts many residents in Westchester County from participating in the program. The legislation which I am introducing today would correct that problem at a time when more and more Americans are losing sight of the dream of home ownership. This measure can help keep that dream alive.

RULES OF COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR FOR THE 103D CONGRESS

(Mr. FORD of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I hereby submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Rules of the Committee on Education and Labor for the 103d Congress, as adopted by the committee.

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR FOR THE 103D CONGRESS

RULE 1. REGULAR AND SPECIAL MEETINGS: VICE CHAIRMAN

(a) Regular meetings of the committee shall be held on the second and fourth Tuesdays of each month at 9:45 a.m., while the Congress is in session. When the Chairman believes that the committee will not be considering any bill or resolution before the committee and that there is no other business to be transacted at a regular meeting, he will give each member of the committee, as far in advance of the day of the regular meeting as the circumstances make practicable, a written notice to that effect; and no committee meeting shall be held on that day.

(b) The Chairman may call and convene, as he considers necessary, additional meetings of the committee for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the committee or for the conduct of other committee business. The committee shall meet for such purposes pursuant to that call of the Chairman.

(c) If at least three members of the committee desire that a special meeting of the committee be called by the Chairman, those members may file in the offices of the committee their written request to the Chairman for the special meeting. Immediately upon the filing of the request, the staff director of the committee shall notify the Chairman of the filing of the request. If, within three calendar days after the filing of the request, the Chairman does not call the requested special meeting to be held within seven calendar days after the filing of the request, a majority of the members of the committee may file in the offices of the committee their written notice that special meeting of the committee will be held, specifying the date and hour thereof, and the measure or matter to be considered at that special meeting. The committee shall meet on that date and hour. Immediately upon the filing of the notice, the staff director of the committee shall notify all members of the committee that such meeting will be held and inform them of its date and hour and the measure or matter to be considered; and only the measure or matter specified in that notice may be considered at that special meeting.

(d) All legislative meetings of the committee and its subcommittees shall be open. No business meeting of the committee, other than regularly scheduled meetings, may be held without each member being given reasonable notice. Such meeting shall be called to order and presided over by the Chairman, or in the absence of the Chairman, by the ranking majority party member of the committee present.

(e)(1) The majority member of the committee or of a subcommittee, as appropriate, ranking immediately after the chairman, is designated as vice chairman of the committee or subcommittee, as the case may be.

(2) The chairman of the committee or of a subcommittee, as appropriate, shall preside at meetings or hearing, or, in the absence of the chairman, the vice chairman shall preside.

RULE 2. QUESTIONING OF WITNESSES

Committee members may question witnesses only when they have been recognized by the Chairman for that purpose, and only for a 5-minute period until all members present have had an opportunity to question a witness. The 5-minute period for questioning a witness by any one member can be extended only with the unanimous consent of all members present. The questioning of witnesses in both committee and subcommittee hearings shall be initiated by the Chairman, followed by the ranking minority party member and all other members alternating between the majority and minority party. In recognizing members to question witnesses in this fashion, the Chairman shall take into consideration the ratio of the majority to minority party members present and shall establish the order of recognition for questioning in such a manner as not to place the members of the majority party in a disadvantageous position. The Chairman may accomplish this by recognizing two majority party members for each minority party member recognized.

RULE 3. RECORDS AND ROLLCALLS

(a) Written records shall be kept of the proceedings of the committee and of each subcommittee, including a record of the votes on any question on which a rollcall is demanded. The result of each such rollcall vote shall be made available by the committee or subcommittee for inspection by the public at reasonable times in the offices of

the committee or subcommittee. Information so available for public inspection shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order, or other proposition and the name of each member voting for and each member voting against such amendment, motion, order, or proposition, and whether by proxy or in person, and the names of those members present but not voting. A record vote may be demanded by one-fifth of the members present or, in the apparent absence of a quorum, by any one member.

(b) In accordance with Rule XXXVI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, any official permanent record of the committee (including any record of a legislative, oversight, or other activity of the committee or any subcommittee) shall be made available for public use if such record has been in existence for 30 years, except that—

(1) any record that the committee (or a subcommittee) makes available for public use before such record is delivered to the Archivist under clause 2 of Rule XXXVI of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall be made available immediately, including any record described in subsection (a) of this Rule;

(2) any investigative record that contains personal data relating to a specific living individual (the disclosure or which would be an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy), any administrative record with respect to personnel, and any record with respect to a hearing closed pursuant to clause 2(g)(2) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall be available if such record has been in existence for 50 years; or

(3) except as otherwise provided by order of the House, any record of the committee for which a time, schedule, or condition for availability is specified by order of the committee (entered during the Congress in which the record is made or acquired by the committee) shall be made available in accordance with the order of the committee.

(c) The official permanent records of the committee include noncurrent records of the committee (including subcommittees) delivered by the Clerk of the House of Representatives to the Archivist of the United States for preservation at the National Archives and Records Administration, which are the property of and remain subject to the rules and orders of the House of Representatives.

(d)(1) Any order of the committee with respect to any matter described in paragraph (2) of this subsection shall be adopted only if the notice requirements of committee Rule 19(d) have been met, a quorum of a majority of the members of the committee is present at the time of the vote, and a majority of those present and voting approve the adoption of the order, which shall be submitted to the Clerk of the House of Representatives, together with any accompanying report.

(2) This subsection applies to any order of the committee which—

(A) provides for the nonavailability of any record subject to subsection (b) of this rule for a period longer than the period otherwise applicable; or

(B) is subsequent to, and constitutes a later order under clause 4(b) of Rule XXXVI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, regarding a determination of the Clerk of the House of Representatives with respect to authorizing the Archivist of the United States to make available for public use the records delivered to the Archivist under clause 2 of Rule XXXVI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; or

(C) specifies a time, schedule, or condition for availability pursuant to subsection (b)(3) of this Rule.

RULE 4. STANDING SUBCOMMITTEES: SIZE, RATIO, AND JURISDICTION

(a) There shall be six standing subcommittees with the following jurisdictions:

Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education and Training.—Education beyond the high school level, including but not limited to higher education generally, training and apprenticeship, education professions development, and postsecondary student assistance.

The Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education and Training shall consist of 24 members, 15 from the majority and 9 from the minority.

Subcommittee on Labor Standards, Occupational Health and Safety.—Wages and hours of labor, including but not limited to Davis-Bacon Act, Walsh-Healey Act, Fair Labor Standards Act (including child labor), workers' compensation generally, Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, Federal employees' compensation, Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Worker Protection Act, Service Contract Act, workers' health and safety, including but not limited to occupational safety and health, mine health and safety, youth camp safety, and migrant and agricultural labor health and safety, and the U.S. Employment Service.

The Subcommittee on Labor Standards, Occupational Health and Safety shall consist of 9 members, 6 from the majority and 3 from the minority.

Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education.—Education from preschool through the high school level and vocational education, including but not limited to elementary and secondary education generally, the Follow Through Act, vocational education, school lunch and child nutrition, adult basic education, migrant and agricultural labor education, Youth Conservation Corps, and overseas dependent schools.

The Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education shall consist of 24 members, 15 from the majority and 9 from the minority.

Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations.—Relationship between employer and employee and their representatives, including but not limited to labor-management relations generally, Bureau of Labor Statistics, pension, health, and other employee benefits including Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA), Job Training Partnership Act, Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act, displaced homemakers, library services and construction, museum services, arts and humanities, arts and artifacts indemnity, the Robert A. Taft Institute, and the Institute for Peace.

The Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations shall consist of 24 members, 15 from the majority and 9 from the minority.

Subcommittee on Human Resources.—All matters dealing with programs and services for the elderly, for the elimination of poverty, and for the care and treatment of children, including but not limited to Economic Opportunity and Community Services programs (Head Start Act, Community Services Block Grant Act, etc.), Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Runaway Youth Act, early childhood services, nutrition programs for the elderly, older Americans, Work Incentive Program (WIN), and the JOBS Program.

The Subcommittee on Human Resources shall consist of 11 members, 7 from the majority and 4 from the minority.

Subcommittee on Select Education and Civil Rights.—Special education and equal

employment opportunity programs, including but not limited to alcohol and drug abuse, education of the handicapped, rehabilitation, environmental education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, migrant and agricultural labor, day care, child adoption, child abuse, domestic violence, domestic volunteers, and ACTION (excluding volunteer older American programs).

The Subcommittee on Select Education and Civil Rights shall consist of 9 members, 6 from the majority and 3 from the minority.

(b) The majority party members of the committee may provide for such special and select subcommittees as determined to be appropriate.

RULE 5. EX OFFICIO MEMBERSHIP

The Chairman of the committee and the ranking minority party member of the committee shall have the right to be ex officio members of each subcommittee established pursuant to Rule 4. Ex officio members shall be counted for purposes of determining a quorum and subcommittee ratios (but not size), and shall have the right to vote on all measures and matters considered in each subcommittee.

RULE 6. SPECIAL ASSIGNMENT OF MEMBERS

To facilitate the oversight and other legislative and investigative activities of the committee, the Chairman of the committee may, at the request of a subcommittee chairman, make a temporary assignment of any member of the committee to such subcommittee for the purpose of enabling such member to participate in any public hearing, investigation, or study by such subcommittee to be held outside of Washington, DC. Any member of the committee may attend public hearings of any subcommittee and shall be afforded an opportunity by the subcommittee chairman to question witnesses.

RULE 7. SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIRMANSHIPS

The majority party members of the committee shall have the right, in order of full committee seniority, to bid for subcommittee chairmanships. Any such request shall be subject to approval by a majority of those present and voting in the majority party caucus of the committee. Members so elected shall be chairmen of their respective subcommittees.

RULE 8. SUBCOMMITTEE SCHEDULING

Subcommittee chairmen shall set meeting dates after consultation with the Chairman and other subcommittee chairmen with a view toward avoiding simultaneous scheduling of committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings, wherever possible. Available dates for subcommittee meetings during the session shall be assigned by the Chairman to the subcommittees as nearly as practicable in rotation and in accordance with their workloads. As far as practicable, the Chairman of the committee shall seek to assure that subcommittees are not scheduled to meet for markup or approval of any measure or matter when the committee is meeting to consider any measure or matter for markup or approval.

RULE 9. SUBCOMMITTEE RULES

The rules of the committee shall be the rules of its subcommittees.

RULE 10. COMMITTEE STAFF

Except as provided in Rule XI, clause 5(d) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the staff of the House Committee on Education and Labor shall be appointed as follows:

(1) The subcommittee staff shall be appointed, and may be removed, and their re-

determined by the subcommittee chairman in consultation with and with the approval of the majority party members of the subcommittee within the budget approved for the subcommittee by the full committee;

(2) The staff assigned to the minority shall be appointed and their remuneration determined in such manner as the minority party members of the committee shall determine within the budget approved for such purposes by the committee;

(3) The employees of the committee not assigned to a standing subcommittee or to the minority under the above provisions shall be appointed, and may be removed, and their remuneration determined by the Chairman in consultation with and with the approval of the majority party members of the committee within the budget approved for such purposes by the committee.

RULE 11. SUPERVISION AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEE STAFF

The staff of a subcommittee shall be under the general supervision and direction of the chairman of that subcommittee. The staff assigned to the minority shall be under the general supervision and direction of the minority party members of the committee who may delegate such authority as they determine appropriate. The staff of the committee not assigned to a subcommittee or to the minority shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Chairman, who shall establish and assign the duties and responsibilities of such staff members and delegate authority as he determines appropriate. Staff members shall be assigned to committee business and no other duties may be assigned to them.

RULE 12. HEARINGS PROCEDURE

(a) The Chairman, in the case of hearings to be conducted by the committee, and the appropriate subcommittee chairman, in the case of hearings to be conducted by a subcommittee, shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted on any measure or matter at least one week before the commencement of that hearing unless the committee or subcommittee determines that there is good cause to begin such hearing at an earlier date. In the latter event, the Chairman or the subcommittee chairman, as the case may be, shall make such public announcement at the earliest possible date. The staff director of the committee shall promptly notify the Daily Digest Clerk of the Congressional Record as soon as possible after such public announcement is made.

(b) So far as practicable, each witness who is to appear before the committee or a subcommittee shall file with the staff director of the committee, at least 24 hours in advance of his appearance, a written statement of his proposed testimony, together with a brief summary thereof, and shall limit his oral presentation to a summary of his statement. The staff director of the committee or the subcommittee, as the case may be, shall promptly furnish to the staff director of the minority a copy of such testimony submitted to the committee pursuant to this rule.

(c) When any hearing is conducted by the committee or any subcommittee upon any measure or matter, the minority party members on the committee shall be entitled, upon request to the Chairman by a majority of those minority party members before the completion of such hearing, to call witnesses selected by the minority to testify with respect to that measure or matter during at least one day of hearing thereon.

RULE 13. MEETINGS—HEARINGS—QUORUMS

(a) Subcommittees are authorized to hold hearings, receive exhibits, hear witnesses,

and report to the committee for final action, together with such recommendations as may be agreed upon by the subcommittee. No such meetings or hearings, however, shall be held outside of Washington, DC, or during a recess or adjournment of the House without the prior authorization of the committee Chairman or a majority of a quorum of the subcommittee. Where feasible and practicable, 14 days notice will be given of such meeting or hearing.

(b) One-third of the members of the committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for taking any action other than amending committee rules, closing a meeting from the public, reporting a measure or recommendation, or in the case of the committee authorizing a subpoena. For the enumerated actions, a majority of the committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum. Any two members shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony and receiving evidence.

(c) In the absence of the chairman of the committee or a subcommittee, the ranking majority party member present shall preside.

(d) As far as practicable, when a bill or resolution is being considered by the committee or a subcommittee, members shall provide the clerk in a timely manner a sufficient number of written copies of any amendment offered, so as to enable each member present to receive a copy thereof prior to taking action. A copy of each such amendment shall be maintained in the public records of the committee or subcommittee, as the case may be.

RULE 14. SUBPOENAS

A subpoena may be authorized and issued by the committee or subcommittee in the conduct of any investigation or series of investigations or activities, only when authorized by a majority of the members of the full committee voting, a majority being present. Authorized subpoenas shall be signed by the Chairman of the committee or by any member designated by the committee.

RULE 15. REPORTS OF SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) Whenever a subcommittee has ordered a bill, resolution, or other matter to be reported to the committee, the chairman of the subcommittee reporting the bill, resolution, or matter to the committee, or any member authorized by the subcommittee to do so, may report such bill, resolution, or matter to the committee. It shall be the duty of the chairman of the subcommittee to report or cause to be reported promptly such bill, resolution, or matter, and to take or cause to be taken the necessary steps to bring such bill, resolution, or matter to a vote.

(b) In any event, the report, described in the provision in subsection (d) of this rule, of any subcommittee on a measure which has been approved by the subcommittee shall be filed within seven calendar days (exclusive of days on which the House is not in session) after the day on which there has been filed with the staff director of the committee a written request, signed by a majority of the members of the subcommittee, for the reporting of that measure. Upon the filing of any such request, the staff director of the committee shall transmit immediately to the chairman of the subcommittee a notice of the filing of that request.

(c) All committee or subcommittee reports printed pursuant to legislative study or investigation and not approved by a majority vote of the committee or subcommittee, as appropriate, shall contain the following disclaimer on the cover of such report:

"This report has not been officially adopted by the Committee on Education and Labor (or pertinent subcommittee thereof) and may not therefore necessarily reflect the views of its members."

(d) Bills, resolutions, or other matters favorably reported by a subcommittee shall automatically be placed upon the agenda of the committee as of the time they are reported and shall be considered by the full committee in the order in which they were reported unless the committee shall by majority vote otherwise direct. No bill or resolution or other matter reported by a subcommittee shall be considered by the full committee unless it has been in the hands of all members at least 48 hours prior to such consideration. When a bill is reported from a subcommittee, such measure shall be accompanied by a section-by-section analysis; and, if the Chairman of the committee so requires (in response to a request from the ranking Republican member of the committee or for other reason), a comparison showing proposed changes in existing law.

(e) To the extent practicable, any report prepared pursuant to a committee or subcommittee study or investigation shall be available to members no later than 48 hours prior to consideration of any such report by the committee or subcommittee, as the case may be.

RULE 16. PROXIES

(a) A vote by any member in the committee or in any subcommittee may be cast by proxy, but such proxy must be in writing and in the hands of the staff director of the committee or the subcommittee, as the case may be, during each rollcall in which they are to be voted. Each proxy shall designate the member who is to execute the proxy authorization and shall be limited to a specific measure or matter and any amendments or motions pertaining thereto; except that a member may authorize a general proxy only for motions to recess, adjourn, or other procedural matters. Each proxy to be effective shall be signed by the member assigning his or her vote and shall contain the date and time of day that the proxy is signed. Proxies may not be counted for a quorum.

(b) Proxies shall be in the following form:

Hon. _____,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC

DEAR _____: Anticipating that I will be absent on official business or otherwise unable to be present, I hereby authorize you to vote in my place and stead in the consideration of: (1) _____ and any amendments or motions pertaining thereto; and (2) motions to recess, adjourn or for other procedural matters.

Member of Congress.

Executed this the _____ day of _____, 19____,
at the time of _____ P.M./A.M.

RULE 17. AUTHORIZATION FOR TRAVEL

(a) Consistent with the primary expense resolution and such additional expense resolutions as may have been approved, the provisions of this rule shall govern travel of committee members and staff. Travel to be paid from funds set aside for the full committee for any member or any staff member shall be paid only upon the prior authorization of the Chairman. Travel may be authorized by the Chairman for any member and any staff member in connection with the at-

tendance of hearings conducted by the committee or any subcommittee thereof and meetings, conferences, and investigations which involve activities or subject matter under the general jurisdiction of the committee. Before such authorization is given, there shall be submitted to the Chairman in writing the following:

- (1) the purpose of the travel;
- (2) the dates during which the travel is to be made and the date or dates of the event for which the travel is being made;
- (3) the location of the event for which the travel is to be made; and
- (4) the names of members and staff seeking authorization.

(b) In the case of expenses for travel of members and staff of a subcommittee to hearings, meetings, conferences, or investigations involving activities or subject matter under the legislative assignment of such subcommittee, including the expenses of witnesses at hearings, subject to the limitations contained in Rule 22, to be paid for out of funds allocated to such subcommittee, prior authorization must be obtained from the subcommittee chairman and the Chairman. Such prior authorization shall be given by the Chairman only upon the representation by the appropriate chairman of the subcommittee in writing setting forth those items enumerated in clauses (1), (2), (3), and (4) of subsection (a) and in addition thereto setting forth that subcommittee funds are available to cover the expenses of the person or persons being authorized by the subcommittee chairman to undertake the travel and that there has been a compliance where applicable with Rule 12 of the committee.

(c)(1) In the case of travel outside the United States of members and staff of the committee or of a subcommittee for the purpose of conducting hearings, investigations, studies, or attending meetings and conferences involving activities or subject matter under the legislative assignment of the committee or pertinent subcommittees, prior authorization must be obtained from the Chairman, or, in the case of a subcommittee, from the subcommittee chairman and the Chairman. Before such authorization is given, there shall be submitted to the Chairman, in writing, a request for such authorization. Each request, which shall be filed in a manner that allows for a reasonable period of time for review before such travel is scheduled to begin, shall include the following:

- (A) the purpose of travel;
- (B) the dates during which the travel will occur;
- (C) the names of the countries to be visited and the length of time to be spent in each;
- (D) an agenda of anticipated activities for each country for which travel is authorized together with a description of the purpose to be served and the areas of committee jurisdiction involved; and
- (E) the names of members and staff for whom authorization is sought.

(2) Requests for travel outside the United States may be initiated by the Chairman or the chairman of a subcommittee (except that individuals may submit a request to the Chairman for the purpose of attending a conference or meeting) and shall be limited to members and permanent employees of the committee.

(3) The Chairman shall not approve a request involving travel outside the United States while the House is in session (except in the case of attendance at meetings and conferences or where circumstances warrant an exception).

(4) At the conclusion of any hearing, investigation, study, meeting, or conference for

which travel outside the United States has been authorized pursuant to this rule, each subcommittee (or members and staff attending meetings or conferences) shall submit a written report to the Chairman covering the activities of the subcommittee and containing the results of these activities and other pertinent observations or information gained as a result of such travel.

(d) Members and staff of the committee performing authorized travel on official business shall be governed by applicable laws, resolutions, or regulations of the House and of the Committee on House Administration pertaining to such travel, including rules, procedures, and limitations prescribed by the Committee on House Administration with respect to domestic and foreign expense allowances.

(e) Prior to the Chairman's authorization for any travel, the ranking minority party member shall be given a copy of the written request therefor.

RULE 18. OVERSIGHT

(a) In order to enable the committee to carry out its responsibilities under Rule X, clause 2 of the Rules of the House of Representatives, each subcommittee shall review and study, on a continuing basis, the application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of those laws, or parts of laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of that subcommittee, and the organization and operation of the federal agencies and entities having responsibilities in or for the administration and execution thereof, in order to determine whether such laws and the programs there under are being implemented and carried out in accordance with the intent of the Congress and whether such programs should be continued, curtailed, or eliminated. In addition, each such subcommittee shall review and study any conditions or circumstances which may indicate the necessity or desirability of enacting new or additional legislation within the jurisdiction of that subcommittee (whether or not any bill or resolution has been introduced with respect thereto), and shall on a continuing basis undertake future research and forecasting on matters within the jurisdiction of that subcommittee.

(b) The Chairman of the committee, consistent with Rule 4, from time to time in order to fulfill the committee's responsibility under rule X, clause 3(c) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, shall assign matters to subcommittees for reviewing, studying, and coordinating, on a continuing basis, all laws, programs, and government activities dealing with or involving domestic educational programs and institutions, and programs of student assistance, which are within the jurisdiction of other committees.

(c) The Chairman of the committee, consistent with Rule X, clause 2(d) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, shall from time to time assign matters to subcommittees for reviewing and studying on a continuing basis the impact or probable impact of tax policies affecting subjects within the jurisdiction of the committee.

(d) Upon the request of the chairman of any subcommittee of the committee (after consulting with the ranking minority member of such subcommittee), and in order to enable the committee to carry out its responsibilities under section 431 of the General Education Provisions Act with respect to the consideration of final regulations, the Chairman of the committee shall transmit to the appropriate department or agency head a formal statement of objection to any final regulation identified in such request for the

purpose of suspending the effective date of such regulation until not less than twenty days after the end of any adjournment described in the first sentence of subsection (d)(2) of such section. Any such objection shall be deemed to have been directed by the committee on the date of the request of such subcommittee chairman.

RULE 19. REFERRAL OF BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND OTHER MATTERS

(a) Each bill, resolution, or other matter, which relates to a subject listed under the jurisdiction of any subcommittee named in Rule 4, which has been referred to the committee shall within two weeks be referred to the subcommittee of appropriate jurisdiction unless, by majority vote of the majority party members of the committee, consideration is to be by the full committee or there is to be shared consideration under subsection (b)(2) by more than one subcommittee pursuant to a joint referral for such purpose.

(b)(1) In carrying out subsection (a) with respect to any matter, the Chairman may (consistent with Rule 4) refer the matter jointly to two or more subcommittees for concurrent consideration simultaneously or for consideration sequentially (subject to appropriate time limitations in the case of any subcommittee), or divide the matter into two or more parts (reflecting different subjects and jurisdictions) and refer each such Part to a different subcommittee, or refer the matter pursuant to subsection (b) of Rule 4 to a special ad hoc subcommittee appointed by the Chairman (from the members of the subcommittees having legislative jurisdiction) for the specific purpose of considering such matter and reporting to the committee thereon, or make such other provisions as may be considered appropriate.

(2) In the conduct of hearings and meetings of subcommittees sitting jointly, pursuant to subsection (a), for purposes of shared consideration of any bill or resolution, including marking up or reporting any such measure to the full committee—

(A) the rules otherwise applicable to all subcommittees shall likewise apply to joint subcommittee hearings and meetings for purposes of such shared consideration, and

(B) every member of each of such subcommittees shall for purposes of determining a quorum be counted individually in the aggregate total number of members of such subcommittees, and shall have equal voting and proxy rights as individual members during the shared consideration of any such bill or resolution, in the same manner as if the total memberships of such subcommittees were combined to constitute a single subcommittee.

(c) Referral to a subcommittee shall not be made until three days have elapsed after written notification of such proposed referral to all subcommittee chairmen, at which time such proposed referral shall be made unless one or more subcommittee chairmen shall have given written notice to the chairman of the full committee and to the chairman of each subcommittee that he intends to question such proposed referral at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the committee, or at a special meeting of the committee called for that purpose, at which time referral shall be made by the majority members of the committee. All bills shall be referred under this rule to the subcommittee of proper jurisdiction without regard to whether the author is or is not a member of the subcommittee. A bill, resolution, or other matter referred to a subcommittee in accordance with this rule may be recalled

therefrom at any time by a vote of the majority members of the committee for the committee's direct consideration or for reference to another subcommittee.

(d) All members of the committee shall be given at least 24 hours' notice prior to the direct consideration of any bill, resolution, or other matter by the committee; but this requirement may be waived upon determination, by a majority of the members voting, that emergency or urgent circumstances require immediate consideration thereof.

RULE 20. COMMITTEE REPORTS

(a) All committee reports on bills or resolutions shall comply with the provisions of clause 2 of Rule XI and clauses 3 and 7(a) of Rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(b) No such report shall be filed until copies of the proposed report have been available to all members at least 36 hours prior to such filing in the House. No material change shall be made in the report distributed to members unless agreed to by majority vote; but any member or members of the committee may file, as part of the printed report, individual, minority, or dissenting views, without regard to the preceding provisions of this rule.

(c) Such 36-hour period shall not conclude earlier than the end of the three-day period (provided under clause 2, paragraph (1)(5) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives) after the committee approves a measure or matter if a member, at the time of such approval, gives notice of intention to file supplemental, minority, or additional views for inclusion as part of the printed report.

(d) The report on activities of the committee required under clause 1 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, shall include the following disclaimer in the document transmitting the report to the Clerk of the House:

"This report has not been officially adopted by the Committee on Education and Labor or any subcommittee thereof and therefore may not necessarily reflect the views of its members."

Such disclaimer need not be included if the report was circulated to all members of the committee at least 10 days prior to its submission to the House and provision is made for the filing by any member, as part of the printed report, of individual, minority, or dissenting views.

RULE 21. MEASURES TO BE CONSIDERED UNDER SUSPENSION

A member of the committee may not seek to suspend the Rules of the House on any bill, resolution, or other matter which has been modified after such measure is ordered reported, unless notice of such action has been given to the Chairman and ranking minority member of the full committee.

RULE 22. BUDGET AND EXPENSES

(a) The Chairman in consultation with the majority party members of the committee shall, for each session of the Congress, prepare a preliminary budget. Such budget shall include necessary amounts for staff personnel, for necessary travel, investigation, and other expenses of the committee; and, after consultation with the minority party membership, the Chairman shall include amounts budgeted to the minority party members for staff personnel to be under the direction and supervision of the minority party, travel expenses of minority members and staff, and minority party office expenses. All travel expenses of minority party members and staff shall be paid for out of the amounts so set

aside and budgeted. The chairman of each standing subcommittee, in consultation with the majority party members thereof, shall prepare a supplemental budget to include funds for such additional staff, and for such travel, investigations, etc., as may be required for the work of such subcommittee. Thereafter, the Chairman shall combine such proposals into a consolidated committee budget, and shall present the same to the committee for its approval or other action. The Chairman shall take whatever action is necessary to have the budget as finally approved by the committee duly authorized by the House. After such budget shall have been adopted, no change shall be made in such budget unless approved by the committee. The Chairman or the chairman of any subcommittee may initiate necessary travel requests as provided in Rule 17 within the limits of their portion of the consolidated budget as approved by the House, and the Chairman may execute necessary vouchers therefor.

(b) Subject to the rules of the House of Representatives and procedures prescribed by the Committee on House Administration, and with the prior authorization of the Chairman of the committee in each case, there may be expended in any one session of Congress for necessary travel expenses of witnesses attending hearings in Washington, DC:

(1) out of funds budgeted and set aside for each subcommittee, not to exceed \$2,000 for expenses of witnesses attending hearings of each such subcommittee;

(2) out of funds budgeted for the full committee majority, not to exceed \$2,000 for expenses of witnesses attending full committee hearings; and

(3) out of funds set aside to the minority party members,

(A) not to exceed, for each of the subcommittees, \$2,000 for expenses of witnesses attending subcommittee hearings, and

(B) not to exceed \$2,000 for expenses of witnesses attending full committee hearings.

(c) A full and detailed monthly report accounting for all expenditures of committee funds shall be maintained in the committee office, where it shall be available to each member of the committee. Such report shall show the amount and purpose of each expenditure, and the budget to which such expenditure is attributed.

RULE 23. APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES AND NOTICE OF CONFERENCE MEETINGS

(a) Whenever in the legislative process it becomes necessary to appoint conferees, the Chairman shall recommend to the Speaker as conferees the names of those members of the subcommittee which handled the legislation in the order of their seniority upon such subcommittee and such other committee members as the Chairman may designate with the approval of the majority party members. Recommendations of the Chairman to the Speaker shall provide a ratio of majority party members to minority party members no less favorable to the majority party than the ratio of majority members to minority party members on the full committee. In making assignments of minority party members as conferees, the Chairman shall consult with the ranking minority party member of the committee.

(b) After the appointment of conferees pursuant to clause 6(f) of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives for matters within the jurisdiction of the committee, the Chairman shall notify all members appointed to the conference of meetings at least 48 hours before the commencement of

the meeting. If such notice is not possible, then notice shall be given as soon as possible.

RULE 24. BROADCASTING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS

(a) When any hearing or meeting of the committee or a subcommittee is open to the public, that hearing or meeting may be covered in whole or in part by television broadcast, radio broadcast, and still photography, or by other such methods of coverage. Such coverage of hearings and meetings is a privilege made available by the House and shall be permitted and conducted only in strict conformity with the purposes, provisions, and requirements of clause 3 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(b) The general conduct of each hearing or meeting covered under authority of this clause and the personal behavior of committee members, staff, other government officials and personnel, witnesses, television, radio and press media personnel, and the general public at the hearing or other meeting, shall be in strict conformity with and observance of the acceptable standards of dignity, propriety, courtesy, and decorum traditionally observed by the House.

(c) Persons undertaking to cover committee hearings or meetings under authority of this rule shall be governed by the following limitations:

(1) If the television or radio coverage of the hearing or meeting is to be presented to the public as live coverage, that coverage shall be conducted and presented without commercial sponsorship.

(2) No witness served with a subpoena by the committee shall be required against his or her will to be photographed at any hearing or to give evidence or testimony while the broadcasting of that hearing, by radio or television, is being conducted. At the request of any such witness who does not wish to be subjected to radio, television, or still photography coverage, all lenses shall be covered and all microphones used for coverage turned off. This paragraph is supplemental to clause 2(k)(5) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, relating to the protection of the rights of witnesses.

(3) The number of television and still cameras permitted in a hearing or meeting room shall be determined in the discretion of the chairman of the committee or subcommittee holding such hearing or meeting. The allocation among the television media of the positions of the number of television cameras permitted by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee in a hearing or meeting room shall be in accordance with fair and equitable procedures devised by the Executive Committee of the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(4) Television cameras shall be placed so as not to obstruct in any way the space between any witness giving evidence or testimony and any member of the committee or the visibility of that witness and that member to each other.

(5) Television cameras shall operate from fixed positions but shall not be placed in positions which obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing or meeting by the other media.

(6) Equipment necessary for coverage by the television and radio media shall not be installed in, or removed from, the hearing or meeting room while the committee is in session.

(7) Floodlights, spotlights, strobolights, and flashguns shall not be used in providing any method of coverage of the hearing or meeting, except that the television media

may install additional lighting in the hearing or meeting room, without cost to the government, in order to raise the ambient lighting level in the hearing or meeting room to the lowest level necessary to provide adequate television coverage of the hearing or meeting at the then current state of the art of television coverage.

(8) In the allocation of the number of still photographers permitted by the committee or subcommittee chairman in a hearing or meeting room, preference shall be given to photographers from Associated Press Photos and United Press International Newspictures. If requests are made by more of the media than will be permitted by the committee or subcommittee chairman for coverage of the hearing or meeting by still photography, that coverage shall be made on the basis of a fair and equitable pool arrangement devised by the Standing Committee of Press Photographers.

(9) Photographers shall not position themselves, at any time during the course of the hearing or meeting, between the witness table and the members of the committee.

(10) Photographers shall not place themselves in positions which obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing by the other media.

(11) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media shall be then currently accredited to the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(12) Personnel providing coverage by still photography shall be then currently accredited to the Press Photographers' Gallery.

(13) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media and by still photography shall conduct themselves and their coverage activities in an orderly and unobtrusive manner.

RULE 25. CHANGES IN COMMITTEE RULES

A proposed change in these rules shall not be considered by the committee unless the text of such change has been in the hands of all members at least 48 hours prior to the meeting in which the matter is considered.

RULES OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES 103D CONGRESS

RULE XI, CLAUSE 2(k)

Investigative hearing procedures

(k)(1) The chairman at an investigative hearing shall announce in the opening statement the subject of the investigation.

(2) A copy of the committee rules and this clause shall be made available to each witness.

(3) Witnesses at investigative hearings may be accompanied by their own counsel for the purpose of advising them concerning their constitutional rights.

(4) The chairman may punish breaches of order and decorum, and of professional ethics on the part of counsel, by censure and exclusion from the hearings; and the committee may cite the offender to the House for contempt.

(5) Whenever it is asserted that the evidence or testimony at an investigatory hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person.

(A) such testimony or evidence shall be presented in executive session, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2(g)(2) of this Rule, if by a majority of those present, there being in attendance the requisite number required under the rules of the committee to be present for the purpose of taking testimony, the committee determines that such evidence or testimony may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person; and

(B) the committee shall proceed to receive such testimony in open session only if a majority of the members of the committee, a majority being present, determine that such evidence or testimony will not tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person.

In either case the committee shall afford such person an opportunity voluntarily to appear as a witness; and receive and dispose of requests from such person to subpoena additional witnesses.

(6) Except as provided in subparagraph (5), the chairman shall receive and the committee shall dispose of requests to subpoena additional witnesses.

(7) No evidence or testimony taken in executive session may be released or used in public sessions without the consent of the committee.

(8) In the discretion of the committee, witnesses may submit brief and pertinent sworn statements in writing for inclusion in the record. The committee is the sole judge of the pertinency of testimony and evidence adduced at its hearing.

(9) A witness may obtain a transcript copy of his testimony given at a public session or, if given at an executive session, when authorized by the committee.

RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY FOR THE 103D CONGRESS

(Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I am presenting herewith a copy of the Rules of Procedure adopted by the Committee on the Judiciary for the 103d Congress on January 21, 1993.

RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Rule I. The Rules of the House of Representatives are the rules of the Committee on the Judiciary and its subcommittees with the following specific additions thereto.

Rule II. Committee Meetings:

(a) The regular meeting day of the Committee on the Judiciary for the conduct of its business shall be on Tuesday of each week while the Congress is in session.

(b) Additional meetings may be called by the Chairman and a regular meeting of the Committee may be dispensed with when, in the judgment of the Chairman, there is no need therefor.

(c) At least 24 hours (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) before each scheduled Committee or subcommittee meeting, each Member of the Committee or subcommittee shall be furnished a list of the bill(s) and subject(s) to be considered and/or acted upon at the meeting. Bills or subjects not listed shall be subject to a point of order unless their consideration is agreed to by a two-thirds vote of the Committee or subcommittee.

(d) The Chairman, with such notice to the ranking Minority Member as is practicable, may call and convene, as he considers necessary, additional meetings of the Committee for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the Committee or for the conduct of other Committee business. The Committee shall meet for such purpose pursuant to that call of the Chairman.

(e) Committee and subcommittee meetings for the transaction of business, i.e., meetings other than those held for the purpose of taking testimony, shall be open to the public ex-

cept when the Committee or subcommittee, by majority vote, determines otherwise.

(f) Every motion made to the Committee and entertained by the Chairman shall be reduced to writing upon the demand of any Member, and a copy made available to each Member present.

(g) In all subcommittee proceedings where a vote on a motion to report a bill to the full Committee results in a tie, such bill shall be reported to the full Committee without recommendation.

(h) For purposes of taking any action at a meeting of the full Committee or any subcommittee thereof, a quorum shall be constituted by the presence of not less than one-third of the Members of the Committee or subcommittee, except that a full majority of the Members of the Committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for purposes of reporting a measure or recommendation from the Committee or subcommittee, closing a meeting to the public, or authorizing the issuance of a subpoena.

(i) A complete transcript shall be made of any full Committee meeting, or any portion thereof, upon the request of any Member of the Committee made before the close of business of the proceeding day, excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays.

Rule III. Hearings:

(a) The Committee or any subcommittee shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted by it on any measure or matter at least one week before the commencement of that hearing, unless the Committee or the subcommittee before which such hearing is scheduled determines that there is good cause to begin such hearing at an earlier date, in which event it shall make public announcement at the earliest possible date.

(b) Committee and subcommittee hearings shall be open to the public except when the Committee or subcommittee, by majority vote, determines otherwise.

(c) For purposes of taking testimony and receiving evidence before any subcommittee, a quorum shall be constituted by the presence of two Members. For purposes of taking testimony and receiving evidence before the full Committee, a quorum shall be constituted by the presence of 10 Members.

(d) In the course of any hearing each Member shall be allowed five minutes for the interrogation of a witness until such time as each Member who so desires has had an opportunity to question the witness.

Rule IV. Proxy Voting. A vote by any Member of the Committee, with respect to any measure or matter being considered in the Committee or in subcommittee, may be cast by proxy if the proxy authorization is in writing, asserts that the Member is absent on official business or is otherwise unable to be present at the meeting of the Committee, designates the person who is to execute the proxy authorization, and is limited to a specific measure or matter and any amendments or motion pertaining thereto; except that a Member may authorize a general proxy for motions to recess, adjourn or for other procedural matters. Each proxy to be effective shall be signed by the Member assigning his or her vote and shall contain the date and time that the proxy is signed. Proxies may not be counted for a quorum.

Rule V. Broadcasting. When approved by a majority vote, an open meeting or hearing of the Committee or a subcommittee may be covered, in whole or in part, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, and still photography, or by any of such methods of coverage, subject to the provisions of House

Rule XI, clause (3). In order to enforce the provisions of said rule or to maintain an acceptable standard of dignity, propriety, and decorum, the Chairman may order such alteration, curtailment, or discontinuance of coverage as he determines necessary.

Rule VI. Standing Subcommittees:

(a) There shall be six standing subcommittees of the Committee on the judiciary, with jurisdictions as follows:

(1) *Subcommittee on Economic and Commercial Law:* Antitrust, bankruptcy, commercial law, economic regulation generally, judgeships, Federal budget matters, other appropriate matters as referred by the Chairman, and relevant oversight.

(2) *Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights:* Civil rights and liberties, other appropriate matters as referred by the Chairman, and relevant oversight.

(3) *Subcommittee on International Law, Immigration, and Refugees:* Treaties and international agreements, citizenship, passports, foreign sovereign immunity, immigration and naturalization, admission of refugees, other appropriate matters, as referred by the Chairman and relevant oversight.

(4) *Subcommittee on Intellectual Property and Judicial Administration:* Patents, trademarks, copyrights, court operations and administration, U.S. Attorneys and U.S. Marshals, Federal Rules of Evidence and Civil and Appellate Procedure, prisons, judicial ethics, RICO, other appropriate matters, as referred by the Chairman, and relevant oversight.

(5) *Subcommittee on Crime and Criminal Justice:* Federal Crime Code, drug enforcement, pretrial services, sentencing, parole and pardons, Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, other appropriate matters, as referred by the Chairman, and relevant oversight.

(6) *Subcommittee on Administrative Law and Governmental Relations:* Administrative Law, claims against the United States, ethics in government, legal services, other appropriate matters, as referred by the Chairman, and relevant oversight.

(b) The Chairman of the Committee and the ranking Minority Member thereof shall be ex officio Members, but not voting Members, of each subcommittee to which such Chairman or ranking Minority Member has not been assigned by resolution of the Committee. Ex officio Members shall not be counted as present for purposes of constituting a quorum at any hearing or meeting of such subcommittee.

Rule VII. Powers and Duties of Subcommittee. Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the full Committee on all matters referred to it or under its jurisdiction. Subcommittee chairmen shall set dates for hearings and meetings of their respective subcommittees after consultation with the chairman and other subcommittee chairmen with a view toward avoiding simultaneous scheduling of full Committee and subcommittee meetings or hearing whenever possible.

Rule VIII. Non-Legislative Reports. No report of the Committee or a subcommittee which does not accompany a measure or matter for consideration by the House shall be published unless all Members of the Committee or subcommittee issuing the report shall have been appraised of such report and given the opportunity to give notice of intention to file supplemental, addition, or dissenting views as part of the report. In no case shall the tie in which to file such views be less than three calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays).

Rule IX. Committee Records. The records of the Committee at the National Archives and

Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with Rule XXXVI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The Chairman shall notify the ranking Minority Member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 1(b) of the rule, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on the written request of any Member of the Committee.

RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE FOR THE 103D CONGRESS

(Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of clause 2(a) of rule XI of the rules of the House, I submit for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the rules adopted by the Committee on Energy and Commerce for the 103d Congress on January 6, 1993.

RULES FOR THE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE

Rule 1. Rules of the House. The Rules of the House are the rules of its committees and its subcommittees so far as is applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day is a motion of high privilege in committee and subcommittees. Written rules adopted by the committee, not inconsistent with the Rules of the House, shall be binding on each subcommittee of the committee. Each subcommittee of the committee is part of the committee and is subject to the authority and direction of the committee. Rule XI of the Rules of the House, which pertains entirely to committee procedure, is incorporated and made a part of the rules of this committee, which are supplementary to the Rules of the House.

Rule 2. Time, Place of Meetings. (a) The committee shall meet on the fourth Tuesday of each month and at such other times as determined by the chairman, or pursuant to subparagraph (b), in Room 2123 of the Rayburn House Office Building, at 9:45 a.m. for the consideration of bills, resolutions, and other business, if the House is in session on that day. If the House is not in session on that day and the committee has not met during such month, the committee shall meet at such time and place on the first day thereafter when the House is in session.

(b) The chairman may call and convene, as he considers necessary, additional meetings of the committee for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the committee or for the conduct of other committee business. The committee shall meet for such purposes pursuant to that call of the chairman.

(c) If at least three members of the committee or subcommittee (whichever is applicable) be called by the chairman or subcommittee chairman, those members may file in the offices of the committee their written request to the chairman or subcommittee chairman for that special meeting. Such request shall specify the measure or matter to be considered. Immediately upon the filing of the request, the clerk of the committee shall notify the chairman or subcommittee chairman of the filing of the request. If, within 3 calendar days after the filing of the request, the chairman or subcommittee chairman does not call the re-

quested special meeting to be held within 7 calendar days after the filing of the request, a majority of the members of the committee or subcommittee (whichever is applicable) may file in the offices of the committee their written notice that a special meeting of the committee or subcommittee (whichever is applicable) will be held, specifying the date and hour thereof, and the measure or matter to be considered at that special meeting. The committee or subcommittee (whichever is applicable) shall meet on that date and hour. Immediately upon the filing of the notice, the clerk of the committee shall notify all members of the committee or subcommittee (whichever is applicable) that such meeting will be held and inform them of its date and hour and the measure or matter to be considered and only the measure or matter specified in that notice may be considered at that specified meeting.

(d) If the chairman of the committee or subcommittee is not present at any meeting of the committee or subcommittee, the ranking member of the majority party on the committee or subcommittee who is present shall preside at that meeting.

(e) Each meeting of the committee or any of its subcommittees for the transaction of business, including hearings and the markup of legislation, shall be open to the public except when the committee or subcommittee in open session and with a quorum present determines by rollcall vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public. This paragraph does not apply to those special cases provided in the Rules of the House where closed sessions are otherwise provided.

(f) At least once a month, the chairman shall convene a meeting of the chairmen of the subcommittees. The purpose of the meeting will be to discuss issues pending before the committee and the procedures for Committee consideration of such matters. The discussion may include, among other items, the scheduling of hearings and meetings, questions of subcommittee jurisdiction and the conduct of joint subcommittee hearings.

Rule 3. Agenda. The agenda for each committee or subcommittee meeting (other than a hearing), setting out the date, time, place, and all items of business to be considered, shall be provided to each member of the committee by delivery to his office at least 36 hours in advance of such meeting.

Rule 4. Procedure. (a)(1) The date, time, place, and subject matter of any hearing of the committee or any of its subcommittees shall be announced at least 1 week in advance of the commencement of such hearing, unless the committee or subcommittee determines in accordance with such procedure as it may prescribe, that there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner.

(2)(A) The date, time, place, and subject matter of any meeting (other than a hearing) scheduled on a Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday when the House will be in session, shall be announced at least 36 hours in advance of the commencement of such meeting.

(B) The time, place, and subject matter of a meeting (other than a hearing or a meeting to which subparagraph (A) applies) shall be announced at least 72 hours in advance of the commencement of such meeting.

(b) Each witness who is to appear before the committee or subcommittee shall file with the clerk of the committee, at least two working days in advance of his appearance, fifty (50) copies of a written statement of his proposed testimony and shall limit his oral presentation at his appearance to a brief

summary of his argument, unless this requirement, or any part thereof, is waived by the committee or subcommittee chairman presiding.

(c) The right to interrogate the witnesses before the committee or any of its subcommittees shall alternate between majority and minority members. Each member shall be limited to 5 minutes in the interrogation of witnesses until such time as each member who so desires has had an opportunity to question witnesses. No member shall be recognized for a second period of 5 minutes to interrogate a witness until each member of the committee present has been recognized once for that purpose. While the committee or subcommittee is operating under the 5 minute rule for the interrogation of witnesses, the chairman shall recognize in order of appearance members who were not present when the meeting was called to order after all members who were present when the meeting was called to order have been recognized in the order of seniority on the committee or subcommittee, as the case may be.

(d) No bill, recommendation, or other matter reported by a subcommittee shall be considered by the full committee unless the text of the matter reported, together with an explanation, has been available to members of the committee for at least 36 hours. Such explanation shall include a summary of the major provisions of the legislation, an explanation of the relationship of the matter to present law, and a summary of the need for the legislation. All subcommittee actions shall be reported promptly by the clerk of the committee to all members of the committee.

(e) Opening statements by members at the beginning of any hearing of the Committee or any of its Subcommittees shall be limited to five minutes each for the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member (or their respective designee) of the Committee or Subcommittee, as applicable, and three minutes each for all other members.

Rule 5. *Waiver of Notice, Agenda, and Layover Requirements.* Requirements of Rules 3, 4(a)(2), and 4(d) may be waived by a majority of those present and voting (a majority being present) of the committee or subcommittee, as the case may be.

Rule 6. *Quorum.* Testimony may be taken and evidence received at any hearing at which there are present not fewer than two members of the committee or subcommittee in question. In the case of a meeting other than a hearing, the number of members constituting a quorum shall be one-third of the members of the committee or subcommittee, except that a matter may not be reported by the committee or a subcommittee unless a majority of the members thereof is actually present.

Rule 7. *Proxies.* No vote by any member of the committee or any of its subcommittees with respect to any measure or matter may be cast by proxy unless a proxy authorization is given in writing by the member desiring to cast a proxy, which authorization shall assert that the member is absent on official business or is absent due to personal illness and is thus unable to be present at the meeting of the committee or subcommittee, and shall be limited to a specific measure or matter and any amendments or motions pertaining thereto. Each proxy to be effective shall be signed by the member assigning his/her vote and shall contain the date and time of day that the proxy is signed. No proxy shall be voted on a motion to adjourn or shall be counted to make a quorum or be voted unless a quorum is present.

Rule 8. *Journal, Rollcalls.* The proceedings of the committee shall be recorded in a journal which shall, among other things, show those present at each meeting, and include a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded and a description of the amendment, motion, order or other proposition voted. A copy of the journal shall be furnished to the ranking minority member. A record vote may be demanded by one-fifth of the members present or, in the apparent absence of a quorum, by any one member. No demand for a rollcall shall be made or obtained except for the purpose of procuring a record vote or in the apparent absence of a quorum. The result of each rollcall vote in any meeting of the committee shall be made available in the committee office for inspection by the public, as provided in Rule XI, clause 2(e) of the Rules of the House.

Rule 9. *Filing of Committee Reports.* If, at the time of approval of any measure or matter by this committee, any member or members of the committee should give notice of an intention to file supplemental, minority, or additional views, that member shall be entitled to not less than three (3) calendar days (exclusive of Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) in which to file such views in writing and signed by that member or members with the committee. All such views so filed shall be included within and shall be a part of the report filed by the committee with respect to that measure or matter.

Rule 10. *Subcommittees.* There shall be such standing subcommittees with such jurisdiction and size as determined by the majority party caucus of the committee and, in addition, a Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations. The jurisdiction, number, and size of the subcommittees shall be determined by the majority party caucus prior to the start of the bidding process for subcommittee chairmanships and assignments. Such subcommittees shall, to the maximum extent practicable, be of equal size. The Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations shall coordinate its work with the work of other standing subcommittees and shall maintain regular communication with the standing subcommittees and the chairman of the full committee in order to obtain advice on subjects for investigation. The standing subcommittees shall maintain regular communication with the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations to advise the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of subjects for investigation.

Rule 11. *Powers and Duties of Subcommittees.* Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive testimony, mark up legislation, and report to the committee on all matters referred to it. Subcommittee chairmen shall set hearing and meeting dates only with the approval of the chairman of the full committee with a view toward assuring availability of meeting rooms and avoiding simultaneous scheduling of committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings wherever possible.

Rule 12. *Reference of Legislation and Other Matters.* All legislation and other matters referred to the committee shall be referred to the subcommittee of appropriate jurisdiction immediately unless, by majority vote of the members of the full committee within five (5) legislative days, consideration is to be by the full committee. In the case of legislation or other matter within the jurisdiction of more than one subcommittee, the chairman of the committee shall have the same authority to refer such legislation or other matter to one or more subcommittees as the

Speaker has under clause 5(c) of Rule X of the House of Representatives to refer a matter to one or more committees of the House. Such authority shall include the authority to refer such legislation or matter to an ad hoc subcommittee appointed by the chairman, with the approval of the committee, from the members of the subcommittees having legislative or oversight jurisdiction.

Rule 13. *Ratio of Subcommittees.* The majority caucus of the committee shall determine an appropriate ratio of majority to minority party members for each subcommittee and the chairman shall negotiate that ratio with the minority party, provided that the ratio of party members on each subcommittee shall be no less favorable to the majority than that of the full committee, nor shall such ratio provide for a majority of less than two majority members.

Rule 14. *Subcommittee Membership.* (a) Subject to the requirements of the Manual of the Democratic Caucus of the House of Representatives, each majority member other than the chairman of the full committee or the chairman of a subcommittee shall in order of committee seniority be entitled to membership on two subcommittees of that member's choice. A member (other than an ex officio member) may serve on more than two subcommittees only if such service is necessary in order to comply with Rule 13. Proceeding in order of seniority on the committee, each majority member, other than the chairman of the full committee and the chairmen of the several subcommittees, shall be entitled to select one subcommittee position each. The subcommittee selection process shall then continue in sequence of committee seniority, including the chairmen of the several subcommittees, for succeeding rounds of selection until all subcommittee positions are filled. The subcommittee selection process shall be conducted at a meeting of the majority party caucus of the committee held prior to any organizational meeting of the full committee. Subcommittee selections of each member shall be recorded by the clerk as made and shall be available for examination by the members.

(b) Minority subcommittee membership shall be selected as determined by the minority.

(c) The chairman and ranking minority member of the committee shall be ex officio members with voting privileges of each legislative subcommittee of the committee of which they are not assigned members. The ex officio members shall not be counted in determining a subcommittee quorum other than a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony.

Rule 15. *Subcommittee Chairmen.* (a)(1) Majority members of the committee shall have the right, in order of full committee seniority, to bid for subcommittee chairmanships. Any request for a subcommittee chairmanship shall be subject to approval by a majority of those present and voting, by secret ballot, in the majority party caucus of the committee. If the caucus rejects a subcommittee chairmanship bid, the next senior majority member may bid for the position as in the first instance. The subcommittee chairmen shall be elected by the full committee from nominations submitted by the majority party caucus of the committee.

(2) If the majority members of the committee shall determine to change the size of any subcommittee after the start of the bidding process, they may do so, but in that event, all previous action on the bidding process shall be expunged and the bidding process shall start anew.

(b) Subcommittee chairmen shall manage legislation reported from their subcommittees on the House floor.

(c) The chairman of the committee may make available to the chairman of any subcommittee office equipment and facilities which have been provided to him and for which he is personally responsible, subject to such terms and conditions as the chairman deems appropriate.

Rule 16. Committee Professional and Clerical Staff Appointments. (a) Whenever the chairman of the committee determines that any professional staff member appointed pursuant to the provisions of clause 6 of Rule XI of the House of Representatives, who is assigned to such chairman and not to the ranking minority member, by reason of such professional staff member's expertise or qualifications will be of assistance to one or more subcommittees in carrying out their assigned responsibilities, he may delegate such member to such subcommittees for such purpose. A delegation of a member of the professional staff pursuant to this subsection shall be made after consultation with the subcommittee chairmen and with the approval of the subcommittee chairman or chairmen involved.

(b) Professional staff members appointed pursuant to clause 6 of Rule XI of the House of Representatives, who are assigned to the ranking minority party member of the committee and not to the chairman of the committee, shall be assigned to such committee business as the minority party members of the committee consider advisable.

(c) In addition to the professional staff appointed pursuant to clause 6 of Rule XI of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the committee shall be entitled, subject to the approval of the majority party members of the committee, to make such appointments to the professional and clerical staff of the committee as may be provided within the budget approved for such purposes by the committee. Such appointee shall be assigned to such business of the full committee as the chairman of the committee considers advisable.

(d) Subcommittee chairman, subject to the approval of the majority party members of the committee, shall be entitled to make such appointments to the professional and clerical staff of the committee as may be provided in the committee budget as provided in rule 18 of these rules. Such professional and clerical appointees shall be delegated to the appropriate subcommittee for the purposes of assisting such subcommittee in the discharge of its assigned responsibilities and may be removed and their compensation fixed by the subcommittee chairman subject to the approval of the majority members of the committee.

(e) In addition to appointments made pursuant to other subsections of this rule, (1) the subcommittee chairman of each of the committee's subcommittees is authorized to appoint, in accordance with such rules as the majority party caucus may prescribe, one staff person who shall serve at the pleasure of such subcommittee chairman, and (2) the ranking minority member of each such subcommittee is authorized to appoint, in accordance with such rules as the minority party caucus may prescribe, one staff person who shall serve at the pleasure of such ranking minority member. Remuneration of any staff person appointed under this subsection shall be governed by paragraph (d) of clause 5 of Rule XI of the House of Representatives.

(f) Any contract for the temporary services or intermittent services of individual con-

sultants or organizations to make studies or advise the committee or its subcommittees with respect to any matter within their jurisdiction shall be deemed to have been approved by a majority of the members of the committee if approved by the chairman and ranking minority member of the committee and, if funded by a subcommittee, by the chairman and ranking minority member of that subcommittee. Such approval shall not be deemed to have been given if at least one-third of the members of the committee request in writing that the committee formally act on such a contract, if the request is made within 10 days after the latest date on which such chairman or chairmen, and such ranking minority member or members, approve such contract.

Rule 17. Supervision, Duties of Staff. (a) The professional and clerical staff of the committee delegated to subcommittees of the committee pursuant to rule 16 shall be subject to the supervision and direction of the subcommittee to which they are assigned with respect to matters before the subcommittee, who shall establish and assign the duties and responsibilities of such staff members and delegate such authority as he determines appropriate. The professional and clerical staff assigned to the minority shall be under the supervision and direction of the minority members of the committee, who may delegate such authority as they determine appropriate. Subject to subsection (b), the professional and clerical staff of the committee not delegated to a subcommittee pursuant to rule 16(d) or to the minority shall be under the supervision and direction of the chairman, who shall establish and assign the duties and responsibilities of such staff members and delegate such authority as he determines appropriate.

(b) The professional staff member who is assigned principal responsibility by a subcommittee chairman with respect to a matter before such subcommittee chairman's subcommittee shall continue to assume principal staff responsibility during any consideration before the full committee, the Rules Committee, the House, and Conference Committees of any matter which is reported by such subcommittee.

Rule 18. Committee and Subcommittee Budgets. (a) The chairman of the full committee and the chairmen of each standing subcommittee, after consultation with their respective ranking minority members, shall for each session of the Congress prepare a preliminary budget for the committee and each standing subcommittee respectively, with such budgets including necessary amounts for professional and clerical staff, travel, investigations, and miscellaneous expenses, and which shall be adequate to fully discharge their responsibilities for legislation and oversight. Thereafter, the chairman of the full committee, meeting with the chairmen of the subcommittees, shall combine such proposals into a committee budget, which shall state separately the budgeted amounts for the committee and for each of the subcommittees. Such budget shall be presented by the chairman to the majority party caucus of the committee and thereafter to the full committee for its approval.

(b) The chairman shall take whatever action is necessary to have the budget as finally approved by the committee duly authorized by the House. No proposed committee budget may be submitted to the House Administration Committee unless it has been presented to and approved by the majority party caucus and thereafter by the full committee. The chairman of the full com-

mittee or the chairmen of the standing subcommittees may authorize all necessary expenses in accordance with these rules and within the limits of their portion of the budget as approved by the House, but the chairman of the full committee shall permit no subcommittee to make an expenditure beyond its portion of the budget (as established in paragraph (a)) unless the chairman determines that such expenditure can be made without exceeding the amount authorized to the full committee by the House.

(c) Committee members shall be furnished a copy of each monthly report, prepared by the chairman for the Committee on House Administration, which shows expenditures made during the reporting period and cumulative for the year by committee and subcommittees, anticipated expenditures for the projected committee program, and detailed information on travel.

Rule 19. Broadcasting of Committee Hearings. Any meeting or hearing that is open to the public may be covered in whole or in part by radio or television or still photography, subject to the requirements of Rule XI, clause 3 of the Rules of the House of Representatives. At all such meetings or proceedings, coverage by radio, television or still photography will be allowed unless specifically forbidden by a record vote of the committee or subcommittee. The coverage of any hearing or other proceeding of the committee or any subcommittee thereof by television, radio, or still photography shall be under the direct supervision of the chairman of the committee, the subcommittee chairman, or other member of the committee presiding at such hearing or other proceeding and, for good cause, may be terminated by him.

Rule 20. Comptroller General Audits. The chairman of the committee is authorized to request verification examinations by the Comptroller General of the United States pursuant to Title V, Part A of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (Public Law 94-163), after consultation with the members of the committee.

Rule 21. Subpoenas. The full committee or any subcommittee, may authorize and issue a subpoena under clause 2(m)(2)(A) of Rule XI of the House of Representatives, if authorized by a majority of the members voting of the committee or subcommittee (as the case may be), a quorum being present. In addition, the chairman of the full committee may authorize and issue subpoenas under such clause during any period for which the House has adjourned for a period in excess of three days. Subpoenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the full committee, or any member of the committee authorized by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Rule 22. Travel of Members of Staff. (a) Consistent with the primary expense resolution and such additional expense resolutions as may have been approved, the provisions of this rule shall govern travel of committee members and staff. Travel to be reimbursed from funds set aside for the full committee for any member or any staff member shall be paid only upon the prior authorization of the chairman. Travel may be authorized by the chairman for any member and any staff member in connection with the attendance of hearings conducted by the committee or any subcommittee thereof and meetings, conferences and investigations which involve activities or subject matter under the general jurisdiction of the committee. Before such authorization is given there shall be submitted to the chairman in writing the

following: (1) The purpose of the travel; (2) The dates during which the travel is to be made and the date or dates of the event for which the travel is being made; (3) The location of the event for which the travel is to be made; (4) The names of members and staff seeking authorization.

(b) In the case of travel of members and staff of a subcommittee to hearings, meetings, conferences, and investigations involving activities or subject matter under the legislative assignment of such subcommittee to be paid for out of funds allocated to such subcommittee, prior authorization must be obtained from the subcommittee chairman and the chairman. Such prior authorization shall be given by the chairman only upon the representation by the applicable chairman of the subcommittee in writing setting forth those items enumerated in (1), (2), (3), and (4) of paragraph (a).

(c) In the case of travel by minority party members and minority party professional staff for the purpose set out in (a) or (b), the prior approval, not only of the chairman but also of the ranking minority party member, shall be required. Such prior authorization shall be given by the chairman only upon the representation by the ranking minority party member in writing setting forth those items enumerated in (1), (2), (3), and (4) of paragraph (a).

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HASTERT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HOKE, for 5 minutes today, and 5 minutes February 2.

Mr. HASTERT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEKAS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BEREUTER, for 5 minutes today, and 5 minutes February 2.

Mr. DOOLITTLE, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GALLEGLY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 60 minutes, on March 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12.

Mr. DREIER, for 5 minutes today, and for 60 minutes on February 2, 3, 4, 16, 17, 18, 23, 24, and 25, and 60 minutes on March 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12.

Mr. DORNAN, for 5 minutes today, and 60 minutes on February 2, 3, 4, 16, 17, 18, 23, 24, 25, and 60 minutes on March 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. MINK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONYERS, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes, on January 28.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LIVINGSTON):)

Mrs. LOWEY, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes, on February 2 and 4.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HASTERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PACKARD.

Mr. GALLEGLY.

Mr. HANSEN, in two instances.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, in two instances.

Mr. WOLF.

Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

Mr. SCHAEFER.

Mr. KYL.

Mr. HEFLEY.

Mr. REGULA.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

Mr. LEWIS of California, in two instances.

Mr. GILLMOR, in two instances.

Mr. BEREUTER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. VENTO.

Mr. LANTOS, in two instances.

Mr. RICHARDSON.

Mr. CLAY.

Mr. MURTHA.

Mr. MFUME.

Mr. CLEMENT, in two instances.

Mr. BERMAN, in two instances.

Mr. SHEPHERD.

Mr. LAFALCE.

Mr. DURBIN.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

Mr. MATSUI.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. NADLER.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 202. An act to designate the Federal Judiciary Building in Washington, DC, as the "Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 27, 103d Congress, the House stands adjourned until noon on Tuesday, February 2, 1993.

Thereupon (at 5 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 27, the House adjourned until Tuesday, February 2, 1993, at 12 noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from

the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

504. A letter from the Comptroller of the Department of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Anti-Deficiency Act which occurred in the Department of Defense, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

505. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of a violation of the Anti-Deficiency Act which occurred in the Department of the Interior, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

506. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the Department's annual report to the President and the Congress, January 1993, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 113 (c), (e); to the Committee on Armed Services.

507. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the first biennial report on the Preliminary Evaluation of the Home Equity Conversion Mortgage Insurance Demonstration, pursuant to Public Law 100-242, section 417 (101 Stat. 1911, 1912); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

508. A letter from the Secretary, Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a copy of the report on the actuarial soundness of the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund, pursuant to Public Law 101-625, section 332 (104 Stat. 4140); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

509. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a copy of a report on the rural rental rehabilitation demonstration program, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1490m note; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

510. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 9-394, "Minimum Wage Act Revision Act of 1992," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

511. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 9-395, "Closing of a Portion of a Deadend Public Alley in Square 2200, S.O. 91-153, Act of 1992," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

512. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 9-396, "Stable and Reliable Source of Revenues for WMATA Act of 1982 Amendment Act of 1992," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

513. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 9-397, "General Obligation Bond Act of 1992," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

514. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 9-398, "Prevention of Transmission of the Human Immunodeficiency Virus Amendment Act of 1992," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

515. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 9-399, "Drug User's Automobile Forfeiture Amendment Act of 1992," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

516. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 9-400, "Medical and Geriatric Parole Act of 1992," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

517. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 9-401, "Criminal and Juvenile Justice Reform Amendment Act of 1992," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

518. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 9-402, "Closing of a Public Alley in Square 368, S.O. 88-419, Act of 1992," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

519. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 9-403, "Closing of a Public Alley in Square 3921, S.O. 91-11, Act of 1992," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

520. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 9-404, "Closing of a Public Alley in Square 247, S.O. 90-236, Act of 1992," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

521. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 9-405, "Election Temporary Amendment Act of 1992," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

522. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 9-406, "Patient Counseling Temporary Amendment Act of 1992," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

523. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 9-407, "Subsidy for Existing Low-Yield Cooperative and Single-Room Occupancy Housing Projects Temporary Act of 1992," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

524. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of a report entitled, "Review of the Department of Public Work's Water and Sewer Utility Administration's Capital Improvements Program," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 47-117(d); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

525. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting Notice of Final Funding Priorities for the Rehabilitation Research and Training Centers Program, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

526. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting Notice of Final Funding Priorities for the Research in Education of Individuals with Disabilities Program, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

527. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting final regulations—Guaranteed Student Loan and PLUS Programs, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

528. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report on the implementation of title IV—The Health Care Quality Improvement Act of 1986, pursuant to Public Law 99-660, section 432(c) (100 Stat. 3794); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

529. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the 17th annual report on the Automotive Fuel Economy Program, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 2002(a)(2); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

530. A letter from the Advisory Panel on Alzheimer's Disease, Chairman, transmitting the fourth report on administrative and leg-

islative actions to improve services for individuals with Alzheimer's Disease and related dementias, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 679; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

531. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting a copy of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve's Final Corrective Action Plan; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

532. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notice of proposed lease to Spain for defense articles (Transmittal No. 3-93), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

533. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the fiscal year 1991 report on the extent and disposition of United States contributions to international organizations, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2226(b)(1); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

534. A letter from the Secretary, Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the report entitled "Allocating Homeless Assistance by Formula", pursuant to Public Law 101-625, section 823(c) (104 Stat. 4355); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

535. 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.

536. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting text of agreements in which the American Institute in Taiwan is a party between January 1, 1991 and December 31, 1991, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3311(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

537. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of Presidential Determination No. 93-6, designating refugees, displaced persons, and victims of conflict from the former Yugoslavia as qualifying for assistance under section 2(b)(2) of the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2601(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

538. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for FY 1992, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

539. A letter from the Acting Secretary, American Battle Monuments Commission, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for FY 1992, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

540. A letter from the Executive Director, Christopher Columbus Quincentenary Jubilee Commission, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for FY 1992, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

541. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Agriculture Workers, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for FY 1992, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

542. A letter from the Manager, CoBank—National Bank for Cooperatives, transmitting the annual report for CoBank—National Bank for Cooperatives Retirement Trust Fund for the year ending December 31, 1991,

pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9503(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Government Operations.

543. A letter from the Chairman, Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for FY 1992, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

544. A letter from the Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's annual pension plan report for the plan year ending December 31, 1992, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9503(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Government Operations.

545. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for Fiscal Year 1992, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

546. A letter from the Director, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1992, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

547. A letter from the Director, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1992, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

548. A letter from the Chairman, International Trade Commission, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1992, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

549. A letter from the Executive Director, Marine Mammal Commission, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1992, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

550. A letter from the Chairman, National Capital Planning Commission, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Manager's Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1992, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

551. A letter from the Chairman, National Commission on Responsibilities for Financing Postsecondary Education, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1992, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

552. A letter from the Administrator, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1992, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

553. A letter from the Chairman, National Endowment for the Humanities, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Manager's Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1992, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

554. A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1992, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

555. A letter from the Chairman, National Mediation Board, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1992, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

556. A letter from the Director, National Science Foundation, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Fi-

nancial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1992, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

557. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1992, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

558. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1992, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

559. A letter from the Director of Legislative Affairs, U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

560. A letter from the Board of Governors, U.S. Postal Service, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

561. A letter from the Staff Director, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1992, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

562. A letter from the Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report on the necessity to construct modifications to the Meeks Cabin Dam, Lyman Project, WY, in order to preserve its structural safety, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 509; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

563. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the 1993 update to the National Plan for Research in Mining and Mineral Resources and the 1992 report on the Mineral Institute Program of the U.S. Department of the Interior, pursuant to 30 U.S.C. 1229(e); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

564. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration, transmitting its report on progress in correcting deficiencies in the Airmen and Aircraft Registry System, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. app. 1401 note; to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation.

565. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the fiscal year 1991 report on advisory and assistance services, pursuant to Public Law 101-161, section 641(a)(1) (103 Stat. 986); jointly to the Committees on Appropriations and Agriculture.

566. A letter from the Associate Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the third annual report on negotiations concerning offsets in military exports, pursuant to Public Law 100-456, section 825(d)(3) (102 Stat. 2022); jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign 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. MOAKLEY: Committee on Rules, House Resolution 52, Resolution establishing the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse

and Control, the Select Committee on Aging, the Select Committee on Hunger, and the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families (Rept. 103-6). Referred to the House Calendar.

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. JACOBS:

H.R. 646. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to provide claimants for benefits based on disability with a face-to-face, evidentiary hearing before making an initial decision, to provide those claimants whose application is denied with opportunity for a subsequent hearing without any requirements for intervening "reconsideration," and to specify the medical information to be collected and maintained in making disability determinations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 647. A bill to establish the Social Security Administration as an independent agency, which shall be headed by a Social Security Board, and which shall be responsible for the administration of the Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance Program under title II of the Social Security Act and the Supplemental Security Income Program under title XVI of such act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 648. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that, in determining whether an individual applying for or receiving benefits based on disability is engaging in substantial gainful activity, a portion of the cost of acquiring a van which is specially equipped for the individual's disability and which the individual needs for transportation to work shall be excluded from amounts treated as such individual's earnings, and to make conforming changes in title XVI; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JACOBS (for himself, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. MINETA):

H.R. 649. A bill to amend the Poultry Products Inspection Act to require the slaughter of poultry in accordance with humane methods; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 650. A bill to amend title XIV of the Public Health Service Act (the Safe Drinking Water Act) to clarify that review by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency under section 1424(e) is mandatory, to improve interagency coordination in the protection of sole or principal drinking water source aquifers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma:

H.R. 651. A bill to amend the National and Community Service Act of 1990 to authorize appropriations for the Civilian Community Corps Demonstration Program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 652. A bill to provide grants to States for the establishment of community works progress programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 653. A bill to amend the Watermelon Research and Promotion Act to expand operation of the act to the entire United States, to authorize the revocation of the refund provision of the act, to modify the referendum procedures of the act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAYES of Louisiana:

H.R. 654. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the 200th Anniversary of the establishment of the U.S. Mint and the commencement of our national coinage; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BARCIA:

H.R. 655. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to make crop quality reduction disaster payments to producers of the 1992 crop of corn, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. MORAN, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. FROST, Mr. GOSS, Mr. SHAW, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. BELENSON):

H.R. 656. A bill to provide more effective protection for marine mammals; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

H.R. 657. A bill to repeal the prohibition in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1993, on purchasing any lock which has not been certified as passing certain security lock specifications, and to prohibit the Secretary of Defense from carrying out a retrofit program to replace locks which do not meet such specifications; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 658. A bill to provide assistance to certain agricultural producers whose crop quality has been adversely effected by drought, heat, wind, excessive moisture, or other natural climatological event; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CAMP (for himself, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. GUNDERSON, and Mr. KILDEE):

H.R. 659. A bill to provide assistance to certain producers of high-moisture feed grains through a recourse loan program; establishing a period to allow for the orderly repayment of such loans; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LAFALCE (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. MAZZOLI, and Mr. MANN):

H.R. 660. A bill to facilitate the providing of loan capital to small business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois:

H.R. 661. A bill to provide for the manufacturer, importer, or dealer of a handgun or an assault weapon to be held strictly liable for damages that result from the use of the handgun or assault weapon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRANE:

H.R. 662. A bill to limit United States contributions to the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 663. A bill to repeal the provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 which provides that the accumulated earnings tax shall be applied without regard to the number of shareholders in the corporation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEFazio (for himself and Mrs. UNSOLD):

H.R. 664. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives for domestic timber production and manufacturing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 665. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide that fraud against

insurance companies will be subject to strong Federal criminal and civil penalties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORNAN (for himself and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 666. A bill to amend the Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to provide that any rescission of budget authority proposed by the President take effect unless specifically disapproved by the adoption of a joint resolution; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Rules.

By Mr. DORNAN (for himself, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 667. A bill to enhance the readiness, discipline, good order, and morale of the Armed Forces by providing by law for the continuation of the policy of the Department of Defense on homosexuals serving in the Armed Forces, as in effect on January 1, 1993; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DORNAN:

H.R. 668. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to remove the limitation on the deductibility of capital losses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 669. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for dividends paid by domestic corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAXMAN:

H.R. 670. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to ensure that pregnant women receiving assistance under title X of the Public Health Service Act are provided with information and counseling regarding their pregnancies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 671. A bill to establish a national commission on health care fraud and abuse; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FISH (for himself, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. MANTON, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 672. A bill to provide for adherence with the MacBride Principles by United States persons doing business in Northern Ireland; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Ways and Means, and Rules.

By Mr. GALLEGLY (for himself, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. GINGRICH, and Mr. DORNAN):

H.R. 673. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that dislocated defense workers are eligible for the targeted jobs credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLEGLY (for himself, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. LEVY, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. STUMP, and Mr. PACKARD):

H.R. 674. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage investments in new manufacturing and other productive equipment by providing a temporary investment tax credit to taxpayers who increase the amount of such investments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEKAS:

H.R. 675. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide an automatic continuing appropriation for the U.S. Government; jointly, to the Committees on Appropriations and Rules.

By Mr. HANSEN (for himself, Mr. ORTON, and Ms. SHEPHERD):

H.R. 676. A bill to amend the amount of grants received under chapter 1 of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HANSEN (for himself and Ms. SHEPHERD):

H.R. 677. A bill to exchange lands within the State of Utah, between the United States and the State of Utah; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HEFLEY:

H.R. 678. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a mechanism for taxpayers to designate \$1 of any overpayment of income tax, and to contribute other amounts, for use by the U.S. Olympic Committee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLDEN (for himself, Mr. KOLBE, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. EMERSON, and Mr. OLVER):

H.R. 679. A bill to restore and increase the deduction for the health insurance costs of self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOUGHTON:

H.R. 680. A bill to grant employees family and temporary medical leave under certain circumstances, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor, Post Office and Civil Service, and House Administration.

By Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 681. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax relief for small businesses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. MANN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. WYNN, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. TORRES, Mr. KASICH, Ms. BYRNE, Mr. GOSS, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. COYNE, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. WILSON, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PORTER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. FROST, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. SANGMEISTER, and Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ):

H.R. 682. A bill to authorize the American Battle Monuments Commission to establish a memorial, in the District of Columbia or its environs, to honor members of the Armed Forces who served in World War II, and to commemorate the participation of the United States in that war; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 683. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to the treatment of certain areas in applying the purchase price requirements applicable to mortgage revenue bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MANZULLO:

H.R. 684. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to deduct a children's contribution from the amount of income applied monthly to payment for the cost of care in an institution for an individual receiving medical assistance under a State

Medicaid plan; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCNULTY:

H.R. 685. A bill for the relief of Henry Johnson; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 686. A bill for the relief of Dorris Miller; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MFUME (for himself and Mr. FROST):

H.R. 687. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the deduction for business use of the home; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MOLINARI (for herself, Mr. KYL, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. MANTON, Ms. FOWLER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mrs. COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. COX, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. EWING, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. FROST, Mr. HYDE, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. ROTH, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. MORAN, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. GREENWOOD, and Mr. PAXON):

H.R. 688. A bill to prevent and punish sexual violence and domestic violence, to assist and protect the victims of such crimes, to assist State and local efforts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 689. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to provide for fair and expeditious representation elections; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REGULA:

H.R. 690. A bill to amend the National Literacy Act of 1991 to establish in the Department of Labor an Office of Workplace Education to provide workplace education services to small businesses and to provide grants to States to improve the productivity of those businesses; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RIDGE:

H.R. 691. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage immediate investments in new manufacturing and other productive equipment by temporarily allowing an investment tax credit to taxpayers who increase the amount of such investments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. SABO, and Mr. OWENS):

H.R. 692. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to increase the minimum wage and to provide for an increase in such wage based on the cost of living; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SMITH of Oregon (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. KOPETSKI, and Ms. FURSE):

H.R. 693. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to provide additional studies and investigations at Crater Lake; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. SNOWE:

H.R. 694. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to expand and intensify programs of the National Institutes of Health with respect to research and related activities concerning osteoporosis, Paget's disease, and related bone disorders; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 695. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish an Office of Research on Women's Health, and for other

purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SOLOMON:

H.R. 696. A bill entitled the "Drug Kingpin Death Penalty Act"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VENTO (for himself, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. STARK, and Mr. WAXMAN):

H.R. 697. A bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, for urgently needed assistance for the homeless as authorized in the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. VENTO:

H.R. 698. A bill to protect Lechuguilla Cave and other resources and values in and adjacent to Carlsbad Caverns National Park; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. VOLKMER:

H.R. 699. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to provide grants for the purchase of recycling equipment; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GIBBONS (for himself and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 700. A bill to modernize and simplify the administration of the customs laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VOLKMER:

H.R. 701. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a 25-percent investment tax credit for recycling equipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. VUCANOVICH (for herself, Mr. BILBRAY, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. COX, Mr. STUMP, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. WOLF, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SUNDBLUM, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. KYL, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. GOSS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. FAWCETT, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. WILSON, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. COBLE, Mr. WALSH, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. McCANDLESS, and Mr. MCCREERY):

H.R. 702. A bill to limit State taxation of certain pension income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLF (for himself, Mr. HYDE, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, and Mr. PAYNE of Virginia):

H.R. 703. A bill to provide for pilot programs conducted by the Federal Prison Industries to test the feasibility of meeting the need for increased employment of Federal prisoners by producing items, for the private market, in conjunction with private U.S. firms, that would otherwise be produced by foreign labor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 704. A bill to regulate fishing in certain waters of Alaska; jointly, to the Committees on Natural Resources and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 705. A bill to protect the fisheries of Bristol Bay, AK, by purchasing certain oil

leases, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Natural Resources and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CLEMENT (for himself, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. GORDON, Mr. PORTER, Mr. LANCASTER, and Mr. BATEMAN):

H.J. Res. 76. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing the President to disapprove or reduce an item of appropriations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. FOWLER (for herself, Mr. GOSS, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. KIM, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. CANADY, and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland):

H.J. Res. 77. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit terms of office for Representatives and Senators in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANTON:

H.J. Res. 78. Joint resolution designating the weeks beginning May 23, 1993, and May 15, 1994, as "Emergency Medical Services Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MYERS of Indiana:

H.J. Res. 79. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating the week beginning on November 21, 1993, and November 20, 1994, as "National Family Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.J. Res. 80. Joint resolution designating June 1, 1993, through June 7, 1993, as a "Week for the National Observance of the Fiftieth Anniversary of World War II"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.J. Res. 81. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States repealing the second amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 82. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that the United States shall guarantee to each person the right to employment opportunity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VALENTINE (for himself and Mr. LEWIS of Florida):

H.J. Res. 83. Joint resolution to designate the week beginning March 7, 1993, as "National Manufacturing Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GEPHARDT:

H. Con. Res. 27. Concurrent resolution providing for an adjournment of the House from Wednesday, January 27, 1993, to Tuesday, February 2, 1993; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. KOPETSKI (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Ms. FURSE):

H. Con. Res. 28. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the stamp commemorating the Oregon National Historic Trail should be issued in Oregon City, OR; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LEWIS of Florida:

H. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the U.S. Customs Child Pornography and Protection Unit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McNULTY:

H. Con. Res. 30. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should award the Presidential Medal of Freedom to Martha Raye; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOYER:

H. Res. 51. Resolution designating majority membership on certain standing committees of the House; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CLEMENT (for himself, Mr. PENNY, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. GOSS, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. STUMP, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. INGLIS, and Mr. MCHUGH):

H. Res. 53. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to require a rollcall vote on all appropriation measures; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HEFLEY (for himself, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GOSS, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. PORTER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. STUMP, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. ROHRBACHER):

H. Res. 54. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to provide for reform of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McNULTY:

H. Res. 55. Resolution urging the President to call on the President of Syria to permit the extradition of fugitive Nazi war criminal Alois Brunner; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SOLOMON:

H. Res. 56. Resolution relating to the prosecution of Saddam Hussein and responsible members of the Iraqi Government for war crimes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 57. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to require a three-fifths majority on passage of any bill, amendment, or conference report that increases revenues; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. TRAFICANT introduced a bill (H.R. 706) for the relief of Charles Laurie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 2: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Ms. BYRNE, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. MCHALE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. PASTOR, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. SWETT, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. FINGERHUT, Ms. FURSE, Mr. KLING, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Ms. SHEPHERD, Mr. STUPAK, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 14: Mr. COSTELLO, Ms. BYRNE, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. E.B. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. WISE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. POSHARD, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 20: Mr. RIDGE.

H.R. 24: Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. POMBO, and Mrs. VUCANOVICH.

H.R. 59: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. ROTH, Mr. EWING, Mr. MORAN, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. PORTER, Mr. MCCREERY, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. EMERSON,

SON, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. CLINGER, and Mr. MCCANDLESS.
 H.R. 81: Mr. BEREUTER, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. EVANS.
 H.R. 104: Mr. SOLOMON.
 H.R. 109: Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. WELDON, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. RAMSTAD.
 H.R. 142: Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. DURBIN.
 H.R. 159: Mr. WALKER.
 H.R. 162: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. COBLE, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma, Mr. EWING, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HYDE, Mr. KLUG, Mr. LEACH, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. ORTON, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. PORTER, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. THORNTON, Mr. UPTON, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. WOLF, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. CRANE, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. SUNDQUIST, and Mr. HOUGHTON.
 H.R. 168: Mr. TRAFICANT.
 H.R. 191: Mr. BLUTE.
 H.R. 243: Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. MFUME, Mr. BOUCHER, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Mr. FROST.
 H.R. 244: Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. MFUME, Mr. BOUCHER, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Mr. FROST.
 H.R. 324: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. MCDADE.
 H.R. 335: Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. KING, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. PETRI, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. LEVY, Mr. INGLIS, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. HENRY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. GOSS, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, and Mr. SPENCE.
 H.R. 421: Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. GOSS, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. WALKER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. WILSON, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr.

WELDON, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, and Mr. BATEMAN.
 H.R. 425: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. BOEHLERT, Ms. BYRNE, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. FINGERHUT, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HUGHES, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KING, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MILLER of California, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. PETRI, Mr. PORTER, Mr. RAVENEL, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WELDON, Mr. WOLF, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. MOAKLEY, and Mr. SKEEN.
 H.R. 427: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. BOEHLERT, Ms. BYRNE, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. FINGERHUT, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HUGHES, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KING, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MILLER of California, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. PETRI, Mr. PORTER, Mr. RAVENEL, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WELDON, Mr. WOLF, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. MOAKLEY, and Mr. SKEEN.
 H.R. 429: Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
 H.R. 431: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CLAY, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MINETA, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. PASTOR, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. STARK, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. YATES, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. SABO.
 H.R. 451: Mr. GOODLING.
 H.R. 465: Mr. COX.
 H.R. 493: Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina, Mr. HANCOCK, and Mr. MCCRERY.
 H.R. 494: Mr. WILSON, Mr. CLAY, Mr. KING, Mr. WYNN, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GINGRICH, and Mr. MCCANDLESS.
 H.R. 513: Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. FA-

WELL, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. STEARNS.
 H.R. 526: Mr. MFUME, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. KLINK.
 H.R. 567: Mr. MCCANDLESS and Mr. STUMP.
 H.J. Res. 2: Mr. SOLOMON and Mr. UPTON.
 H.J. Res. 4: Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. WILSON, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. ROTH, Mr. KING, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. QUINN, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HANCOCK, and Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina.
 H.J. Res. 7: Mr. GOODLING, Mr. WALSH, Mr. KLUG, Mr. KING, Mr. BLUTE, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. BALLENGER, and Mr. POMBO.
 H.J. Res. 9: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. POMBO, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, and Mr. KING.
 H.J. Res. 30: Mr. WELDON, Mr. BLUTE, and Mr. HANCOCK.
 H.J. Res. 37: Mr. MCCRERY, and Mr. WILSON.
 H.J. Res. 38: Mr. EWING, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. BALLENGER, and Mr. WILSON.
 H.J. Res. 69: Mr. APPEGATE, Mr. BILBRAY, Ms. DANNER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MCDADE, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. WELDON, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. INHOPE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PAXON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. REGULA, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. SHEPHERD, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TORRES, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. UPTON, and Mrs. VUCANOVICH.
 H. Con. Res. 6: Mr. BOUCHER and Mr. LAUGHLIN.
 H. Res. 16: Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. BLUTE, and Mr. QUINN.
 H. Res. 41: Mr. GOSS.