



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 103^d CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, July 1, 1993

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 1, 1993.

I hereby designate the Honorable G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

THOMAS S. FOLEY,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

Rev. Dr. Frederick D. Perkins, Pastor, Marion Baptist Church, Monroe, LA, offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, thank You for blessing this Nation with the high concepts of equality of people, human rights under law, and freedom of worship as expressed in love for God and love for one another.

Help us, Lord, feed the hungry, shelter the homeless, care for the sick, and secure the elderly.

Our Heavenly Father, help us give leadership to other evolving nations that are struggling to form democratic governments of the people, by the people, and for the people.

Bless this Congress with the resources to provide jobs for the unemployed, safety for our homes, education for our children, healing for our sick, and growth for our Nation.

Our Heavenly Father, we pray that You will bless this Congress with that level of wisdom, vision, knowledge, understanding, and determination that when the last decision is made and the final act is passed, You, O Lord, can add a plus to the highest grade.

In the name of Jesus, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the

last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Pledge of Allegiance will be led by the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. BALLENGER.

Mr. BALLENGER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

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 bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1876. An act to provide authority for the President to enter into trade agreements to conclude the Uruguay round of multilateral trade negotiations under the auspices of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, to extend tariff proclamation authority to carry out such agreements, and to apply congressional fast-track procedures to a bill implementing such agreements.

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

H.R. 63. An act to establish the Spring Mountains National Recreation Area in Nevada, and for other purposes.

H.R. 868. An act to strengthen the authority of the Federal Trade Commission to protect consumers in connection with sales made with a telephone, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1189. An act to entitle certain armored car crew members to lawfully carry a weapon in any State while protecting the security of valuable goods in interstate commerce in the service of an armored car company.

H.R. 2264. An act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 7 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1994.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to

the bill (H.R. 2264), an act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 7 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1994, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints:

From the Committee on the Budget: Mr. SASSER, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. DOMENICI, and Mr. GRASSLEY; from the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Mr. LEAHY, Mr. PRYOR, and Mr. LUGAR; from the Committee on Armed Services: Mr. NUNN, Mr. SHELBY, and Mr. COATS; from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. D'AMATO; from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. INOUE, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. STEVENS, and Mr. DANFORTH; from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. FORD, Mr. WALLOP, and Mr. HATFIELD; from the Committee on Environment and Public Works: Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. MOYNIHAN, and Mr. CHAFEE; from the Committee on Finance: Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BRADLEY, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. DOLE, Mr. ROTH, Mr. DANFORTH, and Mr. CHAFEE; from the Committee on Foreign Relations: Mr. PELL, Mr. KERRY, and Mr. HELMS; from the Committee on Governmental Affairs: Mr. GLENN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. ROTH, and Mr. STEVENS; from the Committee on the Judiciary: Mr. DECONCINI and Mr. HATCH; from the Committee on Labor and Human Resources: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. PELL, Mr. METZENBAUM, Mr. DODD, Mr. SIMON, Mr. HARKIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. WOFFORD, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. COATS, Mr. GREGG, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. DURENBURGER; from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. DECONCINI, and Mr. MURKOWSKI; to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 102-246, the Chair, on behalf of the majority leader,

□ 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.

in consultation with the Republican leader, appoints the following individuals to the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board: Edwin L. Cox of Texas to a 3-year term and Adele Hall of Kansas to a 2-year term.

The Chair further announces the terms of the individuals appointed to this board on March 11, 1993, as follows: John W. Kluge of New York to a 5-year term and Arthur Ortenberg of New York to a 4-year term.

THE REVEREND DR. FREDERICK D. PERKINS

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

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to welcome today our guest Chaplain The Reverend Dr. Frederick Douglas Perkins. Dr. Perkins is pastor of the Marion Baptist Church and vice president of the Monroe Union Theological Seminary of Monroe, LA.

It is a great honor as well as befitting that Dr. Perkins offer the opening prayer before this the U.S. House of Representatives.

Dr. Perkins is a fine citizen of this country and a great spiritual leader in my district. More importantly, he embodies the teachings of Christ and the basic fundamental democratic principles of this great country. Once again, on behalf of the State and the Fourth Congressional District of Louisiana, I am very happy to welcome today's guest Chaplain, the Reverend Dr. Frederick Douglas Perkins.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. One-minute speeches will be delayed until later in the day.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 2519, and that I be permitted to include tabulations, charts and other extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consider-

ation of the bill (H.R. 2519) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not to exceed 1 hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] and myself.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair designates the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and requests the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS] to assume the chair temporarily.

□ 1006

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2519, with Mr. HASTINGS (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the bill was considered as having been read the first time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the unanimous consent agreement, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First I want to thank the staff, the minority and the majority members of our subcommittee for their work on this bill. It was a very, very tough bill. It is the second year that we have had to report bills that were less than the current services level. That is very tough.

There are 105 pages of explanation and another 23 pages of tables that have been printed in the committee report on this bill and I do not intend to read them back to the Members of the House. They have had them for several days and have had a chance to study them, and it will not be necessary to elaborate on them any more than that.

But I do want to point out a few things.

The bill is within the 602(b) allocation for outlays. It is also substantially under the 602(b) allocation for budget authority by \$751 million. The reason we are so far under in budget authority

is that we had to be under that far in order to stay within the outlay allocation. The bill is even under last year's appropriated level by \$593 million. The bill is also under the budget request by \$1,963,000,000. And as I indicated earlier, on an average in this bill, we are only at 95 percent of current services. That means that anytime we increased something in the bill over 95 percent of current services, we had to reduce some other program below that level.

We did increase a few items like the FBI, the DEA, the INS, the support of U.S. prisoners account where we are opening up some new prisons. We also increased the NIST, which is a high priority with both the administration and Members of the House. We also increased the international trade and some of the other programs.

The administration required all of the agencies, or virtually all of them, not quite all of them, to take some reduction in FTEs, and in administrative costs in order to comply with the overall mandate to have some deficit reduction. We usually accepted those. There are some exceptions such as the Border Patrol in INS. But all of these agencies that we took the reductions in testified that they could comply with the reductions.

So we have brought Members the best bill that we could under the circumstances, with very, very stringent and tight overall caps that were placed on us.

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

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we bring to the House today this bill for fiscal 1994 for Commerce, Justice, State. And in my 9 years on the subcommittee, this was by far the most difficult year we have had to face.

□ 1010

I believe it is merely a foreshadowing of the years to come.

We are living in an austere budget climate, constrained by the spending caps in the 1990 budget agreement. We must control spending, yet we have to fund important programs needed to meet the diverse interests of our Nation. Diverse and compelling interests are competing for scarce resources, and nowhere is this more evident than in the Commerce, Justice, State appropriations bill.

This bill funds programs to fight the war on crime and drugs, to promote economic development, to increase U.S. trade and competitiveness, and to build peace and democracy in this New World.

Scarce resources demand we make hard choices—we have to prioritize and have to streamline programs. And, while we did not agree on all priorities, overall the subcommittee made the tough choices needed to bring a good bill to the floor.

Mr. Chairman, as our chairman said, this is a lean bill. Total funding is \$756 million under our discretionary spending allocation, and \$249 million below fiscal 1993. In addition, the total is \$2 billion less than the President's request of us.

Consequently, we have cut 5 percent from the amount most programs need next year to operate at this year's level. For many of these programs, this comes on top of a 7 percent cut included in last year's bill.

Reflecting the need to put our own domestic needs first, we have cut spending for the Department of State and international programs 8 percent below the fiscal 1993 level, in that way freeing up funds for programs that help us here at home.

Having said that, Mr. Chairman, this bill still means real cuts in domestic programs that are of great concern to me, and I know others in the body.

While our spending constraints just did not allow us to fund more programs as we would have liked, we did do our best to channel our limited funds to a handful of very high priority areas.

In the Department of Justice, we have increased immigration inspectors at our borders, protected the border patrol from the cuts faced by other agencies, and provided funds to activate new prisons due to come on line in 1994, though with a slight delay.

For the Commerce Department, we have given significant increases to the administration's technology and manufacturing initiatives. The Economic Development Administration receives a slight increase over 1993, as does the weather service modernization program. Also, the Federal court system is given a substantial increase in this bill—12 percent over 1993 level. And, legal assistance to the poor receives a sizable 12-percent increase.

These two agencies are the ones that receive the highest increases in our proposals.

Mr. Chairman, now more than ever, this Congress must eliminate programs that have proven to be ineffective. A telling example comes in the area of broadcasting to Cuba. For several years, the evidence has overwhelmingly been mounting that TV Marti just does not work. Thus, our committee finally made the right choice by eliminating funding for TV Marti.

And finally, I want to bring to the Members attention an issue of extreme concern to me, and one that I believe should be of great concern to the Congress and the country—U.N. peacekeeping. Mr. Chairman, in the last 2 years, the number of peacekeeping operations has exploded to a record high—13 ongoing peacekeeping operations, somewhere in the World with the United Nations now considering even a 14th. The United States is assessed by the United Nations one-third of the cost, with the U.S. share for just these 13 operations

estimated at close to \$1 billion for this year, and another \$1 billion next year.

And, this is just the beginning. There are as many as 12 additional conflicts the United Nations may choose to become involved in, which will generate even greater bills.

And if they do, they simply send us the bill for 31.7 percent. That is not a figure we decided; that is a figure they decided. And I have some real problems with another body telling the U.S. Congress, "You shall pay X, Y, or Z because this is what we decided you should pay, and you shall send so many troops to a location on the other side of the world whether you like it or not." I have got a problem with that, Mr. Chairman, and I think the administration and the Congress are going to have to grapple with this right away because the list keeps exploding and American men and women are being exposed to even greater dangers every day, not to mention the dollars that we are talking about in this bill.

U.N. peacekeeping has evolved beyond the traditional role of ensuring the implementation of a truce, to imposing that truce with an international militia. U.S. dollars and U.S. manpower are being put on the line in great numbers, in settings that are remote, at best, to this Nation's security interests.

At the same time, all efforts to decrease the U.S. assessment for peacekeeping have fallen on deaf ears at the United Nations.

As the chairman knows, we only pay 25 percent of the operating costs of the United Nations. But for peacekeeping operations they bill us for 31.7 percent. Our friends in Japan pay around 8 percent, and our friends in Germany pay about 12 percent, and Uncle Sam pays 31.7 percent. I have got a problem with that.

All attempts to get the United Nations to adopt even the most basic of reforms, such as creating an inspector general so that we know how our monies are being spent, have fallen, again, on deaf ears. They refuse to do it. Mr. Chairman, I have got a problem with that.

Mr. Chairman, I question how much longer we can go home and defend our commitment of enormous funds and manpower to a peacekeeping process that is exploding in numbers and dollars and locations, with sometimes questionable results. As it stands, the United Nations is sending the U.S. bills which we cannot pay. This bill proves that fact. Mr. Chairman, we have included less than half the amount that we may be asked to contribute for our share of these 13 peacekeeping operations. We cannot afford to pay the bills that they are sending us.

Therefore, I urge that both the Congress and the administration address this important area of issues.

Mr. Chairman, our subcommittee was faced with a difficult task, and I be-

lieve we have risen to the challenge. I commend my chairman, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH], and all members of the subcommittee. We have several new members on the subcommittee who have rendered great service to us this year. We congratulate them and all of our staff on both sides of the aisle for their great work and long hours in preparing this bill.

Mr. Chairman, we bring to the House a good bill, one I believe all Members can support. I therefore urge support of this bill.

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

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations.

□ 1020

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary appropriations bill for fiscal year 1994. This is the 10th appropriations bill for fiscal year 1994 to come before the House.

We on the committee want to thank Members on both sides of the aisle for their support and assistance. We would not be at this point without that taking place.

I want to commend the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH], chairman of the Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Appropriations Subcommittee, and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], the ranking minority member on the subcommittee on the excellent job they have done in bringing out this bill.

Mr. Chairman, this bill provides for important law enforcement, business promotion, and research and technical assistance funding. It also provides funding for the State Department and for important U.N. peacekeeping activities. This is a difficult bill to develop under constrained funding. The subcommittee has done an excellent job.

Mr. Chairman, they have an excellent staff on this subcommittee. Time after time, long after we, the Members in the House, are at home, this staff is still on Capitol Hill gathering the facts and preparing reports on our bills, to assist us, and we appreciate it.

This is the fifth appropriations bill to be considered this week. I want to thank all Members from both sides of the aisle for their cooperation on these bills, and again I want to commend the chairman and the ranking minority member and all the other members of the subcommittee for a good job. This is an excellent subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of this bill.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to a member of the full committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from Kentucky for bringing a very fine bill to the floor. They have prioritized spending within very constrained parameters and have stayed below their 602(b)'s while funding a number of very important national priorities. I must mention, however, Mr. Chairman, a very high priority issue that I believe was overlooked in this bill.

The United States entered binding financial obligations under international law when it signed the historic Chemical Weapons Convention on January 13, 1992. Total U.S. commitment for fiscal year 1994 is \$16 million, but funds to meet these obligations were not included in this bill.

Unlike many earlier arms control agreements, the Chemical Weapons Convention requires that critical verification and other implementation procedures be developed between signing and ratification, so that compliance can be verified from the moment the Convention enters into force. It specifies that this work will be done by a preparatory commission. By signing the Chemical Weapons Convention, the United States concurred in the establishment of this preparatory commission and, under international law, committed to pay \$16 million, approximately 25 percent of the commission's expenses.

In order for the Secretariat to be operational by January 1995, the prepcom must begin work no later than January 1994. Failure to meet this international obligation could undermine many nations' ratification of the convention and severely hamper the Secretariat's ability to implement the convention.

I understand the constraints faced by the gentlemen from Iowa and Kentucky in this bill, but I believe that making a small investment to end the threat of chemical weapons is a very high priority. I hope that the gentlemen would look favorably on working in conference to provide these funds.

I am also very concerned about the future of our Nation's international broadcasting. During the campaign, Bill Clinton announced that he strongly supported creating a surrogate radio broadcast to beam messages of truth and freedom to the people of China and other tightly controlled, politically repressive nations in Asia, Burma, Tibet, Laos, North Korea, Cambodia, and Vietnam. The President's budget requested \$30 million for such a program.

The State Department authorization bill that passed the House 2 weeks ago contains a provision clearing the way for creation of surrogate radio broadcasts to China and other Asian nations. The bill that we are considering tonight, however, except for two sen-

tences of report language that was included at full committee at my request, makes no mention of Radio Free Asia and provides no funds for such a program. Instead, it appears that we are going to defer to some future Senate action on this issue and perhaps try to work something out in conference. Why do it this way? Apparently, the White House has not yet made up its mind.

Despite the tremendous wave of democracy sweeping across the world, China, North Korea, Tibet, Vietnam, Burma, and other Asian nations are not sharing in this surge of political freedom. We can, in a cost effective way, help promote positive change from within these nations by providing factual information specifically relevant to the people who live there through surrogate broadcasts.

I am very disappointed that this bill does not speak forcefully to this issue. I urge the Chairman and Mr. ROGERS to work with the Senate to find funds to create surrogate radios to Asia.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS].

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, this is my first year of service on the subcommittee, and I want to commend the chairman, Mr. SMITH, and my subcommittee colleagues on both sides of the aisle for producing a bipartisan, balanced bill. We tried to satisfy the needs of the diverse agencies under our jurisdiction, while at the same time paying attention to the chorus that is echoing throughout the land to cut spending. We have done both.

This bill was about setting priorities. We were working with a tight budget, and we approved a bill that's nearly \$2 billion under the President's request and \$600 million less than we're spending this year.

I want to point out that this bill contains specific spending cuts—the specific cuts that the mass-mailing fund-raisers, the talk-show hosts, and some of the so-called good government groups have accused President Clinton and Congress of not making. One good example is our broadcasts to Cuba, which, by most objective accounts are as ineffective as they are expensive. Our subcommittee eliminated—for a number of reasons—funding for both TV and Radio Marti. I wish the full Appropriations Committee had held the line against both Radio and TV Marti, but it restored part of the funding for radio.

I am satisfied, though, that we did not restore funds for TV Marti. At least we will not continue to spend \$28,000 an hour to broadcast Popeye cartoons and Lifestyles of the Rich and Famous to Cuba, broadcasts that have consistently been blocked by the Cuban

Government, and which apparently reach Cuba for only a few minutes in the wee hours of the night.

We know how difficult it is to pull the plug on a program, even programs as ineffective as this one. I continue to believe that the country shouldn't be borrowing additional millions to fund broadcasts to Cuba, and I think the Coloradans who have been flooding my office with cut-spending-first postcards would agree.

By making cuts elsewhere in the bill, we were able to increase funding for NOAA, NIST, and NTIA programs that can play a major role in revitalizing our economy. The administration requested, and I strongly support, targeted increases in NOAA, NIST, and NTIA programs that invest in scientific research and the application of that research to strengthen the economy.

During our recent debates on the space station and the SSC, we have talked at great length about scientific research and the role the Federal Government should play in it. These three Commerce Department agencies deal with precisely the type of research and applied technology we should be encouraging, and I am pleased the committee was able to do so.

Most Americans are familiar with the good work of these agencies; they just are not aware who's doing it. When we watch the weather reports on the television news, we are impressed with the Doppler radar pictures that show approaching storms. But we probably don't know that the Doppler radar was developed in NOAA's labs. And we probably do not know that the weather satellite pictures are often transmitted from a NOAA satellite. And who is showing managers of marinas, resorts, and fishing docks how to deal with the tons of smelly waste that are left over from commercial and sport fishing? That's NOAA, too.

President Clinton, along with trying to make a dent in the Federal deficit, is trying to reverse 12 years of a hands-off attitude toward American business. He realizes that the Federal Government has to work hand-in-hand with our industries if we hope to stay competitive in the 21st century. The Federal agency that will be leading the charge is the one that has been working with American businesses for over 90 years: The National Institute of Standards and Technology [NIST]. I am proud that the committee has committed itself to helping finance this investment in our future by funding, as much as is possible in these tight fiscal times, NIST's efforts.

We have seen a multitude of articles recently about the information superhighway. This is a concept whose possibilities we are just beginning to realize, and it is one in which American industry has—and should have—the lead. But we have to make absolutely certain that, in dealing with a system as

enormous and complex as this, we are all singing from the same hymnal. The National Telecommunications and Information Administration [NTIA] is helping write that hymnal—or at least it is making sure the hymns are numbered the same in everyone's book. Without some kind of universal standards for operation, the superhighway could easily become filled with potholes. NTIA will help set those standards, and the committee has recognized the importance of NTIA's activity.

This bill also tackles the need for serious, responsible reforms in a number of important areas. The committee's report includes language supporting the administration's efforts to help make significant improvements in the financial management and administration of the United Nations, and to negotiate a more equitable assessment rate for the United States share of U.N. peacekeeping operations. I am a strong supporter of American participation in this body, but I recognize that improvements can—and must—be made if we are to convince the American taxpayer that U.N. operations are a solid and fair investment.

The committee also included language, which I requested, in its report regarding the need to reform the government's security classification system. The committee supports the President's decision to establish a task force that will produce a comprehensive post-cold war plan that addresses the current problem of over-classification of documents. This practice costs too much, both in dollars and in the ability of a democratic society to function. The committee expects that these new rules and procedures will mean future savings, and has directed the Departments of Commerce, State, and Justice to submit detailed reports on classification-related expenditures and specific plans for reducing costs in the next fiscal year.

We've also made some important strides in making our criminal justice system more effective and responsible to public need. The committee has included \$16 million more than the adjusted current services level in the salaries and expenses account for the courts of appeals, district courts, and other judicial services, directing that this money is to be used to meet the highest priority needs of the Federal courts. Certainly, this could fund much, if not all, of the expenses necessary to add the 35 new bankruptcy judges we authorized during the 102d Congress. With the nearly threefold increases in bankruptcy filings over the last 12 years, these new judges are sorely needed. One of these judges would sit in my home State, and I hope that serious consideration is given to spending at least part of the \$16 million on funding for these new bankruptcy judgeships.

The bill also provides \$297,252 million for defender services and \$77,095 million

for fees for jurors. At these levels, we should avoid the problems we faced in the current fiscal year, when the courts came close to running out of money. That financial crisis led to a proposal to cancel civil trials to ensure that criminal trials could continue throughout the fiscal year. We have a constitutional obligation to provide access to the courts for civil litigants, and we should never put the courts in the position of having to close the courthouse door to those entitled to their day in court. I'm pleased that we haven't done that with this bill.

I'm also pleased that the committee was able to increase funding for the Legal Services Corporation [LSC]. The \$400 million we propose is far less than the LSC requested, and far less than it needs. One of the basic principles of our system of justice that every American has a right to a fair hearing in a court of law. That right is an empty one without legal counsel, and so we have some obligation to provide legal representation to people who can't afford it. This is important in civil cases, too, not just in criminal ones. The LSC is an essential part of the effort to provide this assistance. I support their efforts and hope that we will be able to provide more resources for this valuable program in the future.

Another important step we have taken in this bill is to eliminate the restriction on the use of Federal funding to provide abortion services to women incarcerated in Federal facilities. This restriction affects only a very few women each year, but most of them are too poor to afford the costs of an abortion on their own. I believe that it is particularly cruel to force a woman to carry to term an unwanted pregnancy behind bars. The forced delivery is only the tragic prelude to the mandatory relinquishment of the child that immediately follows.

To summarize, the Mr. Chairman, this is a good, taut bill. It finances the necessary functions of government, and it takes into account the need to put our Federal financial house in order. I urge its passage.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to a very hard-working member of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by commending my colleagues, the chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] and the ranking Republican, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] for the outstanding job that they have done on this legislation.

It has been said and will continue to be said during the course of this debate that this is a responsible and a fair bill. I think that is true.

I also think it should be said that the way they deal with other subcommittee members and our staffs is something to be commended, and I thank

them for the courtesies they have shown us.

The fact that it is a fair bill I think is demonstrated by the numbers. I doubt that there are very many appropriation bills that we are considering this year that are as much below the fiscal year 1993 enacted levels as this bill is—about \$602 million, to be exact, below last year's enacted levels and \$2 billion below the administration's request.

While I support the overall outcome of this, I do want to take this time to share some of my concerns about some of the priorities, or I should say some of the misplaced priorities in the bill.

As my colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] has suggested, we are concerned about the amount of money that is in here or not in here in the area of law enforcement for Justice Department programs for which our subcommittee has responsibility.

For example, support for the detention of U.S. prisoners, that is, Federal prisoners being held, is \$50 million below the President's request and will result in funding 874,000 fewer jail days than originally estimated. That means Federal prisoners will have to be discharged in a fashion that does not support the safety of the American public.

So I think we should be very concerned by the fact we are not providing enough funds for maintaining people in the prisons that we have already built.

More funding is clearly needed for the Immigration Service. We have been hearing a lot these days about the growing crisis in Immigration, and this bill reduces funding from the President's request for the INS along our border.

□ 1030

The FBI and the DEA, the Drug Enforcement Agency, have also been reduced below the President's request. So, I have concerns about funding in law enforcement areas. But I want to, particularly at this time as we talk about those decreases, emphasize where there has been an increase that I have a real concern about, and that is in the area of the industrial services account. It is called the industrial technology services account in the Department of Commerce.

In 1993 we enacted \$86 million. The President requested \$233 million. Now our mark was considerably below that, at \$162 million, but an increase of almost 100 percent.

The problem here, Mr. Chairman, is a matter of priority. I understand the President's request. I understand his view that the Federal Government can assist the private sector in trying to identify those technologies which will work and which can be developed.

There are two particular programs here that we are talking about: the advanced technology program, or ATP, and the manufacturing extension partnership, or MEP. Those are the two big ones.

Now ATP's purpose is, and I quote from the budget justification, "to share the cost of high risk research projects with U.S. companies and industry led joint ventures seeking to develop new, precompetitive, generic technologies." The MEP programs; that is, the manufacturing extension partnership, is one that is, and I quote, to assist manufacturers to modernize their production capability.

In both of these cases I think we are making a mistake. I do not believe Federal Government should indulge in an industrial policy that tries to pick winners and losers among new emerging technologies. I simply do not think it works. I do not think it can be done.

If we want to look at an example where it has failed, we need only look at Britain where the Government tried very specifically to pick out technologies and to assist those technologies. It simply does not work. The Government does not know how to pick those technologies. The private sector marketplace knows how to do that.

Having said that, I do want to again reiterate that I appreciate the hard decisions that have been made in this bill by the chairman and the members of the subcommittee. I may disagree on some of the priorities, but I certainly commend the overall levels of funding in this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, these are tough times, and I think we have made some tough choices, and I commend the subcommittee for its work.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN].

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the subcommittee, I rise in strong support of the fiscal year 1994 Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary appropriations bill.

Under the expert leadership of our able chairman and ranking member, we have put together a bill that is truly responsive to the needs of our Nation.

As always, Chairman SMITH has acted with the utmost fairness in conducting the business of the subcommittee.

We have done our best to increase funding for the Commerce Department. The President has targeted this agency as the engine of his competitiveness agenda. At the National Institute of Standards and Technology, funding for the advanced technology program will enable the Department of Commerce to continue its initiative to provide matching support to industry-led proposals for precompetitive, high-risk, generic technologies. Further, increases for the manufacturing extension program will enable the Commerce Department to continue the deployment of manufacturing centers and outreach initiatives. This means that our small and Medium-size manufacturers will get the help that they need to bring new technology to the shop floors.

I am pleased to report that the committee has provided a 2-percent increase over fiscal year 1993 levels for the Economic Development Administration. The EDA provides grants to assist economic development activities: For planning and coordination and other financial assistance that help reduce substantial and persistent unemployment in economically distressed areas.

Under the Small Business Administration, this bill provides funds for programs which are extremely beneficial to small business owners and individuals seeking to start their own businesses. A good number of these programs are geared toward helping people who are struggling to overcome a barrier—a handicap or some financial disadvantage—to achieve the American dream.

I have long been a supporter of the invaluable assistance that both EDA and SBA bring to my constituents, as West Virginia felt the effect of economic downturn over a decade ago. For my colleagues who represent districts currently under economic distress, I ask you to make a special note of the resources in these two programs and give these agencies your personal support.

This bill provides increases for certain priority programs in the Justice Department to continue the war on drugs and crime—including justice assistance programs, organized crime, drug enforcement, FBI, DEA, Immigration and Naturalization Service, and Federal prison salaries and expenses. In addition, this legislation takes important initiatives in the area of juvenile justice programs. We have provided funds for the expansion of a program to prevent and reduce the participation of at-risk youth in gangs, and have funded regional and local children's advocacy centers to coordinate assistance for victims of child abuse.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this appropriations bill.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], a very hard-working member of the full committee.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, without question my district is one of the hardest hit by the flow of illegal immigrants. We rely on the Border Patrol to help stem the flow of illegal immigrants over our border.

This bill includes an increase of \$6.4 million over the administration's budget request for the Border Patrol. This level of funding is intended to allow the Patrol to maintain its current level of agents.

Although I would like to see a much greater funding increase for the Border Patrol, I appreciate the attention given to the Patrol by Chairman SMITH and ranking member HAL ROGERS.

I wish I could offer the same regards to the Clinton administration. Under

the budget request submitted to Congress, the administration directed the INS to make cuts to the Border Patrol over and above those already made. We cannot afford these cuts.

The Border Patrol is already seriously underfunded. Along the 14-mile San Diego-Mexico border, understaffed Border Patrol are trying to turn back 3,000 to 4,500 illegal aliens every night. Over half a million illegal immigrants enter California every year.

Once illegal aliens are across the border, costs associated with these aliens increase tenfold. Unfortunately, the tab is picked up by the Federal, State, and local taxpayers at a cost of \$5 billion a year.

If the administration is serious about improving our immigration policy, a good place to start is to beef up the Border Patrol and give them the resources they need to stop the flood of illegal immigrants coming over the border.

While I greatly appreciate the willingness of the committee to work with us, there simply is not enough funding for the Border Patrol in this bill or in the administration's request. I hope to work with the administration and the committee to secure sufficient funding for the Border Patrol.

□ 1040

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to address some of the issues raised by this bill regarding funding for law enforcement. First, I would like to commend Chairman SMITH and Chairman NATCHER for their work on this bill and for making their best efforts to fully fund law enforcement within the limitations of a very tight budget. They did their best to make special accommodations for accounts within the war on crime and drugs such as the organized crime task forces, the DEA, the FBI and others. If I had my way, Mr. Chairman, I would put even more resources into law enforcement but we have to do the best we can during times of austerity. I think this bill does the best it can in that regard.

There is one item I would like to address specifically and that is the area of Federal assistance to State and local law enforcement, specifically the Edward Byrne Memorial Drug Grants. One of the most important things that the Federal Government can do to help fight crime in my view is to provide assistance to State and local efforts. This bill provides for a cut of approximately \$100 million from last year's appropriation in the formula grant part of the Byrne program. That cut, unfortunately, means less money for State and local law enforcement in every State. In the case of my State, New York, it comes to about \$7 million.

Now, to be sure, some of that is made up through establishment of a new, \$56

million special discretionary grant program which will fund four programs: Community policing, the FBI's NCIC 2000 system, the Washington Regional Task Force and police overtime. Two points about this new program: First, I support all four of these initiatives. No one in the Congress is a bigger supporter of community policing than this Member. In fact, I wrote a community policing cop-on-the-beat program for the crime bill last year. However, I would prefer that programs like this be written by the authorizing committees before they are funded. Second, I would also prefer that these programs be funded without having to make a 25-percent reduction in Federal block grant support of State and local law enforcement. The loss of that money is going to disrupt State and local law enforcement funding in every State. Finally, this bill provides for an increase in juvenile justice funding of another \$56 million over last year—again, an admirable goal but not when it comes at the expense of desperately needed aid to the front lines of the war on crime—State and local law enforcement.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak about the amendment that I am going to offer. I want to thank the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], and I also want to thank the chairman, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH], for the work that they did in trying to restore the Border Patrol moneys back up to at least the level of last year. We appreciate that deeply.

The problem is that the problem of smuggling of illegal immigrants and narcotics across the borders of the United States has grown by leaps and bounds. There is absolutely a torrent of cocaine flooding through the land borders right now.

We have increased the interdiction of cocaine in the California-Mexico border by 1,000 percent over the last several years. According to the GAO, 20 percent of the Federal inmate population are illegal aliens. The social service costs for California and every State in the Union has gone up markedly as a result of delivery of services to illegal aliens.

We have estimated in San Diego County that we spend \$143 million a year in unreimbursed costs for social and criminal justice costs for illegal aliens. We have extrapolated that out to a cost that we feel is fairly reliable of \$3 billion a year paid in California for social services and justice costs and other costs for illegal aliens.

Mr. Chairman, we have had now an increase of 1,000 percent of Chinese illegal aliens coming across the land border between Mexico and the United

States over just the last 4 months of the year. That is, over 500 Chinese illegal aliens have been arrested coming across the land border.

Lastly, and perhaps most critical, Mr. Chairman, we have done an experiment in which we took illegal aliens who had been convicted of major crimes. After they did their time in the United States we sent them in deep repatriation to Mexico City. So far 34 of those 300 criminal aliens have been recaptured coming back across the border between the United States and Mexico.

Mr. Chairman, if you consider that at any given time our Border Patrol is so small that we only have about 50 to 60 agents on the entire California-Mexico border, and if you consider the fact that in excess of 5 illegal aliens come through for every 1 that is captured, that means that roughly half of these criminal aliens have already made their way back into the United States.

Mr. Chairman, there are many reasons, with our very liberal immigration policy, for having a border that has integrity. And that requires people. We need desperately to add about 2,000 border patrolmen to our present force.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I am going to offer will add some 600 Border Patrol agents. It is not up to what we need, but it will help us greatly. I hope that every Member will support this amendment.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank Chairman SMITH, Chairman NATCHER, and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], for offering the bill and doing such a good job for law enforcement.

Mr. Chairman, in California we are being overrun. Over 50 percent of the children born in Los Angeles County Hospital, over 50 percent of the children born in that hospital are to illegal aliens. "20/20" did an expose showing the costs to the Federal Government. They then go down and collect Medicaid. They are coming up with a health care bill in the Senate and the House, and you can imagine the costs that are being passed on.

Twenty-five percent of the felons in California prisons are illegal aliens. We would like to even ship them back to where their home country is, but we cannot do that because of our own laws.

At Palomar Hospital last month, Dr. Brown told me about an illegal that was in a knife fight and needed a \$200,000 operation. Of course, he cannot pay for it. That cost goes on to the hospital. Who has to pay for that?

Drivers in my district, two families have been totally destroyed by illegal aliens driving with no driver's licenses and no ability to pursue that.

San Diego County Sheriff Jim Roache is having to turn out convicted

felons out of the system because there is no room. Over 25 percent of those people are illegal aliens.

Drugs, I have been on eight drug raids in San Diego with local law enforcement. Every single one of them had illegal aliens dealing drugs. State Senator Craven and Governor Wilson released information on the cost to the State of California and the Federal Government: \$2 billion to the State of California for illegal aliens in health care, in education, and in law enforcement.

Mr. Chairman, the money that we put in to stop this will come back one hundredfold, just to stop the flow of illegal immigration.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO].

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in praise of the work that has been done on this bill, and especially to praise the committee for the fact that they had the wisdom to exclude from consideration TV Marti, a Government-funded station which supposedly beams information about democracy into Cuba.

The fact of life is that TV Marti has been a total failure. It has been seen, according to people who keep a watch on this, a couple of times during its first 3 years of existence. During that time it was able to beam some Popeye cartoons. Now, I am a big Popeye fan, but I do not think that is what we should be sending to Cuba to bring about political changes.

Second, there is a balloon, a technological balloon, that brings the signal across to Cuba, which is called Fat Albert. The balloon tends to get loose every so often and travel throughout the Everglades, where we have to spend money tracking it down.

It is almost difficult not to laugh when we talk about TV Marti, because it is supposed to be a very serious subject. But it is a very serious waste of money.

□ 1050

By allowing the committee the opportunity to say, we really do not want to fund this any longer, we are sending a clear message. First, that we shall not be wasting money. Second, that perhaps there are better ways of dealing with this issue and bringing out this information than having this totally failed enterprise. And third, I would say that TV Marti is just another example of what could very well be a failed policy on our part in trying to bring about political changes in Cuba.

There are certainly other ways to accomplish that. There are ways not to accomplish that. TV Marti is the most glaring example of how we do not accomplish these political changes.

I want to congratulate the committee on the fact that they had the wisdom not to include Fat Albert and this wasted time in the appropriation.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Let me just say that may two colleagues who spoke previously, from California, illuminated an issue that is extremely important to the people of this country and the taxpayers of this country. We have a virtual tidal wave of illegal aliens coming across the Mexican-American border. We have problems on both the east and the west coast as well.

But the real major problem is that 1,980 border between us and Mexico. I was just in Mexico about 2½ weeks ago. I found that we are getting about 2.2 million illegal aliens crossing that border per year. We are sending about half of them back, but we are keeping 1 to 1.2 million illegal aliens in this country. They are going all over the place, but particularly in the Southwest and in California.

Last year, I hope all my colleagues will pay attention to this and everybody in the country, last year there were 37,000 illegal alien births in Los Angeles County alone, in one county, in Los Angeles County, CA, there were 37,000 illegal alien children born last year alone. Each one of those children, when they are born, are eligible for AFDC payments of about \$620 per month. That is \$25 million a month in welfare payments to illegal alien children in one county in one State in the whole country.

Now, we have to do something about that. The taxpayers of this country do not want their money spent for that purpose.

How do we do it? Well, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] has suggested that we get 600 more Border Patrol people on that border. Granted, that is not enough, but that is a step in the right direction.

I am going to propose an amendment today that will cut the Commerce Department back to the rate of inflation. In other words, we will increase their budget to the rate of inflation.

If we cut it back to that level in this bill, we will save \$60 million, and that will pay for the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], which will put 600 more Border Patrol people on that border to keep these illegal aliens out.

I am telling Members, it is a major, major problem. The welfare benefits, the benefits for prenatal care and for postnatal care for these people, the health benefits, all that stuff adds up to billion of dollars that we cannot afford with the huge deficit that we are incurring right now.

I applaud that gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER]. I hope we will look with favor upon his amendment. I hope we will look with favor upon my amendment, which will provide the funds for what he wants to do by cutting back to the rate of inflation the Department of Commerce appropriation.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH].

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee to engage in a colloquy.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I would like to discuss a matter of vital importance to the victims of Hurricane Andrew in my district and across south Florida. I am concerned that funds appropriated in the past for hurricane relief efforts are being used in areas that did not suffer any hurricane damage, while other areas of Dade County which were completely destroyed continue to suffer.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The gentleman is referring to the \$50 million appropriated in the emergency supplemental last year. We put it under EDA, but they are to make grants for economic development in disaster-impacted areas.

Mr. DEUTSCH. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

However, I have learned that several of the grants the EDA has made, or is considering making in Florida, are for projects that are not in hurricane-damaged areas. Specifically, a \$2.5 million grant went to make renovations to the Omni Mall in Miami, which was not at all affected by the hurricane. The EDA is also considering a \$5.5 million grant to the Wynwood Foreign Trade Zone, which also lies outside the hurricane impacted area. I would like to express my concern to the committee, and the Congress; and to request that the inspector general of the Commerce Department conduct an investigation to determine what funds were spent outside the FEMA-designated hurricane impacted areas.

I would also ask that an attempt be made to target any funds not yet obligated toward areas directly impacted by the hurricane, and which lie within the FEMA designated hurricane impact area.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the Commerce Department to look into the gentleman's concerns and to respond to the committee as soon as possible.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS].

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the chairman of the appropriations subcommittee. I am trying to work my way through this budget.

I have a question in regard to the Small Business Administration. My question is, Can the gentleman assure the body that there are no funds included in the Small Business Administration budget, either in the salaries and expenses or any other part of the budget money, for the tree-planting program?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCINNIS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, the salaries and expenses account is where that is carried and until it is earmarked, it is possible the item is in the appropriations bill. But also the Small Business Development Center Program is in there, and numerous other programs are in salaries and expenses.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Chairman, a further question. Does the gentleman know the amount? I understand it is approximately \$16 million in salary and expenses.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, there is no amount earmarked in our bill.

Mr. MCINNIS. But there is money that can be allocated?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. It is an authorized program, and any authorized program under salaries and expenses could be funded.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Chairman, again, for another question, is there an authorized amount?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. There is an authorized amount. The authorization is for \$30 million.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I quickly want to congratulate the committee. This is a very ambitious bill. I am not a member of the committee, but I was given the opportunity to testify before the committee.

In my prior political life, I was a prosecutor. This bill contains good funding for prosecutors that want to get involved in child abuse issues, particularly child sexual abuse issues.

We started a new program in our district, the Children's Advocacy Center Program. That funding is included in this bill, as well.

I want to congratulate the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill. It is a good bill. I would like to thank Chairman NATCHER for his leadership in bringing this bill to the floor as expeditiously as possible. Also, I would like to thank Chairman SMITH for his genuine commitment to effective and successful programs that are contained in this bill. Representatives MOLLOHAN and MORAN were helpful in listening to the requests of this Member and offering sound advice.

I rise in strong support of the juvenile justice programs that are contained in this bill. The bill speaks directly to preventing the physical abuse and sexual abuse of children. Funding is available until expended for section 213 of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 for regional children's advocacy centers and section 214 of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 for local children's advocacy centers.

Section 6 of Public Law 102-586, the Children's Advocacy Program, establishes a program to focus attention on child victims by assisting communities in developing child-focused, community-oriented, facility-based programs designed to improve the resources available to children and families; provide support for nonoffending family members; enhance coordination among community agencies and professionals in the multidisciplinary approach to child abuse so that trained medical personnel will be available to provide medical support of community agencies and professionals involved in the intervention, prevention, prosecution, and investigation systems that respond to child abuse cases.

Before I discuss the substantive law, I would like to present some guiding principles that we must follow in order to effectively prevent child abuse. Then I would like to discuss the importance of the use of multidisciplinary teams and a community approach to prevent child physical abuse and child sexual abuse. First, society needs to convey a clear message that sexual abuse of children is unacceptable behavior. Second, we need a criminal justice system that is responsible for helping and protecting child victims and holding offenders accountable. Third, the needs of the child victim must be foremost in our minds and we must work to ensure that children are not at risk from further revictimization from the very system designed to protect them. Fourth, there must be a coordination of activity of all involved public and private agencies to intervene in the lives of abused children in a meaningful way and to insure that the judicial system does not revictimize them through repetitious interviews and examinations. Fifth, coordination of activities and services, without a doubt, must exist at the Federal level.

Pursuant to Public Law 102-586 the term "multidisciplinary response to child abuse" means a response to child abuse that is based on mutually agreed upon procedures among the community agencies and professionals involved in the intervention, prevention, prosecution, and investigation systems that best meets the needs of child victims and their nonoffending family members. The cornerstone of an effective child abuse program like the Children's Advocacy Center programs is the use of multidisciplinary teams. A multidisciplinary team consists of representatives from law enforcement, child protective services, victim advocates, medicine and mental health who meet on a regular basis to review cases and issue joint recommendations in the best interest of each child.

The primary goals of a multidisciplinary team include elimination of duplicative efforts by professionals, protection of the child and the child's family from further abuse and trauma; rapid successful investigation and prosecution of alleged offenders of child sexual abuse; and assurance of specialized thera-

peutic care to meet the needs of child and family. All of these goals can be achieved through the coordination of community agencies and professionals involved in the intervention system.

Multidisciplinary teams minimize the trauma children can suffer during the investigation and intervention process, promote better understanding of and respect for other team member's role and expertise, and facilitate more informed case management decisions. As the members of a team build working relationships, communication between agencies becomes easier and the coordination of services begins to fall into place.

It is important to realize that multidisciplinary teams are not meant to replace any existing profession, agency or individual. They are intended to strengthen and build interagency and professional relationships. Each community has its own service network with individual strong points and weaknesses. Each multidisciplinary team should be tailored to incorporate the strengths and unique characteristics of its own community network.

Multidisciplinary teams can weave the service delivery system together in such a way that effective case management will occur, in conjunction with the most effective use of effort and time by the professionals and families involved. Multidisciplinary teams provide a means to better use existing resources while improving service to child victims of sexual abuse and physical abuse.

Let me share with you one of the most persuasive reasons a multidisciplinary approach is warranted. It is important for us to recognize that abused children are revictimized when they are bounced from agency to agency where professionals have no specialized training or knowledge of the needs of children. Children in such a setting are subjected to multiple investigative interviews, and persons responsible for intervening on behalf of child victims exercise little or no coordination or teamwork.

When the term "revictimization" is used, it may come across as being too bureaucratic or too academic. What is meant by the term revictimization? How is a victim of physical or sexual child abuse revictimized by a system that exists to help victims? The manner in which a child is treated during the first interviews greatly affects the child's ability to withstand the pressures inherent in involvement with the child protection and criminal justice systems. Also, it has an impact on the child's mental health. Multiple interviews involving multiple investigators at multiple locations in a short period of time can be very traumatic to a child.

The revictimization can occur at various intervals. It can occur when an untrained police officer questions the child for hours in the morning at a police station, again in the afternoon when a doctor examines and questions the child, and again the next day when a representative from a child services agency interviews the child. Multiple and uncoordinated interviews by untrained or improperly trained individuals can be confusing, frightening, and embarrassing to the child. The result is that a case falls through the cracks. The revictimization leads to the child recanting the story. This can allow an offender to walk away free. We must eliminate institutional revictimization.

Thus, it is simply not enough for us to train prosecutors under one program, train doctors under a separate program, and train children's advocates under yet another program. The approach at the local level, on the frontlines, must be a coordinated multidisciplinary team approach. Additionally, coordination must exist at the Federal level. Thus our approach must be two-pronged.

Effective intervention becomes prevention. The children's advocacy program approach creates a system and develops resources that deter more abuse, strengthen children and families, hold offenders accountable, and reduce juvenile delinquency and other criminal behavior.

It is my desire as the author of the authorizing legislation to see an expeditious implementation of the Children's Advocacy Program. The program is based on a successful model that I initiated as the district attorney of Madison County, AL. I am proud of the Center in Huntsville. It has become a national model in developing a comprehensive, multidisciplinary response to child abuse that is designed to meet the needs of child victims and their families. We have an excellent staff of professionals who are experienced in providing remedial counseling to children and families. For years we have acted as a national training and education center, and as a resource facility. The Children's Advocacy Center in Huntsville has been effective in helping communities resolve problems that may occur during the development, operation, and implementation of a multidisciplinary program that responds to child abuse. Additionally, we have provided technical assistance to communities nationwide with respect to the judicial handling of child abuse and neglect.

The purpose and mission of the Children's Advocacy Program is to provide technical assistance, training and networking opportunities to help communities establish, and maintain child abuse prevention, intervention, prosecution and investigation programs which provide quality services for helping victims of child abuse.

First, it establishes the Regional Children's Advocacy Centers. The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Office will work in coordination with the Office for Victims of Crime and the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect to establish a children's advocacy program to focus attention on child victims by assisting communities in developing child-focused, community-oriented, facility-based programs designed to improve the resources available to children and families. These three Federal agencies do have an optimal working relationship in this area. It is incumbent, therefore, that they have the opportunity to work together and coordinate activities.

The regional center's purpose will be to provide information, services, and technical assistance to aid communities in establishing multidisciplinary programs that respond to child abuse. The number of communities that call the Huntsville Children's Advocacy Center for help is very significant. When I was district attorney, I traveled repeatedly across this country working with many communities. The Huntsville Center continues this important outreach program.

Second, the Children's Advocacy Program establishes Local Children's Advocacy Centers. This section compliments and enhances work that was carried out in 1990 by, among others, Senator BIDEN, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee. These centers will be the local community arms working on child abuse cases. Local involvement and empowerment are the driving principles of this approach. Thus, a community can develop a program that fits its unique needs.

The Children's Advocacy Program accomplishes two other goals. It directs grant recipients to consult with each other on a regular basis to exchange ideas, share information, and review children's advocacy program activities. Second, it establishes a children's advocacy advisory board that will provide guidance and oversight in implementing the selection criteria and operation of the regional children's advocacy program. The board shall consist of individuals who are experienced in the child abuse investigation, prosecution, prevention, and intervention systems.

Implementation of the Children's Advocacy Program will break the cycles of abuse and neglect which take a devastating toll on our society. Numerous publications, such as the *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* and the *Journal of Family Violence* tell of the direct correlation between child abuse and adult drug addiction and sexual abuse. A recent National Institute of Justice study found that "childhood victimization represents a widespread, serious social problem that increases the likelihood of delinquency, adult criminality, and violent criminal behavior." By effectively addressing the needs of abused children and intervening in their lives, advocacy programs help eliminate this costly and detrimental pattern.

The Children's Advocacy Program continues a history of involvement by the Federal Government as both an advocate for the Nation's children and as a provider of services on their behalf. Multidisciplinary teams improve services and maximize the use of limited resources. In Huntsville, AL, we serve about 240 child sexual victims annually. Almost 50 percent of the cases are referred for prosecution and nearly 100 percent of these result in guilty pleas or convictions. This was achieved by implementing an approach that focuses on the child.

If our society is ever to convey the clear message that the sexual abuse and physical abuse of children is not an acceptable behavior, then we must redesign the systems responsible for helping and protecting child victims so that the children benefit and offenders are held accountable.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my thanks to Chairman SMITH for responding favorably to my request to include language in the report on this bill indicating that the committee expects FBI Director William Sessions to fulfill his pledge to find jobs in this area for Identification Division employees who cannot and do not wish to move to West Virginia once the division is relocated there.

In 1991, I contacted Director Sessions and expressed my concern about the fate of em-

ployees who could not relocate. The Director promised me personally that these employees would be afforded another job with the FBI in this area at a comparable pay rate. This promise was not made lightly, but as a matter of elementary fairness to the employees, especially those not highly salaried whose personal and family position made it impossible to move.

When it was recently brought to my attention that the Director was considering renegeing on his commitment, thereby placing many of my constituents at risk of losing their jobs, I immediately wrote him seeking assurance that his commitment still stands. I have yet to hear back from the Director on this matter.

Earlier this month, when the Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights marked up the FBI's reauthorization bill, I wrote Chairman DON EDWARDS to express my strong support for a provision he included requiring the FBI to fulfill this commitment, a commitment which was reaffirmed by both Director Sessions and Deputy Assistant Director Stanley Klein during testimony given before that subcommittee in 1991 and 1992.

It would be unconscionable to permit the Bureau to step back from a commitment which was not only made personally to me, but to a subcommittee of the House. Chairman SMITH, your action on this matter today, and the action taken by Chairman EDWARDS, will help to ensure that the Identification Division's employees are able to continue their careers with the FBI.

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Chairman, today, I rise in strong support of the amendment by my friend and colleague, DUNCAN HUNTER, which would increase the appropriation for the Border Patrol by \$60 million. As my colleagues must know, the condition of the Californian economy is terrible. The lingering recession, the massive defense cuts that the State is asked to bear, and unfunded Federal mandates are all contributing factors to California's fiscal woes.

The largest unfunded Federal mandate in California is immigration. As my California colleagues have already pointed out, half of the babies born in San Diego and Los Angeles are born to immigrants. Twenty-five percent of the people incarcerated in California's prisons are foreign born. Governor Pete Wilson has estimated that California pays \$1.4 billion for the social, health, and correctional services provided to immigrants and refugees as mandated by national immigration policy.

Along with several of my California colleagues, Republican and Democrat alike, I have made the elimination of unfunded Federal mandates one of my highest priorities. We have to take firm actions to address the problems of these unfunded Federal mandates before they completely overwhelm our State and local jurisdictions. I wholeheartedly support Congressman HUNTER's amendment since it will augment the resources of the Border Patrol so that they can prevent illegal immigrants from entering our country and placing further burdens on our local budgets.

It should be understood that additional cuts and rescissions can be made in this legislation to more than offset the \$60 million increase that the amendment calls for. Again, I urge my colleagues to support the Hunter amendment.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2519, appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, State, and the judiciary. Programs within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration [NOAA] funded through the Department of Commerce are of immense importance to New Jersey's coastal economy and the health of New Jersey's marine ecosystem.

This bill appropriates a total of \$1.77 billion for NOAA in fiscal year 1994, which funds important programs such as the National Ocean Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and the Oceanic and Atmospheric research programs.

I am pleased that the committee has included report language indicating that funds will be available through NOAA's construction account sufficient to maintain ongoing construction projects. My particular concerns is for a multispecies aquaculture facility which is being built in New Jersey.

Through the support of the chairman and the committee over the past 2 years, this facility has made significant progress. A site has been located, planning and engineering designs are well underway, and the development of training and outreach programs has begun. Moreover, the State has committed a match to Federal funds and is developing a State aquaculture plan. These factors are crucial in meeting the rising demand for fresh, healthful products, reversing local economic decline, and expanding aquaculture nationwide.

I am also pleased that the committee has restored funding for the national undersea research program [NURP]. NURP is crucial to understanding our oceans and plays a key role in observing global climate change in ways not available to traditional shipboard research. The \$17.8 million appropriations is necessary in order for the six regional centers to meet immediate goals and to honor existing commitments for fiscal year 1994.

The committee has also restored sufficient funds to continue the fishing vessel obligation loan guarantee program. This program provides many benefits for the fishing industry particularly in the area of underutilized species, refinancing existing loans and seafood safety. Further, I believe the report language narrowing the focus of the program is essential to avoid contributing to overcapitalization of the industry.

Finally, I am pleased to see funds appropriated to continue the important work of several other programs that are crucial to maintaining and improving our marine environment, including the Sea Grant College Program, Marine Sanctuary Program, National Coastal Research and Development Institute, and the Coastal Zone Management Program.

Despite these austere times and the necessary budget cuts, this bill reflects NOAA's strong commitment to marine science and to the preservation and protection of the coastal, ocean and Great Lakes environments and their associated living marine resources. This is a rational bill and I urge my colleagues' support for its passage.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, this year, it is clear that the 12-year spending spree has screeched to a halt. President Clinton sent to us a budget with more than \$200 billion in cuts during the next 5 years. Many people say

that's not enough. In response the House cut another \$50 billion.

That's not enough, many people still say. So, we cut billions of additional dollars from the appropriations bills through amendments on the floor of the House. I have supported many of these additional cuts.

Of course, there is no denying that the ramifications of our actions begin with the strokes of the red pencil. Often the cuts are paired with the pains of reduced services, losses of jobs, and added difficulties for our citizens.

The Commerce, Justice, and State appropriations bill is not immune to these cuts. Two million dollars were cut from President Clinton's proposals, and hundreds of millions of dollars more in cuts are anticipated.

One important program has suffered severe cuts in the committee. The Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Formula Grant Program provides funding, training and technical assistance to State and local governments. It has largely been the laboratory for State experiments in innovative law enforcement initiatives, but it has also been singled out for a whopping 28-percent budget cut—\$117 million less than last year's funding level.

This cut will affect urban areas, rural areas, large States and small States. California will lose more than \$12 million in law enforcement funds; New York \$7½ million; and Texas, more than \$7 million. As for rural States, Wyoming will lose \$480,000 from last year's grant of \$1.7 million and Montana will see \$620,000 less than last year's grant of \$2.2 million.

This money does not just fall into a black hole. Its purpose is to provide means for communities to combat crime through innovative procedures. It was through this grant program that community policing was first tried, with such success that President Clinton has proposed additional funding to help combat crime in our cities through this method. It was also through this program that the Drug Abuse Resistance Education Program was begun, which teaches our schoolchildren the skills and self-esteem to resist drugs.

States use the grant program funds for prosecution of drug offenders, improvements for crime laboratories, combating domestic violence, and for drug testing and treatment of offenders. The grant program also aids local jurisdiction in providing proper training and equipment for our law enforcement officials. It has also sponsored an Innovative Rural Programs Reporting and Evaluation Workshop to explore the types of programs which are effective in rural areas and how they differ from those in urban centers.

Crime is rising. Funds for combatting crime are being cut. I can't be the only person who sees a train wreck, and not a light at the end of this tunnel. I agree with many that it is time to pay the piper, cut spending and raise revenue, but this is not the right program to gut. I urge my colleagues in the Senate to restore the funding of the Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Formula Grant Program to 1993 levels.

Mr. ZELIFF. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the Penny amendment. In times of economic distress, it does not make sense of this body to cut funding for the Small Business Administration, one of the best tools for economic recovery.

My home State of New Hampshire has experienced very difficult economic times, five out of the seven largest banks recently failed, and 30 percent of the banking assets were lost. The unemployment rate has gone from the lowest in the country to one of the highest. The economy in New Hampshire is still in very poor shape. Numerous New Hampshire businesses have not survived and of those that have, many are only barely surviving, because of the help of the SBA and its loan guarantee programs.

This country depends on its small businesses to create jobs. In fact, 80 percent of the jobs in this country are created by small businesses. The President in his February 17 address to Congress and the Nation, talked about getting the economy moving, putting people back to work, and living within our means. But his program doesn't reflect this. The few programs designed to stimulate investment and job creation have been watered down during the budget process. The best way to help our small businesses is through the Small Business Administration Loan Guarantee Program, which is the only real tool small businesses have left in this country.

SBA programs stimulate capital formation, economic growth, and job creation. They address finance, marketing, production, and human resource management. In 1992 in New Hampshire alone, the SBA provided almost \$110 million in small business lending, which saved almost 15,000 jobs. In 1994 it is estimated that the SBA 7a program will create and maintain 6,200 jobs in New Hampshire. From 1983 to 1992 the SBA provided 426 million dollars worth of loans, saving almost 40,000 jobs in New Hampshire. SBA lending in New Hampshire increased by 141 percent from 1991 to 1992.

The SBA 7a loan program has a very low subsidy cost. The program generates \$20 of credit for only \$1 of taxpayer's money. For \$141 million the 7a program will provide \$2.6 billion in loans to borrowers. My good colleague from Minnesota has stated that, "after rising to nearly 30 percent in 1983, non-performing loans are now 15 percent * * *." However, the facts are that in 1983, the SBA's guaranteed loan loss ratio was 11.3 percent and in 1991, the SBA loss rate on guaranteed loans was 2.2 percent.

The SBA has the lowest loss rate and best portfolio performance of the five major Federal credit agencies—SBA, HUD, Farmers Home Administration, Veterans' Administration, and Education.

The 7a program not only creates new jobs but also retains existing jobs by making credit available to established small businesses. The GAO reports that 40 percent of all term loans made in the entire country to small businesses are made through the SBA 7a loan program.

The SBA 7a loan program promotes small business formation and growth by guarantees of up to 90 percent of the amount provided by commercial lenders. If the 7a lending program runs out of funds, virtually all immediate and long-term credit will be unavailable to small businesses in the country because of regulatory pressure and because the administration's eased regulations have not taken effect. The 7a program's demand level has grown by 31 percent over this time last year and in 1992 grew by 37 percent over the previous year.

With the momentum of the SBA program growing, every time the program temporarily shuts down it disrupts the confidence of both our lenders and our borrowers and slows job creation and job maintenance.

My good colleague from Minnesota has stated that, "during calendar years 1990 and 1991, 23,000 small businesses accessed SBA programs." But, the facts are that during 1990 and 1991, 1,690,000 businesses received SBA training and counseling and the SBA guaranteed more than 215,000 loans worth more than \$26 billion.

Our small businesses need the SBA. In this difficult economic environment the SBA is the only friend our small businesses have. I know first hand the successes that the SBA loan guarantee programs have had in saving businesses and saving jobs. It's a big ocean and the SBA is the only lifeboat around. I urge my colleagues to vote against the Penny amendment. We need to save the Small Business Administration.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this appropriations bill.

This year, I have had the pleasure and the honor of serving with Chairman SMITH, Representative ROGERS, and other members on the Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Subcommittee. I appreciate the tough decisions that the chairman has made, and I want to particularly thank the subcommittee staff, John Osthaus, George Schafer, Sally Chadbourne, Sara Magoulick, and Ray Cicali for their assistance and hard work.

This is a difficult bill. It groups together some of the most important agencies in the Federal Government and forces us to make spending decisions among them. The Department of State, the Department of Commerce, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Drug Enforcement Agency, and the Federal judiciary are only a few of the organizations that fall under the jurisdiction of this subcommittee. I wish we could fund every one of these agencies. I wish we had the resources. Unfortunately we do not. But the chairman and the ranking member have proposed the most reasonable and fair ways to fund the programs under this bill.

Although the agencies under the jurisdiction of this committee will be among the most important in the new administration, the spending allocations have not expanded. The appropriations under this bill are more than \$601 million less than enacted in 1993. The recommendation under this bill is almost \$2 billion less than administration's request. Furthermore, the budget authority recommended in this bill is \$759 million less than the 602(b) allocation and \$2 million less in outlays than the 602(b) allocation. This bill is fiscally responsible and responsive to the need to cut budget deficit.

I strongly support the bill as drafted by the chairman and the committee.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I am extremely pleased the Commerce, Justice, State appropriations bill for fiscal year 1994 includes funding for the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act and specifically for the Juvenile Mentoring Program.

As the author of this mentoring program, I soundly believe mentoring programs provide the necessary partnership between schools,

public and private agencies, institutions and business, which can help make a difference in the lives of our Nation's at-risk youth.

It has been proven that a relationship exists between poor academic achievement, school completion, and juvenile delinquency. By using mentors to work with at-risk youth, as in the Juvenile Mentoring Program, we provide young people with the positive role models they need to lead successful lives. Mentors provide academic assistance and experience in the workplace as well as helping to develop positive interests and attitudes. The Juvenile Mentoring Program also provides better coordination between the youth's home, school, and residential facility and helps to ensure at-risk youth keep up with their classmates. This encourages them to stay in school once they return to their homes. By making this investment in young people, we help them to be assets to their communities rather than repeat offenders or gang members.

The \$2 million provided in H.R. 2519 by the Appropriations Committee will most certainly go a long way in helping our Nation's communities reduce juvenile delinquency. I appreciate the attention the Appropriations Committee has given to this important program and encourage schools to apply for and use this funding to develop mentoring programs for at-risk youth. I commend the committee for providing increases for the overall Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. This investment will pay for itself many times over in reduced costs for law enforcement, job training, and other social services. With juvenile crime on the rise in our country, particularly violent crime, it is of the utmost importance that we support the activities authorized under this law.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2519, the Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1994.

I would particularly like to commend the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] for their hard work on this important legislation.

H.R. 2519 provides critically needed funds: For the modernization of the technologies used by the national weather service;

For the completion and launch of the next generation geostationary weather satellite [Goes-"Eye"]; and

For the technology administration's effort to increase our technical and economic competitiveness in the world market.

Mr. Chairman, although the funds for these and other important programs are below the administration's request, they do reflect increases over current levels in many cases. On the whole, this is fair and reasonable.

I am particularly gratified to see an appropriations bill where earmarks, unauthorized programs, and authorization language have been kept to a minimum. This is as it should be. I commend both the full committee chairman, Mr. NATCHER, and the subcommittee chairman, Mr. SMITH, for their cooperative approach to the authorizing committees in this regard.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, I applaud the committee for reducing funding in the bill by

over \$600 million from last year's level. However, there are a couple of items on which I would like to make some comments.

First, I oppose spending in the bill for the Economic Development Administration [EDA] and the Small Business Administration [SBA]—excluding the disaster loan program, and I plan to introduce amendments to strike funding from the bill for these two agencies. The amendments would save taxpayers about \$925 million in fiscal year 1994.

Second, I would like to take notice of the fact that the committee funded only about two-thirds of the President's request for U.S. contributions to U.N. peacekeeping operations. While I fully understand and respect the committee's decision and the budget restraints which the committee faced, I am concerned about the fact that our country continues to be in arrears on its assessments to the United Nations, and in particular, to its peacekeeping programs. The decision to underfund the President's fiscal year 1994 request will only worsen the problem which the United Nations is faced with when meeting its expanded responsibilities and expectations in the area of peacekeeping and peacemaking.

Mr. Chairman, to deal with this serious problem, I have proposed that we transfer the budget function for "U.S. contributions to U.N. peacekeeping activities" from the State Department to the Defense Department. Since peacekeeping and peacemaking are critical elements of our national security in the post-cold war era, it is important that we fund our obligations in these areas from our national security budget—a budget which is more than 65 times as large as the State Department's budget.

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2519, the Commerce—Justice—State appropriations bill for fiscal year 1994.

I want to give my thanks to Chairman NEAL SMITH and each member of the subcommittee who so graciously gave their time and attention to the needs of the people in the 19th District of Illinois.

I particularly want to make note of report language accompanying the bill concerning the Route 16 corridor in Charleston, IL. Between Mattoon and Charleston, in Coles County, there is tremendous opportunity for economic development—new jobs for our people. The city of Charleston is working diligently to extend water and sewer lines along this corridor to provide the basic public infrastructure necessary for economic activity. In putting together this project, we have had excellent cooperation from local, State and Federal agencies, including the Economic Development Administration. The report language included in the bill recognizes that and is an important step forward in the development of the Route 16 corridor.

I know this is one small item in a very comprehensive and significant piece of legislation, but it is crucial to our efforts to create jobs and provide people new economic opportunities.

I also thank my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee for including funds in this bill which could be used for the 35 additional bankruptcy judgeships which were authorized last Congress. It is my understanding that the committee has included an additional \$16 mil-

lion in the Judiciary salaries and expenses account. This money is to cover the highest priority needs of the Federal judiciary—and could fund many, if not all, of the 35 bankruptcy judgeships.

We all realize the important role this funding will play in accelerating the economic recovery process. There has been a dramatic increase in bankruptcy filings in the last few years and dockets continue to overwhelm judges in many districts including the Southern District of Illinois. Between 1980 and 1992, filings increased nationwide 193.4 percent, almost a threefold increase. The economic impact of this backlog is significant. The courts experience delayed cases, assets are frozen, and creditors—often small businesses—do not receive funds available for distribution from the debtor or a trustee. With the funding of these 35 new bankruptcy judgeships we can look forward to reduced backlog, quicker turn around for individual cases, and ultimately a positive impact on our economy.

I again wish to thank the subcommittee and full committee members for their support and urge adoption of the bill.

Mr. SWETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to thank my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee and subcommittee chairman NEAL SMITH for bringing the Commerce, Justice, State, and judiciary appropriations bill to the floor today. I especially want to congratulate Chairman SMITH for bringing this bill in at 3 percent below fiscal year 1993 appropriations and 8 percent below the amount requested by the administration.

I understand that the Appropriations Committee had to make some tough choices in order to accomplish this. For discretionary programs within the bill, funding is held below the current services level. At the same time, funding for high priority programs within the bill—Justice Department agencies involved in the war on drugs and the Small Business Administration section 7(a) program—have received increases.

Also included in the bill is a \$16 million increase in the judiciary salaries and expenses account. According to the committee report, these additional funds were added to cover the highest priority needs of the Federal judiciary, and they could fund many, if not all, of the 35 additional bankruptcy judges which were authorized by Congress in 1992.

Mr. Chairman, over the past several years we have seen a dramatic increase in the number of bankruptcy filings across the country. Dockets continue to overwhelm bankruptcy judges in many districts, particularly in New Hampshire. Unlike larger States, New Hampshire has only one judge to handle the bankruptcy filings for the entire State. This worked well during the mid-1980's, when we averaged under 500 filings per year. However, since that time we have seen an explosion in the size of the docket at the Federal Bankruptcy Court for the District of New Hampshire. For example, in 1984 there were 497 filings. In 1992, the number of filings had grown to 3,840—a 673-percent increase over an 8-year period.

Much of this increased activity is due to the dramatic downturn in the New England economy since 1991. The collapse of our real estate market has led many homebuilders and small contractors to seek bankruptcy protection. Many of the small firms that have failed

have filed for chapter 11. The percentage of chapter 11 cases unresolved after 4 years in the New Hampshire district is more than 10 percent above the national average. For chapter 7 filings, the national average case-processing period is 5.6 months, contrasted with New Hampshire's case-processing period of 6.3 months. Moreover, the number of chapter 7 cases over 4 years old in New Hampshire is more than three times the national average.

This explosion in the backlog of bankruptcy cases in New Hampshire has taken place, while the number of judges in my State has stayed constant at one. A single bankruptcy judge, the Honorable Charles Yakos of Manchester, has been given the task of managing, by himself, a docket that has grown by over 500 percent since 1987. That is why it was right for Congress to authorize the 35 additional judgeships last year, and that is why it is even more important to fully fund each of these positions in fiscal year 1994.

Mr. Chairman, efficiency in the operation of our Federal bankruptcy court system is important to economic recovery nationally. In New Hampshire it is particularly critical as devastated small businesses seek to work themselves out of debt, get back on their feet and begin creating jobs again. Devoting the \$16 million increase in the judiciary salaries and expense account to fund these new positions for the Federal bankruptcy courts is vital to this process of economic recovery.

I commend Chairman SMITH and ranking member ROGERS for bringing this important bill to the floor.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the fiscal year 1994 Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary appropriations bill.

The Subcommittee on Census, Statistics, and Postal Personnel, which I chair, has jurisdiction over Federal holiday commissions. I am pleased to note that the legislation before us includes full funding for the Martin Luther King, Jr. Federal Holiday Commission. I am honored to serve as a member of the Commission, as well.

The Commission, established in 1984, has worked tirelessly to institutionalize the King holiday and coordinate holiday activities across the Nation. When the Commission first began its work, only 17 States observed the King holiday. On January 18, 1993, all 50 States observed Doctor King's birthday with a paid holiday. This was a long time in coming, and wouldn't have happened without the enormous efforts of the King Commission.

The Commission received no funding prior to 1990. I believe that this modest appropriation will enhance the Commission's ability to elevate the way people view the King holiday. Unfortunately, the observance of Doctor King's birthday continues to be viewed by many as a holiday for black Americans alone. Martin Luther King, Jr. did not represent just one segment of our population. He worked to ensure equality of opportunity for all Americans.

I want to commend Chairman NEAL SMITH and the committee for recognizing the particular importance of the Commission's work and for ensuring that the Commission will have an adequate appropriation to carry out its programs.

I urge my colleagues to support the level of funding contained in the fiscal year 1994 Com-

merce, Justice, State, and judiciary bill for the King Commission.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2519, Commerce-Justice-State appropriations for fiscal year 1994. I would like to express my great appreciation to Chairman SMITH for his hard work in crafting such a fine bill. In particular, I am supportive of the provisions to increase funding for the National Marine Sanctuary Program and coastal zone management programs, essential programs which protect the coastline in California and across the Nation.

As the only Federal program specifically designed to protect our most outstanding marine areas, the National Marine Sanctuary Program is of crucial importance to our Nation's coastal regions. The enrollment of three new sanctuaries in the program in the past year is a testament to the program's importance and popularity. The sanctuaries off the coast of California make up the largest protected marine area in the world. However, the increase in number, size, and complexity of designated sanctuaries has strained the program's limited resources in recent years.

Next year, as a result of Chairman SMITH's decision to increase funding from \$7 million to \$9 million, the National Marine Sanctuary Program will be better able to ensure that Congress' mandate of environmental protection for sensitive marine areas is responsibly and effectively maintained.

I am pleased that this bill also increases funds for coastal zone management programs. The district I represent, Marin and Sonoma Counties in California, is famous for its beautiful coast. The coastal zone management programs are vital to the health of my district's coasts as well as those of the Nation. With Federal funding in real dollars decreasing over the past 10 years, the coastal zone management programs have been under growing pressure to meet more demands with fewer dollars. The increased funding that the Appropriations Committee has provided will help the coastal zone management programs fulfill their important mission.

In addition, this bill continues funding of the weather data buoys which provide fishermen with critical weather information. Generations of families have made their living fishing in the coastal waters off Marin and Sonoma Counties, and the weather buoys stationed in these waters are relied upon by the fishermen and their families to ensure safe and successful journeys.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to support the Commerce-State-Justice appropriations bill.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I have no other requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2519

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the

fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE AND RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS

JUSTICE ASSISTANCE

For grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other assistance authorized by title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, the Missing Children's Assistance Act, as amended, and the Victims of Crime Act of 1984, as amended, including salaries and expenses in connection therewith, \$91,300,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized by section 1001(a) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, as amended by Public Law 102-534 (106 Stat. 3524), of which \$650,000 of the funds provided under the Missing Children's Program shall be made available as a grant to a national voluntary organization representing Alzheimer patients and families to plan, design, and operate a Missing Alzheimer Patient Alert Program.

In addition, for grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other assistance authorized by part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, for State and Local Narcotics Control and Justice Assistance Improvements, \$427,000,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized by section 1001(a) of title I of said Act, as amended by Public Law 102-534 (106 Stat. 3524), of which: (a) \$356,000,000 shall be available to carry out the provisions of subpart 1 and chapter A of subpart 2 of part E of title I of said Act, for the Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Programs; (b) \$15,000,000 shall be available to carry out the provisions of chapter B of subpart 2 of part E of title I of said Act, for Correctional Options Grants; (c) \$25,000,000 shall be available pursuant to the provisions of chapter A of subpart 2 of part E of title I of said Act, for community policing; (d) \$13,000,000 shall be available to the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for the National Crime Information Center 2000 project, as authorized by section 613 of Public Law 101-647 (104 Stat. 4824); (e) \$2,000,000 shall be available for the activities of the District of Columbia Metropolitan Area Drug Enforcement Task Force; and (f) \$16,000,000 shall be available to reimburse any appropriation account, as designated by the Attorney General, for selected costs incurred by State and local law enforcement agencies which enter into cooperative agreements to conduct joint law enforcement operations with Federal agencies: *Provided*, That funds made available in fiscal year 1994 under subpart 1 of part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, may be obligated for programs to assist States in the litigation processing of death penalty Federal habeas corpus petitions.

In addition, for grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other assistance authorized by the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, as amended, including salaries and expenses in connection therewith, \$123,000,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized by section 299 of part I of title II and section 506 of title V of said Act, as amended by Public Law 102-586, of which: (a) \$93,000,000 shall be available for expenses authorized by parts A, B, and C of title II of said Act; (b) \$6,000,000 shall be available for expenses authorized by sections 281 and 282 of part D of title II of said Act for

prevention and treatment programs relating to juvenile gangs; (c) \$2,000,000 shall be available for expenses authorized by part G of title II of said Act for juvenile mentoring programs; and (d) \$22,000,000 shall be available for expenses authorized by title V of said Act for incentive grants for local delinquency prevention programs.

In addition, for grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other assistance authorized by the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990, as amended, \$8,700,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized by sections 214B, 218, and 224 of said Act, of which: (a) \$500,000 shall be available for expenses authorized by section 213 of said Act for regional children's advocacy centers; (b) \$1,500,000 shall be available for expenses authorized by section 214 of said Act for local children's advocacy centers; (c) \$1,600,000 shall be available for technical assistance and training, as authorized by section 214A of said Act, for a grant to the American Prosecutor Research Institute's National Center for Prosecution of Child Abuse; (d) \$1,000,000 shall be available for training and technical assistance, as authorized by section 217(b)(1) of said Act for a grant to the National Court Appointed Special Advocates program; (e) \$3,500,000 shall be available for expenses authorized by section 217(b)(2) of said Act to initiate and expand local court appointed special advocate programs; and (f) \$600,000, notwithstanding section 224(b) of said Act, shall be available to develop model technical assistance and training programs to improve the handling of child abuse and neglect cases, as authorized by section 223(a) of said Act, for a grant to the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges.

PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICERS BENEFITS

For payments authorized by part L of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796), as amended, such sums as are necessary, to remain available until expended, as authorized by section 6093 of Public Law 100-690 (102 Stat. 4339-4340).

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the administration of the Department of Justice, \$117,196,000; of which not to exceed \$3,317,000 is for the Facilities Program 2000, to remain available until expended.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$30,898,000; including not to exceed \$10,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character, to be expended under the direction, and to be accounted for solely under the certificate of, the Attorney General; and for the acquisition, lease, maintenance and operation of motor vehicles without regard to the general purchase price limitation.

WEED AND SEED PROGRAM FUND

For necessary expenses, including salaries and related expenses of the Executive Office for Weed and Seed, to implement "Weed and Seed" program activities, \$12,829,000, to remain available until expended for intergovernmental agreements, including grants, cooperative agreements, and contracts, with State and local law enforcement agencies engaged in the investigation and prosecution of violent crimes and drug offenses in "Weed and Seed" designated communities, and for either reimbursements or transfers to appropriation accounts of the Department of Jus-

tice and other Federal agencies which shall be specified by the Attorney General to execute the "Weed and Seed" program strategy: *Provided*, That funds designated by Congress through language or through policy guidance in reports for other Department of Justice appropriation accounts for "Weed and Seed" program activities shall be managed and executed by the Attorney General through the Executive Office for Weed and Seed: *Provided further*, That the Attorney General may direct the use of other Department of Justice funds and personnel in support of "Weed and Seed" program activities only after the Attorney General notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate in accordance with section 605 of this Act.

UNITED STATES PAROLE COMMISSION SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the United States Parole Commission as authorized by law, \$9,385,000.

LEGAL ACTIVITIES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL LEGAL ACTIVITIES

For expenses necessary for the legal activities of the Department of Justice, not otherwise provided for, including not to exceed \$20,000 for expenses of collecting evidence, to be expended under the direction of, and to be accounted for solely under the certificate of, the Attorney General; and rent of private or Government-owned space in the District of Columbia; \$400,968,000; of which not to exceed \$10,000,000 for litigation support contracts shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the funds available in this appropriation, not to exceed \$50,099,000 shall remain available until expended for office automation systems for the legal divisions covered by this appropriation, and for the United States Attorneys, the Antitrust Division, and offices funded through "Salaries and Expenses", General Administration: *Provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated, not to exceed \$1,000 shall be available to the United States National Central Bureau, INTERPOL, for official reception and representation expenses.

In addition, for reimbursement of expenses of the Department of Justice associated with processing cases under the National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, not to exceed \$1,900,000 to be appropriated from the Vaccine Injury Compensation Trust Fund, as authorized by section 6601 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act, 1989, as amended by Public Law 101-509 (104 Stat. 1289).

CIVIL LIBERTIES PUBLIC EDUCATION FUND

For fiscal year 1994 and thereafter, after payments authorized by section 105 of the Civil Liberties Act of 1988 (Public Law 100-383) have been obligated for all known eligible individuals, any amounts remaining under the total authorized level for the Civil Liberties Public Education Fund, may be used by the Board of Directors of the Fund for research contracts and public educational activities, and for publication and distribution of the hearings, findings, and recommendations of the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians, pursuant to section 106(b) of the aforementioned Act, subject to appropriations provided for the purposes of section 106(b) of said Act.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, ANTITRUST DIVISION

For expenses necessary for the enforcement of antitrust and kindred laws, \$63,817,000: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed

\$19,000,000 of offsetting collections derived from fees collected for premerger notification filings under the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976 (15 U.S.C. 18(a)) shall be retained and used for necessary expenses in this appropriation, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 1994, so as to result in a final fiscal year 1994 appropriation estimated at not more than \$44,817,000: *Provided further*, That any fees received in excess of \$19,000,000 in fiscal year 1994 shall remain available until expended, but shall not be available for obligation until October 1, 1994.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

For necessary expenses of the Office of the United States Attorneys, including intergovernmental agreements, \$808,797,000, of which not to exceed \$2,500,000 shall be available until September 30, 1995 for the purposes of (1) providing training of personnel of the Department of Justice in debt collection, (2) providing services to the Department of Justice related to locating debtors and their property, such as title searches, debtor skiptracing, asset searches, credit reports and other investigations, (3) paying the costs of the Department of Justice for the sale of property not covered by the sale proceeds, such as auctioneers' fees and expenses, maintenance and protection of property and businesses, advertising and title search and surveying costs, and (4) paying the costs of processing and tracking debts owed to the United States Government: *Provided*, That of the total amount appropriated, not to exceed \$8,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$10,000,000 of those funds available for automated litigation support contracts shall remain available until expended.

UNITED STATES TRUSTEE SYSTEM

For the necessary expenses of the United States Trustee Program, \$94,008,000, as authorized by 28 U.S.C. 589a(a), to remain available until expended, for activities authorized by section 115 of the Bankruptcy Judges, United States Trustees, and Family Farmer Bankruptcy Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-554), of which \$56,521,000 shall be derived from the United States Trustee System Fund: *Provided*, That deposits to the Fund are available in such amounts as may be necessary to pay refunds due depositors: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed \$37,487,000 of offsetting collections derived from fees collected pursuant to section 589a(f) of title 28 United States Code, as amended by section 111 of Public Law 102-140 (105 Stat. 795), shall be retained and used for necessary expenses in this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the \$94,008,000 herein appropriated shall be reduced as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 1994, so as to result in a final fiscal year 1994 appropriation estimated at not more than \$56,521,000: *Provided further*, That any of the aforementioned fees collected in excess of \$37,487,000 in fiscal year 1994 shall remain available until expended, but shall not be available for obligation until October 1, 1994.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

For expenses necessary to carry out the activities of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$940,000.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES
MARSHALS SERVICE

For necessary expenses of the United States Marshals Service; including the acquisition, lease, maintenance, and operation of vehicles and aircraft, and the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for police-type use without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year; \$339,808,000, as authorized by 28 U.S.C. 561(i), of which not to exceed \$6,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

SUPPORT OF UNITED STATES PRISONERS

For support of United States prisoners in the custody of the United States Marshals Service as authorized in 18 U.S.C. 4013, but not including expenses otherwise provided for in appropriations available to the Attorney General; \$307,700,000, as authorized by 28 U.S.C. 561(i), to remain available until expended.

FEES AND EXPENSES OF WITNESSES

For expenses, mileage, compensation, and per diems of witnesses, for expenses of contracts for the procurement and supervision of expert witnesses, for private counsel expenses, and for per diems in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law, including advances, \$103,022,000, to remain available until expended; of which not to exceed \$4,750,000 may be made available for planning, construction, renovation, maintenance, remodeling, and repair of buildings and the purchase of equipment incident thereto for protected witness safesites; of which not to exceed \$1,000,000 may be made available for the purchase and maintenance of armored vehicles for transportation of protected witnesses; and of which not to exceed \$4,000,000 may be made available for the purchase, installation and maintenance of a secure automated information network to store and retrieve the identities and locations of protected witnesses.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, COMMUNITY
RELATIONS SERVICE

For necessary expenses of the Community Relations Service, established by title X of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, \$26,792,000, of which not to exceed \$17,415,000 shall remain available until expended to make payments in advance for grants, contracts and reimbursable agreements and other expenses necessary under section 501(c) of the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980 (Public Law 96-422; 94 Stat. 1809) for the processing, care, maintenance, security, transportation and reception and placement in the United States of Cuban and Haitian entrants: *Provided*, That notwithstanding section 501(e)(2)(B) of the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980 (Public Law 96-422; 94 Stat. 1810), funds may be expended for assistance with respect to Cuban and Haitian entrants as authorized under section 501(c) of such Act: *Provided further*, That to expedite the outplacement of eligible Mariel Cubans or other aliens from Bureau of Prisons or Immigration and Naturalization Service operated or contracted facilities into Community Relations Service contracted hospital and halfway house facilities, the Attorney General may direct reimbursements to the Cuban Haitian Entrant Program from "Federal Prison System, Salaries and Expenses" or "Immigration and Naturalization Service, Salaries and Expenses": *Provided further*, That if such reimbursements described above exceed \$500,000, they shall only be made after notification to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives

and the Senate in accordance with section 605 of this Act.

ASSETS FORFEITURE FUND

For expenses authorized by 28 U.S.C. 524(c)(1) (A)(ii), (B), (C), (F), and (G), as amended, \$60,275,000 to be derived from the Department of Justice Assets Forfeiture Fund.

RADIATION EXPOSURE COMPENSATION

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For necessary administrative expenses in accordance with the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act, \$2,586,000.

INTERAGENCY LAW ENFORCEMENT

ORGANIZED CRIME DRUG ENFORCEMENT

For necessary expenses for the detection, investigation, and prosecution of individuals involved in organized crime drug trafficking not otherwise provided for, to include intergovernmental agreements with State and local law enforcement agencies engaged in the investigation and prosecution of individuals involved in organized crime drug trafficking, \$384,381,000, of which \$50,000,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That any amounts obligated from appropriations under this heading may be used under authorities available to the organizations reimbursed from this appropriation: *Provided further*, That any unobligated balances remaining available at the end of the fiscal year shall revert to the Attorney General for reallocation among participating organizations in succeeding fiscal years, subject to the reprogramming procedures described in section 605 of this Act.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for detection, investigation, and prosecution of crimes against the United States; including purchase for police-type use of not to exceed 1,665 passenger motor vehicles of which 1,300 will be for replacement only, without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year, and hire of passenger motor vehicles; acquisition, lease, maintenance and operation of aircraft; and not to exceed \$70,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character, to be expended under the direction of, and to be accounted for solely under the certificate of, the Attorney General; \$2,024,705,000, of which not to exceed \$25,000,000 for automated data processing and telecommunications and \$1,000,000 for undercover operations shall remain available until September 30, 1995; of which not to exceed \$8,000,000 for research and development related to investigative activities shall remain available until expended; of which not to exceed \$10,000,000 is authorized to be made available for making payments or advances for expenses arising out of contractual or reimbursable agreements with State and local law enforcement agencies while engaged in cooperative activities related to violent crime, terrorism, organized crime, and drug investigations; of which \$75,400,000, to remain available until expended, shall only be available to defray expenses for the automation of fingerprint identification services and related costs; and of which \$1,500,000 shall be available to maintain an independent program office dedicated solely to the relocation of the Identification Division and the automation of fingerprint identification services: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$45,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Drug Enforcement Administration, including not to

exceed \$70,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character, to be expended under the direction of, and to be accounted for solely under the certificate of, the Attorney General; expenses for conducting drug education and training programs, including travel and related expenses for participants in such programs and the distribution of items of token value that promote the goals of such programs; purchase of not to exceed 1,117 passenger motor vehicles of which 1,117 are for replacement only for police-type use without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year; and acquisition, lease, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; \$718,684,000, of which not to exceed \$1,800,000 for research shall remain available until expended, and of which not to exceed \$4,000,000 for purchase of evidence and payments for information, not to exceed \$4,000,000 for contracting for ADP and telecommunications equipment, and not to exceed \$2,000,000 for technical and laboratory equipment shall remain available until September 30, 1995, and of which not to exceed \$45,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I believe the first amendment is on line 14, page 18. I ask unanimous consent that the portion of the bill through line 13 on page 18 be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order with regard to the material up to page 18, line 13?

□ 1100

If not, are there any amendments?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the administration and enforcement of the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and alien registration, including not to exceed \$50,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character, to be expended under the direction of, and to be accounted for solely under the certificate of, the Attorney General; purchase for police-type use (not to exceed 597 of which 302 are for replacement only) without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year, and hire of passenger motor vehicles; acquisition, lease, maintenance and operation of aircraft; and research related to immigration enforcement; \$999,000,000, of which not to exceed \$400,000 for research shall remain available until expended, and of which not to exceed \$10,000,000 shall be available for costs associated with the Training program for basic officer training: *Provided*, That none of the funds available to the Immigration and Naturalization Service shall be available for administrative expenses to pay any employee overtime pay in an amount in excess of \$25,000: *Provided further*, That uniforms may be purchased without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$5,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That the Land Border Fee Pilot Project

scheduled to end September 30, 1993, is extended to September 30, 1996.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HUNTER

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HUNTER: Page 19, line 3, strike "\$999,000,000" and insert "\$1,059,000,000".

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, we have talked about this issue in the general debate for a few minutes. First I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], for working hard to try to get Border Patrol funding to at least the level that it was at last year. And I know that was a difficult task. But once again, the problem is that the challenge that we now have with illegal immigration, and not only illegal immigration, the smuggling of people, but also the smuggling of narcotics has grown by leaps and bounds, and very simply there is a flood of cocaine across the land border between the United States and Mexico. We have now increased interdiction of cocaine by 1,000 percent, my colleagues, over the last several years. Over half a billion dollars' worth of cocaine has been captured just in the last 3 months coming over that 70- or 80-mile stretch just west of Yuma, AZ. We now have in excess of 400,000 apprehensions of illegal aliens in the last year. And according to the GAO, and I think this is an important factor for our Members to consider, 22 percent of the Federal inmate population are illegal aliens.

We have tried in California to make some evaluation of the impact on the taxpayer that is caused by illegal aliens, and we have made a couple of stabs at it, and I think they are fairly accurate. In San Diego County we compiled \$143 million in annual costs that are a result of illegal aliens. They include medical costs and law enforcement costs. The gentleman from California [Mr. MOORHEAD] has pushed hard and in fact has worked and received higher authorizations for the Border Patrol in years past and has been involved in this. Also my colleague from California, ELTON GALLEGLY, in Los Angeles has done some fairly extensive analysis. We think you can safely say that \$3 billion in social costs, criminal justice costs were paid in California last year to illegal aliens, largely, in fact almost totally unreimbursed costs.

Mr. Chairman, if you look at the Border Patrol itself, and ask yourself how large is this contingent of American officers that patrols this massive land border, you will find that there are only 4,035 agents and 734 support personnel in the Border Patrol. Now, we have authorized much higher levels. And when we passed the 1986 Immigration Act we authorized a much higher level than that, but that is all we have. And what that really boils down to is if you take the Border Patrol at any

given time on the massive border, and I will take California, for example, the 150- or 160-mile border between the United States and Mexico in California, you only have about 50 agents actually on the line at any given time spread out over this 150-mile border.

As a result of that, anyone who wants to get into the United States can, whether they are a terrorist, an illegal alien, or someone who is carrying massive loads of narcotics, and they are now carrying loads of cocaine on their backs in backpacks and coming across the land border. Just in the last several months we have captured over 500 Chinese aliens coming across the land border. They have realized that this is the way to go. We have captured now in the El Centro sector 559 million dollars' worth of cocaine, half a billion worth of cocaine in just a couple of months.

Let me just say this is a massive problem. All of the analysis indicates that for criminal justice reasons, for social cost reasons, and for reasons of giving some integrity to our immigration system, we must have more Border Patrol agents. There is only one agency that is authorized to patrol the U.S. border, and that is the Border Patrol.

This amendment will give some \$60 million and provide 600 new agents. It is not everything that we need, but it is a start, and I would urge every Member to support that.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder how many Members might want to speak on this amendment. We are under time pressure today, as Members know. I am wondering if it would be reasonable to have a time limit on the debate on this.

Mr. ROGERS. If the gentleman will yield, Mr. Chairman, we have five or six speakers on this side. I think it may not be possible on this amendment. Perhaps we could try for a larger time limit than the gentleman had earlier proposed.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. On other amendments, you mean, or this one?

Mr. ROGERS. On just this one.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Does the gentleman want to ask for a time limit amendment on this?

Mr. ROGERS. I doubt we can on this one.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, we are under great constraints in this bill. Many of our programs received funding of only 95 percent of current services, which took us to our limit on outlays. And the President requested that most of the departments take reductions in order to reduce the deficit. We did not approve all of the reductions and Border Patrol is one such case.

Members will remember the President said we are going to reduce the ex-

ecutive department and we hope the Congress will do likewise. Well, we have taken reductions in most every agency, but in this case the reduction assigned to the agency was \$14,754,000, and we put half of that back, \$6.5 million of it.

We could always use more Border Patrol personnel, and I am sympathetic to that. When we get to the Senate, we hope that they will have a little better allocation than we have on the House side. But we are up to the limit on outlays. So if we approve this amendment that means that we break our 602(b) allocation. So this amendment is a budget buster.

It seems that we cannot do anything that really satisfies everybody in this area, and I know it is a very important area. But we had a bill on the floor here, H.R. 2608, just 2 years ago which came up, and I notice the Members who are wanting to support this amendment, virtually every one of them voted at that time to take \$76 million out of the INS, \$76 million. You cannot have it both ways, vote to take \$76 million out of INS, and then come back later and say, well, we should increase INS.

We are doing the best we can on this, and you cannot have it both ways.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, none of the San Diego delegation voted against the INS.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The gentleman is wrong on that. I have the tallies.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I did not vote against it, and I know Mr. HUNTER did not vote against it, and Mr. PACKARD did not vote against it.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. We have done the best that we can, but if you add \$60 million to the Border Patrol, we will exceed our outlay allocation, making this a budget-busting amendment. So when you vote on it, if you want to bust the 602(b) allocation, OK, but you should know what you are doing.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I think it is real important to note that if we reduce the amount in Commerce to just the rate of inflation we could save over \$60 million, and that would pay for the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. That is at a later point in the bill, but at this point it is a budget-busting amendment.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield further for a question?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Would the gentleman be amenable to the kind of amendment that I am talking about

that would provide the money for this amendment?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I am sure as tight as these finding levels are, there would be opposition to any amendments to cut something out of the bill.

□ 1110

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there is probably no agency in the U.S. Government that I would rather find money for right now than the Immigration and Naturalization Service, especially the Border Patrol. In fact, when the administration request came to us, their request proposed cutting out 92 of the agents we already have in the border patrol. By scrounging here and there, our subcommittee has been able to hold the Border Patrol harmless from that proposed cut by the administration. We are not going to let that happen in this bill as it is right now. In fact, we also increased the INS inspectors by the use of a new land border fee system. And, by the way, while we were protecting the Border Patrol from cuts proposed by the administration, we were unable to protect the FBI and DEA from cuts. So, consequently, there is going to be, if this bill passes, over 200 FBI agents will be cut, there is going to be at least 143 DEA agents cut because we did not have the money. But we did protect the Border Patrol. We are increasing INS inspectors.

I would love to give them \$60 million. We just do not have the money, Mr. Chairman, it is just not there. As we go through the process of this bill, I say to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], and in the conference with the Senate, this is my No. 1 priority, and I daresay it is Chairman SMITH'S No. 1 priority.

So, help us out. We are trying to help you. The gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] came before our subcommittee with a very moving, explicit demonstration of the problem just at San Diego. And it was absolutely moving, the presentation that the gentleman made, of hordes of people streaming across unchecked at the border gates at San Diego. And there are other places in our country, of course, where the same thing is happening. Not to mention the problem of the terrorists in New York City and at the CIA entranceway, who are here illegally, many of them trying to play on America's goodheartedness by claiming political asylum from persecution back home, all the while here under the pretext of claiming political asylum while they brought their bombs with them to bomb American institutions. It is outrageous.

We are trying to find every penny we can to put on the Border Patrol and the INS, in order to send back home those people who are here illegally for a nefarious purpose of terrorism, not to

mention to block those coming across the border from Mexico and other places.

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

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

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, would it help at all for the gentleman to know that I have already, through staff, checked with the parliamentarians, and I will have a couple of points of order later on that I have already added up that will save \$385 million?

Now, that is \$385 million of unauthorized expenditures that will be stricken from the bill that will remain under the committee's 602(b) allocation. That is not money that goes directly to the deficit reduction, because the committee will still retain that under the 602(b) allocation.

It seems to me that some of that money—and I think the gentleman is absolutely correct in his sense of priorities—it seems to me that some of that money then would be money that could be used to do what the gentleman from California wants to be done. I think there are going to be some other points of order that will even be in greater amounts and it would redirect the priorities, I would say to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I understand that, that there will be points of order during the bill, that will create funds. It is not there now. This amendment is first up.

Give us a chance to work on this, is all I am saying. I think everyone on the subcommittee, certainly me, and I know the chairman are extremely sympathetic to your plea and your plight, and we are going to try to find the funds. I hope you will give us a chance to work it out.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his response, and I thank the chairman, too, because I know he is concerned about this area and worked hard to restore the funds to at least the level of last year. The problem is that we are faced with an overwhelming situation that is costing, in the United States, speaking as a whole—it is being pennywise and pound-foolish—that by depriving the Border Patrol of the number of agents we decided we needed back in 1986, over 6,000 agents, we are costing the country billions in social costs and criminal justice costs. So I have to tell my friend that I think it is time that we had a chance to work a prioritization, which is really what we are doing here on the floor. I appreciate the gentleman's appreciation of the problem.

I think we need to go forward and try to get 600 agents on, it is still going to be a small corporals guard, but it is still going to be necessary.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, obviously I have a concern, coming from a border State and border district. I share the concern that my colleagues from California have in offering this amendment today with regard to the Border Patrol and Immigration Service. In my remarks in the general debate on this bill I talked about the cuts in the number of Border Patrol agents that I think need to be restored. I think, however, as my colleague, Mr. ROGERS, has said, this amendment may be a little premature. We are planning to offer a motion to recommit—and in that motion we will restore to the INS some of these funds for Border Patrol as well as for the investigative and border agents who do the regular inspections—but there are also other priorities, and one of the other top priorities is the number of Federal prisoner days. That is the money for maintaining Federal prisoners in the Federal prison system.

I think we ought to wait until we see how this bill looks at the end of today's debate with the amount of money that is struck on points of order, to know what we have available to us in order to restore this and to make sure that the motion to recommit restores it in the proper places where the administration's top priorities are.

I support the administration priorities in law enforcement, but that includes money for maintaining prisoners in the Federal prison system as well as for the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the FBI and the DEA. We need to look at all of those. I would say that INS, as well as the Federal prison days, are the top priorities that we have.

So I would say at this moment we ought to wait until we see what this bill is going to look like at the end. This is a fluid situation.

We know much in this legislation is not authorized, much will be struck; we will have a number of dollars at the end of this debate today that can then be perhaps reallocated in a responsible fashion rather than doing it now when we do not know what is there, and rather than doing it with just one of the Federal agencies, law enforcement agencies, I would suggest that we wait on that.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOLBE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has made the telling point here that I think bears underlining. After we get through the bill today, before we have the final vote, we will have a last

chance to look back and see what items were stricken and what moneys may have been freed up and what we can responsibly do, looking at INS, at that time. This is premature. The gentleman's point is well taken.

I would hope that the Members would stick with us.

Then let us see where we are, where we stand at the end of the bill, and we can look back.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOLBE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, would it be possible, since one of the problems is the placement of this amendment in the bill, would it be proper to ask unanimous consent that this amendment be allowed at a later point in the bill after we have gone through points of order against the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOLBE. I yield to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman has explained; the minority controls the motion to recommit. So all of these can be taken care of in a motion to recommit.

Mr. KOLBE. Reclaiming my time, I think that the motion to recommit, as you know, works as an amendment, and clearly we have this in mind. We are watching this. We intend to make sure these dollars are returned to the law enforcement side, where we believe they should be.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California.

□ 1120

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I greatly appreciate the gentleman's offer to put it in the motion to recommit. Many of us feel this is the most important amendment we will consider today, because it will save millions, if not billions of dollars in the border States.

Twenty-two percent of the Federal prisoners are illegal aliens. You will cut that cost dramatically.

I do not like to see it put in a huge amendment that has many, many other things that could go down. This is vital and so important.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I can assure the gentleman from California that the motion to recommit is not going to be huge covering all kinds of things. It is going to be targeted in law enforcement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, and I will not object, but I just would like to say that I would like to ask the gentleman to yield to me when he gets his 1 minute for a unanimous-consent request, and my unanimous-consent request would be that this amendment will be in order at any point in the bill, so that once there is a resolution of some of these points of order, we will know there is money there available for this amendment.

So I wish the gentleman would yield to me for that.

Further reserving the fight to object, Mr. Chairman, I would like the gentleman to yield to me before his time is up so I can do that.

Mr. KOLBE. I will do so Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] has expired.

(On request of Mr. DREIER, and by unanimous consent, Mr. KOLBE was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, if the Members here will bear with us, we have already discussed a motion to recommit at the end of the bill when we know what vacancies we have from the bill. At the motion to recommit, the gentleman from Arizona will be offering a motion to recommit that can put moneys into the INS.

Now, if the Members will help us out here, we are going to try to help you, but please help us out.

Mr. KOLBE. Reclaiming my time for just one moment, Mr. Chairman, may I say to the gentleman from Kentucky that this issue has had some discussion, I know, with staff and other members of the full committee about possibly reserving some of the money for other priorities, law enforcement priorities.

The No. 1 priority of the Justice Department is the prisoner days. Without that, we will have to release prisoners very early.

Mr. Chairman, I promised that I would yield to the gentleman from Indiana, and I yield to the gentleman at this time.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that this particular amendment, because of the importance of it, be allowed at any point in the bill so that once points of order against the bill have been raised which will provide the money for this amendment, we will know that it is there and we can go ahead with it.

So Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that this amendment be so considered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to clarify this. Is the gentleman referring to the Hunter amendment?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I am, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman requesting that it be withdrawn at this point?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. No, I am not, Mr. Chairman. I am just asking that it be allowed at any point within the consideration of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is pending now. If it is defeated, the gentleman's request would not be in order.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Let me make my position clear. We are doing exactly what we should be doing right now, which is allowing the full body to prioritize and inject some prioritization into this bill that has been crafted by the committee.

If you think that Border Patrol funding is important, then it should take a priority and some of the other parts of the bill perhaps should accommodate that funding priority.

I am not willing to wait for the rest of the bill to be worked out and see if possibly there is some money around to stop this massive problem that is burdening our criminal justice system, burdening our social system and overwhelming the country.

So I have to tell my friend, the gentleman from Indiana, I would be constrained to object to any such unanimous-consent request.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. That being the case, Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my request.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman, in this motion to recommit, would the gentleman reinstate the full amount that is requested for the Border Patrol?

Mr. KOLBE. The full amount that is requested by this amendment?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The \$60 million, yes.

Mr. KOLBE. No, I cannot say that would be the case because of the No. 1 priority, which is the prisoner days to maintain Federal prisons.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has again expired.

(At the request of Mr. SHAW, and by unanimous consent, Mr. KOLBE was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield,

the gentleman has already stated that under points of order there is about \$385 million that is going to come up. That No. 1 priority surely can take the \$385 million. The motion to recommit would allow \$60 million which is in this amendment.

Mr. KOLBE. It would not take \$385 million, but I think as we go through the numbers the gentleman will see there is not \$385 million available, either; but I will be happy to talk to the gentleman about that. We are still in a fluid position at this point in terms of the numbers.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOLBE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make an observation here with regard to the motion to recommit. If this amendment passes, then it still can be fixed as far as the funding in the motion to recommit.

So this amendment is actually some insurance that we do get an absolute up or down vote on this particular issue, that we do get to fully debate it. There is no issue that I can think of that is more important to the future of this country than the question of protecting our borders.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOLBE. Certainly, I yield to my very distinguished chairman.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, there is a question about whether the motion to recommit will include enough funds to bring INS up to the budget request. The gentleman controls the motion to recommit. The bill is less than \$20 million under the budget request for INS, not \$60 million. We are less than \$20 million under the budget request.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct. That is why I have some concerns about the \$60 million that we are talking about.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOLBE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS. Of course, as we know, Mr. Chairman, the minority will control the motion to recommit. We have not yet decided what will be in the motion to recommit, but this amendment comes at a time when we do not have any money left in the bill.

Now, if it were later in the bill after we had something stricken out, we could talk about it, but at this point in time we do not have any funds. At the end of the bill we will likely have some moneys that have been stricken. We can consult on the motion to recommit and try to address this problem, but it is premature in the consideration of this bill.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's comments. I think he is correct. I think it is premature.

Ms. SCHENK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to increase INS funding by \$60 million.

The San Diego, Tijuana border region which Congressman FILNER, HUNTER, and I directly represent, is the Nation's busiest and most violent border zone. More than 50 percent of all undocumented persons apprehended throughout the United States were apprehended in this region in 1992.

Yet the Border Patrol in San Diego remain grossly underfunded. No Member of this body can truly understand how desperate the situation is until they have seen it for themselves.

I have ridden with the agents and I have seen the overwhelming and demoralizing odds, the vehicles that have long exceeded Government recommended mileage replacement standards, and the vehicles that have their hoods tied down with wire.

I have heard potential border crossers laugh at the Border Patrol agents saying: "Just wait until nightfall—you can't stop us."

Border Patrol agents in San Diego have special needs. They must use horses, helicopters, all-terrain vehicles, and mountain bikes to protect what is the most overrun 15 miles of the border.

Just last month my office received a desperate call from the Border Patrol in San Diego. They are absolutely stone broke. They received sedans which are going to remain unused until they can get money to transform them into usable vehicles.

I know the Appropriations Committee has been generous with their funding for Border Patrol this year and I thank them. However, with over 50 percent of the national workload of undocumented alien traffic and 30 percent of the national drug seizures, San Diego has never been realistically funded for its workload.

To my colleagues who think \$60 million is an increase too great to bring home to their constituents, think about this: In the State of California alone the cost of providing services and incarcerating undocumented aliens is \$2.8 billion per year. These are costs that no taxpayers want to bear the burden of.

This is not a problem unique to San Diego or California. The recent attempt by hundreds of Chinese citizens to enter the United States through Mexico, New York, and New Jersey shows the need for greater resources at our border.

The Border Patrol authorization requires INS to appropriate sums as may be necessary to the Border Patrol; \$60 million is absolutely necessary to provide resources and an additional 600 agents to the Border Patrol. The Hunter-Moorhead-Schenk amendment

would provide these resources and I urge my colleagues in the House to vote in favor of this amendment.

□ 1130

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment.

Last year, Mr. Chairman, the Border Patrol was designated as the primary agency responsible for drug interdiction between ports of entry along the United States-Mexican border. Each year more than 1 billion dollars' worth of drugs are captured along that border, and yet there are probably two or three times that much that gets through. In the past 7 months over 800,000 illegal immigrants were apprehended nationwide, and yet at least three or four times that number are making it through. The GAO reports that upward of 22 percent of the Federal prisons population are illegal aliens. In California at least 25 percent of our State prison population are illegal aliens. The same problem is true in Florida, and Texas, and other border-line areas.

Eighty-one percent of all Americans support an increase in the border control, notwithstanding that the major new responsibility of the Patrol's ongoing principal mission is to deter illegal entry and conduct related apprehension activity along the borders. In the San Diego area alone, Mr. Chairman, 3,000 to 4,500 undocumented aliens flood our border daily. It is estimated that for every illegal alien at that particular point three gain successful entry. In fiscal year 1992 the U.S. Border Patrol arrested 1.2 million aliens.

Mr. Chairman, I authored an amendment to the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 authorizing a substantial 50-percent increase in the Border Patrol. This amendment passed, and yet these levels have never been properly funded. We are currently at the level of around 4,800 for Border Patrol personnel, but there is only about 1,200 on duty at any one time, along that southern border. If my amendment had received sufficient appropriations, we would have been at the level of 6,600 by the end of fiscal year 1994.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORHEAD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleague, an authorization does not mean anything if you vote against the appropriation for INS. The gentleman was one of those that voted for a \$76 million cut. The Appropriations bill is where the final number comes in.

Mr. MOORHEAD. However, we did not get any additional money put into it, for this purpose either. We have had additional authorizations for Border

Patrol agents on a number of occasions. The Immigration Act of 1990 included an amendment I offered on the floor for an additional 1,000 Border Patrol officers. The Department of Justice Appropriations Authorization Act for fiscal year 1991 included \$55 million to hire and train 1,000 additional Border Patrol personnel, yet we continue to allow the border to remain underfunded. During the fiscal year 1993, the Border Patrol lost 65 agents. The President's budget request for fiscal year 1994 included a decrease of 93 agents. It constantly goes on. The problems grow.

In California, Mr. Chairman, we spend \$450 million a year just providing emergency medical care for illegal aliens. The overall cost to the State of California is in the billions, as well as it is to other border States. Organized crime and unscrupulous smugglers are now taking great advantage of our unprotected borders. We need to do something about this problem now.

Mr. Chairman, every dollar we spend will probably save us at least 10, and far more in Federal budget expenditures than we ever will spend for the Border Patrol. Let us get down and do the job for America. I can tell my colleagues, if I walk my district, they will stop me at every other house and ask me what we are going to do about this problem. It is a serious problem. It is the most serious problem there is in our State of California. It is dangerous. Please give us some relief.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to, first of all, support the issue of the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], his amendment, and I want to, second of all, support Mr. HUNTER in his efforts in this Congress in many areas, specifically this.

My colleagues, I have had a bill to this effect that would call for troops to be returned from overseas where they are cashing their checks in bases in foreign countries and placing those soldiers on our borders. There is one Patrol border agent for every 2½ mile of border. America is being literally overrun with illegal immigration, and we are making illegal immigrants citizens.

What is the policy of this unbelievable legislative body?

Beam me up.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I would like to further say we have gone through three nominees for our Nation's highest law enforcement office trying to find somebody that did not hire an illegal alien.

Now I understand the dilemma that this chairman is in and the Committee on Appropriations is in, and I would like to say this: There are an awful lot of needs in law enforcement, and we must deal with them. But the most

critical and urgent need that faces this Congress is people jumping the fence on our border without enough people to monitor it, and, my colleagues, it is time to pay up. We cannot have it both ways. We cannot complain about illegal aliens jumping our fence without putting in the funds and backing up the personnel to handle that.

So let me say this—

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] mentioned a second ago that this country was allowing undocumented immigrants to become U.S. citizens. I would like to ask the question of the gentleman in a second. The reason I will ask is for the following reason:

There is no doubt that there are problems at our borders, and there is a need to beef up the Border Patrol, but I am very disturbed and saddened by the debate that is taking place today because the emphasis is not on the immigrants who are coming in. It is on the illegal immigration that is occurring, and I think it is a very sad statement with all of us who are probably the children at some point of immigrants to try to paint the monster image on individuals who are coming to this country, rightfully or wrongfully, for the purpose of trying to have a better life. We must address the problem of undocumented immigration into this country, but we should not be attacking people and making them look like monsters as they come into this country.

So I ask—

Mr. TRAFICANT. Reclaiming my time—

Mr. BECERRA. If I may ask the question of the gentleman then: Can you please explain to me how it is this country is allowing undocumented immigrants to become U.S. citizens?

Mr. TRAFICANT. Reclaiming my time, and I gave the gentleman an opportunity to participate, my great-grandparents were immigrants as well. They came in the legal way. I think it is time to get back to an immigration policy that allows people to come to America under the legal parameters, and let me say one last thing:

We are not helping all of these people in the other countries by taking a small number of them into America and further eroding our economy. We would be better off to teach them how to fish rather than coming in here and giving them a loaf of bread.

So, in answer to the gentleman's question, I don't think your question applies to this particular issue. I say we don't have enough Border Patrol agents for people who are jumping the fence illegally, and that's what this amendment deals with, and I support it.

Mr. BECERRA. But the question was, Mr. TRAFICANT, about a statement that this country was permitting those who are here without documentation to become U.S. citizens. I rise today, and I thank the gentleman for yielding, because many statements have been made today that are untrue. There are not 800 illegal immigrants, and I do not use the term; I use the term "undocumented" immigrants who have come into this country and who are still here.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman can strike the last word. We have an immigration bill that said, if you would jump the fence, and you are in America for 5 years illegally, although you were here for 5 years, we made those illegal immigrants citizens eventually.

I do not want to get into that issue. That is exactly what the bill did, and the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA] can take his own time.

This is a Member that is against it. This is a Member that is against the Congress turning its back against people jumping our fence.

□ 1140

I think it is very significant. It is not a slight to any ethnic group or any people, but I think it is time that Congress put its foot down.

Mr. Chairman, I support the Hunter amendment.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the Hunter amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Hunter-Moorhead amendment is a necessary step. Admittedly, money is not the answer to our immigration problems, and I regret the fact that my distinguished neighbor, the chairman of the subcommittee, and my equally distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky, are caught up in the middle of a debate here, but I say to the Members of the House that what we see here today is an insurrection under parliamentary procedures in the House.

This is not a California problem, this is not a Florida problem or a New York City problem; this is an America problem, and the Judiciary Committee lackadaisically has failed to address the need for effective controls for the illegal alien problem for years.

This gentleman comes from a State as far away from the coast as possible, but I say this is an American problem, and we representatives of the American people are here today to be heard for them. If we take a look at the number of Members gathered around here today, surely it must understand that we can keep a cap on immigration reform, especially the control of our borders for only so long. The leadership of this House, and particularly the Judiciary Committee of the two bodies, have failed to address the problems of illegal

aliens and the effective control of our borders and refugee problems that are confronting the country. It is time that the Members and its American people be heard, and that is why so many Members want to speak on behalf of this amendment today.

Mr. Chairman, I also speak to the Members as a member of the Intelligence Committee, and I can tell the Members that we are particularly vulnerable to terrorist events in this country. We are an open society. And we want to be an open society. We want to be open to legal immigrants, but I want to tell my colleagues, and particularly the members of the Judiciary Committee, that if we do not take some of the actions that the INS has been crying for these many years now, if we don't give them the legal tools and resources to reduce the numbers of people who are coming in here illegally or by devious and fraudulent abuse of our processes, some coming with ill intent in their hearts, if we do not take some steps to begin to shut the door on abuses of political asylum, then we are going to have terrorist events in this country that will shake the foundations of our constituencies. And some of our Members will wonder why it is that we have not acted before this crisis. They will wonder why it is that the Judiciary Committee has set on these reform issues year after year.

For example, in New York City alone today we have 15,000 people claiming political asylum waiting for hearings. They are coming in at a remarkable pace around the whole country and not just by commercial airlines, but by the boatload. I would ask the members of the Judiciary Committee and other interested people, as well as members of this subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, if you need a confirmation of the abuses of the system and frustration of our INS personnel who are crippled or handicapped by inadequate law or resources, then just go out to Dulles airport and see the problems they have there today.

The claims that are made by people coming in for political asylum today are rarely legitimate. They are patently fraudulent. They are tearing up visas; they are tearing up passports on the planes. They are giving them back to people on the plane who are commercial immigration expeditors, illegal immigration expeditors. They say the magic phrase "I seek political asylum and they are issued a green card, made eligible for welfare benefits, and disappear into our society. And that is what we are facing here today.

We can throw all the money at this problem we want—and I approve of this amendment because it is a small, important step that will help, in particular, the border States—but unless we get some action out of the Judiciary Committee on the necessary reforms we are going to have continued and increasing problems.

So, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to put some pressure on this Judiciary Committee, the committees in this House and the other House. We must have some reforms; if one holds townhall meetings or listens to constituents, one knows it is a top priority of many constituents across this land. Without reforms now we will, after related terrorist events, have the type of xenophobic demands that will result in draconian changes in our legitimate refuge and immigrations procedures and programs.

Finally, yesterday, after great travail, after much discussion about inadequate steps like preclearance at foreign airports, some Members on the House Judiciary Committee are finally, it appears, going to do something. Reform of the political asylum procedures is but one of many steps that need to be taken. Immigration reform does not have to be done comprehensively for we get bogged down in controversy. We can and should take some steps now to provide some of the important tools that the INS needs.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues, as a first small start, to approve the Hunter-Moorhead amendment here today.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if, with the indulgence of my colleagues, we can make some kind of an effort to limit debate. We have been on this for 40 minutes. If we do not get this bill passed, we are not going to get any money.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield and accept the amendment?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Of course not.

Would 20 minutes be enough? All the Members know how they are going to vote on this.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. How about 25 minutes?

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman could give us 40 minutes equally divided. The problem is, I say to the subcommittee chairman, that we have a lot of Members who want to speak on this issue.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I know. It is a very important issue to a lot of people.

Mr. HUNTER. They have come down to the floor, and they all have something to say about this.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. How about 30 minutes? Would that not be enough? That would be altogether 1 hour and 10 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I have counted the number of heads on our side, and there are a couple of Members on the gentleman's side who want to speak.

Could the gentleman give us 40 minutes?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. All right.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment end in 40 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I say to the Members that if I move it, I am not going to move it for 40 minutes. I will move for something less than that. Can we not make some reasonable accommodation?

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, from my perspective I think we can accommodate the Members who want to speak on this in 40 minutes. Obviously there are other Members who have a concern with that. That would be fine with me.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to ask for 40 minutes if I have to move it; I am going to ask for 20 minutes on a motion.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I think we can get it done in 40 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment end at 12:25.

Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw that.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment end in 40 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, let me find out how many speakers there are with a show of hands.

I would say there are at least 12 Members here.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. That is about 4 minutes apiece.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman calls for a vote, it is going to take 20 minutes. Why does the gentleman not make it for 1 hour? If the gentleman would make it for 1 hour, I think that would cover it.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. No, I am not going to do that.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If the gentleman calls for a vote, we are going to waste an hour anyhow, and probably more.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, we are going to have to figure some way to move this bill.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If the gentleman calls for a vote, we will waste an hour anyway, and probably more.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw my request temporarily.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I represent the 50th District of California, which is the border area between California and Mexico, and I want to speak to the amendment.

First, I want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH], for working very closely with me and with other freshman Members of Congress to help them resolve infrastructure problems on the border. He has been, along with the ranking member, the gentleman from Kentucky, very sensitive to the issues we have raised, and I know he is very concerned and very aware of what is going on. I want to thank the gentleman for being sensitive and for doing so much to help us on the border.

We have heard from other Members from the San Diego area and from other parts of the Nation about the need for more Border Patrol. My own experience, from living at the border for the last 15 or 20 years, indicates that that is true.

I am going to vote for this amendment, but let us not kid ourselves, I say to my colleagues from both sides of the aisle. This addition of Border Patrol agents is not going to solve the problems we all have spoken about and have recognized. This will not solve the problem. The problem is deeper. The problem requires a far more comprehensive point of view.

We need to work on economic development on both sides of the border. We need to work with our Mexican counterparts on law enforcement. We need to have the employers on this side of the border understand the law.

There are a lot of elements to solving the problem. It is not just adding to the Border Patrol.

So let us pass this amendment, but I beg my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to get in a problem-solving mode on this issue. I have heard very inflammatory rhetoric today. I have heard rhetoric that will polarize this issue instead of helping solve the problem.

□ 1150

So let us add those agents, but let us recognize that this is not going to solve the problem. Let us get into a problem solving mode. And, please, let us recognize that the strength of this country is diversity. Let us recognize the basic humanity of all individuals, whatever names you want to put on them for the purpose of this debate. Let us work together to get at the economic development that is so crucial for helping all people have a better way of life on both sides of the border.

Mr. Chairman, please, let us down the rhetoric. Let us get into a problem solving mode on what is a real issue for all of this Nation.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that by just the show of force, that the com-

mittee understands the importance of this. We've heard people say "It is the economy, stupid." In California, in my district, illegal immigration is the absolute No. 1 issue, and I would say the No. 1 issue in the State of California, border States, and for Americans, and I am sure the chairman would agree. We are becoming overrun.

Second, I would like to assure the honorable gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA], that this is a matter of illegal immigration, and not legal immigration, which made this country so great. And I would like to associate myself with the words of the gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER].

Mr. Chairman, we are asking for \$60 million. Governor Wilson of California, State Senator Craven, and colleagues on both sides of the aisle, have identified that it costs the State of California alone over \$2 billion a year for the illegal immigration problem. Can you imagine what it will cost in the rest of the country?

If we can save dollars by adding dollars, then that is a savings, and we need to run it like this.

Let me give you a couple of examples. Over 50 percent of the children born in L.A. County Hospital are to illegal aliens. They then go down and qualify for Medicaid.

Who pays for that? Not only the taxpayers, but this takes the services away from the very, very poor. Over 37,000 children, illegals, were born in Los Angeles County alone. Just L.A. County. That is not the rest of the State. That is just in L.A. County. Six hundred twenty dollars a month, per person. That equates to \$25 million per month.

In 1 minute, we can pay for this amendment nationally. One minute, by just the cost savings.

The gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER] has also stated that this is not a total answer, but it is sure going to help and be one of the most effective means.

We need to stop illegals at the borders. Not once they get into our cities, not have to jail them, not have to house them. Twenty-five percent of all the felons in California are illegal aliens. San Diego County Sheriff Jim Roache is having to turn other felons out of the jail system on a revolving door system. Can you imagine what the cost of this is? We are not even talking about the World Trade Center cost.

They are having to shut down education programs in my wife's school because of the glut of illegal immigrants. They live in the canyons. It has just become critical, and it is not something that we need to turn our backs on.

When you say there is a priority of Federal prisoners, boy, I will tell you, come to the State. I have had several Members on both sides of the aisle come down to the border with the gen-

tlewoman from California [Ms. SCHENK], the gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER], the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], and the gentleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLEY], and they cannot believe the situation. It is like a flood coming across the border, and they cannot stop them.

Mr. Chairman, this will help and aid that problem.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate the gentleman for his point. One of the things I found my constituents in Pennsylvania, who are not faced with the flood across the border, are concerned about, is that we have added additional costs to the Federal Government in the reconciliation bill by suggesting that we are going to create this brand new entitlement program that reimburses 100 percent of all the costs of illegal alien babies being born in this country.

Here is a fantastic new cost that we are now imposing on the Federal Government in the reconciliation bill. Virtually everybody who voted for the reconciliation bill voted for a brand new entitlement program to pay 100 percent of the cost of illegal aliens having babies in this country.

Now, that is something where we see this whole philosophy is extending out to brand new programs, brand new entitlement programs, that are going to cost us billions of dollars over a period of just a few years.

So the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] makes an absolute point that is on target, and I congratulate him for his statement.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment, and all amendments thereto, end in 40 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] how many speakers are on his side?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, three or four, probably. I doubt if we will use all the time over here, but I cannot tell the gentleman that for sure.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, we have six. That makes 10.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, that is too much time. All Members know how they are going to vote. That is about 4 minutes apiece.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Would it be possible to try to allocate to each one of the speakers 4 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will distribute the time.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I understand the Chair will distribute the time. I would like to have a

gentleman's agreement, because there are not as many Members on the other side who plan to speak.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] asks unanimous consent that all time on this amendment, and all amendments thereto, be limited to 40 minutes. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, could I just ask of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH], if we could have sort of a general agreement, recognizing the Chair's power to recognize, that if there is some time left over on the one side, and there are one or two surplus speakers, we will try to accommodate them?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I did not ask that the time be evenly divided by sides.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will allot time to all Members standing at the time of the request.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH]? There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Members standing at the time the unanimous-consent request was agreed to will be recognized for 3 minutes each.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Ms. HARMAN].

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment of my colleagues from California. The California delegation has been working in a bipartisan fashion to retain and build high-skill, high-wage jobs that are the key to our economic revitalization. We are demonstrating today, that in bipartisan fashion, we are determined to deal with a critical deterrent to economic revitalization, illegal immigration.

Mr. Chairman, we are a nation of immigrants, and I am the daughter of immigrants, who came to America seeking peace and prosperity, and found both. Our strength as a country derives in part from our diversity. However, we must draw the distinction between legal immigration, which is constantly revitalizing our society and our economy, and illegal immigration, which is sapping the economic strength of our Nation in general and California in particular.

Difficult economic times here make it impossible to share limited jobs and resources with those who fail to comply with our immigration laws.

□ 1200

Unfortunately, border patrol funding cuts reduced the number of agents that patrolled our borders last year, and this trend is continuing. The Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 authorized a substantial increase in border control agents, but this increase has never been funded. Our forces along our southern border are spread dangerously thin.

This excellent bipartisan amendment would add 600 agents to our southern border—a good start.

Illegal immigration hurts legal immigration, overburdens stretched community and State services and, in many instances, exposes illegal immigrants to intimidation and exploitation. It is a lose-lose proposition. This amendment will play a real part in reducing the hurt.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH].

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, this is an issue, as the gentlewoman from California mentioned, dealing with illegal immigration. This issue is important to all the people in this country, but I think it is more than just dollars that must be involved here. In order for the job to be finished, taxpayer dollars are not enough. We have to have people to patrol our borders. That is why, for a long time, I have been saying that we have people in the military. We are downsizing our military. We still have many people left in Europe. We are paying \$160 billion a year to protect European borders. From whom? To this day we in this Congress still are spending \$120 billion a year to defend European borders. From whom? Russia? Russia is not our enemy anymore. We are now giving funds to Russia. We are now giving foreign aid to Russia. It is a phantom enemy.

What we have to do is to bring some of the troops that we have in Europe to help us control our borders. We have to get control over our own borders again. To use our military for that purpose, in my opinion, would be an excellent job for them to do. It would save money. It would keep them employed, rather than having them have nothing to do. It would be a way for us also to negotiate an agreement with other countries so that they would have some internal constraints from allowing the people from coming across our border.

We have to, I think, take a look at our visa program and see how that can be changed. Yes, to put more dollars into this program is important. But I think it is going to take more than money. It is going to take people to patrol that border. It is going to take us to redefine how we are going to use our military.

For those who are concerned, that is all of us, with illegal immigration, I think we have to think anew on how we are going to address this particular problem.

Border patrol is important, yes. We have got to show how we can have our military involved. We have got to take a look at the visa program. We have got to look at how we work with other nations, diplomatically, so they have some internal constraints from sending and keep sending all of these people across the border, because it is not only Mexico, the Caribbean, but now

we are having all kinds of problems with Asia. And this problem is going to get worse and worse and worse.

That is why this is preeminently the time when we have to address this issue.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, to accommodate other Members, I will be very brief. I do want to rise in support of the amendment by the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] and others.

This is a tremendously growing problem. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] and I, a couple of weeks ago, had a briefing from an INS official who told us that 187,000 illegal aliens were apprehended at the Mexican border during the month of April alone. There are some estimates that there are three or four times as many as are apprehended, as are coming across, and so this is a problem of concern not just to those from border States but to all of us across the country.

People from Tennessee and other States are greatly concerned about this. A couple of weeks ago an economist from Rice University presented a new study which shows that we spend at least \$12.5 billion on the approximately 5 million illegal aliens here now, at least \$12.5 billion, and some estimates are even higher than that.

In addition to all of that, the INS official who briefed us told us that it cost an average of \$30,000 to remove an illegal alien. And even worse, it takes an average of 3 years of time to do that.

An earlier speaker mentioned that there are 15,000 illegal alien cases awaiting hearings at the present time in New York alone. The INS official who briefed us told us that in Mexico they remove illegal aliens in 3 to 4 weeks time, but he said they were trying to give technical assistance to the Mexicans to get them to update their procedures.

I said that we needed to take lessons from the Mexicans. We need to toughen up our laws in regard to illegal aliens and remove them much faster than 3 years' time.

I do not suppose I have ever spoken in favor of an amendment to increase spending, but I support the efforts by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] to take other moneys from this bill and use it to increase the funding for the Border Patrol, because this is a problem that is at a very serious point now and is going to grow in the future.

Also, I hope, Mr. Chairman, that we learn a lesson from this in this country. All over this world today where nations have allowed their governments to get too big, where they have followed big government liberalism, where they have followed socialism and

Communist-type governments, people have suffered. We see people in other nations starving in the streets or lined up 8 or 9 hours to get a pound of sausage, things that we take for granted.

We need to learn a lesson that we better not stray from our free enterprise system and go in the direction toward more government, more regulation, more redtape in this country where the same things that are causing illegal aliens to want to come so badly to the United States will be happening here at some point in the future.

I rise in strong support of this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do likewise.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, the chairman, for his time and also his patience in allowing Members of this Congress to debate the issue of immigration. I want to say that I am one who supports an increase in the Border Patrol and spending for INS, because I believe it is also essential, as many of my colleagues have said.

But as I remarked a few minutes earlier, I am very disconcerted by the tone of the debate that is taking place today, not because we do not have people who are coming into this country without documentation, not because there are not costs associated with having people in this country who do not have documentation, but because there are so many grand misstatements made about these individuals that I believe that we should have some correction.

First of all, when we talk about people who are apprehended, let us understand that there are less people who are apprehended than we see in apprehensions, because people are oftentimes crossing the border more than one time, obviously, because we have a very porous border. But let us not try to inflate the figures to make a point that I think everyone will agree to. There is a problem at our borders.

We talk about 800,000 apprehensions. Please do not mislead people and have them think that there are 800,000 people that were captured last year. That is just not the case. There were 800,000 apprehensions. Most of us who are from border States know that there are individuals who are apprehended on several occasions coming across the various borders.

What we need to do, beyond the debate of rhetoric, is go into the true way we could try to solve the problem of immigration. We need to, first of all, make sure that the INS has the resources it needs to enforce our immigration policies. We do need more Border Patrol agents. We also have to have a more professional Border Patrol. We are paying millions of dollars in law-

suits because we have Border Patrol agents who are committing abuses against people, not just immigrants, also U.S. citizens. They apprehend these individuals, abuse them, and thereafter we see a suit filed against the INS because of the abuse.

Let us get a professional Border Patrol in our Immigration Service, and we will see a better job done.

Let us also deal with the issue of people who are truly interested in seeing legal immigrants in this country have a decent time in this country once they become legal. Let us provide them with the services. People have to wait hours upon hours in long lines to be able to get the documentation they need to become a U.S. citizen, if they are here as a lawful permanent resident. Let us take care of the problems that we have within INS in that regard.

Let us also, as someone mentioned before, take care of the asylum problem. We have a backlog approaching 200,000 cases for people who have claims for asylum. Let us let these cases go forward quickly so we can see who really needs it and who does not and let us get those who do not have a valid claim out of the country. But remember, we have refugees coming into this country all the time.

We have seen the recent Chinese who were smuggled in this country. But the fact remains, less than 1 percent of the refugees worldwide are admitted into the United States. That is the truth, and we should make sure we color our debate with the truth about immigrants. Let us distinguish immigrants from immigration policy. Let us go after bad immigration policy. Let us make sure we protect people who are immigrants who try to come into this country for valid reasons.

□ 1210

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong support of the Hunter-Moorhead amendment.

I would first like to say the distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee, my friend from Glendale, Mr. MOORHEAD, and I have had the privilege of working on this issue for the past several years. In fact, in 1986 we were able to get a similar amendment put in. Obviously that was not enough, because we still have this flow of illegal immigrants who are coming across the border.

Mr. Chairman, why is it that people flee Mexico and come to the United States? One very simple and basic reason is economic opportunity, economic opportunity. They are seeking either a job, or welfare, health care, the kinds of social welfare programs that we provide. And I believe that there is a way in which we can get to the root of this problem to deal with this issue.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Glendale, CA.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, when we discuss the costs of illegal immigration we have to consider all of the costs of the social programs and other things. The Federal Government, rather than taking care of them, and it is in their field, it is their problem, have mandated those programs over to the States. And that is one of the reasons why Florida, Texas, and California are drowning, because the costs of carrying out these mandated programs are in the billions of dollars. And if the Federal Government wants it, they should finance it themselves rather than pushing it off on the States that are the center of the issue.

Mr. DREIER. My friend is absolutely right. And that is why I would like to briefly mention the two items which I believe are key to getting at the root of this problem. I know my friend from California, Mr. GALLEGLY, from Simi Valley has worked very diligently on this immigration problem, and we are going to be hearing from him in a few moments.

My concern is unfunded Federal mandates. As Mr. MOORHEAD has said, we at the Federal level impose on State and local governments the requirement that they provide this kind of social welfare. That is a magnet drawing people across the border who come here illegally to meet these.

We do not provide the funds for State and local governments to provide those services and yet we tell them to provide those services. That is why I am virulently opposed to unfunded Federal mandates.

The second thing, Mr. Chairman, and I know this is a very controversial issue around here, a rising tide lifts all ships. Indications are that as the economy of Mexico improves, people are not as inclined to leave Mexico and come to the United States. Over the past several years as we have seen the improvement in the economy of Mexico, we have, based on some reports, seen an actual decrease in the flow of illegal immigrants from Mexico to the United States.

That is why implementation of a North American Free-Trade Agreement is key to this issue, because we have to realize that improving the economy of Mexico is in the best interests of the United States of America.

I strongly support the Hunter-Moorhead amendment and I encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GUTIERREZ].

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Chairman, I do not really have any problem with increasing the number of dollars that our country spends on the Border Patrol. It is really with the nature of this discussion.

As America watches us, anyone would think that everyone with a surname of Gonzalez, or Rodriguez, or even Gutierrez across America simply came here to get welfare, simply came here to somehow benefit and not come here to work, as if you could go through the neighborhoods, and the factories of the cities of Chicago, of Los Angeles, and New York and across this country and not see them working.

The fact is we should have a discussion about immigrants to this country and just how it is that they contribute to this country, just how it is that they make America work and take the kind of jobs that every other immigrant group before the Latino community has come here has taken in order to work themselves up by the bootstraps, actually, Mr. Chairman.

It is sad to hear this discussion as though everyone just came here to somehow try to benefit. Let me tell you, ladies and gentlemen, it is strange to hear a discussion about hospitals and about mothers giving birth to babies, and we are worried and preoccupied about the cost. Yet yesterday we had a great discussion on the importance of life here in this very body, and it seems to me that many of those who object to, with such virulence, to anyone having a baby in a decent hospital here, and I do not know, maybe we are only pro-life if they have a permanent resident's card, and maybe only then they should have a baby with quality medical services, I am not sure. But that is part of the problem with this discussion.

We should have a discussion, we should have a discussion about how it is that immigrants contribute to America so that America will understand that, according to Business Week, immigrants contributed to this country last year \$90 billion and only took \$5 billion in social services. Why do we not talk about the richness of the immigrant community that comes into this country in the context of this discussion instead of having this xenophobia? We are starting to sound a lot like England. Let us blame all of the problems that exist in this Nation on the immigrants that arrive here, and let us just forget about the savings and loan bailout that cost us \$200 billion and that has not hurt the American taxpayer in this country. Let us just forget about all of the other problems, Mr. Chairman.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SOLOMON yielded his time to Mr. FISH.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I would say with respect to the previous speaker that I am deeply concerned over his reaction and his assessment of opinions expressed. This is one reason I think that we have to exercise far greater control over illegal immigration and people overstaying in this country.

Fifty percent of our legal immigration represents families of citizens and the families, immediate relatives of those admitted for permanent residence. And I am afraid, and I think the gentleman should think about this, that if we allow hundreds of thousands to violate our laws, to come in with impunity, that the American public will soon evidence a reaction that will actually do harm to those I think the gentleman is concerned about, the legal immigrants that we want in this country, largely for family reunification.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out that our Committee on the Judiciary is working right now on the response to what are the contributing factors to the growing numbers of undocumented aliens. One of these is the abuse of the asylum privilege, a law that we put into effect in a relatively recent time when only 2,000 or 3,000 applications were contemplated a year. Now we have a backlog of 260,000 pending applications that can only be described as a total breakdown in our system where we have fewer officers to adjudicate these claims than do countries like Canada and Sweden. This is an area where clearly resources have to be allocated.

Alien-smuggling, the latest episode to receive publicity, is enormously profitable as an enterprise. The profit must be taken out of this alien-smuggling. By sea is only the latest. We have had alien-smuggling over land for some time. To address this we are considering additional criminal penalties and asset forfeiture provisions.

Our departure control in the United States is virtually non-existent. I mention all of these things because I think it is going to be a combination of efforts that deal with the wave of undocumented aliens that come into the United States. But it has always been and remains the 1,900-mile porous border to our Southwest over which nationals of some 50 nations come in virtually at will. It has been very disappointing that efforts on the part of Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MCCOLLUM, myself, and others on the Judiciary Committee over the last 15 years passing legislation similar to this amendment before Members today to increase our Border Patrol, only to find that we were not taken seriously and administrations have sidetracked this effort.

So I would urge that this amendment is on the right track and part of our total effort to deal with this issue.

□ 1220

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLY].

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot of debate on this issue this morning, but there is one thing that really concerns me. The issue we are dealing with here today is

illegal immigration. It is almost in every case, when we get into this discussion, that we start talking about how much contribution immigrants make to this country. And I could not agree more. We are a Nation of immigrants.

Most of us can track our immigrant roots back less than two or three generations, but the issue we are discussing here today, Mr. Chairman, is illegal immigration.

We are a generous Nation. We allow more people to legally emigrate to this country every year than all the rest of the nations of the world combined. But the issue we are talking about is illegal immigration.

I have had the opportunity to spend quite a bit of time down on our international border at San Diego in recent years, and it is absolutely unbelievable the conditions that our young men and women who are trying to protect our borders are living under.

Trying to solve this problem with the current Border Patrol is like trying to catch a B-1B bomber with a butterfly net; it just ain't going to work without more help.

Two weeks ago I was down at the border. Our Border Patrol agents explained to me that they have over 100 new vehicles, brand-new vehicles that they cannot use because they do not have money to put radios or screens in them. Mr. Chairman, in my State we have 866,000 children in our public school system, K through 12, who are children of illegal aliens. Two-thirds of all the births in Los Angeles County general hospitals last year, the mother had no legal right to be in this country. Twenty-five percent of the entire Federal penitentiary inmate population are aliens.

You know, there is discussion that illegal aliens do not take American jobs. That is just plain bunk.

Professor Huddle of Rice University, an academic, not on one side or the other, produced a document last month that showed that 900,000 Americans have been displaced and replaced by illegal alien workers.

In fact, in my home district in Oxnard, CA, a couple of months ago there was a raid on a plant. Fifty-two illegal aliens were arrested. That hit the papers, and within 24 hours 210 American citizens were at the door of that plant applying for those jobs.

Mr. Chairman, my office, my staff in California, have one of the finest staffs of any Member in this body. They spend as much time helping immigrants legally come into this country than any other issue, and they will continue to do that. But I commit to you that this Member is going to work very aggressively to see that those coming to this country come here legally and orderly for the benefit of this Nation.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLY] just talked about a report from Dr. Donald Huddle. I would like to submit part of that for the RECORD because of the limitation on time. Literally, there are billions and billions and billions of dollars that are being wasted because of the illegal alien problem. And the drug problem is being exacerbated as well.

You go down to the border, and you will see trucks and cars back up for miles and miles and miles. They use sniffer dogs to try to find the drugs that are in these semis that are coming across the border and in these cars. They can only work for about 45 minutes, and the customs officials, the Border Patrol, cannot possibly check every one of those cars or trucks; that is, semis bringing in products from the maquiladoro companies down there.

As a result, billions of dollars of drugs are coming across that border because we do not have enough money to police the border, not to mention the illegal alien problem that we are talking about.

As I mentioned a few minutes ago, there were 37,000 illegal alien babies born in Los Angeles County alone, and that cost \$25 million per month in AFDC payments alone, not to mention the health care costs involved.

Do you know that when they had the Los Angeles riots—you say, well, this does not have an impact on law and order in this country; when they had the L.A. riots and we appropriated billions of dollars out of this Chamber to help Los Angeles recoup from that, there were 1,200 illegal aliens involved in that riot who were deported. That has not been reported very much in the newspaper; 1,200 illegal aliens were involved in that riot, a big part of it, and they were deported.

As a matter of fact, there were estimates as high as 60 percent of the people involved in the Los Angeles riots were illegal aliens.

Now, this is a byproduct of not being able to stop this problem at the border.

The NAFTA issue, brought up a few minutes ago, we will be talking about that at some time in the future; that could exacerbate the problem if we do not have an adequate number of Border Patrol people on that border checking the huge, quantum leap in traffic coming across that border.

When you are talking about lines of cars and trucks 10 to 15 miles long, how are you going to find out if there are drugs in those trucks, how are you going to find out if there are illegal aliens in those trucks, because they are coming across just like that, you cannot stop them.

We have to come up with a method to deal with this very, very difficult problem.

I want to say to my colleagues that I am from Indiana, from middle America. I want to tell you that every single

American, as Mr. BEREUTER said a few minutes ago, should be concerned about this problem because you are paying for it with your tax dollars. And we are not talking about thousands or millions, we are talking about billions of dollars as well as thousands and thousands of lost American jobs.

This is a problem with which we have to deal. We should support the Hunter amendment today. It is extremely important. It is a very small step, but it is a step in the right direction.

The report referred to is as follows:

Info on welfare and illegals.

There are 14 categories of federal and state expenses that illegals consume. These gross cost estimates for 1992 are from Dr. Donald Huddle's report released last week:

Primary and secondary public education, \$3.9 billion.

Public higher education, \$342 million.

School lunch program, \$99.3 million.

Medical care uncompensated, \$237.6 million.

AFDC, \$819.9 million.

Housing assistance, \$244.6 million.

Low Income Home Energy Assistance, \$26.3 million.

WIC, \$71.3 million.

Elderly nutrition, \$1.2 million.

Head Start, \$15.1 million.

Medicaid, \$478.7 million.

ESL/bilingual education, \$858.1 million.

Compensatory education, \$101.1 million.

Corrections/criminal justice, \$456.9 million.

Total expenses illegals consume, \$7.75 billion.

As you can see, the bulk of the money goes to education, but still AFDC/WIC/housing assistance/energy assistance/elderly nutrition totals \$1.16 billion.

Over the next decade, without changes in immigration laws/patterns, illegals are expected to consume \$10.3 billion in AFDC alone. Total "welfare" (same definition as above) over the next 10 years will total \$14.8 billion.

CALIFORNIA

There are an estimated 250,000 citizen children of illegal immigrants in L.A. County alone.

The grant to the average family of one mother and two children on AFDC is \$624.

The state estimates it spends \$727.2 million a year on AFDC to citizen children.

The estimated yearly cost of health and welfare benefits to illegals is \$918 million.

Although AFDC payments are not supposed to be made to illegal immigrants, state officials say that if the counties can't find foster parents or legal relatives to send the checks to, they have no choice but to give them to the illegal immigrant parent.

Statewide, it costs an estimated \$3.6 billion a year to educate illegals and citizen children. Fully 17% of the state's students—866,000—are children of illegal and/or non-citizen parents.

The net cost to the state for providing benefits to illegals is \$3 billion a year.

L.A. COUNTY

Estimated population of illegals and citizen children of illegals totals 950,000 as of January 1992, roughly 10 percent of the county population.

The net county cost for undocumented/citizen children is \$400 million/year.

By far the biggest portion of this figure is for health care (\$196.1 million.) The county says that audits have shown that it pays no

welfare to illegals, except in cases where there is a citizen child. The Huddle study also concludes that illegals are less likely than native-born Americans to be recipients of public assistance programs.

The estimated cost to school districts in the county for educating illegals and citizen children is \$1.03 billion a year.

¾ of the children born in county-operated hospitals are to illegals.

Net cost to San Diego County for illegals is \$146 million.

ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION—BY THE NUMBERS NATIONWIDE

INS estimates there are a minimum of 4.5 million illegals nationwide.

120,000 people claimed asylum in U.S., 1992. Estimated current direct cost of illegals is \$6 billion a year.

Estimated direct costs of illegals in 1990 was \$5.4 billion. Breakdown:

\$2.1 billion—public education—K-12.

\$963.5 million—emergency medical care.

\$831.7 million—criminal justice.

\$665.3 million—Medicaid.

\$368.0 million—public higher education.

\$106.0 million—housing assistance.

\$62.8 million—AFDC.

550,000—illegals in New York state—1992—INS estimates.

430,000—illegals in Texas.

315,000—illegals in Illinois.

186,000—illegals in Florida.

CALIFORNIA

California estimates there are 205,000 citizen children of illegals in the state.

The grant to average family of one mother and two children on AFDC is \$624.

The estimated monthly outgo to citizen children of illegals is \$60.6 million.

The estimated yearly outgo is \$727.2 million.

The estimated yearly total cost of health/welfare benefits to illegals is \$918 million.

Two-thirds of the births in L.A. County operated hospitals are to illegals.

The total annual federal share of the Medicaid program is \$7.5 billion (50% of total).

It costs state and local governments a net \$3 billion each year to provide services to illegal aliens.

It costs Los Angeles County alone \$650 million a year to provide those services.

Fully 17% of the state's public elementary and high school students—866,000—are the children of illegal and non-citizen immigrants.

They cost the state and local school districts some \$3.6 billion a year.

More than 18% of the L.A. County jails—22,000 inmates—are deportable aliens.

These deportable aliens cost the county \$75 million a year. The statewide cost for 13,000 felon aliens is \$250 million.

1,064 aliens were arrested for their part in the 1992 L.A. riots and deported.

ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION STATISTICS NATIONAL

The Center for Immigration Studies estimated in 1991 that illegal aliens directly cost \$5.4 billion for the 13 major Federal and State services (including school lunches, public education, Head Start, and AFDC, but excluding Social Security, unemployment compensation, and food stamps).

Although illegal aliens are statutorily excluded from federal services such as Medicare, Social Security, unemployment compensation, student loans, SSI, AFDC, and food stamps, fraudulent documentation is easy, and therefore, access to the programs is readily available. No one in the federal

government knows with any certainty how much illegals cost all these programs.

The Social Security Administration estimates that by the year 2026 it could be paying more than \$8 billion per year in Social Security benefits to illegal aliens because of false documentation.

U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service spent \$161 million in 1991 to detain and deport 58,000 criminal aliens.

Illegal aliens make up 25% of the 803,000 federal prisoners (Costs \$20,800 per year for an inmate).

In 1988, an estimated \$1.2 billion to \$12.5 billion was spent on unemployment and other transfer payments to American citizens resulting from job displacement due to illegal immigrants.

STATES AND LOCALITIES

To date, states and localities have not tracked their direct and indirect costs related to illegal immigrants; only California, and Los Angeles County in particular, have recently tried to document their illegal alien expenses.

Other states are just beginning to follow California's and L.A.'s lead.

CALIFORNIA

Medi-Cal (California's Medicaid) covers medical expenses for illegal aliens in (1) emergencies and (2) pregnancies.

Federal judge ruled Medi-Cal officials cannot report illegal aliens using their services to immigration officials.

Children born in the U.S. to illegal immigrants are automatically U.S. citizens and eligible for Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC).

Can kick the parents out of the country, but then the child would stay and become a ward of the state.

Last year, nearly 37,000 children born to illegal aliens in L.A. County alone.

Average California AFDC grant (family of three) \$624 per month down from \$663 in July 1992.

97,175 families with illegal parents received an estimated \$63 million per month; \$756 million per year in AFDC.

15,000 undocumented aliens in the California state prison system at an annual cost of about \$330 million.

TEXAS

In 1990, illegal immigrant students cost Texas' border schools at least \$26 million per year to educate them.

In the Brownsville Independent School District, 5,000 of the 37,000 students are estimated to be illegal alien children.

In El Paso county, illegal aliens cost \$3 million in services from the R. E. Tomason General Hospital.

In 1991, Edinburg Hospital rendered \$31 million in unreimbursed health care to Mexican nationals.

In 1991, Valley Baptist Medical Center lost approximately \$750,000 for 420 "drop in" deliveries to Mexican nationals.

Over 450,000 illegal aliens were apprehended on the Texas-Mexico border in 1990.

Border Patrol estimates for every one illegal apprehended, two or three enter the U.S. undetected.

NEW YORK

New York State Corrections Department; As of 1992, between 750 and 1,500 illegal aliens now in state prisons for serious offenses; costing New York about \$38 million per year.

Total of 3,000 undocumented aliens in New York state prisons.

FACT SHEET ON ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION, APRIL 9, 1993

Illegal immigration into the United States is a growing crisis that is causing widespread

problems across the entire nation. The recent examples of Zoe Baird, and the bombing of the World Trade Center, show that illegal immigrants are not just a problem in California or the Southwest—and the public outrage that grew out of these instances are further proof that the American people overwhelmingly support actions to finally regain control over our borders.

HOW MANY ILLEGAL ALIENS ARE ALREADY HERE?

Nobody knows for sure, but the Immigration and Naturalization Service estimates that there were more than 4.5 million illegal aliens nationwide. INS officials privately estimate that there are up to 3 million undocumented aliens in Southern California alone. In addition, some 2 to 3 million more successfully enter the U.S. each year.

Illegal immigration is a growing problem from many parts of the world. INS estimates that 100,000 people from mainland China enter the U.S. illegally each year. Chinese immigrants pay criminal syndicates up to \$30,000 each to buy passage on often unseaworthy ships for the long voyage, and then are often forced by the syndicates into lives of crime if they can't pay off their debts.

By seeking political asylum, apprehended illegal immigrants can remain in the U.S. until a hearing is scheduled. Because of a lack of detention facilities, some 15,000 people enter through JFK Airport in New York and are allowed to disappear onto the streets of New York. In total last year, 117,000 aliens entered the U.S. this way.

COSTS

Nationwide, the Center for Immigration Studies estimates that illegal aliens cost the taxpayers this year more than \$6 billion in direct benefits, a total that excludes social Security, Medicare, food stamps and unemployment compensation, or the extra costs for police, fire, courts, parks and transportation services.

In California, the state Auditor General estimates it costs state and local governments a new \$3 billion each year to provide services to illegal aliens. The Department of Education estimates that fully 17 percent of California's public elementary and high school students—866,000—are the children of illegal and non-citizen immigrants. This costs state and local school districts some \$3.6 billion a year. And the Department of Health Services estimates that it costs the taxpayers \$918 million for health and welfare benefits for immigrants.

Los Angeles County alone estimates it spends \$650 million a year to provide services to illegal aliens.

OTHER COSTS

A growing number of illegal aliens are involved in criminal activity. A 1990 study found that some 22,000 deportable aliens are incarcerated in L.A. County's jails—more than 18 percent of the jail population. This costs the county \$75 million a year, what a report termed "an unnecessary burden on the local justice system." Statewide, the Department of Corrections spends \$250 million to imprison 13,000 illegal aliens convicted of felonies.

Last year, 1,064 aliens were arrested for their part in last spring's Los Angeles riots and returned to their homelands.

Law enforcement authorities agree that there are some 23,000 members of two gangs in Los Angeles who are illegal aliens—gangs responsible for more than 100 murders.

And also in Southern California, a gang of illegal aliens have stolen more than 100,000

pieces of mail from postal trucks since last October, targeting several hundred thousand dollars worth of welfare checks.

The unchecked influx also takes jobs away from citizens and legal residents—particularly lower-skilled workers. L.A. Times labor writer Harry Bernstein in March cited this as a key reason why farm worker unemployment is astronomical.

CITIZEN CHILDREN

As ABC-TV's "20/20" documented in early 1992, a growing part of the illegal alien problem stems from pregnant women coming to the U.S. solely to give birth here, which automatically makes the child of an illegal alien a U.S. citizen. These children are eligible for a full array of welfare benefits, and when he or she turns 21, he or she can petition to bring his or her entire family into the U.S. as legal residents. As one Mexican citizen told the Los Angeles Times, "My children were born in the United States and will be working over there one day."

AMERICAN PEOPLE SUPPORT STRONGER EFFORT

Most Americans support taking strong efforts to stop the virtually unchecked influx of illegal aliens into the U.S. A 1992 Roper poll showed that 86% of those surveyed thought immigration was a major issue. Importantly, 93% of Latinos surveyed said they wanted their Congressman to lead the effort to fight illegal immigration, compared to 85% of non-Hispanic whites.

WHAT CONGRESSMAN GALLEGLY'S BILLS WOULD DO

Congressman Gallegly is committed to serious, comprehensive reforms of our immigration system that will continue to ensure that our generous legal immigration policies are continued, while ensuring that we regain control over our borders. This package of legislation would:

Increase Border Patrol staffing to 6,600 agents by 1994. Currently, there are only 4,143 agents—and the Border Patrol expects to cut 158 positions next year. Considering that there are, at any given time, more police patrolling Capitol Hill than our entire southern border, we need to give the overworked Border Patrol the resources it needs to do the job, not cut the agency even further. (HR 1078)

Require one state-of-the-art, counterfeit-resistant registration card be issued to all legal resident-alien, containing magnetic strips, holograms or other features (such as those already used on California driver's licenses). Tamper-resistant documents are the only way that employer sanctions requirements can be strictly enforced. (HR 1079) In January, INS agents seized 32,000 phony "green cards," birth certificates, drivers licenses and other forms of identification last January in Orange County—along with nearly \$60,000 in cash and receipts. Some of the forgeries were so good that even experts couldn't tell the difference. A month later, the INS seized another 88,000 bogus documents, worth \$1.6 million.

End the payment of welfare and other federal benefits (including AFDC, OASDI, SSI, food stamps, and public housing) to illegal aliens. (HR 1080)

Stop the transportation of illegal aliens to and from job sites by permitting vehicles used to carry illegal aliens—including to household day laborer jobs—to be impounded. (HR 1081)

Provide for 2,500 Border Patrol agents to be recruited from military personnel discharged due to defense cutbacks. (HR 1082)

Cut off federal assistance to local governments that do not cooperate with the INS in

the arrest and deportation of illegal aliens. (HR 1083) Beginning in January, the state has begun stepping up efforts to force cities and counties to cooperate with INS or lose federal funding passed through the state.

Bring our citizenship laws into line with virtually every other country on earth by closing the current loophole that enables pregnant women to slip into the U.S. just to give birth here, automatically making her child a U.S. citizen. (HJ Res. 129/HR 1191) The 1992 Roper poll showed that 84% of those surveyed support such a measure.

Some 57 Members of Congress, from both parties and 20 states, have cosponsored some or all of Gallegly's bills, and as a newly appointed member of the Immigration subcommittee, he will be in a position to build public and Congressional awareness of the scope of this crisis.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in favor of the amendment.

I do not think there is any question, from the debate and the way it has gone on, as to how the House is going to vote on this important issue. There is no question but that illegal immigration has done a lot to run up the cost of Government in this country, to run up the cost of crime and the victims of crime.

A lot has been said about whether this is becoming a prejudice thing rather than a question of law enforcement. I think it is important to realize here and to state first of all we are talking about doing a small act to stop illegal immigration into this country, a small act that is going to have a small effect, but certainly one that is going to bring back many more times the benefits than the \$60 million we are going to spend on the border patrols.

The question of illegal immigration, the first thing that that person does when he gets into this country is violate our laws by coming across our borders illegally.

There is a whole industry that has grown up around it, to print counterfeit cards, to get them into the work force. We thought we did a lot years ago when we passed Simpson/Mazzoli. But what has happened?

We put in employer sanctions. What happened?

We created a whole new cottage industry, coming up with illegal papers. We found that when we are talking about more jobs for American people, we are finding that if we could get rid of the illegal alien, we would virtually have no unemployment problem in this country. We talk about the rising costs of health care. All these illegal aliens are entitled to this when they come into this country, and they are getting it, delivering babies at our taxpayers' expense.

I had a lady call me the other day, and she said, "I have terminal cancer. I cannot afford much more. I am almost tapped out." Yet the illegal aliens coming into this country are getting their babies delivered free. They are getting medical treatment

free. They are getting \$400-odd per month to help them live. Yet we are still groping and trying to find precious tax dollars.

□ 1230

Let us look at this as an investment in the future. This is going to bring back many more times the savings than the \$60 million it is going to cost the Federal Government to hire these new agents.

But let us not stop here. Much has been said about the Judiciary Committee and what they are doing. Let us go forward. Let us streamline our extradition process. Let us put it in such a way that the people know that when they are here, when they are caught here, that they are going to be deported, instead of blending into our court system and going on for years and years.

It is virtually impossible to deport someone in this country who has been coached in the most elementary form of our laws and can claim asylum. Then they get into the court system for years. By the time their name finally comes up, they have disappeared. They cannot be found. They have had children, and here comes the illegal population, and it continues to grow.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good amendment. Let us pass it. This is an investment in America.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS. I will be brief, Mr. Chairman.

This amendment causes an outlay problem for us on the subcommittee. We worked hard to stay within our allocation for both budget authority and outlays. Standing alone, though, it is an irresistible amendment for me, because I fought so hard to get more money for the INS to stop the problems we have been hearing about. Given the severity of the problem we face at our borders, I am constrained to vote for this amendment, even though it causes procedural difficulties on the bill. So be it.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Hunter amendment which would fund 600 additional Border Patrol personnel at \$60 million.

We have illegal immigration problems and political asylum problems at stake. We have terrorism. We have got public safety. We have got public health. We have got jobs.

This is a hot button issue. It is not going to stay in the box any longer. It can no longer wait for the Clinton administration to get out in front of it. We have got to do something about it.

Right now it is irresponsible for us to continue to fund social services for illegal aliens without addressing the policy which is actually encouraging the influx of new illegal aliens to cross our borders. That cost to us over the next 5 years for treating this problem, just providing those services, is estimated to be about \$27 billion for social services for illegal aliens.

Just for instance, over the last 40 years, 1 million refugees have entered the United States by way of the State of Florida. Eighty-five percent of them are still there. I assure you that trend has not abated.

Two-thirds of those attempting to cross the Mexican border make it, and the other third have the chance to try again the next night. Yet the Federal Government continues to cut back its support, covering fewer numbers of refugees for shorter periods of time.

We are falling far short of meeting the needs of Florida just to take care of its refugees. Meanwhile, they are crowding our schools, our hospitals, and our labor force, and of course, they are a burden to our State taxpayers.

It is obvious that this amendment would save money in the long run. It is obvious it is a very good investment.

Let me point out something else, however. I would not want to see these funds come from the asylum process, because Florida has a border crossing problem, not as great as Texas or California, but it has an asylum process. We have got a parolee process that is out of control. Right now we have a backlog of 9,000 Haitians from just the most recent Haitian political asylum event alone. The estimate is at the rate of clearance, it will take 800 years just to clear 9,000 Haitians in this one process.

We have 150 AOC officers doing 50,000 cases in 1993, and that does not compute.

So these funds cannot come out of the Asylum Officers Corps.

We have no system for no-shows. We have no system to follow up or monitor those who are coming HIV-infected into this country.

The citizens of our country are saying, "Darn it, do something about it."

This is a chance, I know it was not supposed to come out of the box today procedurally. I know we are in an appropriations bill. I know this is upsetting things, but the people of this country are saying, "OK, it's real. It's out there. Do something about it."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COLLINS].

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment to add additional agents out in our borders. Even though I represent an area of Georgia, a State that is not experiencing near the problems as many of our border States, those border States that are spending billions of dollars of

State funds due to the problems of people illegally crossing our border; however, the people who I represent do participate in the costs incurred by the Federal Government due to those people crossing our borders illegally.

Mr. Chairman, \$60 million for additional agents to patrol those borders is a small price to pay compared to the billions of dollars that we are participating in due to those illegal aliens.

I agree with the statement that we need to approach this problem through the judiciary, but we know those wheels turn slowly.

This is a good amendment. I strongly support it, and I urge my colleagues also to support it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. There are many in the world who rightfully look to the United States as the land of opportunity. Unfortunately, because of the ceilings placed on legal immigration each year, some individuals obtain residence and employment through illegal means. With the increase in illegal aliens coming into the United States, I am in favor of additional funding for the border patrol. Furthermore, I support the use of military forces to ensure that our borders are adequately monitored.

I have concerns over the costs associated with illegal immigration. In many respects, it is the State government which determines which, if any, benefits will be available to illegal aliens. Our Government should be cautious about giving benefits to everyone from around the world who wishes to reside in the United States. Furthermore, recently enacted employer sanctions have contributed to a decline in employment of illegal aliens and enhanced the security of American jobs. Please be assured that I will support efforts which reduce illegal immigration and minimize associated costs.

I encourage all Members to support the Hunter amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I think we have had an excellent discussion and an excellent airing of this issue and I think we are about ready to take an important step in gaining control of our borders.

I just want to start by addressing myself to the gentleman who spoke a few minutes ago and talked about this effort as somehow an affront to people who have migrated to this country, some legally and some illegally.

Let me just say, one thing I learned as a border Congressman is nobody wins by having an open border and having a no man's land on the international border.

In the years before we built a steel fence along the border, we averaged nine murders a year. Those nine murders were committed by gangs that moved back and forth across the inter-

national border with impunity. When we finally built a steel fence along the border, they were no longer able to move back and forth, and as a result of that, while we had nine murders a year for the last 10 years or so, up until two years ago after we built the fence we went to zero murders, and all those citizens who were murdered were citizens of Mexico.

So the facts are that having an open border, having a border out of control does not serve anybody well and it does not serve any nation.

Now, we have the most benevolent immigration policy in the world, and I know we are going to be addressing that shortly, but having that benevolent immigration policy requires that we have some integrity at our borders and some border control.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. MOORHEAD] for being one who really has driven authorization in the past; the gentleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLEY] for all the work he has done; the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SCHENK]; the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM]; the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD]; the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW]; the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH]; the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COLLINS]; the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN] for her excellent statement; the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS]; and of course, the ranking member, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] for his help in the discussion today and of course, our chairman, for putting up with this long discussion.

Members who have not been tuning in to this discussion might ask, "Why do you have to have more Border Patrol?"

It is because there is only one agency that patrols the U.S. border that is given that charter, and that is the Border Patrol. So for reasons of social costs brought on by illegal aliens, criminal justice costs, narcotics smuggling, and I think importantly in the future perhaps deterrence of terrorists who want to cross the international border, we have to have people at the border. You cannot control the border without personnel. That means Border Patrol.

This amendment for some 600 additional Border Patrol agents, while it does not meet the standards that we set in 1986 when we changed the Immigration law, nonetheless it takes a major step forward.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask everyone to support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] to close the debate.

Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. It is worthy on its merits, but it is an add-on with offsets.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, the question is not whether the Border Patrol or INS is important.

Let me call to your attention that in this bill we have \$999 million for the Immigration and Naturalization Service. That is about as close to a billion dollars as you can get.

We have in here \$360 million for the Border Patrol, and that is \$6 million more than the budget request.

Now, I have been down to the border, like a lot of you have. I have flown in the helicopter and seen what their problem is. There are miles and miles of border. You could put agents down there almost shoulder to shoulder. You could put a hundred thousand agents down there and you still could not cover the border.

So it is true what the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] and some others have said, it is true that money alone will not solve this problem. This is also a legislative issue.

□ 1240

This bill includes funding for the NAFTA negotiations. It includes a lot of things besides appropriations for the Border Patrol.

We have done our best in this to stay within our 602(b) allocation. I am exasperated though when I see that so many people who voted for a \$76 million cut in the INS in previous years when we were considering this bill up here are now complaining because we do not have enough money for INS. Virtually all of the proponents of this amendment except the new Members of Congress, were the ones who voted for the \$76 million cut.

We do our best around here to try to allocate these funds carefully. We get complaints if we do not appropriate enough, and then complaints because we appropriated too much.

The Border Patrol is a high priority with the committee. We have already restored one-half of the proposed deficit reduction cuts the President assigned to this agency. The motion to recommit has been explained to my colleagues. I do not know for sure what will be in that motion, but, if it is at all reasonable, I do not intend to oppose it. I have said all along that if we can find the money we will try to provide funding for critical law enforcement programs.

Now, I say to my colleagues you can't just take money that is stricken out of other programs and not reserve it. That is going to come back to haunt you if you try to do that. To the extent that we can squeeze out the money, this is one of the highest priorities, if not the highest priority, in the bill.

Now the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE], and the minority, have control of the motion to recommend, but I want to tell my colleagues that what we are talking about here now is basically this: If you vote yes on this amendment, you are voting to violate the 602(b) allocation for outlays to this subcommittee. It will be the first time this year that it's been done, the first time. If we start doing it on this bill, it's going to be done again, and again, and again. We have not violated the 602(b) allocation since the budget summit agreement 3 years ago.

I tried to stay within not just the budget authority allocation, but also the allocation on outlays because I think that is the only responsible thing to do. We have a lot of budget authority left, but that was necessary in order to get down to the outlay level that we were allocated. Outlays are not subject to a point of order in the House, but outlays are in the Senate. I have tried to do the responsible thing, and that is to reduce budget authority enough so we do not go over our ceiling in the outlays.

Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleagues, if you vote yes on this, you are voting to violate the 602(b) allocation on outlays to this committee.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Chairman, the inability of the Federal Government to enforce our immigration laws has forced States like California and Texas to spend billions of taxpayers' dollars to provide services—such as education and health care—on illegal aliens. I support the amendment offered by my colleague from California, DUNCAN HUNTER, which increases the Immigration and Naturalization Service budget by \$60 million to combat illegal immigration.

Illegal immigration depresses U.S. wages and displaces American workers. State and county governments have been financially devastated by this Nation's inability to enforce current immigration laws.

In light of the devastating impact illegal immigration has on the United States and especially my home State of California, I strongly believe additional resources must be provided to the Border Patrol in order to control illegal immigration.

Mr. Chairman, the combination of continued illegal immigration, increased taxes, and job displacement is too much for the American worker to accept. Give the Border Patrol a fighting chance—support the Hunter amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 265, noes 164, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 318]

AYES—265

Ackerman	Gillmor	Miller (FL)
Andrews (TX)	Gilman	Mineta
Applegate	Gingrich	Minge
Archer	Goodlatte	Molinari
Army	Gordon	Moorhead
Bacchus (FL)	Goss	Nadler
Bacchus (AL)	Grams	Neal (NC)
Baker (CA)	Green	Nussle
Balenger	Greenwood	Ortiz
Barlow	Gunderson	Oxley
Barrett (NE)	Gutierrez	Packard
Bartlett	Hall (TX)	Pallone
Barton	Hamburg	Pastor
Bateman	Hancock	Paxon
Becerra	Hansen	Payne (NJ)
Bellenson	Harman	Petri
Bentley	Hastert	Pickett
Bereuter	Hefley	Pombo
Berman	Herger	Pryce (OH)
Bilbray	Hinchey	Quillen
Bilirakis	Hobson	Quinn
Bishop	Hochbrueckner	Ramstad
Blackwell	Hoekstra	Rangel
Bliley	Hoke	Ravenel
Boehlert	Horn	Richardson
Boehner	Huffington	Royce
Brooks	Hunter	Rogers
Brown (FL)	Hutchinson	Rohrabacher
Bryant	Hutto	Ros-Lehntinen
Bunning	Hyde	Roth
Burton	Inglis	Roukema
Buyer	Inhofe	Roland
Byrne	Inslee	Roybal-Allard
Callahan	Istook	Royce
Calvert	Jefferson	Sanders
Camp	Johnson (CT)	Sangmeister
Canady	Johnson (GA)	Santorum
Castle	Johnson (SD)	Sarpalius
Clayton	Johnson, Sam	Saxton
Clinger	Johnston	Schenk
Clyburn	Kaptur	Schiff
Coleman	Kasich	Schumer
Collins (GA)	Kennedy	Scott
Collins (IL)	Kildee	Serrano
Combest	Kim	Shaw
Condit	King	Shuster
Cooper	Kingston	Sisisky
Coppersmith	Kiecicka	Skelton
Cox	Klug	Smith (MI)
Crapo	Knollenberg	Smith (NJ)
Cunningham	Kolbe	Smith (OR)
Danner	Kyl	Smith (TX)
Darden	Lantos	Snowe
de la Garza	LaRocco	Solomon
de Lugo (VI)	Laughlin	Spence
Deal	Lazio	Stark
DeLay	Leach	Stearns
Deutsch	Lehman	Stump
Diaz-Balart	Levin	Sundquist
Dickey	Levy	Swett
Dingell	Lewis (CA)	Talent
Dixon	Lewis (FL)	Tanner
Doolittle	Lightfoot	Tauzin
Dornan	Linder	Taylor (NC)
Dreier	Livingston	Tejeda
Duncan	Long	Thomas (CA)
Edwards (CA)	Machtley	Thomas (WY)
Emerson	Manton	Torkildsen
Engel	Manzullo	Torres
English (AZ)	Margolies-	Torricelli
Eshoo	Mezvinsky	Tracetic
Evans	Martinez	Upton
Everett	Mazzoli	Velazquez
Ewing	McCandless	Vucanovich
Farr	McColum	Walker
Fawell	McCurdy	Walsh
Fazio	McHugh	Waters
Fields (LA)	McInnis	Waxman
Filner	McKeon	Weld
Fingerhut	McKinney	Wilson
Fish	McMillan	Wolf
Fowler	McNulty	Woolsey
Franks (CT)	Meek	Young (AK)
Franks (NJ)	Menendez	Young (FL)
Frost	Meyers	Zeliff
Galleghy	Mfume	Zimmer
Gallo	Mica	
Gekas	Michel	
Gilchrest	Miller (CA)	

NOES—164

Abercrombie	Hamilton	Peterson (MN)
Allard	Hastings	Pickle
Andrews (ME)	Hayes	Pomeroy
Andrews (NJ)	Hefner	Porter
Baesler	Hilliard	Portman
Baker (LA)	Hoagland	Poshard
Barca	Holden	Price (NC)
Barcia	Hoyer	Rahall
Barrett (WI)	Hughes	Reed
Bevill	Jacobs	Regula
Bonior	Johnson, E.B.	Reynolds
Borski	Kanjorski	Roemer
Boucher	Kennelly	Rose
Brewster	Klein	Rostenkowski
Browder	Klink	Rush
Brown (CA)	Kopetski	Sabo
Brown (OH)	Kreidler	Sawyer
Cantwell	LaFalce	Schaefer
Cardin	Lambert	Schroeder
Carr	Lancaster	Sensenbrenner
Chapman	Lewis (GA)	Sharp
Clay	Lipinski	Shays
Clement	Lloyd	Shepherd
Coble	Lowey	Skaggs
Collins (MI)	Maloney	Slatery
Conyers	Mann	Slaughter
Costello	Markey	Smith (IA)
Coyne	Matsui	Spratt
Cramer	McCloskey	Stenholm
Crane	McCrery	Stokes
DeFazio	McDade	Strickland
DeLauro	McDermott	Studds
Dellums	McHale	Stupak
Derrick	Meehan	Swift
Dicks	Mink	Synar
Dooley	Mollohan	Taylor (MS)
Dunn	Montgomery	Thompson
Durbin	Moran	Thornton
Edwards (TX)	Morella	Thurman
English (OK)	Murphy	Towns
Flake	Murtha	Underwood (GU)
Foglietta	Myers	Unsoeld
Ford (MI)	Natcher	Valentine
Ford (TN)	Neal (MA)	Vento
Frank (MA)	Norton (DC)	Visclosky
Furse	Oberstar	Voikmer
Gejdenson	Obey	Washington
Gephardt	Oliver	Watt
Geren	Orton	Wheat
Gibbons	Owens	Williams
Glickman	Parker	Wise
Gonzalez	Payne (VA)	Wyden
Gooding	Pelosi	Wynn
Grandy	Penny	Yates
Hall (OH)	Peterson (FL)	

NOT VOTING—10

Blute	Fields (TX)	Romero-Barceló
Bonilla	Henry	(PR)
Faleomavaega	Houghton	Skeen
(AS)	Moakley	Whitten

□ 1304

Messrs. STUPAK, GIBBONS, and WILLIAMS, and Ms. SLAUGHTER changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. MFUME, TALENT, SCHUMER, FIELDS of Louisiana, FAZIO, SERRANO, MCCURDY, BLACKWELL, FINGERHUT, JEFFERSON, and TORRES, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, and Ms. MCKINNEY changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the administration, operation, and maintenance of Federal penal and correctional institutions, including purchase (not to exceed 770 of which 405 are for replacement only) and hire of law enforcement and passenger motor vehicles; and for the provision of technical assistance and advice on corrections related issues to foreign governments; \$1,950,000,000: *Provided,*

That there may be transferred to the Health Resources and Services Administration such amounts as may be necessary, in the discretion of the Attorney General, for direct expenditures by that Administration for medical relief for inmates of Federal penal and correctional institutions: *Provided further*, That the Director of the Federal Prison System (FPS), where necessary, may enter into contracts with a fiscal agent/fiscal intermediary claims processor to determine the amounts payable to persons who, on behalf of the FPS, furnish health services to individuals committed to the custody of the FPS: *Provided further*, That uniforms may be purchased without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$6,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$50,000,000 for the activation of new facilities shall remain available until September 30, 1995.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF CORRECTIONS

For carrying out the provisions of sections 4351-4353 of title 18, United States Code, which established a National Institute of Corrections, and for the provision of technical assistance and advice on corrections-related issues to foreign governments, \$10,211,000 to remain available until expended.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For planning, acquisition of sites and construction of new facilities; leasing the Oklahoma City Airport Trust Facility; purchase and acquisition of facilities and remodeling and equipping of such facilities for penal and correctional use, including all necessary expenses incident thereto, by contract or force account; and constructing, remodeling, and equipping necessary buildings and facilities at existing penal and correctional institutions, including all necessary expenses incident thereto, by contract or force account; \$175,000,000 to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed \$14,074,000 shall be available to construct areas for inmate work programs: *Provided*, that not to exceed \$16,000,000 from unobligated balances shall be available for the Cooperative Agreement Program (CAP): *Provided further*, That labor of United States prisoners may be used for work performed under this appropriation: *Provided further*, that not to exceed 10 percent of the funds appropriated to "Buildings and Facilities" in this Act or any other Act may be transferred to "Salaries and Expenses", Federal Prison System upon notification by the Attorney General to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate in compliance with provisions set forth in section 605 of this Act: *Provided further*, That unless a notification as required under section 6505 of this Act is submitted to the Committee on Appropriations of the House and Senate, none of the funds in this Act for the CAP shall be available for a cooperative agreement with a State or local government for the housing of Federal prisoners and detainees when the cost per bed space for such cooperative agreement exceeds \$50,000, and in addition, any cooperative agreement with a cost per bed space that exceeds \$25,000 must remain in effect for no less than 15 years.

FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INCORPORATED

The Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated, is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available, and in accord with the law, and to make such contracts and commitments, without regard to fiscal

year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the program set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for such corporation, including purchase of (not to exceed five for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INCORPORATED

Not to exceed \$3,100,000 of the funds of the corporation shall be available for its administrative expenses, and for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, to be computed on an accrual basis to be determined in accordance with the corporation's prescribed accounting system in effect on July 1, 1946, and such amounts shall be exclusive of depreciation, payment of claims, and expenditures which the said accounting system requires to be capitalized or charged to cost of commodities acquired or produced, including selling and shipping expenses, and expenses in connection with acquisition, construction, operation, maintenance, improvement, protection, or disposition of facilities and other property belonging to the corporation or in which it has an interest.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

SEC. 101. In addition to amounts otherwise made available in this title for official reception and representation expenses, a total of not to exceed \$45,000 from funds appropriated to the Department of Justice in this title shall be available to the Attorney General for official reception and representation expenses in accordance with distributions, procedures, and regulations established by the Attorney General.

SEC. 102. Subject to subsection (b) of section 102 of the Department of Justice and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1993, authorities contained in Public Law 96-132, "The Department of Justice Appropriation Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 1980", shall remain in effect until the termination date of this Act or until the effective date of a Department of Justice Appropriation Authorization Act, whichever is earlier.

SEC. 103. None of the funds appropriated under this title shall be used to require any person to perform, or facilitate in any way the performance of, any abortion.

SEC. 104. Nothing in the preceding section shall remove the obligation of the Director of the Bureau of Prisons to provide escort services necessary for a female inmate to receive such service outside the Federal facility: *Provided*, That nothing in this section in any way diminishes the effect of section 103 intended to address the philosophical beliefs of individual employees of the Bureau of Prisons.

SEC. 105. Pursuant to the provisions of law set forth in 18 U.S.C. 3071-3077, not to exceed \$2,000,000 of the funds appropriated to the Department of Justice in this title shall be available for rewards to individuals who furnish information regarding acts of terrorism against a United States person or property.

SEC. 106. For fiscal year 1994 and thereafter, deposits transferred from the Assets Forfeiture Fund to the Buildings and Facilities account of the Federal Prison System may be used for the construction of correctional institutions, and the construction and renovation of Immigration and Naturalization Service and United States Marshals Service detention facilities, and for the authorized purposes of the Cooperative Agreement Program.

SEC. 107. Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation made available for the current

fiscal year for the Department of Justice in this Act may be transferred between such appropriations but no such appropriation, except as otherwise specifically provided, shall be increased by more than 10 percent by any such transfers: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to any appropriation made available in title I of this Act under the heading, "Office of Justice Programs, Justice Assistance": *Provided further*, That any transfer pursuant to this section shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 605 of this Act shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

SEC. 108. Notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302 or any other statute affecting the crediting of collections, the Attorney General may credit, as an offsetting collection, to the Department of Justice Working Capital Fund, for fiscal year 1994 and thereafter, up to three percent of all amounts collected pursuant to civil debt collection investigation activities of the Department of Justice. Such amounts in the Working Capital Fund shall remain available until expended and shall be subject to the terms and conditions of that fund, and shall be used only for paying the costs of processing and tracking such litigation.

SEC. 109. (a) Section 524(c)(9)(E) of title 28, United States Code, as amended, is further amended by inserting "up to and including September 30, 1993," immediately after the phrase "and on September 30 of each fiscal year thereafter,".

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the first \$20,000,000 of the amounts made available in fiscal year 1994 from surplus amounts remaining on September 30, 1993, in accordance with section 524(c)(9)(E) of title 28, United States Code, as amended, shall be transferred to Federal Prison System, "Buildings and facilities".

RELATED AGENCIES

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Commission on Civil Rights, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$7,565,000, of which \$2,000,000 is for regional offices and \$700,000 is for civil rights monitoring activities authorized by section 5 of Public Law 98-183; *Provided*, That not to exceed \$20,000 may be used to employ consultants: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be used to employ in excess of four full-time individuals under Schedule C of the Excepted Service exclusive of one special assistant for each Commissioner: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be used to reimburse Commissioners for more than 75 billable days, with the exception of the Chairman who is permitted 125 billable days.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission as authorized by title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended (29 U.S.C. 206(d) and 621-634), the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, and the Civil Rights Act of 1991, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; hire of passenger motor vehicles as authorized by 31 U.S.C. 1343(b); nonmonetary awards to private citizens; not to exceed \$26,000,000, for payments to State and local enforcement agencies for services to the Commission pursuant to title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as amended, sections 6 and 14 of the Age Discrimination in Employment

Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, and the Civil Rights Act of 1991; \$230,000,000: *Provided*, That the Commission is authorized to make available for official reception and representation expenses not to exceed \$2,500 from available funds.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Communications Commission, as authorized by law, including uniforms and allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-02; not to exceed \$450,000 for land and structures; not to exceed \$300,000 for improvement and care of grounds and repair to buildings; not to exceed \$4,000 for official reception and representation expenses; purchase (not to exceed sixteen) and hire of motor vehicles; special counsel fees; and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; \$129,889,000, of which not to exceed \$300,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1995, for research and policy studies.

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Maritime Commission as authorized by section 201(d) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended (46 App. U.S.C. 1111), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; hire of passenger motor vehicles as authorized by 31 U.S.C. 1343(b); and uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-02, \$18,383,000; *Provided*, That not to exceed \$2,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Trade Commission, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-5902; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and not to exceed \$2,000 for official reception and representation expenses; \$88,740,000: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed \$19,000,000 of offsetting collections derived from fees collected for premerger notification filings under the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976 (15 U.S.C. 18(a)) shall be retained and used for necessary expenses in this appropriation, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 1994, so as to result in a final fiscal year 1994 appropriation estimated at not more than \$69,740,000: *Provided further*, That any fees received in excess of \$19,000,000 in fiscal year 1994 shall remain available until expended, but shall not be available for obligation until October 1, 1994: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available to the Federal Trade Commission shall be available for obligation for expenses authorized by section 151 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Improvement Act of 1991 (Public Law 102-242, 105 Stat. 2282-2285).

NATIONAL COMMISSION TO SUPPORT LAW
ENFORCEMENT
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the National Commission to Support Law Enforcement, \$500,000, as authorized by section 211(B) of Public Law 101-515 (104 Stat. 2122), to remain available until expended.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Securities and Exchange Commission, including serv-

ices as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, the rental of space (to include multiple year leases) in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and not to exceed \$3,000 for official reception and representation expenses, \$57,856,000, of which not to exceed \$10,000 may be used toward funding a permanent secretariat for the International Organization of Securities Commissions, and of which not to exceed \$100,000 shall be available for expenses for consultations and meetings hosted by the Commission with foreign governmental and other regulatory officials, members of their delegations, appropriate representatives and staff to exchange views concerning developments relating to securities matters, development and implementation of cooperation agreements concerning securities matters and provision of technical assistance for the development of foreign securities markets, such expenses to include necessary logistic and administrative expenses and the expenses of Commission staff and foreign invitees in attendance at such consultations and meetings including: (i) such incidental expenses as meals taken in the course of such attendance, (ii) any travel or transportation to or from such meetings, and (iii) any other related lodging or subsistence.

In addition, upon enactment of legislation amending the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-1 et seq.), and subject to the schedule of fees contained in such legislation, the Commission may collect not to exceed \$16,600,000 in fees, and such fees shall be deposited as an offsetting collection to this appropriation to recover the costs of registration, supervision, and regulation of investment advisers and their activities: *Provided*, That such fees shall remain available until expended.

STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the State Justice Institute, as authorized by The State Justice Institute Authorization Act of 1988 (Public Law 100-690 (102 Stat. 4466-4467)), \$13,550,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$2,500 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

This title may be cited as the "Department of Justice and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1994".

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND
TECHNOLOGY
SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL RESEARCH AND
SERVICES

For necessary expenses of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, \$210,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed \$5,880,000 may be transferred to the "Working Capital Fund".

Mr. SMITH of Iowa (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the portion of the bill through page 32, line 18, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order to the material just referred?

Are there any amendments to the material just referred?

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY SERVICES

For necessary expenses of the Manufacturing Extension Partnership, the Advanced Technology Program and the Quality Outreach Program of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, \$162,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed \$1,290,000 may be transferred to the "Working Capital Fund".

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that on page 32, lines 19 through 26, there are unauthorized appropriations, in violation of clause 2, rule XXI, of the rules of the House.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BROWN of California). The point of order is conceded and is sustained by the Chair. The paragraph is stricken.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION OF RESEARCH FACILITIES

For construction of new research facilities, including architectural and engineering design, not otherwise provided for the National Institute of Standards and Technology, as authorized by 15 U.S.C. 278c-278e, \$61,686,000, to remain available until expended.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language appearing in the bill on page 33, lines 1 through 6. The paragraph provides appropriations that have not been authorized by law and is in violation of House rule XXI, clause 2(a).

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I concede this program is not authorized at this point.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BROWN of California). The point of order is conceded.

The Chair sustains the point of order. The paragraph is stricken.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC
ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONS, RESEARCH, AND FACILITIES
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of activities authorized by law for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, including acquisition, maintenance, operation, and hire of aircraft; not to exceed 439 commissioned officers on the active list; as authorized by 31 U.S.C. 1343 and 1344; construction of facilities, including initial equipment as authorized by 33 U.S.C. 883i; grants, contracts, or other payments to nonprofit organizations for the purposes of conducting activities pursuant to cooperative agreements; and alteration, modernization, and relocation of facilities as authorized by 33 U.S.C. 883i; \$1,650,000,000, to remain available until expended; and in addition, \$55,544,000 shall be derived by transfer from the fund entitled

"Promote and Develop Fishery Products and Research Pertaining to American Fisheries".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment Offered by Mr. WALKER:

Page 33, line 21, strike "\$1,650,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,640,366,000".

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 10 minutes, to be divided equally 5 minutes on each side.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, what this amendment does is cut the bill by \$9.6 million. Let me explain what I am doing here. The President's original intent in his 1994 budget request for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration was to put some money into the new radar systems for weather forecasting, but to reduce some other programs that have now had money added back into them by this bill.

Mr. Chairman, let me tell you about the programs where we have added money. This is over and above the President's request:

The Land Information System, Observation buoys, Non-point pollution, Marine sanctuary sites program, Oyster disease research, Aquaculture, Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Research, Center for Shark Research, Fisheries Management Program, Columbia River Smolt, International Fisheries Commission, Beluga Whale Committee, Fishery Observers Training, East Coast Observers, Andromous Fishery project, Atmospheric modification grant, Southeastern storm research, Susquehanna Riv. Flood System, Marine prediction research, Sea grant college program, Sea Grant-Zebra Mussel, National Coastal R&D Institute, and NOAA Undersea Research Program, (NURP).

□ 1310

All of those are programs where this committee added money over and above what the President requested to the tune of \$37 million.

The committee, though, also then cut \$27 million out of the money for the new radar system for weather.

I would submit to my colleagues that a lot of these programs are worthwhile, but what they could do is live within the moneys that the President requested for them.

I also submit to Members that it is necessary to move on for public safety with the new generation of radar systems. What this amendment does is it strikes the money that was added for these programs and at the same time allows \$27 million to be reserved for the purpose of the new Doppler radars that will provide us with the advanced weather interactive processing system.

It seems to me that when we start trading off public safety for a lot of these projects that some Members would regard as pork that we are doing the wrong thing. So what this amendment adds up to is a cut of about \$10 million overall but it, at the same time, redistributes the priorities in a way to go back to the President's original numbers and at the same time provide \$27 million for the new generation of radars that I believe we need, if we are to provide the public safety for this country in the future.

I would ask that the House support me in cutting some money but at the same time moving away from pork toward public safety.

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

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we can not tell for sure what would be cut out by the gentleman's amendment.

If I could have the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, certain programs funded under NOAA are not authorized at this point, and certain items were not included in the budget request. We did continue to put the money in to continue at the existing level some of these initiatives that have been under way for some time. Until we go to conference on this bill, we do not know for sure what the funding levels will be.

Now, in view of that, the gentleman is only cutting \$10 million out of a \$1.65 billion account. If he does not intend to have a rollcall vote on this, I am not going to make a big issue out of it. We do not know for sure yet where we are yet on NOAA. And with that in mind, while I oppose the amendment, I am not going to ask for a recorded vote, if it carries, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS], who wanted to take a little bit of time here in favor of the amendment.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time so that I may speak in support of this amendment. Earlier today, the committee approved a point of order raised striking language in the bill funding unrequested earmarks.

While I am not seeking a specific earmark at this time, I would like to bring to the distinguished chairman's attention and that of my other colleagues a concern several of my colleagues and I share—and that is the level of funding that has been currently allocated toward the National Weather Service.

The National Weather Service serves a major national interest in providing us with the most up to date and accurate meteorological, hydrologic, and oceanographic warnings, warnings forecast, and planning information to en-

sure the safety of the population, mitigate property losses and improve the economic efficiency of the Nation.

Specifically, the National Weather Service needs additional funding to develop and deploy its advanced weather interactive processing system. This need to modernize the NWS has never been more apparent than in recent times. The Nation has witnessed the tragedy and destruction Hurricane Andrew brought upon the citizens of Florida, and States in the gulf coast all the way up the Atlantic coast. Aside from the huge economic losses that have been suffered in my State of Florida, the emotional and human toll is immeasurable.

The bottom line is this—we need to lend more support to the NWS so that it may provide us with more timely and accurate weather and flood warning and forecast services to the public. We all benefit from the services of the NWS. One program under the NWS that has already helped the entire Nation is the next generation weather radar [Nexrad]. Nexrad will replace existing obsolete weather radars and enhance severe weather and flood warnings. If you turn on your local news, the weatherman will often mention the use of Doppler radar. This advanced Doppler system can increase tornado warning lead times and reduce false alarms. In short, it saves lives. The Midwest has experienced a large number of tornadoes and mother nature does not discriminate. Natural disasters can and do occur everywhere. Furthermore, accurate mapping of heavy rainfall also will be possible on a wide scale, enabling extensive improvements in forecasting of flash floods and river flooding.

Mr. Chairman, I could go further explaining the innumerable benefits the National Weather Service provides to us, but I think the message is clear—it needs our assistance. Let us do our part so that they can carry out their mission and better serve the public and save lives.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, let me say to the gentleman that I thank him for being a cosponsor of the point of order that just succeeded.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR].

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

I represent a coastal area of California, which the Congress of the United States has designated as the largest marine sanctuary in the United States, the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary. Part of the reason for that designation is that they wanted this country not only to preserve but to understand the new frontier of interaction between the coast and the land.

Part of that interaction is the investment we have made in the Fleet Numerical Weather Station, which is the

largest Navy center for ocean weather predictions. Part of the need for that is in the cuts that have been mentioned here today. That is to take out the observation buoys, which were added by the committee. These observation buoys help the domestic fisheries fleet; these buoys help the Weather Service.

I think it would be penny-wise and pound-foolish to delete this appropriation. There is also, as part of the National Marine Sanctuary Program, a massive educational opportunity for this country to learn more about the new frontier that we have created. I would suggest to this House that adoption of this amendment would take a giant step backward for what has been done in previous years to make this country more aware of the ocean and the opportunities of that ocean by providing the update, instrument and education process that this appropriation allows.

I oppose the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to commend the leadership of Chairman SMITH and the foresight of the committee for including an important level of funding for National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration [NOAA] programs that are vital to California's central coast and the Nation.

I applaud the committee for achieving considerable savings in this bill by keeping total spending 5 percent below the administration's request, yet seeing to it that an efficient level of funding was retained for the National Marine Sanctuary Program, the Center for Ocean Analysis and Prediction [COAP] and the central California observation buoys. These are all high priority for NOAA's management and research operations and I am very pleased that the legislation reflects this fact.

By increasing the level of funding for the Marine Sanctuary Program by \$2 million over the administration's request and last year's level, we will be taking an important step to ensure the efficient management of our Nation's marine sanctuaries. I also appreciate the committee's recognition that even with this level of funding, NOAA may have difficulties in carrying out the effective management of the program. This national program includes the recently designated Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary in my district. The designation of the sanctuary as the largest marine sanctuary in the United States was a milestone for the people of California's 17th Congressional District, who cherish the resource, and for the Nations. The management of the sanctuary is now in a formative stage and is dependent on a strong level of funding.

The California observation buoys off the coast of my district have proven imperative for guaranteeing the safety of mariners in California waters and it is essential that they remain in operation.

I also want to emphasize the importance of the operations conducted at NOAA's Center for Ocean Analysis and Prediction. The establishment of COAP was intended to provide the United States with crucial information pertaining to our national defense, fishery and coastal zone management, maritime transportation, and weather forecasting. With expanded re-

search necessitated by the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary, COAP fills a critical roll for NOAA through cooperation with other marine research institutions in the area. In addition to the tremendous contribution COAP lends to our Nation's marine understanding, given the devastating impact of the closure of the Fort Ord Light Infantry Base in my district, Federal and private collaboration of resources such as those of COAP will be essential for the economic health of this community. COAP makes good scientific and national security sense and represents intelligent use of Federal resources.

Again, I commend the chairman and the committee for approving this important legislation and I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT FUND

Of amounts collected pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1456a, not to exceed \$7,800,000, for purposes set forth in 16 U.S.C. 1456a(b)(2).

CONSTRUCTION

For repair and modification of, and additions to, existing facilities and construction of new facilities, and for facility planning and design and land acquisition not otherwise provided for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, \$89,775,000, to remain available until expended.

FLEET MODERNIZATION, SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION

For expenses necessary for the repair, construction, acquisition, leasing, or conversion of vessels, including related equipment to maintain and modernize the existing fleet and to continue planning the modernization of the fleet, for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, \$23,064,000, to remain available until expended.

FISHING VESSEL OBLIGATIONS GUARANTEES

For the cost, as defined in section 502 of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, of guaranteed loans authorized by the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, \$459,000.

FISHING VESSEL AND GEAR DAMAGE COMPENSATION FUND

For carrying out the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 95-376, not to exceed \$1,273,000, to be derived from receipts collected pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 1980 (b) and (f), to remain available until expended.

FISHERMEN'S CONTINGENCY FUND

For carrying out the provisions of title IV of Public Law 95-372, not to exceed \$999,000, to be derived from receipts collected pursuant to that Act, to remain available until expended.

FOREIGN FISHING OBSERVER FUND

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Atlantic Tunas Convention Act of 1975, as amended (Public Law 96-339), the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976, as amended (Public Law 100-627) and the American Fisheries Promotion Act (Public Law 96-561), there are appropriated from the fees imposed under the foreign fishery observer program authorized by these Acts, not to exceed \$550,000, to remain available until expended.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the general administration of the Department of Commerce provided for by law, including not to exceed \$3,000 for official entertainment, \$33,042,000.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General Act in carrying out the provision of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended (5 U.S.C. App. 1-11 as amended by Public Law 100-504), \$15,860,000.

BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for collecting, compiling, analyzing, preparing, and publishing statistics, provided for by law, \$131,170,000.

PERIODIC CENSUSES AND PROGRAMS

For expenses necessary to collect and publish statistics for periodic censuses and programs provided for by law, \$110,000,000, to remain available until expended.

ECONOMIC AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, as authorized by law, of economic and statistical analysis programs of the Department of Commerce, \$45,220,000, to remain available until September 30, 1995.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONS AND ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses for international trade activities of the Department of Commerce provided for by law, and engaging in trade promotional activities abroad without regard to the provisions of law set forth in 44 U.S.C. 3702 and 3703; full medical coverage for dependent members of immediate families of employees stationed overseas and employees temporarily posted overseas; travel and transportation of employees of the United States and Foreign Commercial Service between two points abroad, without regard to 49 U.S.C. 1517; employment of Americans and aliens by contract for services; rental of space abroad for periods not exceeding ten years, and expenses of alteration, repair, or improvement; purchase or construction of temporary demountable exhibition structures for use abroad; payment of tort claims, in the manner authorized in the first paragraph of 28 U.S.C. 2672 when such claims arise in foreign countries; not to exceed \$327,000 for official representation expenses abroad; purchase of passenger motor vehicles for official use abroad not to exceed \$30,000 per vehicle, obtain insurance on official motor vehicles; and rent tie lines and teletype equipment; \$221,445,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the provisions of the first sentence of section 105(f) and all of section 108(c) of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2455(f) and 2458(c)) shall apply in carrying out these activities without regard to 15 U.S.C. 4912; and that for the purpose of this Act, contributions under the provisions of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act shall include payment for assessments for services provided as part of these activities.

EXPORT ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONS AND ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses for export administration and national security activities of the Department of Commerce, including costs associated with the performance of export administration field activities both domestically and abroad; full medical coverage

for dependent members of immediate families of employees stationed overseas; employment of Americans and aliens by contract for services abroad; rental of space abroad for periods not exceeding ten years, and expenses of alteration, repair, or improvement; payment of tort claims, in the manner authorized in the first paragraph of 28 U.S.C. 2672 when such claims arise in foreign countries; not to exceed \$22,000 for official representation expenses abroad; awards of compensation to informers under the Export Administration Act of 1979, and as authorized by 22 U.S.C. 401(b); purchase of passenger motor vehicles for official use and motor vehicles for law enforcement use with special requirement vehicles eligible for purchase without regard to any price limitation otherwise established by law; \$34,747,000, to remain available until expended; *Provided*, That the provisions of the first sentence of section 105(f) and all of section 108(c) of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2455(f) and 2458(c)) shall apply in carrying out these activities.

MINORITY BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT AGENCY
MINORITY BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses of the Department of Commerce in fostering, promoting, and developing minority business enterprise, including expenses of grants, contracts, and other agreements with public or private organizations, \$38,362,000, of which \$22,800,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$15,562,000 shall be available for program management for fiscal year 1994.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I believe the next point of order or amendment is on page 39 after line 15. In view of that, I ask unanimous consent that the portion of the bill through page 39, line 15, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order against the material up to page 39, line 15?

If not, are there any amendments up to that point?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES TRAVEL AND TOURISM
ADMINISTRATION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the United States Travel and Tourism Administration including travel and tourism promotional activities abroad for travel to the United States and its possessions without regard to 44 U.S.C. 501, 3702 and 3703, including employment of American citizens and aliens by contract for services abroad; rental of space broad for periods not exceeding five years, and expenses of alteration, repair, or improvement; purchase or construction of temporary demountable exhibition structures for use abroad; advance of funds under contracts abroad; payment of tort claims in the manner authorized in the first paragraph of 28 U.S.C. 2672, when such claims arise in foreign countries; and not to exceed \$15,000 for official representation expenses abroad; \$17,120,000, to remain available until expended; *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated by this paragraph shall be avail-

able to carry out the provisions of section 203(a) of the International Travel Act of 1961, as amended: *Provided further*, That in addition to fees currently being assessed and collected, the Administration shall charge users of its services, products, and information, fees sufficient to result in an additional \$3,000,000, to be deposited in the General Fund of the Treasury.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language of the bill commencing at and including all of line 16, page 39, down through the end of and including all of line 16 at page 40.

The point of order is that this constitutes a violation of rule XXI, clause 2, in that it is legislation in an appropriation bill and raises approval of provisions which, in fact, are authorizations or are expenditures which are unapproved by authorization by law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, one part of this is not subject to a point of order. I am getting a substitute ready to put back in the part that is not subject to a point of order.

□ 1320

Mr. Chairman, I concede that point of order on the last proviso.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BROWN of California). The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] concedes the point of order. The Chair sustains the point of order, and the paragraph is stricken.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Iowa: Page 39, after line 15, insert the following:

UNITED STATES TRAVEL AND TOURISM
ADMINISTRATION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the United States Travel and Tourism Administration \$17,120,000, *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated by this paragraph shall be available to carry out the provisions of section 203(a) of the International Travel Act of 1961, as amended:

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] reserves a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, my amendment puts the funding for USTTA back in the bill, and that part of the paragraph that was a limitation on an appropriations bill only. It does not put back in the part of the language that was subject to the original point of order.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2519 specifically prohibits the U.S. Travel and Tourism Administration from funding the Cooperative Marketing Program, which was created by legislation last year, and mandated in the Tourism Policy and Export Promotion Act.

The Cooperative Marketing Agreement Program provides Federal funds in the form of matching grants to States and to local tourism initiatives to promote international tourism. Last year international tourism brought in \$16 billion more in revenue to the United States than our fellow citizens spent abroad. It was a \$16 billion balance of payments winter for America.

The program is designed to encourage tourism agencies that previously have been excluded from promoting international tourism to engage in tourism promotion activities abroad, to encourage other citizens of other countries to come to the United States, see our wonders, and spend their money in our country.

The USTTA has literally been flooded with calls from all 50 States expressing interest in the program. Every day the agency gets at least three or four calls from State organizations who want to engage in a tourism promotion activity. For example, Minnesota and the other States along the Mississippi River and the Great Lakes States are organizing a program to promote tourism among the fresh water wonders, where we have 50 percent of the fresh water on the face of the Earth in the Great Lakes States.

However, the way this language was crafted was that it takes 25 percent of the total budget of USTTA and reserves it for this grant program. I would like to talk further with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, which has authority over this program, to see if in the future we could craft an amendment that might mitigate the way in which it is constructed, so it would not take one-fourth of the total USTTA budget.

The point is this is a very good initiative. It would get started this year, if only the money could be made available, but the amount was reduced from the administration's budget.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBERSTAR. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman, and I want to commend him for his comments. He was very interested in this business of trying to see to it that we have a workable program to encourage tourism in the United States. It is a very valuable thing.

I want it clear what my good friend, and I love him, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] is doing. He is seeking to change the entire formula that

is referred to by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR], and he is seeking to see to it that no longer will that money, which has been going to the States to encourage tourism through State efforts, be available.

This is a regrettable thing. It is directly in contravention of the intention of every one of the Members in every one of the committees which worked on this matter, and which achieved a successful program which was broadly accepted by the Governors, by the States, by the travel, and by the tourism industry.

It confounds me that my good friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH], a man of enormous intelligence and rectitude, would come forward with a curious amendment of this sort. I would urge my colleagues, if I do not succeed in my point of order, to vote this amendment down, and we will try to address this thing properly.

This is a clear attempt by the Committee on Appropriations to stifle something which is working well, and something which was approved by every committee which worked on the matter the last time, and something which has been thoroughly and enthusiastically accepted by all of the State agencies, and indeed, by the travel and tourism industry.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the gentleman's attention.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman has my attention, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I would say to the gentleman, here is what the situation is. By putting this new provision in and saying 25 percent of the money has to be used for this purpose, what the gentleman did was to take that out of all the other operations in the Travel and Tourism Administration. They are not able to absorb that kind of a cut, especially in 1 year.

What the gentleman did by saying that 25 percent had to be used for a new purpose was to appropriate on an authorization bill. That is not what he is supposed to do. He is deciding that the appropriations for other purposes shall be limited to 25 percent, and 25 percent of the whole bill shall be used for this one purpose.

I understand from good sources, I think, that that is not what the gentleman intended to do. I think it can be worked out. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT] is the chairman of the authorizing subcommittee, and I do not have any question but what it could be worked out legislatively. As it stands now, that is what the gentleman is doing, appropriating on a legislative bill.

I think it can be worked out so it does what the gentleman intends to do,

instead of what the gentleman does not intend to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR] has expired.

(At his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. OBERSTAR was allowed to proceed for four additional minutes.)

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] is one of my oldest and most esteemed and valuable friends.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. If the gentleman will yield, I concede his statement, instead of all the flattery.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to no man in my respect and affection for the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH]. However, it is regrettable, indeed, that his interpretation of the rules of the House is so incorrect. It surprises me to find a man of this skill with such an inadequate interpretation of the rules.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. If the gentleman will yield, what we need is to adhere to the House rule that says, "You cannot appropriate on a legislative bill."

Mr. DINGELL. I would say to the gentleman, we have not and we do not appropriate, in the Committee on Energy and Commerce. It is possible there are other committees around here that are not so constrained.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I would ask the gentleman, why does he not go along with this, and then we can correct it?

Mr. DINGELL. It is very clear, however, that my dear friend seeks to legislate in an appropriation bill. That is something which the rules of the House address with great probity. Beyond that, the gentleman says what we seek to do is remove 25 percent from this agency for purposes of making it available to States. That is precisely correct, and that is precisely what the gentleman seeks to undo.

My dear friend says we can work this thing out. I think there is a splendid way in which we can work this thing out, and I am anxious to do so. I would suggest to the House that the best way in which this could be done is not by permitting the gentleman to come forward with an amendment of this curious sort, founded upon such a regrettable understanding of the rules of the House, but rather, it would be better that we simply excise the whole of the matter, and then I assure the gentleman of my best efforts to work with him as he goes to conference with the Senate, where he will address this matter with Senator HOLLINGS and other Members of the Senate who happen to have an identical feeling to my own on this matter, which is considerably at variance with the feelings of my dear friend, the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBERSTAR. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. In all seriousness, this has been a heavily personnel-directed agency. A 25-percent cut from an agency which spends so much on personnel is just too much for 1 year.

□ 1330

Even if you want to redirect the program toward grants, it is just too much for 1 year.

Mr. DINGELL. Will the gentleman yield just a bit more, please?

Mr. OBERSTAR. I would like to reclaim a moment for myself to simply observe that had the Appropriations Committee not felt it necessary to cut \$3 million out of the administration's request we would not be facing this problem.

I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman is correct. This does afford a requirement that 25 percent of the money of the agency now go to newer and better uses. And I applaud that, and I am sure everybody else who has studied that agency comes to that same happy conclusion.

Here is the problem which we confront: There are a lot of people who have been sitting around in that agency twiddling their thumbs, doing less than an adequate job. It always pains me to see good people forced into that kind of a situation.

I would suggest the best thing we can do for the people who have had that unfortunate circumstance is that we remove them from their employment and allow them to seek elsewhere where they might make a more constructive contribution to the Government of their country.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. If the gentleman will yield once more, when you cut that much in personnel the first year, it requires more money instead of less because RIF's cost money, and you are going to have less money left instead of more. You cannot reduce personnel that fast without actually hurting all of the programs that are in the agency, and a 25-percent reduction would be too much for 1 year.

Mr. OBERSTAR. In my judgment, the purposes of tourism and the purposes of this provision of the substantive law would be better served if there were an authorization of a specific amount, perhaps increasing over a period of a defined number of years for this export promotion, tourism program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota have 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. ROGERS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, how long shall we go on with this, I ask the gentleman? We have a lot of other amendments and we have a 2:30 deadline. Can we wrap this up?

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield to my dear friend, the gentleman from Minnesota, [Mr. OBERSTAR] who has been most generous to me.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I simply wanted to observe that I think that the best cure for the problem that we are facing here would be in the future to consider an amendment to the substantive law that would set aside a specific amount for the Tourism Policy and Export Promotion Act of grants to States and units of local government for tourism promotion, set a specific dollar amount rather than take 25 percent out the total amount available for this very small agency.

But that is a matter entirely within the jurisdiction of the gentleman from Michigan, and I look forward to working with him in my capacity as chair of the Travel and Tourism Caucus. But for the present moment, we have to deal with the law that is in place, and the gentleman has another agenda for that objective.

Mr. DINGELL. I think the gentleman makes eminently good sense. As soon as I can get some drafting done I will have a little amendment which I think will enable us to move forward in our understanding of what is good legislative policy.

I will tell my special friend from Iowa, for whom I have enormous affection, that it will be my purpose to work with him. I am not trying to drive anybody from employment. But this is a matter which our committee has gone to great detail. This is not the first time that I have had the misfortune to speak on this subject on the House floor, nor the House to have the misfortune to listen to me on this rather tedious subject.

However, the hard fact of the matter remains that the agency has not been doing the job which it should do over time.

The committee very nearly excised the entire agency. The reason we would do so was that we had been spending money for a goodly period of time and accomplishing nothing, or very little. That is hardly the way in which the public money should be spent. Instead, the last time this matter was up for authorization the committee came to the conclusion that some of this money should be earmarked for expenditures by the States, and that in so doing we would then and thereby achieve the purpose of expanding tourism, and do so in a way that would achieve the greatest benefit per dollar spent.

I am very happy to keep the agency in being. I want to see it function as a

coordinating agency. I recognize that getting tourism in Iowa, or Kentucky where my dear friend from Kentucky comes from, is done best by the State agency and not by a bureaucracy in Washington which sits and happily shuffles papers from one side of the desk to the other.

The purpose here is a simple one, and that is to see to it that we continue the new process which will give us an incentive for the States and an ability for the States to go out and procure tourism at the State and local level, and not to have some bureaucrat in Washington dealing with questions about which he knows very little. Indeed, it is the history of this agency that over time they have spent a great deal of money on travel and entertainment and other matters, and regrettably have spent very little in actually procuring travelers to visit our shores, and to see what goes on in different parts of our country, and to go to see the beauties of Iowa, or the beauties of Kentucky, or the beauties of Michigan or Minnesota or any of the other great States.

So I would urge my colleagues if they really want to do something to help their State, to help their tourism industry, to see to it that the country prospers by bringing in tourists, oppose what it is that my dear friends on the Appropriations Committee have tried to do and move forward towards the idea of seeing to it that we concentrate now on making a program which is working to work as well as we possibly can by seeing to its funding, not by stripping it of funds.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I am happy to yield to my dear friend, the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman makes a very valid point. There have been mistakes made by the USTTA in years past, and we now have a new administration, and a new Secretary of Commerce who was raised in the tourism sector, who wants tourism promotion to succeed, and will clear out the errors of the past. And I know that the gentleman from Michigan, with his vigorous oversight ability, will suggest ways to make this agency work better, and we in the Travel and Tourism Caucus will work with the gentleman toward that objective. We want the agency to work. It is lean and we want it to work best for the traveling public at home and to be successful in bringing tourism into the United States from other countries.

Mr. DINGELL. I agree with the gentleman. And this is no surprise to the agency. They knew this cut was coming.

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] insist upon his point of order?

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I do insist upon my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. DINGELL. The point of order, if I may be heard on the matter, the point of order is that under clause 2(c) of rule XXI, an amendment in this form is not in order at this point.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BROWN of California). The gentleman has correctly stated the rules, that an amendment in the form of a limitation is not in order until the end of the bill.

The Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Patent and Trademark Office provided for by law, including defense of suits instituted against the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks; \$88,329,000, to remain available until expended, to be derived from deposits in the Patent and Trademark Office Fee Surcharge Fund as authorized by law: *Provided*, That the amounts made available under the Fund shall not exceed amounts deposited; and such fees as shall be collected pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1113 AND 35 U.S.C. 41 and 376 shall remain available until expended.

TECHNOLOGY ADMINISTRATION SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Technology Administration, \$4,500,000.

NATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, as provided for by law, of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration, \$18,927,000, to remain available until expended.

PUBLIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES, PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION

For grants authorized by section 392 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, \$20,254,000, to remain available until expended as authorized by section 391 of said Act, as amended: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$2,000,000 shall be available for program administration as authorized by section 391 of said Act: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of section 391 of said Act, the prior year unobligated balances may be made available for grants for projects for which applications have been submitted and approved during any fiscal year.

INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE GRANTS

For grants authorized by section 392 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, \$21,746,000, to remain available until expended as authorized by section 391 of said Act, as amended: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$2,000,000 shall be available for program administration as authorized by section 391 of said Act: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the requirements of section 392(a) and 392(c) of such Act, these funds may be used for the planning and construction of telecommunications networks.

ENDOWMENT FOR CHILDREN'S EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the National Endowment for Children's Educational Television Act of 1990, title II of Public Law 101-437, including costs for contracts, grants and administrative expenses, \$1,000,000, to remain available until expended.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF
COMMERCE

SEC. 201. During the current fiscal year, applicable appropriations and funds made available to the Department of Commerce by this Act shall be available for the activities specified in the Act of October 26, 1949 (15 U.S.C. 1514), to the extent and the manner prescribed by said Act, and, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3324, may be used for advanced payments not otherwise authorized only upon the certification of officials designated by the Secretary that such payments are in the public interest.

SEC. 202. During the current fiscal year, appropriations made available to the Department of Commerce by this Act for salaries and expenses shall be available for hire of passenger motor vehicles as authorized by 31 U.S.C. 1343 and 1344; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; and uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902).

SEC. 203. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to support the hurricane reconnaissance aircraft and activities that are under the control of the United States Air Force or the United States Air Force Reserve.

SEC. 204. None of the funds provided in this or any previous Act, or hereinafter made available to the Department of Commerce shall be available to reimburse the Unemployment Trust Fund or any other fund or account of the Treasury to pay for any expenses paid before October 1, 1992, as authorized by section 8501 of title 5, United States Code, for services performed after April 20, 1990, by individuals appointed to temporary positions within the Bureau of the Census for purposes relating to the 1990 decennial census of population.

SEC. 205. Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation made available for the current fiscal year for the Department of Commerce in this Act may be transferred between such appropriations, but no such appropriation shall be increased by more than 10 percent by any such transfers: *Provided*, That any transfer pursuant to this section shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 605 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

This title may be cited as the "Department of Commerce Appropriations Act, 1994".

TITLE III—THE JUDICIARY

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the operation of the Supreme Court, as required by law, excluding care of the building and grounds, including purchase or hire, driving, maintenance and operation of an automobile for the Chief Justice, not to exceed \$10,000 for the purpose of transporting Associate Justices, and hire of passenger motor vehicles as authorized by 31 U.S.C. 1343 and 1344; not to exceed \$10,000 for official reception and representation expenses; and for miscellaneous expenses, to be expended as the Chief Justice may approve; \$22,326,000.

CARE OF THE BUILDING AND GROUNDS

For such expenditures as may be necessary to enable the Architect of the Capitol to carry out the duties imposed upon him by the Act approved May 7, 1934 (40 U.S.C. 13a-13b, \$2,699,000, of which \$300,000 shall remain available until expended.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE
FEDERAL CIRCUIT
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries of the chief judge, judges, and other officers and employees, and for necessary expenses of the court, as authorized by law, \$13,127,000.

UNITED STATES COURT OF INTERNATIONAL
TRADE
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries of the chief judge and eight judges, salaries of the officers and employees of the court, services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and necessary expenses of the court, as authorized by law, \$11,100,000.

COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND
OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICES
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For the salaries of circuit and district judges (including judges of the territorial courts of the United States), justices and judges retired from office or from regular active services, judges of the United States Court of Federal Claims, bankruptcy judges, magistrate judges, and all other officers and employees of the Federal Judiciary not otherwise specifically provided for, and necessary expenses of the courts, as authorized by law, \$2,189,131,000 (including the purchase of firearms and ammunition); of which not to exceed \$20,000,000 shall remain available until expended for space alteration projects; and of which \$500,000 is to remain available until expended for acquisition of books, periodicals, and newspapers, and all other legal reference materials, including subscriptions.

In addition, for expenses of the United States Court of Federal Claims associated with processing cases under the National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, not to exceed \$2,063,000 to be appropriated from the Vaccine Injury Compensation Trust Fund.

DEFENDER SERVICES

For the operation of Federal Public Defender and Community Defender organizations, the compensation and reimbursement of expenses of attorneys appointed to represent persons under the Criminal Justice Act of 1964, as amended, the compensation and reimbursement of expenses of persons furnishing investigative, expert and other services under the Criminal Justice Act (18 U.S.C. 3006A(e)), the compensation (in accordance with Criminal Justice Act maximums) and reimbursement of expenses of attorneys appointed to assist the court in criminal cases where the defendant has waived representation by counsel, the compensation and reimbursement of travel expenses of guardians ad litem acting on behalf of financially eligible minor or incompetent offenders in connection with transfers from the United States to foreign countries with which the United States has a treaty for the execution of penal sentences, and the compensation of attorneys appointed to represent jurors in civil actions for the protection of their employment, as authorized by 28 U.S.C. 1875(d), \$297,252,000, to remain available until expended as authorized by 18 U.S.C. 3006A(i).

FEES OF JURORS AND COMMISSIONERS

For fees and expenses of jurors as authorized by 28 U.S.C. 1871 and 1876; compensation of jury commissioners as authorized by 28 U.S.C. 1863; and compensation of commissioners appointed in condemnation cases pursuant to rule 71A(h) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (28 U.S.C. Appendix Rule 71A(h)); \$77,095,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the compensation

of land commissioners shall not exceed the daily equivalent of the highest rate payable under section 5332 of title 5, United States Code.

COURT SECURITY

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, incident to the procurement, installation, and maintenance of security equipment and protective services for the United States Courts in courtrooms and adjacent areas, including building ingress-egress control, inspection of packages, directed security patrols, and other similar activities as authorized by section 1010 of the Judicial Improvement and Access to Justice Act (Public Law 100-702); \$84,500,000, to be expended directly or transferred to the United States Marshals Service which shall be responsible for administering elements of the Judicial Security Program consistent with standards or guidelines agreed to by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts and the Attorney General.

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED
STATES COURTS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts as authorized by law, including travel as authorized by 31 U.S.C. 1345, hire of a passenger motor vehicle as authorized by 31 U.S.C. 1343(b), advertising and rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, \$44,612,000, of which not to exceed \$7,500 is authorized for official reception and representation expenses.

FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Judicial Center, as authorized by Public Law 90-219, \$18,467,000; of which \$1,800,000 shall remain available through September 30, 1995, to provide education and training to Federal court personnel; and of which not to exceed \$1,000 is authorized for official reception and representation expenses.

JUDICIAL RETIREMENT FUNDS

PAYMENT TO JUDICIARY TRUST FUNDS

For payment to the Judicial Officers' Retirement Fund as authorized by 28 U.S.C. 377(o), \$20,000,000 to the Judicial Survivors' Annuities Fund, as authorized by 28 U.S.C. 376(c), and in addition to the Claims Court Judges' Retirement Fund, as authorized by 28 U.S.C. 178(i), \$545,000.

UNITED STATES SENTENCING COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For the salaries and expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of chapter 58 of title 28, United States Code, \$8,468,000, of which not to exceed \$1,000 is authorized for official reception and representation expenses.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THE JUDICIARY

SEC. 301. Appropriations and authorizations made in this title which are available for salaries and expenses shall be available for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109.

SEC. 302. Appropriations made in this title shall be available for salaries and expenses of the Special Court established under the Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973, Public Law 93-236.

SEC. 303. Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation made available for the current fiscal year for the Judiciary in this Act may be transferred between such appropriations, but such appropriation, except as otherwise specifically provided, shall be increased by more than 10 percent by any such transfers:

Provided, That any transfer pursuant to this section shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 605 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

SEC. 304. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the salaries and expenses appropriation for district courts, courts of appeals, and other judicial services shall be available for official reception and representation expenses of the Judicial Conference of the United States: *Provided*, That such available funds shall not exceed \$10,000 and shall be administered by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts in his capacity as Secretary of the Judicial Conference.

This title may be cited as "The Judiciary Appropriation Act, 1994".

TITLE IV—RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

OPERATING-DIFFERENTIAL SUBSIDIES

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORITY)

For the payment of obligation incurred for operating-differential subsidies as authorized by the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, \$240,870,000 to remain available until expended.

OPERATIONS AND TRAINING

For necessary expenses of operations and training activities authorized by law, \$76,423,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Transportation may use proceeds derived from the sale or disposal of National Defense Reserve Fleet vessels that are currently collected and retained by the Maritime Administration, to be used for facility and ship maintenance, modernization and repair, conversion, acquisition of equipment, and fuel costs necessary to maintain training at the United States Merchant Marine Academy and State maritime academies: *Provided further*, That reimbursements may be made to this appropriation from receipts to the "Federal Ship Financing Fund" for administrative expenses in support of that program in addition to any amount heretofore appropriated.

READY RESERVE FORCE

For necessary expenses to acquire and maintain a surge shipping capability in the National Defense Reserve Fleet in an advanced state of readiness and for related programs, \$300,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That reimbursement may be made to the Operations and Training appropriation for expenses related to this program.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Maritime Administration is authorized to furnish utilities and services and make necessary repairs in connection with any lease, contract, or occupancy involving Government property under control of the Maritime Administration, and payments received therefor shall be credited to the appropriation charged with the cost thereof: *Provided*, That rental payments under any such lease, contract, or occupancy for items other than such utilities, services, or repairs shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

No obligations shall be incurred during the current fiscal year from the construction fund established by the Merchant Marine

Act, 1936, or otherwise, in excess of the appropriations and limitations contained in this Act or in any prior appropriation Act, and all receipts which otherwise would be deposited to the credit of said fund shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

COMMISSION ON IMMIGRATION REFORM

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Commission on Immigration Reform pursuant to section 141(f) of the Immigration Act of 1990, \$900,000, to remain available until expended.

COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, as authorized by Public Law 94-304, \$1,047,000, to remain available until expended as authorized by section 3 of Public Law 99-7.

COMPETITIVENESS POLICY COUNCIL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Competitiveness Policy Council as authorized by section 5209 of the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988, \$1,140,000, to remain available until expended.

MARINE MAMMAL COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Marine Mammal Commission as authorized by title II of Public Law 92-522, as amended, \$1,226,000.

MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. FEDERAL HOLIDAY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Federal Holiday Commission, as authorized by Public Law 98-399, as amended, \$300,000.

OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the United States Trade Representative, including the hire of passenger motor vehicles and the employment of experts and consultants as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$21,318,000, of which \$2,500,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$98,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that this portion of the bill, through page 54, line 23, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order on page 42, and I want to make certain that I am protected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will ask for points of order.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order to be raised up to the bottom of page 54?

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order on page 42.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language

beginning on page 42, line 9, after the word "act," and continuing through line 13.

This provision violates clause 2(c) of rule XXI of the rules of the House in that it is legislation on an appropriations bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. No, Mr. Chairman. The gentleman from Massachusetts wishes to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY] to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak against the point of order.

As chairman of the subcommittee authorizing the NTIA, I want to make a number of points.

The language appropriating funds for NTIA to fund the planning and construction of telecommunications networks is consistent with the current statutory authority that guides grant-making by the NTIA.

□ 1340

In addition, the language is consistent with the President's proposal that the Federal Government should play an important, but limited, role in funding pilot projects. In addition, the language, by referring to "telecommunications networks," prejudices no one and no particular technology, since virtually any technology would fall under that heading. I might add that I think it is advisable that Congress not get involved in choosing particular technologies but, instead, use inclusive terms, and this language follows that advice.

This appropriation is a necessary step in getting the NTIA moving in these critical areas. I support the inclusion of this language and intend to work through the authorization process to ensure the NTIA has ample authority to discharge its responsibility as the lead agency in guiding our Nation toward the electronic superhighways of tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania desire to be heard further on the point of order?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard further on the point of order.

Mr. Chairman, the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts was a statement on the legislative language, but not on the point of order that was raised that this constitutes legislating in an appropriation bill. If the gentleman referred to rule XXI, clause 2, he will find that you are not permitted to change existing law. The very nature of the language says that it is changing existing law. It says, "notwithstanding the requirements of section 392(a) and 392(c) of such act," which means that the language is in itself an admission that it is changing

the law that presently exists. That is a direct violation of clause 2(c), and I would ask that my point of order be upheld.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, if I may, just briefly: In the Appropriation Committee report itself it makes the point that these funds are provided under existing authorities for telecommunications grant authorities, although the committee—that is, the Appropriations Committee—does recognize that the authorizing committee may soon consider a separate authorization for this initiative.

So we do agree with that interpretation, but we await the rule of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BROWN of California). Does any other Member desire to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The provisions of the rule prohibit legislation on an appropriation bill. The clear language of the material the gentleman from Pennsylvania raises objections to says that, "notwithstanding the requirements of section 392(a) and 392(c) of such act," which constitutes, in effect, an effort to nullify legislation already in existence and has to be construed as legislation, therefore, on an appropriations bill.

The Chair upholds the point of order, and the proviso is stricken.

Are there any amendments to the material up to page 54?

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise to engage in a colloquy with respect to the material starting on page 45 of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

Regarding the salaries and expenses of judicial services, on line 2 on page 46, it says the money appropriated is for bankruptcy judges as well as other judges and clerks, and so forth. Let me ask the gentleman a specific question.

You know, the Congress last session created some new bankruptcy judges. Are the salaries included in this appropriation sufficient for those judges?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUILLEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, there is in this appropriation \$16 million for new judges. We never separated them by bankruptcy and magistrates and Federal Claims Court and article 3 judges. So there is \$16 million there. And the Judicial Conference, as they are approved, allocates the money. Otherwise, this money lapses at the end of the year. Otherwise they may be short in one account and over in another, and it would lapse. So there is money there for bankruptcy judges, provided they are approved by the Judicial Conference.

Mr. QUILLEN. I realize they have to be approved. But once they have been approved, the money is here to pay their salaries.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. There is \$16 million for the various kinds of judges.

Mr. QUILLEN. That is not entirely the option as to where the money goes. But is it the gentleman's intention that the funds be used to pay the salaries for approved bankruptcy judges?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. It includes bankruptcy judges, Federal Claims Court judges, magistrates, and Article 3 judges, yes, money to fund new bankruptcy positions are included.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no amendments to the material up to page 54, and no points of order, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of the Small Business Administration as authorized by Public Law 101-574, including hire of passenger motor vehicles as authorized by 31 U.S.C. 1343 and 1344, and not to exceed \$3,500 for official reception and representation expenses, \$243,326,000 of which \$71,266,000 is for grants for performance in fiscal year 1994 or fiscal year 1995 for Small Business Development Centers as authorized by section 21 of the Small Business Act, as amended: *Provided*, That not more than \$500,000 of this amount shall be available to pay the expenses of the National Small Business Development Center Advisory Board and to reimburse Centers for participating in evaluations as provided in section 20(a) of such Act, and to maintain a clearinghouse as provided in section 21(g)(2) of such Act. None of the funds appropriated for the Small Business Administration under this Act may be used to impose any new or increased loan guaranty fee or debenture guaranty fee, or any new or increased user fee or management assistance fee, except as otherwise provided in this Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PENNY

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PENNY: On page 55, line 8, strike \$243,326,000 and insert \$237,456,000.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, by taking up the Penny amendment first, does not preclude the McInnis amendment, does it?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair, unfortunately, is unaware of the nature of all the amendments being proposed, and recognized Mr. PENNY because he is the senior member and deserves recognition at this point. The Chair cannot answer the gentleman's question as to whether his amendment would be precluded, but the Chair does not think it would be.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would propose a \$5 million

cut in the program. I have filed an amendment to cancel all appropriations for loans made under the SBA Program. This program is one in which I think we ought to enter into a more thorough debate. The SBA Program is of questionable value in terms of providing assistance to the small-business community in America.

This program serves about two-tenths of 1 percent of all the small businesses in our country. It provides those businesses with the financial assistance and loan guarantees that are preferable to the kinds of financing that the vast majority of American small businesses must secure in order to conduct a successful enterprise.

This program is also subject to a very high default rate. During the 1980's, the default rate ranged in the area of 30 percent on loans made under this program. The default rate has since declined to about a 20-percent level, but still far higher than the default rate for loans to businesses as a general rule. In fact, there is no bank that could survive if they offered loans that resulted in this high a default level.

This amendment is a small nick out of this program, but it is designed to send a signal that there are deep and growing questions about the validity of this kind of assistance program when in our Federal Government we have several economic development initiatives, many of which would do a far better job of serving the needs and interests of the small-business community without prejudicing a few thousand recipients, as compared to all the many hundreds of thousands of small-business people in our society who get by quite nicely without SBA assistance.

□ 1350

Mr. Chairman, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] for any comments he would like to make at this point.

(At the request of Mr. DREIER and by unanimous consent, Mr. PENNY was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong support of this amendment.

I served for several years on the Small Business Committee. There is no better sounding term to describe the operations that go on from the Federal level to the small-business community than the Small Business Administration.

The fact of the matter is this cut is I believe a very good first step to dealing with a very serious problem that is out there.

Quite frankly, I believe that the direct and guaranteed loan programs of

the Small Business Administration provide a subsidized competitive advantage over those small businesses that have to rely on the private marketplace for their sources of credit.

Now, the argument is provided that due to the credit crunch we have today that there is not enough capital out there available for small businesses. I admit that we can point to some successes in the business world today that have been started with loans from the Small Business Administration, but the fact of the matter is that we have \$403 million this year provided in this loan program. It is a drop in the bucket when you look at just one financial institution, the Bank of Boston, which has provided \$6 billion through the private marketplace.

So I happen to be here in strong support, and I am happy to cosponsor this amendment with my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota, because in years past I have been working on efforts to try to transfer the very beneficial aspects of the Small Business Administration to the Commerce Department, and at the same time maintaining those, but getting rid of this incredible bureaucracy.

There are 4,000 employees there who are not business oriented. They are part of the bureaucracy.

Are they good people? Yes, Mr. Chairman, there are very many good people within the Small Business Administration, but as I look at the choice that I will have in this bill whether or not we provide \$60 million to proceed with toughening up the Border Patrol to stem the flow of illegal immigrants across the borders into the United States, or to continue the Small Business Administration at the same level, it is a very easy decision for me to make.

I happen to believe that dealing with the flow of illegal immigrants is a much better priority for us than it is to see us have the Small Business Administration perpetuated.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support this amendment and urge my colleagues to vote in behalf of it.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCINNIS TO THE
AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PENNY

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MCINNIS to the amendment offered by Mr. PENNY: In lieu of the number "237,456,000" insert "221,456,000".

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY] for the steps he has taken, but it is not extensive enough.

Let me explain exactly what the intent of my amendment is. My amendment is to go in and take \$16 million which is in the salary and expense item and is intended to be used for the Tree Planting Program.

Many of you may remember back in May when 209 of us stood up against

this program. I do not think the people of America anticipate that the Small Business Administration should be spending \$16 million to plant trees. That \$16 million, under testimony that I elicited in the Small Business Committee, that \$16 million would leverage \$380 million on the street.

Let me make a couple points about this amendment and the \$16 million that is being spent for tree planting.

First of all, in the Small Business Committee, let me say that is where I first saw the \$16 million. Then when we got on to the second supplemental on the House floor, the number was \$14 million. I could not figure out what happened to the \$2 million.

I sat down, and of course being new to the process I did not understand what happened to that \$2 million, and I have been tracing it.

Now I find out nothing happened to the \$2 million. In fact, it was \$14 million in the second supplemental to plant trees and it is \$16 million in addition to it under this budget.

This amendment to plant tree certainly is not what the fundamental purpose of the Small Business Agency is for.

There are a couple very basic points that we need to make. We should make these points to the American people.

No. 1, the President of this country has not requested these funds.

No. 2, the Small Business Administration has not requested these funds. These funds are being mandated on the Small Business Administration by the U.S. Congress.

We are in a year where we are talking about deficit control, where we are talking about priorities, where we are talking about every agency in front of us has to prioritize, has to spend their dollars in the most efficient manner possible, and yet we sneak \$16 million into the Small Business Administration to grow trees. It makes no sense today. It makes no sense tomorrow, and it made no sense back in May when 209 of us stood up and said to cut out the tree planting program.

I think it is a commitment of ours, I think it is incumbent upon us to look at this program and cut that program out of there. That is what that \$16 million does.

While I commend the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY] and certainly the \$5 million is a step in the right direction, I go further than the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY]. I go to a specific program, the Tree Planting Program, and I cut out three times what the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY] cuts out, and it will not impact any other program in the Small Business Administration.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY].

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could get unanimous consent to cut off debate in 10 minutes, 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] and 5 minutes to me.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. ROGERS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I think we have only three speakers here. One has already spoken.

Can we live with a total of 10 minutes?

Is that on the amendment to the amendment or the entire package?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, that is on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto.

Mr. ROGERS. I think we can agree only on the McInnis amendment to the amendment, Mr. Chairman, we can agree on a 10-minute limit.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, that is the whole thing, if it carries or loses. That would take care of the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the gentleman's request?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate end in 10 minutes on this substitute amendment and all amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa for a 10-minute limitation on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS].

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would ask for my remaining time. I had 5 minutes. I would ask for the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman that he does not have any balance to his time.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY] and would like to correct some misinformation Members may have received about SBA programs.

I know that in the amendment as it stood originally, I want to say that before we get further down the road and I forget to say it. I have talked to NFIB today. They strongly object to the Penny amendment and will score it as a no in its original condition. I do not know, I cannot speak for them as it has been amended.

In a Dear Colleague letter, the gentleman claimed that the agency does

not do the job of assisting small businesses. While I will be one of the first to say that we can do more to help small businesses in this country.

The fact is that hundreds of thousands of small businesses have been helped by the SBA and its programs—programs that have allowed businesses to begin, to expand, to add more jobs, to drive our economy—and this assistance has occurred in every State, including Minnesota.

The gentleman from Minnesota claims that of approximately 15 million small businesses in the United States, only 23,000 accessed SBA programs during calendar years 1990 and 1991. I don't know where the gentleman got his information, but just looking at the SBA's loan and loan guarantee programs, the agency had 106,216 active loans being serviced in 1990, for a total value of \$12.7 billion and 109,259 active loans in 1991 for a total value of \$14.1 billion. The SBA 7(a) general business loan guarantee program, which is but one of SBA's loan programs, has already provided over 14,000 loans from the start of fiscal year 1993 through April 30 of this year. The 7(a) program will provide loan guarantees for approximately 26,000 more small businesses in the remainder of this fiscal year—that is if the program receives the funding it needs to meet loan demand for the rest of the fiscal year 1993.

While Mr. PENNY wants to eliminate funding for this and all other SBA programs, citing high default rates for SBA loans, the fact is that the SBA loss rate on its guaranteed loans was 2.2 percent in 1991. I would point out to my colleagues that the SBA has the best loan portfolio performance and the lowest loss rate of the 5 major Federal credit agencies, which are HUD, the Farmers Home Administration, the Veterans' Administration, the Department of Education and the SBA. The taxpayer's dollar is better protected being placed in the SBA 7(a) program to foster a small business than in most any other Federal loan guarantee program.

Furthermore, thousands of jobs are created or maintained through the assistance provided to small businesses under the 7(a) program. As of April 1993, about 383,000 jobs were created or preserved with the help of 7(a) loan guarantees—7,100 of which were in the gentleman's home State of Minnesota. Given the current credit crunch, in which lenders are reluctant to give to small business borrowers, many businesses who obtained loans with the SBA guarantee would not have gotten the loans they needed without this program. We are seeing this now, as the 7(a) program is out of money. Money for small businesses dried up when the 7(a) program shut down, because regulatory pressures keep banks from making the loans without the guarantee. I

would also ask where the gentleman gets the facts to support his assertion that small business loans to go large businesses. SBA's 7(a) loans are given only to businesses that meet small business size standard criteria.

The gentleman mentions in his Dear Colleague that the default rate for energy loans are nearly 40 percent. The energy loan program, which was mandated by Congress, was phased out 10 years ago. It did have a higher loss ratio than other programs, but it was relatively a very small program, accounting for only \$63 million in loans during the program's life.

In addition to loan and loan guarantee programs, the SBA also provides valuable training and counseling to small business owners through such entities as the Small Business Development Centers, the Small Business Institute, the Service Corps of Retired Executives or SCORE, and the like. In 1990, 833,000 small businesses were helped through one of SBA's business development programs. In 1991, that number was 857,000—many more than the 23,000 suggested by the gentleman from Minnesota.

We have over 110,000 employees in the Department of Agriculture working for the 2.3 million farms in this country. The Small Business Administration has only 3,800 employees advocating the interests of our 20 million small businesses. If the gentleman from Minnesota would like to take away the only voice of small business in the country, how does he believe our economy will improve and employment will grow? In his Dear Colleague, he gives little import to the 23,000 loans the SBA gave the last 2 years. Perhaps he should retire to the Cloakroom and read this morning's Wall Street Journal. There is an excellent article which shows that despite even the President's recent call for the Nation's banks to ease access to credit for small business, the banks still have their sign out—no small businesses need apply. I urge an emphatic "no" vote on this ill-conceived amendment.

□ 1400

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS] for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to the amendment, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS] for the tree-planting program. I just want to make a couple of quick points.

No. 1, the U.S. Forest Service spent last year \$53 million to plant approximately 213 million trees. There are plenty of trees being planted. We do not need the Small Business Administration in the tree-planting program.

We need them in the loan program to help our small businesses.

Mr. Chairman, I would encourage a "yes" vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY].

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAFALCE], the chairman of the Committee on Small Business.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Chairman, as my colleagues know, a "Dear Colleague" letter was sent out about a day or so ago with some fictions rather than facts about the Small Business Administration indicating that there would be an effort to eliminate all the monies for the Small Business Administration, save disaster loan money.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, let me point out that that is not the amendment before us today. It has been watered down from all the money other than disaster; first, a \$5 million reduction, and now a \$16 million reduction from S&E.

But, second, everything in that letter was fiction rather than fact. I will not go into that now. Let me just point out though that the loan guarantee program of the Small Business Administration alone has been virtually singularly responsible for virtually every small business loan in the United States these past several years. There has been a tremendous credit crunch going on. A small business person cannot go to a bank and get a loan without a guarantee. That is why the loan guarantee program of the Small Business Administration has doubled and tripled over the past several years.

Right now, Mr. Chairman, the window has been shut for over 2 months, and in the supplemental bill coming up we have over \$175 million in that bill in order to leverage 3.2 billion dollars' worth of loan guarantees which we will use between now, today, and September 30 of this year—\$3.2 billion. We need the salary and expenses, that money, to deal with this, to manage this, to service it.

I say to my colleagues, "Don't cut \$16 million from S&E. Don't cut \$5 million from S&E. We need every penny because every single year it seems it's necessary to deal with this credit crunch to virtually double the loan guarantee program."

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the original amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY], and I will give my colleagues an example of how effective the Small Business Administration has been in my district, not only for the taxpayer, but to create jobs.

I have a firm that started in the early 1980's called Biomet, with four people, and they took out a half-a-million-dollar loan from SBA. Today they have 200 people working at Biomet in Warsaw, IN, and they are paying back that \$500 million every 2 weeks in taxes to the U.S. Government.

Now that is a success story, and I think that the gentleman is usually right on target. Today he is a little bit off target.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Chairman, is any of that money from the tree planting program of the SBA that was used for this small businessman?

Mr. ROEMER. To the best of my knowledge, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. SANTORUM. The amendment before us right now is the tree planting program in which they are trying to cut \$16 million, of which of that \$16 million last year a million went into the district of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAFALCE]. So I would just suggest that this is a very appropriate cut—

Mr. ROEMER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I would just say we should not be taking huge meat axes to the SBA budget at this point when the economy and jobs are so important to us.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the facts are these:

This is the salaries and expenses account for the Small Business Administration. We have in the bill \$243,326,000. That account covers the Small Business Development Center Program, the SCORE Program, the minority programs, the microloan programs and outreach programs that are important to women and minorities. They are all funded in this one account.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY] did was reduce the account to 95 percent of current services. Most accounts in this bill are at 95 percent of current services. What the amendment to the amendment would do is reduce the account slightly more than that. It would not reduce any one program; it would reduce the entire account.

I am not going to stand here and tell my colleagues that the agency will close down if it is cut \$10 million or \$5 million. I am not going to ask for a rollcall vote however it goes, because we cannot fine tune it finely enough to know whether \$5 million or \$10 million is going to be the amount. Hopefully, in conference, we will be able to do all right by this agency. We will get some additional information. But I do want to present these facts to my colleagues.

Ninety-five percent, which the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY]

has in his amendment, of current services is not as much as I would like to give SBA. On the other hand, it is what the average agency in the bill is getting. So, I am not going to ask for a rollcall vote however this vote goes.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MACHTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

As a member of the Small Business Committee, a committee which represents the Nation's 20 million small businesses, I would assert that the gentlemen from Minnesota's amendment would do nothing to improve a struggling economy.

In fact, to eliminate funding for the Small Business Administration would have a profound negative impact on the economy.

Given the tight market for small business loans, the SBA has become the sole hope for success among many small businesses.

In fact, 40 percent of all term loans made to small businesses in this country are made through the SBA 7(a) Program.

In 1990, the SBA, through its loan and loan guarantee programs, provided \$12.7 billion to small businesses.

In 1991, the SBA helped leverage \$14.1 billion in loans to small businesses.

In 1993, the SBA has already provided over 14,000 loans to entrepreneurs.

If the 7(a) Program had not run out of money last April, I am sure that this number would be even higher.

In fact, it is estimated that the SBA will provide loan guarantees for about 26,000 more businesses this year.

The gentleman from Minnesota claims that programs like the 7(a) have enormous default rates.

This is simply not the case.

The 7(a) Program has a loss rate of only 2.2 percent.

That is down from a default rate of 11.3 percent in 1983.

As my colleagues can see, the SBA is hard at work to improve its programs in order to provide efficient, effective service to the Nation's 20 million businesses.

The SBA has been particularly helpful in providing much needed relief to the New England region as it struggles to recover from the recent recession, which was exacerbated by numerous bank failures.

The New England Lending and Recovery Act, operated through the SBA, has helped shore up our regional banks, by pumping private capital back into surviving lending establishments.

In addition, through its small business development centers, small business institutes and service corps of retired executives, the SBA is playing an active role in helping businesses adjust to the continuing defense draw-down which is occurring throughout the country.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Minnesota for his enthusiasm in cutting Government spending in an effort to create a healthy economy.

But cutting funding for important programs in the Small Business Administration isn't the best way to reach this objective.

If my colleagues are truly interested in economic revitalization they will realize that the

SBA helps small businesses fuel our economy through expansion, job creation and increased revenues.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote against the Penny amendment.

□ 1410

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY] as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Ms. SHEPHERD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill, but I would also like to express my great concern about the status of the radiation exposure compensation trust fund, which will receive a zero appropriation level for fiscal year 1994 with passage of this bill. The trust fund has, since its inception, offered a formal apology and significant monetary relief for American nuclear testing radiation exposure victims and uranium miners. It is my understanding that the President's initial Justice Department budget request included \$75,250,000 for the radiation exposure compensation trust fund. It is also my understanding that this request was amended after the Justice Department discovered reserves over and above the \$75,250,000 that would fulfill grant requests through fiscal year 1994.

Since you have confirmed my understanding, I would also like to clarify that the intent of this zero appropriation was not to negate the need for Radiation Exposure Compensation Act as it was authorized, but simply to recognize that the trust fund has a sufficient current surplus to cover all expected radiation compensation exposure fund claimants into fiscal year 1994.

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage the chairman of the subcommittee in a colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, March 13 was a very devastating time for seven of the nine counties that I represent in Florida as they became disaster areas during that storm, and one of the things that has come to our attention is that the citizens of west central Florida lack direct access to the National Weather Service radio service.

As the hurricane season begins, it is extremely important for the citizens of this area to have the most complete and up-to-date weather information. This part of Florida is very vulnerable to the effects of severe storms due to a high concentration of people living in low-lying coastal areas and, just as importantly, having a limited number of evacuation corridors.

I understand from local officials in my district that a site has been chosen to place the necessary technical equipment. The only thing they need now is the funding.

Is it correct that the money for these types of projects comes out of the National Weather Modernization Fund?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Yes, Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman will yield, the National Weather Service radio upgrade program is included in the modernization plan.

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Chairman, I believe it is vital that the National Weather Service radio system in this area of Florida is operational during the current hurricane season. Is it possible the necessary funding for this project can come from the fiscal year 1993 appropriations?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Yes. I will ask the Department of Commerce to look into the availability of this funding and report back to the subcommittee immediately.

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Chairman, is it possible that the funding can be made available immediately?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I will respond to the gentlewoman's concerns as soon as I get a report back from the Department.

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended (5 U.S.C. App. 1-11 as amended by Public law 100-504), \$7,962,000.

BUSINESS LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of direct loans, \$22,994,000, and for the cost of guaranteed loans, \$219,459,000, as authorized by 15 U.S.C. 631 note: *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, \$94,737,000, which may be transferred to and merged with the appropriations for Salaries and Expenses.

DISASTER LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of direct loans, authorized by 15 U.S.C. 631 note, \$75,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this or any other Act may be used for the cost of direct loans to any borrower under section 7(b) of the Small Business Act to relocate voluntarily outside the business area in which the disaster has occurred.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the direct loan program, \$76,101,000, which may be transferred to and merged with the appropriations for Salaries and Expenses.

SURETY BOND GUARANTEES REVOLVING FUND

For additional capital for the "Surety Bond Guarantees Revolving Fund", authorized by the Small Business Investment Act,

as amended, \$12,369,000, to remain available without fiscal year limitation as authorized by 15 U.S.C. 631 note.

SBIC BANKRUPTCY PROVISION

None of the funds provided by this Act for the Small Business Administration may be used to guarantee any participating securities authorized by Public law 102-366 until legislation has been enacted which directly or indirectly prohibits the filing of a petition under the Bankruptcy Code by a small business investment company licensed under subsection (c) or (d) of section 301 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 or regulations implemented to reduce risks to the Small Business Administration from companies licensed under section (c) or (d) of section 301 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958.

THOMAS JEFFERSON COMMEMORATION COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Thomas Jefferson Commemoration Commission as authorized by Public law 102-343, \$62,000: *Provided*, That any unobligated balances of amounts made available for fiscal year 1993 shall expire on September 30, 1994.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that this portion of the bill, through page 58, line 2, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order with regard to the material up to the point specified?

Are there any amendments to the language up to that point?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION PAYMENT TO THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

For payment to the Legal Services Corporation to carry out the purposes of the Legal Services Corporation Act of 1974, as amended, \$400,000,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be expended for any purpose prohibited or limited by or contrary to any of the provisions of section 607 of Public Law 101-515 and that all references to "1991" in section 607 of Public Law 101-515 shall be deemed to be "1994".

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language appearing in the bill on page 58, lines 3 through 12. The paragraph provides appropriations that have not been authorized by law and is in violation of House rule XXI, clause 2(a).

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] rise?

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I regret that we must concede the point of order because the Legal Services Corporation continues to lack authorizing legislation.

I want there to be no misunderstanding about why no funds for the Legal Services Corporation will be included in this bill once it has passed the House. It is not because my subcommittee did not fund the Legal Services Corporation. We did. In fact, the Legal Services Corporation got a 12-percent increase over 1993 while most other programs were being cut.

Once again, the problem is in the authorizing committee of Congress which has still not passed an authorization for the Legal Services Corporation since 1977.

Mr. Chairman, I support the Legal Services Corporation, and I hope the authorizers will act quickly so that we can work in conference with the Senate to fund this important program.

Once again, Mr. Chairman, I regret that the point of order must be conceded.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BROWN of California). The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] has conceded the point of order. The Chair upholds the point of order, and the paragraph is stricken.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

For grants for trade adjustment assistance and for economic development assistance as provided by the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended, the Public Law 91-304, and such laws that were in effect immediately before September 30, 1982, \$223,150,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this heading may be used directly or indirectly for attorneys' or consultants' fees in connection with securing grants and contracts made by the Economic Development Administration.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that on page 58, lines 15 through 25, these are unauthorized appropriations and in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI of the rules of the House.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I concede the fact that DEA is not authorized.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BROWN of California). The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee concedes the point of order. The Chair sustains the point of order, and the paragraph is stricken.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of administering the economic development assistance programs as provided for by law, \$26,284,000: *Provided*, That these funds may be used to monitor projects approved pursuant to title I of

the Public Works Employment Act of 1976, as amended, title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, and the Community Emergency Drought Relief Act of 1977.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HEFLEY

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HEFLEY: Page 59, strike lines 1 through 8.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I was not aware of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

□ 1417

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. SKAGGS] having assumed the chair, Mr. BROWN of California, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2519) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE FROM THURSDAY, JULY 1, 1993 UNTIL TUESDAY, JULY 13, 1993, AND CONDITIONAL RECESS OR ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE FROM THURSDAY, JULY 1, 1993 OR FRIDAY, JULY 2, 1993, UNTIL TUESDAY, JULY 13, 1993

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 115) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 115

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Thursday, July 1, 1993, it stand adjourned until noon on Tuesday, July 13, 1993, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns at the close of business on Thursday, July 1, 1993 or Friday, July 2, 1993, pursuant to a motion made by the Majority Leader, or his designee, in accordance with this resolution, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon, or until such time as may be specified by the Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, on Tuesday, July 13, 1993, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the

Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

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

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY, JULY 14, 1993

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under the calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday, July 14, 1993.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER AND THE MINORITY LEADER TO ACCEPT RESIGNATIONS AND MAKE APPOINTMENTS NOTWITHSTANDING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until Tuesday, July 13, 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

□ 1420

MAKING SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 1993

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 216 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 216

Resolved. That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2118) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SKAGGS). The gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman

from California [Mr. DRIER], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During debate on this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 216 waives all points of order against the conference report on H.R. 2118 and against its consideration. The rule also provides that the conference report will be considered as having been read.

The supplemental provides necessary funding for our urgent domestic needs, including \$220 million for the Summer Youth Employment Program. This includes \$50 million for the new Youth Fair Chance Program and raises the maximum eligibility age from 21 to 30 years.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report provides \$150 million for discretionary grants to hire additional community police officers and makes the funds available until expended. The supplemental also provides \$5.5 million to pay jurors. Federal courts are not able to impanel juries because they have run out of funds. The chief judge of the Northern District of Texas announced recently he could not impanel any further juries until this supplemental is enacted.

The conference report provides \$11.5 million for the FCC to begin implementing the Cable Television Consumer Protection and Competition Act of 1992.

Mr. Speaker, there are additional funds for the FBI and Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms to respond to terrorist and extremist acts and to offset increased costs for the Waco, TX, operation. The conference report includes \$11.3 million for the Secret Service to meet increased costs to protect former President Bush and losses associated with the World Trade Center bombing.

The conference report includes \$95 million for community development disaster assistance, offset by rescissions and transfers. The supplemental also provides the subsidy amount needed to fund \$3.2 billion in SBA business loan guarantees.

The conference report includes \$6 million from the Public Health Emergency Fund for the recent outbreak of acute illness in the Four Corners area of the Navajo Nation. There is \$36 million included for the FDA to hire additional personnel to expedite the drug approval process and to fill 5 full-time slots to begin implementation of the Mammography Quality Standards Act.

The conference report includes \$475 million for veterans's compensations and pensions. It also covers the costs of Operation Restore Hope in Somalia. The bill includes \$616 million for DOD operations and maintenance accounts and \$293 million to pay for transportation costs incurred in Operation Restore Hope and an additional \$23 million to continue aid to the Kurdish refugees in northern Iraq. These costs are

offset by specific DOD rescissions, totalling \$923 million. The conference report also includes \$50 million for defense conversion fully offset by a \$50 million rescission.

Mr. Speaker, the supplemental appropriation act is \$1.5 billion below the President's request and \$831.6 million below the House bill.

Mr. Speaker, this is the customary rule for conference reports. While I recognize that those on the other side of the aisle oppose the summer youth grant program and the rejection of the D'Amato workfare program, I urge my colleagues to adopt this fair rule and move directly to the debate on this important legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, as we rush toward the Independence Day recess, I want to thank my friend, the gentleman from Dallas, Texas [Mr. FROST], for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on this rule. The conference report which incorporates the two supplemental appropriation bills adopted by the House in late May does not closely resemble those measures. We in the Committee on Rules were the first to see this conference report very late last night, so very few of our colleagues have had an opportunity to look it over.

Mr. Speaker, as the Committee on Rules majority does with most major bills we have considered this year, we waived the three-day layover rule for conference reports, preventing Members from having the opportunity to look at the measure, we well as the Budget Act, and virtually every other rule of this House.

As I have said in our reform efforts, Mr. Speaker, the best reform we could bring about would be simply to comply with the standing rules of this House. Tragically, this rule throws those out.

There a number of important programs that are funded by this supplemental, such as the Somalia operation, defender services, and jury pay. But this supplemental does not achieve its original objective. That was to stimulate the economy and create jobs. In fact, we no longer even hear it called the stimulus package. The only jobs being created are for the White House staff, which President Clinton promised us he was going to reduce by 25 percent.

Mr. Speaker, what started out as an urgent and ambitious \$16 billion business as usual program, has now been pared back to simply a normal business as usual program.

Consider what is in this bill. It provides \$125,000 to expand the Vice President's entertainment budget. It increases the eligibility for the so-called summer youth program from 21 to 30. There are many of us that think that 30 is still young, but I do not quite think that that would qualify them for

a youth program. And it provides for an additional \$14 million for that very important tree planting program, which we just voted to be eliminated 15 minutes ago.

The SBA has repeatedly urged Congress to eliminate the tree planting program because it has nothing to do with small business development and it takes resources away from very legitimate programs. Tree planting has never created a permanent job, outside of the bureaucracy of the SBA. As one SBA official put it, once you dig the hole, the job is over.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, an average of \$189 was spent for each tree that was planted. The figure includes a per tree cost of \$1,400 in Washington, DC, and \$782 in the Virgin Islands. I would note that more than 90 percent of all trees are planted in this country by private property owners at no cost to the Government whatsoever. It is ironic that the only place where there is becoming a shortage of trees is on Government-owned land.

□ 1430

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out what's not in the conference report. The other body adopted an amendment to reduce the Federal reimbursement for State administrative costs of the AFDC Program by 50 percent, if the States do not enroll at least 10 percent of certain general assistance recipients in a workfare program. This amendment would not have cut benefits. It would merely create a financial incentive for the State welfare bureaucracies to implement workfare programs. This is real welfare reform, Mr. Speaker, which President Clinton called for in his book "Putting People First," but it was deleted from the bill.

Mr. Speaker, as I stated, there are some positive aspects to this bill, although overall, I have concluded that it is a bad bill. However, I can say for sure that there are no positive aspects whatsoever to this rule.

I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

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

I urge strong support both for the rule and for the conference report on this legislation. I am here to speak in support especially of a provision in the legislation that provides \$6 million to the Four Corners area in northwest New Mexico to combat the mystery illness that has plagued the region, and no doubt many of my colleagues have seen on television and reported in other media.

Federal and State health experts are continuing to search for the cause and cure for the new viral disease, a new viral disease which has been implicated in the deaths of 21 people in the Southwest.

Many of these victims have been from my district in the northern part of New Mexico. I have called in the last 4 weeks on the President, the Centers for Disease Control, and the Indian Health Service to dedicate all available resources to identify and stop this terrible illness.

I specifically asked the President for the public health emergency funds which are now included in this bill in the amount of \$6 million.

I especially want to commend the conferees for putting this legislation that contains the \$6 million in the conference report. These funds will be used to provide medical assistance, conduct more experiments, bring more doctors in in one of the most extremely remote parts of this country, and that is the Navajo Reservation.

I do, nonetheless, want to make two points crystal clear. First, this is not a Navajo nor an Indian disease. Although many of the victims are Native American, this illness is not limited to one race or ethnic group.

Second, one cannot contract this disease by merely traveling to the Southwest or being in contact with native Americans. Native Americans in the area, particularly the Navajos, have suffered discrimination because of this disease. There have been incidents where they have gone into restaurants, meetings have been canceled in other parts of the country because of lack of information on this disease.

The Centers for Disease Control, the New Mexico Department of Health, and the Indian Health Service have tentatively determined that this illness is caused by a hantavirus which is carried by rodents.

I also want to make clear that these funds do not carry any travel restrictions with them. The funding is to be utilized by the Secretary of Health and Human Services to combat this health emergency in ways she deems appropriate. Traveling to the area is perfectly safe. There has been no need for any travel advisory. There has been no need to declare the area a travel restricted area.

Mr. Speaker, Indian country as a whole and the Navajo Nation specifically are in dire need of better health care. It is sad that the only time we notice these needs is when this kind of tragedy occurs.

I would hope that in the future, as we deal with this national health care plan, this comprehensive national health care plan, we look at our native American reservations, where in some parts of the country there is tremendous need, Third World standards exist and access to health care through the

Indian Health Service is almost nonexistent.

To avoid this kind of tragedy in the future, I strongly suggest that we redirect many of our efforts toward the Indian Health Service to have preventive efforts so this kind of outbreak and the lack of information attendant to it does not happen again.

I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding time to me, and I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the conference report.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, just a few minutes ago, as I said, we voted by a near unanimous vote to eliminate the tree planting program. Tragically, it is included in this supplemental appropriation bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS], the author of the amendment, to delete the tree planting program.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, it is like hunting groundhogs. You go out in the field, and you have got a bunch of holes in the field and you shoot a groundhog, and all of a sudden, he pops up somewhere else.

It was not 10 minutes ago we took away the \$16 million for tree planting out of the Small Business Administration, one of the biggest pork barrels, I think, in this budget. And now all of a sudden, we have got \$14 million popping up. We would like to object to that. But no, we cannot object to that because we have got the rule.

I oppose the rule. I have got a point of order. I think the point of order would allow us to eliminate that \$14 million, but I am going to be prohibited from doing that.

I am trying to learn the process here. Frankly, it is a sneaky process. I am having trouble figuring out all the holes that these groundhogs keep popping up out of.

I tell my colleagues something, when we keep putting money into that kind of budget, and I hear my respected colleague from New Mexico, by the way, it is not limited to one State. I have got the southwestern part of my State that borders the Four Corners. I would like to take that \$14 million, send \$7 million to the Four Corners and take \$7 million, instead of planting trees, to reduce the deficit. But no, I do not know where the groundhog hole is.

I am going to be eliminated, because we cannot debate the rule.

I cannot believe it. I think it is time that we oppose the rule and that we allow both sides of this to have a thorough debate. And once and for all, we get that groundhog called the tree planting project nailed down in one hole and get rid of it while we have an opportunity.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], a hard-working member of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

I rise reluctantly to oppose this rule, mainly because I was not aware of what is in this bill until about an hour ago, when it was brought to my attention that there were certain things in this rule.

I thought I just heard the gentleman from California tell me that they finished the conference at 6 o'clock yesterday. They got the bill at 7 or 9 last night.

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

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, we received it in the Committee on Rules at about 9 o'clock last evening, and this was handed to use. And we were asked then to vote on a rule which waives points of order against items in here, like the tree planting program and increasing the age for the summer youth program, a wide range of other things that clearly should not be in this measure.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to make a point here. The reason I rise to defeat the rule is so that we can write another rule that allows us points of order against these kinds of things. That is the only way that we can get at them.

Members, I have a warning. There are safeguards in our rules to stop us from being embarrassed. The reason we usually lay these things out for 3 days is so that Members can see what has actually been written and we are not blindsided by certain things. But we are about to leave here is just a couple hours for a district work period where we are going back to face our constituents at a time when the newspapers are going to be writing what is in this bill.

□ 1440

Now, are we going to stand up in our town meetings or before our constituents and tell them that we are now raising the age of youth; we are now young if we are under 30, because we have just done that in this bill, or they are attempting in this bill to raise the age of those that can participate in the Youth Fair Chance Program from 21 to 30? That may be a great idea, but there is no way we can debate it.

I will tell the Members, I am going to tell my constituents that I voted for a rule that allowed a bill to come up that raised the age of youth from 21 to 30. Those are great headlines.

There are some other things in here the Members may not know about. The White House office, and we voted on this many times, and cut funds in the White House office, the add-on, \$7.5 million, an add-on of \$7.5 million to the White House office. This is the same White House that repeatedly claims it is going to cut spending, yet we increase spending in their office by \$87.5 million.

I could go on. There is other stuff in here, and I have not been able to get through it with a very fine comb, but I am just really worried that there is a problem or could be a potential problem while I am back home over the next week facing my constituents, and I would hope that the Members would give us an opportunity to have points of order against some things in this bill by voting no on the rule.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], my seat mate on the Committee on Rules.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Greater San Dimas, CA for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this whole exercise of providing Federal funds as supplemental appropriations and for so-called stimulus programs reminds me of a badly seasoned left-over stew. You are not really sure what is in it—and you may not want to ask. But you know it has been spiced up to make it seem better than it really is. Today we have a conference report on which the ink is barely dry. Those of us on the Rules Committee may have a better idea what is in the bill than most of the rest of the House, but we only received it at about 9 last night. The fact is, I think few people really know what is in this \$1 billion, bits-and-pieces spending bill which still provides for 30-year-old teenagers. Yet, today we have a rule that waives all points of order against this conference report and, of course, we will dispense with the reading of this 150-page document in the interest of completing work before the Fourth of July comes and goes. I oppose this rule—and I urge my colleagues to do the same. These past few weeks have been a spending frenzy in this House—a tornado of debate and late-night votes in which this House has voted to spend hundreds of billions of taxpayers' dollars. Of course, these bills include many worthwhile programs deserving of our support. But they also include many lower priority and downright wasteful projects. We cannot just ignore the damage done by years of spending money we do not have, years of running up enormous deficits and forcing taxpayers to pay staggering interest on our astronomical debt. We are addicted to spending—and like any addiction, forceful action is needed to ensure a change in behavior. In my first floor statement of this 103d Congress I pledged to vote "no" on spending bills until the Congress charts a course toward a balanced budget. I am fully aware that we cannot achieve a balanced budget this year, or next year or even the year after that. But we can and must have a plan to reach that goal before we proceed through this annual spending spree. And we do not

have such a plan. What we have is a President pushing a program that never approaches a balanced budget, but predicts instead rising deficits after 5 years and a debt of more than \$6 trillion. I cannot support—and America cannot afford—proceeding with the Nation's business as if we do not have a spending problem. So I will continue to vote "no" on these spending bills until we devise a realistic plan to achieve a balanced budget. I hope my colleagues who truly believe in real change for this Congress will join me.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to our chief deputy whip, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

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

Mr. Speaker, I just rise with a question, since all of this is being done very quickly, and even the Committee on Rules has not had very much of a chance to look at this particular bill.

Since we are waiving all points of order on the bill, can anybody tell me what that includes? What is it that is being waived that required that language in the bill? It would be helpful for the Members to know just what it is we are running over with a steamroller here on our way to passage of this rather questionable piece of legislation.

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

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

Mr. FROST. As the gentleman is aware, there is a 3-day layover rule which, of course, cannot be accommodated within this timeframe. That is being waived.

Mr. WALKER. However, it says "all points of order." Is that the only thing being waived?

Mr. FROST. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I will have to consult with the staff to see if there are any additional points, or matters that are being waived, but that is the primary reason for the rule, is the 3-day waiver.

Mr. WALKER. If I understand correctly, we are waiving the 3-day layover, which was meant to give the Members a chance to study the bill, and by waiving the 3-day layover we cannot figure out what is in the bill, but that is a good reason for rushing it to the floor with all the points of order waived?

I am having trouble understanding how the Members are supposed to find out what is in the legislation.

Mr. FROST. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I do not know if the gentleman was on the floor, but I gave a fairly lengthy summary as to what was in the bill. I do not think there is any question about specific provisions.

If the gentleman has questions about the provisions, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is here, and I am sure he would elaborate on those provisions.

Mr. WALKER. I guess what I am wondering is whether or not something is being waived with regard to now redefining the term "teenager" to age 30. I know the genesis of that particular provision was a deal cut in order to pass the reconciliation bill, but I am a little concerned that we are now in the process of suggesting that 25-year-olds, when they get elected to Congress under the Constitution, will now be regarded by Congress in the bill they passed today as teenagers. I think the country is going to have trouble figuring this one out.

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

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

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I think we have found the fountain of youth. All we have to do is pass a bill to raise the age of being young. I am 46. I want to raise this to 46, so I can be young again.

Mr. WALKER. I am 50. I would like to raise it to 50.

Mr. DREIER. I move that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] be part of the Summer Youth Program.

Mr. WALKER. All we have to do is cut a deal as part of the reconciliation bill.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE].

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule.

I wish to thank the conferees for their hard work on the supplemental before us today. I know that many of the programs in the bill are time-sensitive, and the conferees worked diligently to agree on a report before the Fourth of July. I especially appreciate their cooperation with colleagues from the other body, in the care they took in addressing concerns raised by myself and others regarding the deficit.

This supplemental contains many important items: among them, paying for the United States operation in Somalia, CHAMPUS, SBA loans, low-income rural housing, and Pell grants. While we virtually all agree on the merits of these programs, this supplemental now includes rescissions to help pay for it, and reduce the burden on the deficit.

This supplemental first came before us in May, and at that time it included \$1.2 billion in new spending for its Department of Defense programs. DOD had not requested that spending, it had not been authorized, and in fact the Pentagon had already sent up a reprogramming request to pay for most of the items with existing funds.

At that time, Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. PENNY and I offered an amendment to pay for the DOD items with existing funds; 188 of us voted for that amendment. Among those 188 were all but eight of the freshmen Democrats and 46

Republicans. In fact, the freshmen were more united on this amendment than we were on the reconciliation bill.

Following the other body's unanimous vote for the position we took, 151 of us sent a letter to Chairman NATCHER urging offsets for the Pentagon spending.

Now we have before us a package in which 75 percent of the DOD items are paid for with existing funds. That, I say to my friends, is a victory for the American taxpayer.

The message we are hearing from all around the country is to cut the deficit. But we could not have claimed to be serious about reducing the deficit had we tossed money to an agency which had not even requested it. That is exactly the kind of thing which frustrates the taxpayers about the way Congress does business.

We finally see before us today a package that enables us to not only talk about the deficit, but to actually do something about it. Because of the actions of the conferees, \$973.5 million will not be added to the deficit.

Public interest has been generated across the country about this issue. Thanks to the work of the conferees, we are showing the taxpayers we have heard their pleas and we have resisted adding nearly \$1 billion to the deficit with unrequested, unauthorized spending.

To all those who have questioned the commitment to change in Congress—particularly among the freshmen class—this conference is proof: business as usual is out of business and it is the taxpayers who can take that to the bank.

I urge Members to support the rule and final passage of the bill.

□ 1450

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, the question was asked a little while ago by my friend from Pennsylvania as to what specific waivers were made that will allow this conference report to be implemented, and my friend from Dallas referred to the 3-day layover.

We have to recognize that there is a lot more to it than that. We have non-germane Senate material that is in here. We have unauthorized appropriations, and legislation on appropriations. All of those provisions which are standard rules of the House have been waived to make this conference report in order.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to my friend and classmate, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OXLEY].

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, for those of us who voted against last year's cable act, I guess now is the time to say we told you so, because what happened in the debate, if you will recall, was that some of us who opposed the reregulatory scheme under the cable act as being far too burdensome, also said that at some point the Congress is

going to come back to the taxpayer and ask him for more money for more regulations. So that now you have seen it.

The House did not even get a chance and the Appropriations Committee in the House did not even get a shot at this. It was stuffed into the Senate version of this appropriation. The supplemental appropriation now comes back to the House with \$11.5 million for the FCC to reregulate cable.

Not the first dime has been saved by the first cable subscriber to date. As a matter of fact, the FCC has told us that it will be at least October before they get at it, and we had a hearing last week on the FCC reauthorization. The Chairman of the Commission, Mr. Coelho, told me that based, on a question I had propounded, the average cable subscriber will save less than \$2 a month on his cable bill after all of this reregulation and after the FCC hires all of these lawyers and accountants. This is indeed a jobs bill, by the way, for lawyers and accountants who are out of work, who want to go to work for the FCC. We are going to take \$11.5 million out of the pockets of the taxpayers and try to buy them off with some kind of regulatory scheme somewhere down the line.

The chickens have come home to roost. Everybody in this Chamber should know what a roost this is, and vote against the rule, and vote against this supplemental appropriation. It is the wrong message to send at the wrong time.

We do not need more bureaucracy. We need competition in cable, not more reregulation.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], a hard-working member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague from California for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, as a conferee on the supplemental, I find myself very disturbed, even outraged, that it contains a \$50 million appropriation for the Youth Fair Chance Program, and changes the law to define youth from age 21 in the present law, to age 30. Frankly, I have no issue with the substance per se of these changes. I have great issue, however, with the process under which they are probably going to become law.

They got into the conference through a self-executing rule that should never be allowed, Mr. Speaker, in this House. They got into the conference by way of no hearings, by passing by the Appropriations Committee and adding the dollars, bypassing by the authorizing committee, and making changes in the law, by insulting the chairman and the members of each of those committees that should have had the opportunity to look into the merits and make their

decisions according to the procedures, the normal procedures of this House. I find that, Mr. Speaker, unconscionable. I find that to be a terrible way to legislate. I see this as having the stench of a political payoff about it that reflects unfavorably upon this body and each one of its Members.

We should not, we must not, allow this kind of procedure to prevail. I will vote against the supplemental for this reason, not because I might not favor the changes, had we had a chance to consider them in the normal way, but because of the process by which they became a part of this legislation.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to our friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

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

In the process of going through this particular bill we have found something here that puzzles me a little bit. Money was allocated for, and I am quoting from the language of the bill, in Los Angeles, CA, for "a loan fund to be administered by a nonprofit community organization in support of small business revitalization that will create a beneficial impact on employment, income, savings, and the development of a stronger community economic base in south central Los Angeles." Then we find out that \$1.7 million is being diverted from that to go to a group called the Brotherhood Crusade Black United Front of Los Angeles. When we get very, very specific about a group that is getting \$1.7 million of taxpayer money in here, some of us are wondering who is this group, and why were they specifically designated in the bill for \$1.7 million? And are any of the waivers that we are granting in this rule applicable to that particular grant of money to that one specific group?

Can anybody tell me?

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

Mr. WALKER. Sure, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, a question of that nature is properly directed toward the Appropriations Committee. The chairman of the Appropriations Committee is here, and I do not know whether the gentleman would want to try to respond to that specific question, but I would yield to him for that purpose when the gentleman from Pennsylvania has concluded.

Mr. WALKER. Can the gentleman tell me whether or not any of the waivers we have in this rule were required in order to make this specific grant of money to this group?

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I am advised that that provision was in the House bill, and that waivers would not be required for that provision.

Mr. WALKER. I am wondering if someone can tell us why this specific

group is singled out to get over \$1.7 million?

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] if he wishes to respond to this particular inquiry.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding the time to me. I say to my friend from Pennsylvania that we are trying to find out at this time just exactly what section and what chapter this is in in order to get our detailed information on this matter before us.

The subcommittee chairman involved in this particular bill is on his way to the Chamber.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman will yield, I will tell the gentleman that it is in the Federal Housing Administration, community planning and development, community development grants under the administrative provisions. So it would be in VA-HUD.

Mr. NATCHER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] is the chairman of that subcommittee, and he is on his way to the Chamber at this time. If the rule is adopted, the gentleman's question will be fully answered.

□ 1500

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

Mr. STOKES. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

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

Mr. STOKES. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I was just trying to figure out, we found this one thing down there where the money that is going to Los Angeles, supposedly to support small business revitalization in the badly hit section of the city, all of a sudden we found out that \$1.7 million of the money is being made available to a specific group known as the Brotherhood Crusade Black United Front of Los Angeles. And none of us can figure out just exactly why that specific grant was made. There is no indication of the qualifications of this group to administer a sum of money that size.

My question was: Who is this group, and why were they specifically designated to get \$1.7 million of funds that otherwise would be going for rebuilding of the community?

Mr. STOKES. Let me say to the gentleman that this was a special-purpose grant which was in last year's bill. As you know, we did not put any special purpose grants in our bill this year because they are not authorized. But we

had a request with reference to that particular grant, which had been made last year, to make a technical change. There was some confusion as to whether all the funding went to one of two groups, or not. Actually there were two groups who applied. We had been requested to agree to this technical change. But this is something that was done last year. Nothing has been done new on our part.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman. If he would respond further: The thing that I am concerned about is it specifies here that the earmark in the bill was \$260 million earmarked in Public Law 102-389, which would confirm what the gentleman is saying. But then, what is apparently happening here, is that it is further earmarked down to this specific group. The problem that I have is the language I have indicates that the chairman is absolutely right that there was an earmark in Public Law 102-389. But then what it also indicates is that in this particular bill, we are further earmarking below that, this \$1.75 million that then goes to a very, very specific group, and we cannot find out just exactly what the qualifications of that group are to administer money that was earmarked for a very specific purpose in Los Angeles.

Mr. STOKES. Let me try again and see if I can answer the gentleman's question.

First, there is no new money here at all. This is just a redesignation of previously appropriated funds. At the time that the special-purpose grant was approved in last year's bill, there was evidently, in the language used, some type of error made in terms of the designation. There were two groups applying, and evidently the language in the report needed some clarification. So they came back to us this year and asked for that technical correction.

Now, in terms of the group, HUD would probably have to answer that as to their qualifications. But as I said, all of this was done last year. This is nothing new, no new money at all. It is just a redesignation of what the House and the Senate did last year.

Mr. WALKER. So we are picking between one of the two groups here, we are picking one out of the two groups?

Mr. STOKES. We are merely clarifying and redesignating as it relates to that one group. But originally there were two groups, it is just that the language of the bill, in the 1993 bill, was not clear. The purpose of this language is to try to clarify it.

Mr. WALKER. So that the gentleman is saying that, for the purpose of this bill, we are making it very, very clear that the group that we want the money—the \$1.7 million—to go to, is the Brotherhood Crusade Black United Front of Los Angeles.

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

Mr. STOKES. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, could the gentleman tell us who made the request for the \$1.7 million?

Mr. STOKES. The letter that was written to us, as I recall, came from the city of Los Angeles.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] one of the hard-working Members of the House.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things I hear from my constituents, not just now as I am a Representative, but also as a candidate, I hear it from black and white, rich and poor, rural and urban, is that when it comes to public assistance, when it comes to helping people along through Government finances, one of the things they want to see is able-bodied people pitching in and doing their part. One of the things that has happened with our welfare state that we have right now is that we have a lot of capable people who are physically able, mentally able, and they are not working. It is easy now to take advantage of the welfare lifestyle, if you will, by not working. This is universal.

The President of the United States, the Democrat President, Bill Clinton, said as a candidate over and over and over again,

Let's work for workfare, let's implement workfare. If you are capable of working, we want you working. If you need public assistance, we want to help you. America is a kind-hearted country. But if you are able to work, then, by golly, you need to go out and do that.

This bill, the conferees here rejected the workfare requirement.

As I read this bill—and I am a newcomer, I do not know everything there is to know—but if we support this rule, then we are voting against workfare. To vote against workfare when we are increasing the taxes, increasing regulation, and increasing the hardships on the hard-working poor, the middle class, and everyone else, and to say this is a vote against workfare, is hard for me to take, Mr. Speaker. For that, I urge my colleagues to vote against the rule.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, having observed this display that has taken place over the past 45 minutes or so, I have come to the conclusion that we are going to make an attempt to defeat the previous question. And the reason for that is that, as we look at the waivers that have been put into place in this measure, we clearly are violating our responsibility to deal with the spending problems that we have in this country.

We have seen Members hold up these reports, copies of the conference report that we received in the Committee on

Rules in the middle of the evening last night, finding different programs in here, like the provision which takes the Summer Youth Program and increases the age cap from 21 up to 30. We have seen the \$14 million that is being put back in here for tree planting, which just 45 minutes ago, on a unanimous vote, we knocked out, it is kept in this bill.

It seems to me what we should do is consider this conference report under the standard operating procedures of this House. So, if I could ask my colleagues to join with me in defeating the previous question, it means we will put the 3-day layover provision back into place. It will mean that every Member will have 3 days to go through this measure, sit down with your staff, read through it, find out where transfers have taken place in Los Angeles, Chicago, or other areas.

They will also have a chance to make points of order against measures which do increase up the Summer Youth Program and put in place the tree planting program for the Small Business Administration. The Small Business Administration does not even want the tree planting program. Yet it is put in this bill, and we cannot offer any provision here, we do not have any opportunity to knock that out.

□ 1510

If we defeat the previous question, I plan to offer an amendment which would eliminate the waiver on all points of order. It would allow every Member of this House to have the opportunity to do what our constitutional responsibility should be.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

I just want to point out that in this bill there is \$175 million to pay the full subsidy cost on \$3.2 billion in loan guarantees.

They needed these funds 2 months ago, really. They ran out of money about April 27.

There are 310,000 jobs involved. We should not have any more delay on this bill. If we delay today, it will be after the 4th of July before it is enacted. They need this money now. If we pass this bill today, it will probably be Monday before they can make these loans. Some borrowers are going to have their loans called because they cannot extend the loans under current bank regulations unless it is Government guaranteed. These loan guarantees are terribly important.

I did not mention the defender service and the fees for jurors. They cannot even have civil jury trials because they

do not have the money for fees for jurors.

If we do not waive the 3 day rule and the bill lays over 3 days, we would really be talking about laying over 10 days due to the Fourth of July holiday, not 3 days. That means less jobs next week, a lot of small businesses will have their loans called or they will not get to make a loan. These loans only cost us \$567 each. Some of them are not just 1-year loans. Some of these businesses stay in business for several years. So we should not have any further delay on this bill.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to the subcommittee chairman, my good friend, the gentleman from Iowa, by stating the remarks that I made earlier when we were considering his appropriations bill, and that is as we look at the \$141 million that we want to get out there for SBA loans, it really is ridiculous for the Government to be providing that when the Bank of Boston has already said that at about the same rate they are trying to get \$6 billion out there in loans for the small business sector of the economy. So it seems to me that as we look at this, yes, there are a lot of very important items in this measure. I do not want to delay the funding for the Somalia effort. I do not want to delay the funding for the defender services, and I do not want to delay jury pay. There are good and important items in this program, but the fact of the matter is we should allow our colleagues the opportunity to look through this measure, and that is why as we proceeded with this debate, I made the decision that I am going to move to defeat the previous question.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, perhaps some bank out there has the money without using loan guarantees, but there are hundreds and hundreds of banks around this country, especially country banks, that have to have a Government guarantee on the loan or call the loan. If they do not have the guarantee, the loan counts against their capital and they would exceed the limit and not be permitted to make loans to other people. They could not make car loans.

So it is the smaller banks as well as the borrower that is being helped by this. This is a very important program. We should not have any more delays.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my very hard-working and sensitive friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. Garden Grove is listening.

I just wanted my colleague and particularly my friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle to see that I am wearing a ribbon today actually

printed by Uncle Sam. It is a ribbon dollar bill.

I may not be a handsome man, but I am a sensitive man. I care and this shows that I worry about the budget deficit and the \$4.4 trillion debt that this country has.

Everything we are trying to do on this side of the aisle and why this rule is so important to us is because, like you on this side, we are sensitive people over here. We care.

I think over the next few weeks you will see more and more Members wearing this dollar bill ribbon to show that we care.

In Rush rooms all across this country, Mr. Speaker, at lunch time people are now aware that the budget deficit is before us, and being sensitive men and women we will whip this problem this year and not leave it to my grandchildren or to Mr. GONZALEZ' great-grandson and his 22 grandchildren, is it, 22 or 23.

There is a new sensitivity taking over this Chamber. After a little rough time yesterday that we got through, I want all the visitors who watch us either from our distinguished guests in the gallery or through the 1½ to 3 million audience that follows our proceedings on C-SPAN, I want them to know that we are sensitive. We care.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

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

I just want to point out that the real nature of those ribbons, the Rush ribbons, is that if you wear a \$5 bill, you are five times as sensitive. If you wear a \$10 bill, you are 10 times as sensitive, and if you wear a \$100 bill, and some of us around here may be able to afford to do that, you are 100 times as sensitive about the deficit. So we are hoping that everyone can come and show their true sensitivity.

Have you got a quarter over there? The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] has a penny, I understand.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time, simply to say that this debate has led me to conclude that defeating the previous question is really the most responsible thing that this House can do.

Why? Because we have this report that came to us late last night. We have a wide range of things in here that this House does not support, the most recent being, as I said a few moments ago, the tree planting program. We voted to delete \$16 million just a little while ago, and yet \$16 million is placed back in here.

The only way that we will have an opportunity to raise a point of order to knock that out is by defeating the previous question.

I have my amendment right here, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it seems the gentleman's life is going to be spent talking about trees. I am glad to talk about trees.

The \$14 million was put in here in the House. We had a rollcall vote.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the gentleman that we had a 2-hour debate about that and a rollcall vote. What the gentleman does not want to do is to do what the House has already voted to do.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, if my friend would yield to me, since I have had to yield back the balance of my time, I would simply say that about 1½ hours ago the House nearly unanimously, I did not hear any "noes" called out, we had a vote on the Appropriations bill coming forward. Members of the House had an opportunity to cast a vote on it. They voted to delete it. The SBA does not want it. It seems to me that the only responsible thing for us to do is to allow points of order to be raised against this so we can vote down the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. That was not on this at all. That was for salaries and expenses. That was not on this at all.

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

Mr. Speaker, the minority has some concerns about some provisions of this bill. If the minority does not like the bill, they would have the opportunity to defeat the bill on final passage when it comes up.

This bill deals with a number of pressing matters, matters that must be dealt with right away.

For that reason, I urge my colleagues to support the previous question. Vote for the rule and proceed to consideration of this very important supplemental bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5(b)(1) of rule XV, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within

which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of agreeing to the resolution, following the vote on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 250, nays 172, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 319]

YEAS—250

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Barca
Barca
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Derrick
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geran

Gibbons
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchev
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Hoyer
Hughes
Hutto
Inslee
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kiecicka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies-
Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Oberstar

Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Roemer
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sarpallius
Sawyer
Schenk
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tausin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Trafiacant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Washington
Waters
Watt
Wheat
Whitten
Williams

Wilson
Wise

Woolsey
Wyden

Wynn
Yates

NAYS—172

Allard
Archer
Army
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Billrakis
Billey
Boehlert
Boehner
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Callejo
Camp
Canady
Castle
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combust
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Emerson
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fish
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodiatte
Goodling

Goss
Grams
Grandy
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lazio
Leach
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Machtley
Manzullo
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Molinar
Moorhead
Morella
Murphy

Blute
Bonilla
Dellums
Dooley

NOT VOTING—12

Fields (TX)
Henry
Houghton
Lipinski

□ 1539

Mrs. MORELLA changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SKAGGS). The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, this will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 243, nays 170, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 320]

YEAS—243

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Barca
Barca
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Derrick
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geran
Gibbons

Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchev
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Hoyer
Hughes
Hutto
Inslee
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kiecicka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies-
Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Oberstar

Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Roemer
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sarpallius
Sawyer
Schenk
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tausin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Trafiacant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Washington
Waters
Watt
Wheat
Whitten
Williams

Myers
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sunquist
Talent
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—170

Allard
Archer
Army
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)

Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Billey
Boehlert
Boehner

Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle

Coble	Inglis
Collins (GA)	Inhofe
Combest	Istook
Cox	Jacobs
Crane	Johnson (CT)
Crapo	Johnson, Sam
Cunningham	Kasich
DeLay	Kim
Diaz-Balart	King
Dickey	Kingston
Doolittle	Klug
Dornan	Knollenberg
Dreier	Koibe
Duncan	Kyl
Dunn	Lazio
Emerson	Leach
Everett	Levy
Ewing	Lewis (CA)
Fawell	Lewis (FL)
Fish	Lightfoot
Fowler	Linder
Franks (CT)	Livingston
Franks (NJ)	Machtley
Gallely	Manzullo
Gallo	McCandless
Gekas	McCollum
Gilchrest	McCreery
Gillmor	McDade
Gilman	McHugh
Gingrich	McInnis
Goodlatte	McKeon
Goodling	McMillan
Goss	Meyers
Grams	Mica
Grandy	Michel
Greenwood	Miller (FL)
Gunderson	Molinari
Hancock	Moorhead
Hansen	Myers
Hastert	Nussle
Hefley	Oxley
Hegger	Packard
Hobson	Paxon
Hoekstra	Peterson (MN)
Hoke	Petri
Horn	Pombo
Huffington	Porter
Hunter	Portman
Hutchinson	Pryce (OH)

NOT VOTING—21

Berman	Fields (TX)	Pomeroy
Bilirakis	Henry	Skeen
Blute	Houghton	Spratt
Bonilla	Hyde	Stark
Clinger	Lipinski	Studds
Dellums	Moakley	Waters
Farr	Morella	Waxman

□ 1548

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the rule just adopted, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2118) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report to H.R. 2118, and that I may include tabular and extraneous matters.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1550

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BEILENSEN). Pursuant to House Resolution 216, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of Wednesday, June 30, 1993, at page H 4368.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

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

Mr. Speaker, today we bring to the floor the conference agreement on the fiscal year 1993 Supplemental Appropriations Act (H.R. 2118). This con-

ference agreement covers the items in both H.R. 2118 and H.R. 2244 that passed the House on May 26. When the Senate considered H.R. 2118, they also included items included in the House-passed version of H.R. 2244. As we conferred with the other body, all items in H.R. 2244 were construed to be in conference.

This conference agreement provides net new budget authority of about \$1 billion. This is the result of \$3.5 billion in new appropriations and \$2.5 billion in rescissions.

The conferees were constrained to develop an agreement that was within the limits of the fiscal year 1993 budget resolution and the 1990 budget agreement minicaps. This conference agreement is within those limits. In fact for domestic discretionary, the conference agreement actually reduces the deficit in fiscal year 1993 by \$40 million because of rescissions.

The conference agreement includes: \$220 million from summer jobs of which \$50 million is for the Youth Fair Chance Program; \$341 million for Pell grants; \$3.2 billion in Small Business Administration business loan amounts; \$150 million for police-on-the-streets; \$60 million for fees for jurors and for trial attorney payments; \$475 million for veterans compensation and pensions; and \$1.3 billion for DOD for Somalia peacekeeping, no-fly zone operations in southern Iraq, and other urgent defense needs. These defense funds are offset by \$973 million in DOD rescissions.

Mr. Speaker, this is a responsible conference agreement. It addresses important and urgent needs. It is fiscally responsible.

I urge adoption of this conference agreement.

Mr. Speaker, the following table provides more detail on this conference agreement:

FY 1993 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2118)

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
FY 1993 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL							
CHAPTER I							
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE							
Food Safety and Inspection Service							
103-50	Salaries and expenses.....	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000		
Soil Conservation Service							
.....	Watershed and flood prevention operations.....			3,328,000	3,328,000	+3,328,000	
Rural Development Administration							
.....	Salaries and expenses (rescission).....		-8,576,000	-9,587,000	-9,587,000	-1,011,000	
Rural Development Insurance Fund Program Account:							
Water and sewer facility loans: Direct:							
103-50	(Loan authorization) 1/.....	(470,000,000)	(250,000,000)	(250,000,000)	(250,000,000)		
103-50	Loan subsidy 1/.....	66,821,000	35,543,000	35,543,000	35,543,000		
103-50	Rural water and waste disposal grants 1/.....	281,767,000	35,000,000	35,000,000	35,000,000		
	Total, Rural Development Administration.....	348,588,000	61,967,000	60,956,000	60,956,000	-1,011,000	
Farmers Home Administration							
Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account:							
Low-income single family housing (sec. 502):							
103-50	(Loan authorization) (unsubsidized guaranteed) Loan subsidies:	(234,805,000)	(250,000,000)	(250,000,000)	(250,000,000)		
103-50	Unsubsidized guaranteed.....	4,297,000	4,576,000	4,576,000	4,576,000		
.....	Direct (rescission).....			-64,826,000	-64,826,000	-64,826,000	
.....	Rental housing (sec. 515):						
.....	Loan subsidy (rescission).....			-17,672,000	-17,672,000	-17,672,000	
.....	Credit sales of acquired property:						
.....	Loan subsidy (rescission).....			-3,571,000	-3,571,000	-3,571,000	
.....	Rental assistance program.....			66,287,000	66,287,000	+66,287,000	
Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account:							
Farm ownership: Direct:							
.....	Loan subsidy (rescission).....			-2,317,000	-2,317,000	-2,317,000	
.....	Farm operating: Direct:						
.....	(Loan authorization) 1/.....		(-99,374,000)		(-99,374,000)		(-99,374,000)
.....	Loan subsidy (rescission) 1/.....		-15,000,000	-15,000,000	-15,000,000		
.....	Emergency disaster loans:						
.....	(Loan authorization) 1/.....		(-56,076,000)		(-56,076,000)		(-56,076,000)
.....	Loan subsidy (rescission) 1/.....		-15,000,000	-15,000,000	-15,000,000		
.....	Credit sales of acquired property:						
.....	Loan subsidy (rescission).....			-3,511,000	-3,511,000	-3,511,000	
.....	Salaries and expenses (rescission) 1/.....		-15,000,000	-15,000,000	-15,000,000		
	Total, Farmers Home Administration.....	4,297,000	-40,424,000	-66,034,000	-66,034,000	-25,610,000	
.....	Human Nutrition Information Service (rescission) 1/.....		-2,250,000	-2,250,000	-2,250,000		
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service							
.....	Salaries and expenses (rescission) 2/.....		-3,900,000			+3,900,000	
	Total, Department of Agriculture.....		-59,726,000	-148,734,000	-148,734,000	-89,008,000	
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES							
Food and Drug Administration							
103-3	Salaries and expenses (by transfer).....	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)		
103-3	(User fees).....	(36,000,000)	(36,000,000)		(36,000,000)		(+36,000,000)
	Total, Chapter I:						
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	356,885,000	19,393,000			-19,393,000	
	Appropriations.....	(356,885,000)	(79,119,000)	(148,734,000)	(148,734,000)	(+69,615,000)	
	Rescissions.....		(-59,726,000)	(-148,734,000)	(-148,734,000)	(-89,008,000)	
	(By transfer).....	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)		
CHAPTER II							
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE							
Economic Development Administration							
.....	Economic development assistance programs (rescission).....			-11,807,000			+11,807,000
.....	Economic development revolving fund (rescission) 1/.....		-66,807,000	-83,000,000		+66,807,000	+83,000,000
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration							
.....	Operations, research, and facilities (rescission) 1/.....		-2,544,000	-2,544,000	-2,544,000		
	Total, Department of Commerce.....		-69,351,000	-97,351,000	-2,544,000	+66,807,000	+94,807,000
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE							
Legal Activities							
S.Doc. 103-7	Assets forfeiture fund (rescission) 1/.....	-20,000,000	-5,000,000	-35,000,000	-35,000,000	-30,000,000	
Federal Bureau of Investigation							
103-3	Salaries and expenses.....	16,700,000					
.....	Special program.....			32,000,000	32,000,000	+32,000,000	
Federal Prison System							
.....	Buildings and facilities (rescission) 1/.....		-94,500,000	-130,000,000	-145,000,000	-50,500,000	-15,000,000

FY 1993 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2118), continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
Office of Justice Programs							
103-87	Justice assistance 1/	200,000,000	200,000,000	200,000,000	150,000,000	-50,000,000	-50,000,000
	Rescission 1/		-1,000,000	-1,000,000		+1,000,000	+1,000,000
	Total, Department of Justice	196,700,000	99,500,000	66,000,000	2,000,000	-97,500,000	-64,000,000
THE JUDICIARY							
United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit							
103-3	Salaries and expenses	1,738,000					
United States Court of International Trade							
103-3	Salaries and expenses	935,000					
Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services							
103-3	Salaries and expenses	12,295,000					
103-3	Defender services	64,800,000	55,000,000	55,000,000	55,000,000		
103-3	Fees of jurors and commissioners	7,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000		
103-3	Court security	4,342,000					
	Total, Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services	88,937,000	60,500,000	60,500,000	60,500,000		
Administrative Office of the United States Courts							
103-3	Salaries and expenses	710,000					
Federal Judicial Center							
103-3	Salaries and expenses	100,000					
	Total, The Judiciary	92,420,000	60,500,000	60,500,000	60,500,000		
DEPARTMENT OF STATE							
International Organizations and Conferences							
103-3	Contributions to international peacekeeping activities	293,000,000					
RELATED AGENCIES							
Department of Transportation							
Maritime Administration							
Military useful vessel obligation guarantees:							
	Guaranteed loans subsidy			48,000,000	48,000,000	+48,000,000	
	Rescission			-48,000,000	-48,000,000	-48,000,000	
	Administrative expenses				4,000,000	+4,000,000	+4,000,000
	Rescission				-4,000,000	-4,000,000	-4,000,000
Arms Control and Disarmament Agency							
103-3	Arms control and disarmament activities	2,000,000					
Board for International Broadcasting							
103-3	Israel relay station (rescission)	-180,000,000		-180,000,000	-180,000,000	-180,000,000	
Federal Communications Commission							
103-3	Salaries and expenses	12,000,000		11,500,000	11,500,000	+11,500,000	
Securities and Exchange Commission							
	Salaries and expenses (rescission)			-11,700,000	-11,700,000	-11,700,000	
Thomas Jefferson Commission							
	Salaries and expenses (rescission) 1/		-200,000	-200,000	-100,000	+100,000	+100,000
Office of the United States Trade Representatives							
103-3	Salaries and expenses	750,000		500,000	500,000	+500,000	
Small Business Administration							
	Salaries and expenses (by transfer) 2/		(14,000,000)		(14,000,000)		(+14,000,000)
	Rescission			-2,000,000	-2,000,000	-2,000,000	
Business Loans Program Account:							
103-50	(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(2,575,558,000)	(3,308,958,000)	(3,199,269,000)	(3,199,269,000)	(-109,689,000)	
103-50	Guaranteed loans subsidy	140,883,000	181,000,000	160,000,000	175,000,000	-6,000,000	+15,000,000
Disaster Loans Program Account:							
	Direct loans subsidy (rescission)			-80,657,000	-80,657,000	-80,657,000	
	Total, Small Business Administration	140,883,000	181,000,000	77,343,000	92,343,000	-88,657,000	+15,000,000
United States Information Agency							
103-3	Radio construction	125,100,000					
	Total, Related agencies	100,733,000	180,800,000	-102,557,000	-87,457,000	-268,257,000	+15,100,000
Total, Chapter II:							
	New budget (obligational) authority	682,853,000	271,449,000	-73,408,000	-27,501,000	-298,950,000	+45,907,000
	Appropriations	(882,853,000)	(441,500,000)	(512,500,000)	(481,500,000)	(+40,000,000)	(-31,000,000)
	Rescissions	(-200,000,000)	(-170,051,000)	(-585,908,000)	(-509,001,000)	(-338,950,000)	(+76,907,000)
	(By transfer)		(14,000,000)		(14,000,000)		(+14,000,000)
CHAPTER III							
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - MILITARY							
Military Personnel							
	Military personnel, Navy		7,100,000	7,100,000	7,100,000		

FY 1993 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2118), continued

Doc No.	Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
Operation and Maintenance						
	Operation and maintenance, Army	149,800,000	149,800,000	149,800,000		
	Operation and maintenance, Navy	46,356,000	46,356,000	46,356,000		
	Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps	122,192,000	122,192,000	122,192,000		
	Operation and maintenance, Air Force	266,400,000	266,400,000	266,400,000		
	Operation and maintenance, Defense agencies	2,000,000		2,000,000		+ 2,000,000
	Operation and maintenance, Navy Reserve	237,000	237,000	237,000		
	Humanitarian assistance program		23,000,000	23,000,000	+ 23,000,000	
	Real property maintenance, Defense	29,098,000	29,098,000	29,098,000		
	Total, Operation and Maintenance	616,083,000	637,083,000	639,083,000	+ 23,000,000	+ 2,000,000
Revolving and Management Funds						
	Defense business operations fund	293,500,000	295,500,000	293,500,000		- 2,000,000
Other Department of Defense Programs						
	Defense health program, operation and maintenance	299,900,000	299,900,000	299,900,000		
RELATED AGENCIES						
103-3	National Security Education Trust Fund	5,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000		
	Defense reinvestment for economic growth			50,000,000	+ 50,000,000	+ 50,000,000
GENERAL PROVISIONS						
	Rescission (sec. 304)		-1,250,000,000	-973,507,000	-973,507,000	+ 276,493,000
S.Doc. 103-7	Additional transfer authority (sec. 306)	(300,000,000)		(500,000,000)	(+ 500,000,000)	(+ 500,000,000)
	Total, Chapter III:					
	New budget (obligational) authority	5,000,000	1,226,583,000	326,076,000	-900,507,000	+ 326,493,000
	Appropriations	(5,000,000)	(1,226,583,000)	(1,299,583,000)	(+ 73,000,000)	(+ 50,000,000)
	Rescissions			(-973,507,000)	(-973,507,000)	(+ 276,493,000)
CHAPTER IV						
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR						
Bureau of Land Management						
	Land acquisition (rescission) 2/		-4,958,000		+ 4,958,000	
United States Fish and Wildlife Service						
	Construction and anadromous fish (rescission) 2/		-4,100,000	-1,500,000	+ 2,600,000	-1,500,000
	Land acquisition			1,000,000	+ 1,000,000	+ 1,000,000
National Park Service						
	Construction (rescission) 2/		-6,800,000	-2,700,000	+ 4,100,000	-2,700,000
Bureau of Indian Affairs						
	Operation of Indian programs	12,463,000	7,242,000	17,400,000	+ 4,937,000	+ 10,158,000
	(By transfer)	(8,837,000)	(3,900,000)	(3,900,000)	(-4,937,000)	
103-3	Miscellaneous permanent appropriations (by transfer)	(6,000,000)	(6,000,000)	(6,000,000)		
RELATED AGENCY						
Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation						
	Salaries and expenses (rescission) 2/		-3,000,000	-3,000,000		-3,000,000
	Total, Chapter IV:					
	New budget (obligational) authority	-6,395,000	7,242,000	11,200,000	+ 17,595,000	+ 3,958,000
	Appropriations	(12,463,000)	(7,242,000)	(18,400,000)	(+ 5,937,000)	(+ 11,158,000)
	Rescissions	(-18,858,000)	(-9,900,000)	(-7,200,000)	(+ 11,658,000)	(-7,200,000)
	(By transfer)	(6,000,000)	(14,837,000)	(9,900,000)	(-4,937,000)	
CHAPTER V						
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR						
Employment and Training Administration						
103-50	Training and employment services 1/	320,000,000	320,000,000	200,000,000	-100,000,000	+ 20,000,000
103-87	Rescission 2/		-99,000,000	-50,000,000	+ 49,000,000	-50,000,000
	Community service employment for older Americans			10,000,000	+ 6,000,000	-4,000,000
Departmental Management						
	Salaries and expenses (rescission) 2/		-2,000,000		+ 2,000,000	
	Total, Department of Labor	320,000,000	219,000,000	210,000,000	-43,000,000	-34,000,000
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES						
Health Resources and Services Administration						
103-3	Vaccine injury compensation	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000		
Assistant Secretary for Health						
	Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health		6,000,000	6,000,000	+ 6,000,000	
Social Security Administration						
103-50	Payments to social security trust funds	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000		
103-50	Limitation on administrative expenses: Trust fund	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)		
Administration for Children and Families						
103-3	Refugee and entrant assistance	27,000,000				
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION						
	Impact aid (rescission) 2/		-1,786,000		+ 1,786,000	
	School improvement programs (rescission) 2/		-15,135,000		+ 15,135,000	
	Vocational and adult education (rescission) 2/		-2,946,000		+ 2,946,000	
103-3	Student financial assistance	160,000,000	160,000,000	341,000,000	+ 181,000,000	-12,700,000
	Rescission 2/		-72,490,000		+ 72,490,000	
	Higher education (rescission) 2/		-23,652,000		+ 23,652,000	
	Education research, statistics, and improvement (rescission) 2/		-4,949,000		+ 4,949,000	

FY 1993 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2118), continued

Doc No.	Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
.....	Libraries (rescission) 2/.....		-14,720,000		+14,720,000	
	Total, Department of Education.....	160,000,000	24,322,000	353,700,000	341,000,000	+316,678,000
	COMMUNITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM					
.....	Community Investment Program (rescission).....			-500,000,000	-275,000,000	-275,000,000
	Total, Chapter V:					
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	547,000,000	283,322,000	109,700,000	288,000,000	+4,678,000
	Appropriations.....	(547,000,000)	(520,000,000)	(609,700,000)	(613,000,000)	(+93,000,000)
	Rescissions.....		(-236,678,000)	(-500,000,000)	(-325,000,000)	(-88,322,000)
	(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(+175,000,000)
	CHAPTER VI					
	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION					
.....	Military construction, Navy.....		3,000,000		3,000,000	+3,000,000
.....	Family housing, Navy and Marine Corps.....		4,345,000		4,345,000	+4,345,000
.....	Homeowners Assistance Fund, Defense.....		133,000,000	133,000,000	133,000,000	
.....	Rescission.....		-133,000,000	-133,000,000	-133,000,000	
	Total, Chapter VI:					
	New budget (obligational) authority.....		7,345,000		7,345,000	+7,345,000
	Appropriations.....		(140,345,000)	(133,000,000)	(140,345,000)	(+7,345,000)
	Rescissions.....		(-133,000,000)	(-133,000,000)	(-133,000,000)	
	CHAPTER VII					
	DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION					
	Office of the Secretary					
.....	Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs (rescission).....			-158,000	-237,000	-237,000
.....	Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs (rescission).....			-224,000	-303,000	-303,000
.....	Office of the Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs (rescission).....			-158,000		+158,000
.....	Office of Commercial Space Transportation: Operations and research (rescission).....			-25,000	-25,000	-25,000
103-3	Office of the Assistant Secretary for Transportation Policy (by transfer).....	(2,358,000)	(2,358,000)	(2,358,000)	(2,358,000)	
103-3	Office of the Assistant Secretary for Aviation and International Affairs (by transfer).....	(7,920,000)	(7,920,000)	(7,920,000)	(7,920,000)	
.....	Transportation planning, research and development (rescission).....				-285,000	-285,000
	Total, Office of the Secretary.....			-565,000	-850,000	-850,000
	Coast Guard					
S.Doc. 103-7	Operating expenses (rescission) 1/.....	-3,150,000	-20,000,000	-5,476,000	-7,000,000	+13,000,000
	Federal Aviation Administration					
S.Doc. 103-7	Operations (rescission) 1/.....	-3,100,000	-5,000,000	-13,750,000	-8,000,000	-3,000,000
.....	Facilities and equipment (Airport and Airway Trust Fund) (rescission) 2/.....		-57,400,000		-48,300,000	+9,100,000
S.Doc. 103-7	Grants-in-aid for Airports (rescission).....	-36,750,000		-29,028,000		+29,028,000
S.Doc. 103-7	(Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(100,000,000)		(100,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(+100,000,000)
	Total, Federal Aviation Administration.....	-39,850,000	-62,400,000	-42,778,000	-56,300,000	+6,100,000
	Federal Highway Administration					
.....	Limitation on general operating expenses.....			(-2,248,000)		(+2,248,000)
	National Highway Traffic Safety Administration					
.....	Operations and research (rescission) 2/.....		-7,854,588			+7,854,588
	Federal Railroad Administration					
.....	Railroad safety (rescission).....			-140,000	-140,000	-140,000
.....	Northeast corridor improvement program.....			204,100,000	204,100,000	+204,100,000
.....	Rescission.....			-204,100,000	-204,100,000	-204,100,000
	Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation:					
S.Doc. 103-7	Operations 1/.....	18,000,000	30,000,000	25,000,000	20,000,000	-10,000,000
S.Doc. 103-7	Capital 1/.....	25,000,000	21,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	+4,000,000
	Total, Federal Railroad Administration.....	43,000,000	51,000,000	49,860,000	44,860,000	-6,140,000
	Federal Transit Administration					
.....	Administrative expenses (rescission).....			-305,000	-305,000	-305,000
	Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation					
.....	Operations and maintenance (Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund) (rescission).....			-91,000	-91,000	-91,000
	Office of Inspector General					
.....	Salaries and expenses (rescission).....			-285,000		+285,000

FY 1993 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2118), continued

Doc No.	Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
INDEPENDENT AGENCY						
Interstate Commerce Commission						
Salaries and expenses (rescission)			-360,000	-360,000	-360,000	
Total, Chapter VII:						
New budget (obligational) authority		-39,254,588		-20,046,000	+19,208,588	-20,046,000
Appropriations	(6,250,000)	(51,000,000)	(225,072,000)	(249,100,000)	(+198,100,000)	(+24,028,000)
Rescissions	(-6,250,000)	(-90,254,588)	(-225,072,000)	(-269,148,000)	(-178,891,412)	(-44,074,000)
(By transfer)	(10,278,000)	(10,278,000)	(10,278,000)	(10,278,000)		
CHAPTER VIII						
DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY						
Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms			4,000,000	4,000,000	+4,000,000	
United States Customs Service:						
Salaries and expenses (by transfer)			(1,618,000)	(1,618,000)	(+1,618,000)	
Rescission 2/		-600,000			+600,000	
Bureau of the Public Debt (rescission) 1/		-3,400,000	-3,400,000	-3,400,000		
Internal Revenue Service						
Administration and management (rescission) 2/		-11,000,000			+11,000,000	
Processing tax returns and assistance (rescission)				-1,874,000	-1,874,000	-1,874,000
Tax law enforcement (rescission)				-3,972,000	-3,972,000	-3,972,000
Information systems (rescission)				-1,427,000	-1,427,000	-1,427,000
Total, Internal Revenue Service		-11,000,000		-7,073,000	+3,927,000	-7,073,000
United States Secret Service			11,277,000	11,277,000	+11,277,000	
Total, Department of the Treasury		-15,000,000	11,877,000	4,804,000	+19,804,000	-7,073,000
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT						
The White House Office			7,410,538	5,310,538	+5,310,538	-2,100,000
103-3 (By transfer)	(7,410,538)			(2,100,000)	(+2,100,000)	(+2,100,000)
Special assistance to the President			107,000	107,000	+107,000	
National Critical Materials Council (rescission)			-50,000	-50,000	-50,000	
Office of Administration			415,000	415,000	+415,000	
103-3 (By transfer)	(4,342,000)					
Total, Executive Office of the President			7,882,538	5,782,538	+5,782,538	-2,100,000
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
Federal Election Commission			112,000	112,000	+112,000	
General Services Administration						
Federal Buildings Fund:						
Rental of space (rescission)		-16,000,000	-16,000,000	-16,000,000		
Installment acquisition payments (rescission)		-2,000,000	-2,000,000	-2,000,000		
Deposit to fund			-18,000,000	-5,900,000	-5,900,000	+12,100,000
Northern VA Naval System Command (rescission) 2/		-25,000,000		-25,000,000		-25,000,000
103-3 Allowances and office staff for former Presidents	194,000	194,000	194,000	194,000		
Total, General Services Administration	194,000	-42,806,000	-35,806,000	-48,706,000	-5,900,000	-12,900,000
National Archives and Records Administration						
103-3 Operating expenses	2,997,000	2,997,000	2,997,000	2,997,000		
Total, Chapter VIII:						
New budget (obligational) authority	3,191,000	-54,809,000	-12,937,462	-35,010,462	+19,798,538	-22,073,000
Appropriations	(3,191,000)	(3,191,000)	(8,512,538)	(18,512,538)	(+15,321,538)	(+10,000,000)
Rescissions		(-58,000,000)	(-21,450,000)	(-53,523,000)	(+4,477,000)	(-32,073,000)
(By transfer)	(11,752,538)		(1,618,000)	(3,718,000)	(+3,718,000)	(+2,100,000)
CHAPTER IX						
DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS						
Veterans Benefits Administration						
103-3 S.Doc. 103-7 Compensation and pensions	475,000,000	147,422,000	475,000,000	475,000,000	+327,578,000	
Veterans Health Administration						
Medical care (by transfer)		(5,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	
Departmental Administration						
Construction, major projects (rescission) 2/		-20,500,000			+20,500,000	
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT						
Housing Programs						
Homeownership and opportunity for people						
S.Doc. 103-7 S.Doc. 103-7 everywhere grants (HOPE grants) (rescission) 1/	-100,000,000	-164,500,000			+164,500,000	
S.Doc. 103-7 HOME investment partnership program	75,000,000					
103-3 (By transfer)	(60,000,000)	(60,000,000)	(60,000,000)	(60,000,000)		
(By transfer)			(75,000,000)	(62,500,000)	(+62,500,000)	(-12,500,000)
S.Doc. 103-7 Opportunities for youth: Youthbuild (by transfer)	(40,000,000)	(40,000,000)	(40,000,000)	(40,000,000)		
S.Doc. 103-7 Annual contributions for assisted housing (rescission)	-13,000,000					

FY 1993 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2118), continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
103-3	Severely distressed public housing project (by transfer)	(300,000,000)	(300,000,000)	(300,000,000)	(300,000,000)		
	Rescission			-17,556,000	-10,800,000	-10,800,000	+6,756,000
	Total, Department of Housing and Urban Development	-38,000,000	-164,500,000	-17,556,000	-10,800,000	+153,700,000	+6,756,000
	Federal Housing Administration: FHA - Mutual mortgage insurance program account:						
S.Doc. 103-7	(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(36,000,000,000)		(42,854,000,000)	(42,854,000,000)	+42,854,000,000	
	CBO scoring - accelerated fee rate (language)	-6,250,000					
	FHA - General and special risk program account:						
S.Doc. 103-7	(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(1,000,000,000)		(1,000,000,000)	(500,000,000)	(+500,000,000)	(-500,000,000)
S.Doc. 103-7	Program costs	38,000,000					
	(By transfer)			(38,000,000)	(19,000,000)	(+19,000,000)	(-19,000,000)
S.Doc. 103-7	Transfer of offsetting collections	-10,000,000					
	Government National Mortgage Association						
	Guarantees of mortgage-backed securities loan guarantee program account:						
S.Doc. 103-7	(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(30,000,000,000)		(30,000,000,000)	(30,000,000,000)	+30,000,000,000	
	Community Planning and Development						
S.Doc. 103-7	Community development grants	45,000,000					
103-3	(By transfer)	(40,000,000)	(40,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(40,000,000)		(+20,000,000)
	INDEPENDENT AGENCY						
	Environmental Protection Agency						
	Abate, control, and compliance (rescission)				-6,000,000	-6,000,000	-6,000,000
	Program and research operations				3,000,000	+3,000,000	+3,000,000
	(By transfer)		(5,000,000)			(-5,000,000)	
	Hazardous substance superfund (rescission) 2/		-100,000,000			+100,000,000	
103-50	State revolving funds / construction grants 2/	400,000,000	290,000,000				
103-87						-290,000,000	
	EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT						
	National Space Council (rescission)			-650,000	-650,000	-650,000	
	National Aeronautics and Space Administration						
	Research and development (by transfer)		(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)		
	Rescission 2/		-25,000,000			+25,000,000	
	Space flight, control and data communications (rescission)				-27,200,000	-27,200,000	-27,200,000
	Research and program management				20,000,000	+20,000,000	+20,000,000
	Total, Chapter IX:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	903,750,000	127,422,000	456,794,000	453,350,000	+325,928,000	-3,444,000
	Appropriations	(1,016,750,000)	(437,422,000)	(475,000,000)	(498,000,000)	(+60,578,000)	(+23,000,000)
	Rescissions	(-113,000,000)	(-310,000,000)	(-18,206,000)	(-44,850,000)	(+265,350,000)	(-26,444,000)
	(By transfer)	(440,000,000)	(455,000,000)	(541,000,000)	(529,500,000)	(+74,500,000)	(-11,500,000)
	CHAPTER X						
	FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT						
	Military Assistance						
103-3	Peacekeeping operations	14,000,000					
	CHAPTER XI						
	DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY						
	Power Marketing Administration						
	Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration (rescission)			-40,000,000			+40,000,000
	Grand total:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	2,512,679,000	1,835,055,412	446,973,538	1,003,413,538	-831,641,874	+556,440,000
	Appropriations	(2,831,929,000)	(2,911,623,000)	(3,369,343,538)	(3,467,174,538)	(+555,551,538)	(+97,831,000)
	Rescissions	(-319,250,000)	(-1,076,567,588)	(-2,922,370,000)	(-2,463,761,000)	(-1,387,193,412)	(+458,609,000)
	(By transfer)	(471,030,538)	(497,115,000)	(565,796,000)	(570,396,000)	(+73,281,000)	(+4,600,000)

1/ Items in H.R. 2244 considered by Senate.
 2/ Items in H.R. 2244 not considered by Senate.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, before I begin my remarks, I want to pay tribute to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, for the superb job he did and the many courtesies he extended this side of the aisle as we went through the process. He is a good friend and a fine Member of whom we are all proud. I thank him.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report that we bring to the House, perhaps more than most, is a hodgepodge, in my opinion, of pluses and minuses, not only in the fiscal sense but also in the sense of wins and losses, of things that merit support combined with things that are of questionable value.

In some cases, Mr. Speaker, it seems as though we are taking two steps backward to move one step forward.

When we passed this bill originally on May 26, we provided funding for a number of unmet needs, public defenders and jury fees to keep the judiciary system going, small business loans, the Pell grant shortfalls, Veterans COLA and major unanticipated costs in the Defense Department. That was the bulk of the bill that left the House, trying to get money back to the Defense Department to pay for costs unmet like Operation Restore Hope in Somalia. These items remain in the conference report, some at higher amounts, like veterans compensation and Pell grants. On the same day, Mr. Speaker, the House passed a second supplemental, affectionately referred to as "Son of Stimulus," in which this side prevailed with respect to the philosophy that any item carried in the bill had to be offset. That was where we started from on this side of the bill. That was where we ended.

In that Son of Stimulus bill, every single item in the bill was offset. The Senate took up these measures as part of the first bill and many of them remain in the conference report: summer youth, police, Amtrak, wastewater treatment, and the tree planting program.

Offsets were retained and increased and in some cases some of the more controversial rescissions were settled out.

Now we come to the steps backward. Members will recall that when we considered H.R. 2244, the so-called Son of Stimulus, the rule contained a self-executing new set-aside program for a summer program, the Youth Fair Chance Program, that included pages and pages of authorizing legislation that had never been in front of any committee in this Congress, had never taken testimony, had never had cross-examination and was included over the objection of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Kentucky.

Again, Mr. Speaker, over objections, that set aside is retained in the conference report and the legislative language allowing people up to 30 years to participate in this special summer youth program is once again restated. In my view, Mr. Speaker, that is a fundamental undermining of the legislative process.

But even as this legislative language was being retained, the conference was rejecting another legislative provision added by the Senate to begin welfare reform by requiring States to enroll 10 percent of able-bodied recipients of general assistance in workfare programs. Why one legislative program, Mr. Speaker, and not the other? Why one setting up a new grant program and not another requiring able-bodied people to work?

Finally, Mr. Speaker, a major step back was taken on the Defense funding by including a series of offsets that total almost \$1 billion that undermines with one hand what was done by the House with the other in trying to do what we could to keep the Defense Department at a realistic level of operating capability.

The best that could be said, Mr. Speaker, is that we in this conference report have improved what the Senate brought to the conference. But, Mr. Speaker, that is not enough.

The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] and I have been pointing out to the House that the indices are already there, that we are moving rapidly toward a hollow Army, a hollow Navy, and a hollow Air Force. We have talked about the drop in recruitments, the drop in the number of high school-educated young men and women who are applying for a career in the military. Those trends, Mr. Speaker, are continuing.

If we simply look at the Army budget and compare what is before us this year to the budget that was in existence at Desert Storm, this is what we see:

OPTEMPO, or training, dollars per division, cut by 21 percent;

Maintenance dollars per division, cut by 38 percent;

Facilities maintenance and repair dollars per soldier, cut by 33 percent;

And readiness dollars or O&M, the hardcore of what makes the military able to do what it does, per soldier cut by 36 percent.

The same holds true, Mr. Speaker, in the other branches of the Armed Forces.

□ 1600

The Pentagon sits there with a request that has come up for reprogramming involving about \$2.2 billion in additional funds to meet other unfunded costs from contingency operations and from draw-down of the military.

We simply have to face the fact, Mr. Speaker, that in my view we are on the

road towards making the same mistake we made after World War II, the same mistake that we made after Korea, and the same mistake that we made after Vietnam. We are going to drag our military down and make them a hollow force.

Mr. Speaker, there we have it, some steps forward, and some steps backward; big backward steps in this conference report; a mixed bag, in my view, if there ever was one.

In the end, for myself, we need to take care of the shortfalls in the Judiciary, the small business loan program, improve on the work that the Senate did with respect to the Defense Department, and hopefully some of the regular programs, not the special summer program for 30-year olds that went through here in an unprecedented fashion, but some of the regular summer youth programs that maybe can still be put to work even as we speak on July 1 in midsummer, almost.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this bill will be passed. I do so not with enthusiasm, but because we have made some improvements. I say to my colleagues, I hope this is the last supplemental we see this year.

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

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that there are some very important programs in here that are finally being funded. One is fees for jurors. It is only \$5.5 million, but nevertheless, not having the \$5.5 has meant they have had to hold back on jury trials in civil cases in Federal courts.

There is also another \$55 million for defender services. As we all know, under the Constitution those who are charged with crimes and do not have the money are entitled to be represented. If they are not represented, then they might be turned loose. The Judiciary was short \$55 million in defender services. That is being restored in this bill.

There is also \$175 million that pays the full subsidy cost for \$3.2 billion in loan guarantees for small business borrowers. These loans are made by local banks. The banks get up to a 90-percent guarantee, so they have a 10-percent exposure. Without these loan guarantees, in many cases, the banks are not going to be able to make loans to their regular customers who have a higher risk. If it has a government loan guarantee, then that is not applied against the capital structure of the bank.

This program is very important. They ran out of loan money, loan guarantee money sometime in late April. I hope that they can soon get back in the business of handling these loan guarantees. Some of these are new loans, some of these are renewals of loans that are outstanding.

I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that we offset the items in this bill with rescissions on ongoing programs. That is not new money. This bill is offset by rescissions on ongoing programs. I hope we get this bill passed here tonight. So that the courts and the SBA and the banks will be able to continue these ongoing programs.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS].

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I regret that I must rise today in opposition to the supplemental appropriation bill. As so often happens, there are good features, good programs in this bill, that need funding, but again, so often as it happens, Congress gets carried away and bloats it with some programs that either are unauthorized or unneeded; as an example, the summer jobs bill, \$220 million, of which \$50 million is for a program of Youth Fair Chance Program, involving people up to 30 years of age.

People 30 years of age are entitled to jobs, of course, but \$170 million for summer youth programs? Some do not realize summer is two-thirds gone, and the bill has not gone to the President yet, has not passed the Senate, gone down for signature. By the time the programs have been implemented, we will be wasting time, as so often we have in trying to help summer youth, and it is a program we should have had a long time ago, separated away from some of this stuff that does not belong. We just could not spend wisely \$170 million in the last month before young people go back to school.

Pell grants, when that bill left the House floor a short time ago, it was \$160 million. Now it is \$340 million. I think all of us agree Pell grants has been a good program to help encourage young people to go to school. But is the right figure \$340 million, when in our judgment just about a month ago we thought \$160 million was sufficient?

Another example of potential waste, Police on the Streets. That is a new name. We did not call it that when it left the House of Representatives, but \$150 million to be administered by the Justice Department, the Attorney General; a good program, but how are we going to allocate? Who is going to get the \$150 million, which city? Is your city going to get any of that \$150 million? It is dedicated to go for policemen, for regular pay, for benefits, but no overtime for the first year.

Again, we cannot disagree with helping police on the streets. Every community in this country needs more additional policemen.

Veterans' compensation. We provide in this subsidy \$475 million for veterans, absolutely necessary, a good program. I would not cut it.

CHAMPUS, \$300 million for CHAMPUS. We have an obligation to

our veterans, to our service people, to their families. This is to pay their medical bills, and \$300 million is absolutely essential, but it is added to a lot of other things that are not.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, our minority leader here, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDade], has talked about what we are cutting, national defense. We did in this case offset the rescissions enough that we increased the spending for national defense at \$326 million. Some of this is Somalia, peacekeeping. I do not know if that is necessary. We did not have testimony on it, before our committee. I think the gentleman did have, in the defense committee. I cannot respond to that. However, it was offset by some very good programs in the Defense Department.

We are already cutting the Defense Department dangerously close. Seventy-five percent of the defense spending here was offset, while the other programs, domestic programs, were offset only up to 60 percent.

One of the programs, the Mammography Quality Standards Act which we all support, we offset that by \$3 million from other programs at NIH. It is a good program, but the good programs could have been offset. We could have done this without hitting the budget so hard.

Is Congress not listening to the American taxpayers? We have got to start cutting spending. We cannot continue to put it off until next year or the year after next. The time is today. We can recommit this bill. I am going to have a motion to straight recommitment back to this committee. We will have it back out when we come back. It will be absent these unnecessary spendings.

We will adequately fund the programs that really need funding, still in time for the Pell grants, still in time for CHAMPUS, still in time for the veterans, all of these things are absolutely needed, and we will have time to do it.

I hope that the Members will be able to vote for the motion to recommit and vote for the taxpayers.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the full committee for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 2118, the 1993 Supplemental Appropriations Act. This conference agreement addresses items in both H.R. 2118 and H.R. 2244, the 1993 second supplemental appropriations bill.

Chapter IX includes funding for programs under the jurisdiction of the VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee. All of these funds, with the exception of VA's mandatory compensation and pensions account, are offset.

Let me briefly mention the major agreements included in this conference report.

For VA, the conference report includes \$475 million for compensation and pension payments—the VA's latest estimate of the additional funds needed for fiscal year 1993. The conference agreement does not include the rescission of \$20.5 million in H.R. 2244 for the clinical project at the Wilmington VA Medical Center.

Under the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the conference agreement provides \$122.5 million for the HOME Program and \$95 million for community development grants for use in disaster areas. These additional funds are necessary to help restore areas affected by disasters, such as Hurricanes Andrew and Iniki and Typhoon Omar.

Mr. Speaker, we also increased the credit limitations for the guarantee programs of the Federal Housing Administration and the Government National Mortgage Association. These requested increases are necessary because of higher than anticipated activity in these essential housing programs.

Under the Environmental Protection Agency, the conference agreement includes \$3 million for the program and research operations account. This increase, which is offset, results from the restructuring of several accounts this past year.

Under the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the conference agreement includes \$20 million for the research and program management account. The need for these additional funds results from the redesign of the space station program. These additional funds are offset by a rescission in another NASA account.

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is that all of the increases for discretionary appropriations are offset. These actions are both budget authority and outlay neutral.

I urge members to vote "yes" on adoption of the conference report.

□ 1610

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 1 minute to the very able gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT].

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

Mr. Speaker, every bill has good news and bad news. In this particular bill there is some good news that I think will help some folks who right now are receiving a lot of bad news. I am very pleased to note the Senate added language into the package to allow existing Commodity Credit Corporation funds to be used for crop losses. There is very little money left, however, and it is going to take a lot more. I want to point out to my colleagues that we are

obviously going to be back here pretty soon for another supplemental for the Commodity Credit Corporation. We have been told that once they are back in operation they can function about a week, and then they will be broke and out of money again.

But in my home State of Iowa, with something like 20 percent of the crops not even being planted as yet, the Mississippi River is on a rampage, it is flooding in Iowa, Illinois, Missouri, and other States, we have had a number of levees that broke just this morning and the river is still on its way up, and we have no way of knowing what those damages will be. Obviously we will have to wait until the water goes down to know that. But at least we do have a stopgap measure here with some funds that are available that can go to help the farmers who are under a great deal of distress.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

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

Let me reiterate the comments of my colleague from Iowa. There is money in this bill for disaster assistance. There is money in this bill for guaranteed loans for rural housing, \$4.5 million of Federal funds which will generate \$250 million in construction. There is money in this supplemental for 160 meat inspectors in light of the E. coli disaster which we had in the northwestern part of the United States, \$36 million to the Food and Drug Administration to accelerate the drug approval process, and \$3 million for mammography quality certification. I am also happy to report this bill allows the Secretary to waive a 15-percent cap regulation for the reallocation of unused funds in 1993 to allow States most in need to receive additional funding.

The best news of all is that we meet these needs at no net cost. All increased spending is offset by cuts within the agencies.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANZULLO].

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I will be boarding a National Guard helicopter to examine my congressional district in the northern part of the State of Illinois which is under water from the Mississippi River to the Fox River. This past week a farmer in my district had 50 of his cows float down the Mississippi River because of the extensive flooding.

At a time when disasters are taking place in the Nation because of the amount of rain that has come, we are being asked as Members of the U.S. House of Representatives to vote upon an appropriations bill that has so many programs in here that do not seem to be important at all, in fact are not important at all in terms of what is going

on catastrophically in this country. I call the chairman's attention, for example, to the \$7.4 million in transition costs and salaries and expenses of the White House. It is interesting where some of that money is coming from. The House of Representatives and the other body voted some time ago to fund the Office of National Drug Control Policy, but the \$2.1 million for the transition cost comes from that organization to fight drugs. And then we are being asked to add an additional \$500 million to that.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the time to be spending frivolous money in areas like this. This bill does contain some good programs, but we believe that we are elected for the purpose of watching the purse strings in this Nation. And at a time when calamity is wracking this Nation, at a time when the rains are coming, we have to be alert to vote no on programs like this that spend money unnecessarily.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I support the report before us and urge the adoption by this body.

I would like to address specifically the agreement of House conferees to save the American taxpayers nearly \$1 billion by paying for most of the new spending in Defense through offsetting cuts to low-priority items. As Members know, Mr. Speaker, from our original debate on this issue, the Pentagon came to this Congress and said that it wanted to spend additional money that it felt was necessary, but it was willing to pay for that spending by making cuts in low-priority items.

A hundred and eighty-eight Democrats and Republicans alike voted to amend the original bill to direct the Pentagon to do just that. I sponsored that amendment, Mr. Speaker, because I believe that whenever a Federal department is willing to act in this fiscally responsible manner it should be supported and congratulated at the very least.

I think we should march a brass band down Constitution Avenue whenever a Federal department comes to Congress and says it wants to offset new spending by making some tough choices, setting priorities and cutting spending that is not high priority.

While our position did not prevail on this floor at that time, we now have an opportunity as a result of this conference to take this responsible step by passing the measure that is before us. Make no mistake. I support funding the items requested by the Pentagon. Most of us do. The issue is how these priorities are going to be paid for.

The vote that we are about to take will save the American taxpayer nearly

\$1 billion as we meet these important Pentagon priorities. Setting budget priorities and trimming what we may want to spend but what we may not be able to afford to spend during fiscally difficult times is something that most American households and American businesses all across this country understand very well. And the American people are saying to us that it is about time Congress began to understand that very well.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS].

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I apologize for taking the time, and thank the gentleman for yielding it. Several Members came up and asked how did I make one statement about new money and some Members have come before us and said their particular programs were completely offset.

There is about \$3.5 billion in this bill. Of that \$1.3 billion is for Defense, and of the \$1.3 billion for Defense, \$973 million is offset by rescissions. The remaining part of the bill is about \$2,400,000,000 of which about \$1.4 billion is offset.

In a total bill of \$3.5 billion there is about \$2.46 billion which is offset through rescission.

Many of these rescissions go back as far as 1991 and probably would not have been spent anyway, but in any event, some of the bill is completely offset. I mentioned the mammography as being offset, and many are offset, but there is about \$1.3 billion of absolutely new money that we do not have, \$1.3 billion in new programs that could be recovered by referring this bill back to the committee.

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

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman always raises good points. I just wanted to point out that of that total about \$500 million is mandatory in terms of veterans' COLA's, and a few other programs. If we look at the total amount that is in the bill that is new discretionary spending, it is about \$500 million in both the Defense and domestic area, and if you extract as we do when we consider our budget appropriation items, mandatory spending as the gentleman knows, about \$500 million is the cost of the veterans' COLA program.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Day before yesterday we had the bill on the floor, an appropriation bill where we cut about a half a billion out of mandatory spending. Mandatory spending can be reduced also.

Mr. MCDADE. Let me say to my good friend, I am sure he agrees we do not want to cut the veterans' COLA's.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. I think that is a bad cut. I would vote to go back to the conference and make us redo it.

□ 1620

CHAMPUS, I defended many of these. There are a lot of bad programs. But don't take the bad unless you leave some of the good.

Mr. MCDADE. I am simply clarifying the record with respect to the gentleman's statement.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill, H.R. 2118, the 1993 supplement appropriations bill.

I want to thank the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Kentucky, for restoring threatened funding items.

The bill restores more than \$135 million in funds for the Department of Education. Among the programs to receive continued support is the State student incentive grant, or SSIG, which helps the States establish scholarships. For each Federal dollar, the States provide at least \$1. No Federal funds have yet been obligated for fiscal 1993, but students in many States have been notified that they were to receive awards. As a result of the conference report, 242,000 students will not have their grants reduced.

The bill also provides \$13.7 million for the cooperative education program, which enables institutions of higher learning to participate in work-learning programs. These students spend a semester working on the job in their chosen fields during their course of study. It is an integral part of their education. I am pleased that these funds have been restored.

The bill also provides \$3.8 million for college library and technology cooperation grants, which help college libraries purchase computers and other technologies that enable them to improve their efficiency and infrastructure.

In addition, the bill provides \$341 million for the Pell grant shortfall, more than twice the amount originally passed by the House. Unfortunately, the shortfall stands at more than \$2 billion. But combined with amounts approved by the House in 1994 appropriations, Pell grant recipients should be encouraged that Congress is moving in the right direction, in the face of harsh budget realities.

The bill also contains an additional \$170 million for the summer jobs program. This funding will provide 120,000 new summer jobs for our Nation's youth.

I thank the Appropriations Committee for its hard work.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to comment on provisions affecting programs under the jurisdiction of the Education and Labor Committee in the conference report on H.R. 2118, a bill making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1993.

While I do have some reservations about some of the provisions of the report, I would like to commend Chairman NATCHER and the House delegation for the fine job they did under very difficult circumstances.

In particular, I am very pleased with the provisions of the report that deal with our educational programs. The higher amount, \$341 million, made available to chip away at the Pell grant shortfall will bring the day when we are no longer laboring under this burden closer. The deletion of the education program rescissions which were a part of the House bill

are extraordinarily welcome, particularly the deletion of the proposed elimination of the fiscal year 1993 funding of the State student incentive grants and the Eisenhower Leadership Program. The deletion of the proposed Senate amendment placing a limitation on the amount of chapter 1 funding which an LEA could spend on administrative costs was the right thing to do, for this issue will be considered as the Education and Labor Committee addresses the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act later this Congress.

My reservations, Mr. Speaker, have to do with the employment and training provisions of the report. During our consideration of the House version of H.R. 2244, I expressed concern about the authorization changes being made in the Youth Fair Change Program, and the way these changes were made.

While I have noted that the report indicates that most of the changes to the statute were eliminated, I continue to have concerns about the inclusion of a provision which expands the eligibility for this program to individuals up to age 30. In effect, this continues to make a substantive change to a program under the Job Training Partnership Act—a change made not by the authorizing committee, the Education and Labor Committee; and not really by the Appropriations Committee; but by the House Rules Committee just prior to the original floor consideration of H.R. 2244. While this measure was approved in conference, these actions set a dangerous precedent—that of authorizing on an appropriations bill—when the authorizing committee had no input whatsoever.

The Youth Fair Chance Program was carefully crafted to serve economically disadvantaged youth in areas of high poverty. The language in the agreement would expand and potentially diminish services to high-risk youth once this program is up and running. Quite simply, we do not know what the consequence of the change made in the agreement will be.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report to accompany the bill H.R. 2118, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1993. However, I would like the RECORD to reflect my concern with the portion of the statement of managers that concerns the Federal Communications Commission's implementation of the 1992 Cable Act.

The conferees have stipulated that the Commission should revise their current schedule so that cable consumers will be able to receive refunds no later than September 1. Now I have enormous sympathy for cable subscribers—they've been getting ripped off for years, which is one of the reasons that we passed the Cable Act over the veto of then-President Bush. But the Commission has repeatedly told the Congress that it cannot responsibly implement the new law prior to October 1, 1993. In fact, FCC Chairman Quello and the other two Commissioners wrote me yesterday, and made a compelling case for implementing the law on the first of October. I ask that the text of that letter be reprinted at this point in the RECORD.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Washington, June 30, 1993.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN DINGELL: The Commission is fully aware of the difficulty of balancing

its responsibility to implement complex cable rate regulations with the perceived impact of delaying their effective date. We appreciate your serious concerns about our actions in this regard.

As a Commission, we have allotted highest priority to cooperating with congressional committees and to implementing congressional intent. In his nineteen years at the FCC Chairman Quello has always acted under the assumption that the FCC is an arm of Congress.

However, as Chairman Quello detailed in his testimony June 17 before the House Telecommunications and Finance Subcommittee, the Commission feels it would be practically irresponsible to implement rate regulation before we have the resources and personnel in place. Further, given the complexity of our cable rate regulations, we are concerned about our legal responsibilities in implementing these rules. Thus, a chaotic rush to regulation by an understaffed and underfinanced Commission would reflect on the integrity and efficiency of the Commission's processes, and result in a flood of legal challenges that could take years to unravel. This judgment is shared by each commissioner.

There are four reasons why we have found that cable rate regulation cannot be implemented prior to October 1. Briefly stated, these are:

(1) A statutory prerequisite to regulation of rates for the basic tier is the FCC's certification of local franchising authorities' jurisdiction to regulate these rates. Absent staff to process the expected challenges to these thousands of certification requests and to issue "stop" orders where appropriate, any certification request submitted will automatically become effective 30 days after receipt. This result would be inconsistent with due process and is certainly not contemplated by either the statute or the legislative history.

(2) Even if franchising authority certification were not a problem, any attempt to determine rates and order refunds prior to October 1 would still be premature. Notwithstanding our adoption of benchmarks on April 1, a number of open issues on implementing rate regulation remain to be resolved. On this basis, we cannot say that it will be possible to rationally determine what basic rates should be and what refunds would be in order prior to October 1. As of May 14, when the Commission did not delay the effective date of the rate regulations beyond June 21, we did not fully realize the extent of our implementation challenge. Commissioner Barrett noted his concern regarding the implementation issues. Since that time, we have all agreed that the complexity of cable rate implementation makes it essential that we take more time until October 1.

(3) Recognizing these problems, franchising authorities ranging from small cities in Iowa to New York City have affirmatively welcomed the delay, especially since basic rates will remain frozen in the interim. In other words, they will not be ready to do rate regulation or order refunds prior to October 1. We would further note that the freeze on basic rates, which has been in effect since April 1 and which will continue in effect, has to date produced considerable savings for consumers—a fact that has gone relatively unpublicized during the course of this debate.

(4) Implementing rate regulation on October 1 would put it in closer synch with the final channel reshuffling caused by the implementation of retransmission consent and must carry. These could affect the composition of the basic tier, which in turn could affect the basic rate—and therefore it is much

more orderly to implement these rules in one stage rather than in two stages separated by only sixty days.

Let us underscore one final point: franchising authorities and other interested parties are now proceeding on the understanding that implementation will not occur prior to October 1; their planning is firmly based on that assumption. Under these circumstances, to advance the date having already deferred it—and deferred it with the approval of local governments most immediately affected by premature implementation—not only accentuates the appearance of a Federal Government at war with itself but also, and more importantly, adds to the confusion and forces additional expenditures on planning to comply with yet another, earlier implementation date.

It is difficult to see how confusion, inadequate resources, and inviting a flood of legal challenges comports with the overall public interest.

Respectfully,

JAMES H. QUELLO,

Chairman.

ANDREW C. BARRETT,

Commissioner.

ERVIN S. DUGGEN,

Commissioner.

I would remind my colleagues—and the members of the Federal Communications Commission—that admonitions such as this are not binding law. Nor are they welcome from the Appropriations Committee, which does not have jurisdiction to revise or rewrite legislative policy or regulatory decisions. It is my hope that the Commission continue on its current course, and implement the law in a manner that is fair to cable subscribers, local government officials, and to the Commission itself.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address an issue that has caused a great deal of fear, a great deal of misinformation, and a great deal of concern among the people of Arizona. The issue is the unexplained respiratory distress syndrome which has already taken 16 lives. As of today, there are 29 known cases of the illness.

Mr. Speaker, I have had conversations with the leadership of the Navajo Nation and officials of the Indian Health Services. I know how concerned people are and how hard they are working to develop a good medical response.

In the meantime, it is also important to dispel some myths. The facts are, Mr. Speaker, that it is not unsafe to visit Navajo country or any other of our reservations. The facts are that this is not an illness that affects one people or another. There is no evidence at this time of person-to-person transmission, and contagiousness appears to be low.

I am told that Federal, State, local, and tribal health officials have worked in concert to come up with answers. Together, these officials have made significant progress and have identified the Hantaan virus, which can be spread through rodent urine and excrement, as a possible cause of the disease. Additional tests are being conducted by the Centers for Disease Control. Interviews conducted by Navajo community health workers, and the State health departments are disseminating information on the facts about the disease and what precautions should be taken.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us includes a provision authored by Senator PETE DOMENICI

to make \$6 million available for incurred costs as a result of the disease to the tribal, State, and Federal entities that are involved in this effort. The provision specifies that the funding will be dispensed after specific requests are made. While I do not support the underlying bill, I want to express my support for this provision and hope that we can adequately support the efforts needed to address this problem.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the supplemental appropriation bill and want to point out the importance of one particular item which provides funding to reopen the 7(a) loan program of the Small Business Administration.

Mr. Speaker, in the past 2 months probably every Member of this House has received letters and telephone calls about the closing of the loan guarantee program operated by the SBA under section 7(a) of the Small Business Act. This program expended its entire budget for the fiscal year on April 27 and has remained closed since that date.

Some have said, and a few continue to say, that there is no credit crunch and that banks will make loans without a Government guarantee to creditworthy borrowers. That simply is not true. Anyone who believes that the SBA loan guarantee program is not critically needed should talk with those small businesses which have sought help under this program.

Even though prospective borrowers were told their applications would be put on hold indefinitely pending passage of a supplemental appropriation, they continue to come. They continue to compile the necessary documentation and put their spending plans on hold.

SBA estimates that it has a backlog of more than \$1.1 billion in loan guarantee requests from 5,000 small businesses. These are viable firms who have nowhere else to turn.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the chairman of the appropriations subcommittee which provides funding for the SBA, Representative NEAL SMITH of Iowa, and the other Members who worked with him to find the funds to reopen this vital program.

This is a jobs program. It creates jobs. It preserves jobs. It will help us with our economic recovery. Based upon a study done in the private sector last year, the 7(a) loan guarantee money provided in this bill will allow the small business sector to provide 33,920 jobs in the first year and a total of 134,400 jobs over the next 4 years.

If other programs were as successful and contributed as much per capita to our economy, we would be reducing the deficit.

I urge support for the conference report.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am speaking on behalf of the rural water and sewage treatment facilities direct loan program. This program targets aid to smaller and poorer communities and helps those communities obtain cleaner water and improved waste disposal systems.

For far too long small rural communities have been placed at a disadvantage when trying to obtain Federal assistance to construct rural water and sewage facilities.

This program will help smaller and poorer communities comply with Federal regulations. Many times these communities find themselves unable to comply with Federal regula-

tions because they can't gain access to affordable financing to take the necessary steps to meet compliance regulations.

Mr. Speaker, this program would create jobs for rural communities, a better environment, and a better quality of life for our rural citizens.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the supplemental conference report and to make a few comments on the defense chapter of that report.

On May 26, the House passed a supplemental bill which included \$1.2 billion in new funds for four programs: The operation in Somalia; enforcing the no-fly zone over southern Iraq; the CHAMPUS Program which provides health care for military personnel and their families; and repair of extensive flood damage at Marine Corps bases in California.

The funds were provided for these essential programs because of the committee's concern that the unanticipated costs of Somalia and enforcing the no-fly zone over Iraq are being paid for by transferring funds from various units. This, of course, has detracted from the readiness of those units.

It should be noted that despite the inclusion of the new funds, the total provided for defense for fiscal year 1993 by the House was \$1 billion below the ceiling for defense contained in the budget resolution for fiscal year 1993.

Senate action on this supplemental basically provided funds for the same purposes as the house but offset these expenses by rescissions.

The conference agreement, in summary, provides funding of \$1.3 billion. Of this total, 75 percent, or almost \$1 billion, is offset through rescissions.

These funds are for the same purposes provided in the House-passed version of the supplemental plus a few additional items including humanitarian aid for the Kurds and extending the availability of defense conversion funds which were about to expire.

The conference agreement includes an increase of \$500 million in transfer authority to assist the Defense Department in addressing its internal fiscal year 1993 reprogramming efforts only.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend support of this supplemental bill.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member appreciates the Senate's provision, included in this conference report, that reverses the very unfortunate decision of the House Appropriations Committee to have \$136 million in rescissions for 14 education programs, including the Cooperative Education Program and the State Student Incentive Grant Program.

This Member earlier attempted to offer an amendment to the House second supplemental bill to restore the \$13,749,000 for the Cooperative Education Program that was rescinded by the House Appropriations Committee, but failed to get unanimous consent to successfully accomplish a cut-and-add transfer of funds within the bill to accomplish this purpose. Therefore, this Member is pleased to see this funding for these essential education programs restored by the conference committee.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. MYERS OF INDIANA

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MYERS of Indiana moves to recommit the conference report on H.R. 2118 to the committee of conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 280, nays 138, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 321]

YEAS—280

Abercrombie	Chapman	Fish
Ackerman	Clayton	Flake
Andrews (ME)	Clement	Foglietta
Andrews (NJ)	Clyburn	Ford (MI)
Andrews (TX)	Coleman	Ford (TN)
Applegate	Collins (IL)	Fowler
Bacchus (FL)	Collins (MI)	Frank (MA)
Baessler	Cooper	Frost
Barca	Coppersmith	Furse
Barcia	Costello	Gejdenson
Barlow	Coyne	Gephardt
Barrett (WI)	Cramer	Geren
Becerra	Darden	Gibbons
Beilenson	de la Garza	Gilchrest
Berman	Deal	Gilman
Bevill	DeFazio	Glickman
Bilbray	DeLauro	Gonzalez
Bilirakis	Dellums	Gordon
Bishop	Derrick	Grandy
Blackwell	Deutsch	Green
Boehlert	Diaz-Balart	Gunderson
Bonior	Dicks	Gutierrez
Borski	Dingell	Hall (OH)
Boucher	Dixon	Hall (TX)
Brewster	Durbin	Hamburg
Brooks	Edwards (TX)	Hamilton
Browder	Emerson	Harman
Brown (CA)	Engel	Hastings
Brown (FL)	English (AZ)	Hayes
Brown (OH)	English (OK)	Hefner
Bryant	Eshoo	Hilliard
Byrne	Evans	Hinchev
Callahan	Farr	Hoagland
Canady	Fazio	Hobson
Cantwell	Fields (LA)	Hochbrueckner
Cardin	Filner	Hoke
Carr	Fingerhut	Holden

Hoyer	Mfume	Schumer
Hughes	Michel	Scott
Hutto	Mineta	Serrano
Inslee	Minge	Sharp
Jacobs	Mink	Shepherd
Jefferson	Mollohan	Sisisky
Johnson (CT)	Montgomery	Skaggs
Johnson (GA)	Moran	Skelton
Johnson (SD)	Morella	Slattery
Johnson, E.B.	Murtha	Slaughter
Johnston	Nadler	Smith (IA)
Kanjorski	Natcher	Smith (NJ)
Kaptur	Neal (NC)	Spratt
Kennedy	Oberstar	Stark
Kennelly	Obey	Stearns
Kildee	Olver	Stokes
Kim	Ortiz	Strickland
Kleczka	Orton	Stupak
Klein	Owens	Sweet
Klink	Pallone	Swift
Kopetski	Parker	Synar
Kreidler	Pastor	Tanner
LaFalce	Payne (NJ)	Tauzin
Lambert	Payne (VA)	Taylor (MS)
Lancaster	Pelosi	Taylor (NC)
Lantos	Peterson (FL)	Tejeda
LaRocco	Pickett	Thompson
Laughlin	Pickle	Thornton
Lazio	Pomeroy	Thurman
Lehman	Poshard	Torkildsen
Levin	Price (NC)	Torres
Lewis (GA)	Pryce (OH)	Torricelli
Lightfoot	Quinn	Towns
Lloyd	Rahall	Traficant
Long	Rangel	Tucker
Lowe	Ravenel	Unsoeld
Maloney	Reed	Valentine
Mann	Regula	Velazquez
Manton	Reynolds	Vento
Margolies-	Richardson	Visclosky
Mezvinsky	Ridge	Volkmer
Markey	Roemer	Vucanovich
Martinez	Rogers	Walsh
Matsui	Ros-Lehtinen	Washington
Mazzoli	Rose	Waters
McCloskey	Rostenkowski	Watt
McCrery	Rowland	Wheat
McCurdy	Roybal-Allard	Whitten
McDade	Rush	Williams
McDermott	Sabo	Wilson
McHale	Sanders	Wise
McKinney	Sangmeister	Woolsey
McNulty	Sarpalius	Wyden
Meehan	Sawyer	Wynn
Meek	Schenk	Yates
Menendez	Schiff	Young (FL)
Meyers	Schroeder	

NAYS—138

Allard	Dreier	Klug
Archer	Duncan	Knollenberg
Armey	Dunn	Kolbe
Bachus (AL)	Everett	Kyl
Baker (CA)	Ewing	Leach
Baker (LA)	Fawell	Levy
Ballenger	Franks (CT)	Lewis (CA)
Barrett (NE)	Franks (NJ)	Lewis (FL)
Bartlett	Galleghy	Linder
Barton	Gallo	Livingston
Bateman	Gekas	Machtley
Bentley	Gillmor	Manzullo
Bereuter	Gingrich	McCandless
Bilely	Goodlatte	McCollum
Boehner	Goodling	McHugh
Bunning	Goss	McInnis
Burton	Grams	McKeon
Buyer	Greenwood	McMillan
Calvert	Hancock	Mica
Camp	Hansen	Miller (FL)
Castle	Hastert	Mollinari
Clinger	Hefley	Moorhead
Coble	Herger	Murphy
Collins (GA)	Hoekstra	Myers
Combest	Horn	Nussle
Condit	Huffington	Oxley
Cox	Hunter	Packard
Crane	Hutchinson	Paxon
Crapo	Hyde	Penny
Cunningham	Inglis	Peterson (MN)
Danner	Inhofe	Petri
DeLay	Istook	Pombo
Dickey	Johnson, Sam	Porter
Dooley	Kasich	Portman
Doolittle	King	Quillen
Dornan	Kingston	Ramstad

Roberts	Shays	Talent
Rohrabacher	Shuster	Thomas (CA)
Roth	Smith (MI)	Thomas (WY)
Roukema	Smith (OR)	Upton
Royce	Smith (TX)	Walker
Santorum	Snowe	Weldon
Saxton	Solomon	Wolf
Schaefer	Spence	Young (AK)
Sensenbrenner	Stump	Zeliff
Shaw	Sundquist	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—16

Blute	Henry	Skeen
Bonilla	Houghton	Stenholm
Clay	Lipinski	Studds
Conyers	Miller (CA)	Waxman
Edwards (CA)	Moakley	
Fields (TX)	Neal (MA)	

□ 1643

Mr. HUNTER and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. HAYES, Mr. HOBSON, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. RIDGE, and Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. Speaker, on roll call 213, I was unavoidably absent from the floor. Had I been here, I would have voted "yes," and I ask unanimous consent that my statement appear in the RECORD right after that vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DEAL). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington? There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BLUTE. Mr. Speaker, I took a leave of absence so that I could bring my wife and son home from the hospital in Massachusetts. As a result, I missed four recorded votes.

Had I been present, I would have voted:

Rollcall No. 318, "Yes."
Rollcall No. 319, "No."
Rollcall No. 320, "No."
Rollcall No. 321, "Yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I was on leave of absence when rollcall votes occurred in the House of Representatives.

Had I been present, I would have cast my votes as noted for the following rollcall votes which occurred during my absence.

Rollcall No. 318, Hunter amendment, H.R. 2519, Commerce, Justice, State Appropriations Act, increasing INS funds by \$60 million, "Aye."

Rollcall No. 319, previous questions, H. Res. 216, rule governing debate for H.R. 2118, "No."

Rollcall No. 320, final passage, H. Res. 216, rule governing debate for H.R. 2118, "No."

Rollcall No. 321, final passage, H.R. 2118, Supplemental Appropriation Act, "No."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, due to a prior commitment in my district, I missed

votes. Had I been here, I would have voted in favor of the Hunter amendment to H.R. 2519 (roll No. 318); against the motion to order previous question on the rule (roll No. 319); against the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2118 (roll No. 320); and against final passage of the supplemental appropriations conference report, H.R. 2118 (roll No. 321).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE THROUGH JULY 13, 1993

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication:

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 1, 1993.

I hereby designate the Honorable RICHARD A. GEPHARDT to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions through July 13, 1993.

THOMAS S. FOLEY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

REFERRAL OF H.R. 1511, AGRICULTURAL TRADE ACT OF 1978 AMENDMENTS, TO COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H.R. 1511) to amend the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 to promote and expand the export of agricultural commodities and products to foreign countries, and for other purposes, be referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

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

There was no objection.

DEMOCRAT-CONTROLLED CONGRESS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE LACK OF JOB CREATION

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, why does this administration continue to complain about the lack of job creation while coming out of a recession?

This Democrat-controlled Congress has passed mandate after mandate, restriction after restriction on business, all of which increase the costs of production. Fringe benefits and training costs are fast approaching 40 percent of labor costs. Add to this training costs for new employees and you get a clear picture.

In the old days when manufacturers were forced to work overtime and to pay time and one half, they began to hire more people, creating new jobs. Then it was more cost effective than paying time and half to their current employees. But with all the new mandates Congress has foisted on business, it is now more cost effective in many instances to pay overtime to the current work force rather than to hire new employees.

Federal mandates have increased year after year, causing the costs of doing business to increase year after year. Now business can make a choice—overtime or new jobs. Actions by this Congress has made it more likely for it to be overtime.

Do not ask why no new jobs. The Democrat Congress is responsible and does not even know it.

□ 1650

THE \$700 MILLION D.C. SPENDING BILL

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

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, last night this House passed another huge spending bill, this time \$700 million for Washington, DC.

Before coming to Congress, I was mayor of a city of 60,000 in California. It is one-tenth the size of Washington, DC. Our budget was less than \$11 million. Washington, DC's 1994 budget is \$3.4 billion; 300 times larger. That's \$46,300 per person in D.C. and only \$200 per person in my hometown in California.

My city has only 24 city staff members. Washington, DC, has 24,000. This is 1,000 times more.

My city, like all other cities in California, receives no Federal subsidy. Yet, our Federal Government gave Washington, DC, \$680 million last year. And last night we approved \$700 million for next year. That is not fair.

While I recognize the unique situation of Washington as our Nation's capital, the Federal Government should be eliminating waste and cutting spending. The American taxpayer cannot afford such huge increases in funding for Washington, DC.

The bottom line is that it's more and more and more spending and there doesn't appear to be any end in sight.

That is why I rose yesterday in strong support of the Walsh amendment. This amendment sought to cut \$17 million. That's only a 2.5-percent cut in the Federal subsidy to D.C. It's only a ½-percent cut in the overall D.C. budget. That's right—only a ½-percent cut. I'm sure D.C. can afford this tiny reduction. I'm very disappointed that the Democrats who control this House rejected this tiny cut.

Every city in my State of California is having to do more with less—less police officers, less jails, and less money to educate our children but they don't get a Federal subsidy.

Washington, DC, doesn't need more money. It already has the highest income tax and property taxes in the Nation. On top of this Congress has poured in billions more. For what? It's time to stop throwing money down the Washington, DC, drain.

It's time for local government to become more responsible and fiscally disciplined.

Let me give you just one example of mismanagement. Every day when I drive to the Capitol, I fear losing a car axle and having an accident because of the grossly deteriorated condition of the Francis Case Bridge along Interstate 395. This is a major traffic and safety hazard. And, it's been like this for years. Washington, DC, says it can't afford to fix the bridge without more Federal money.

Yet they can find the money to totally rebuild roads that they had to dig up only a few months later and re-do them again because they forgot to lay in new gas pipes on Benton Street. Now this is what I call total waste.

What does Washington do with all its money and all its employees? Many services the Federal Government needs, it already pays for itself. Let's look at police protection. The Federal Government provides Capitol Police, Park Police, Secret Service, Federal Protective Services, and Smithsonian Police, all through other budgets.

Washington, DC, claims it needs more Federal money because it can't tax Federal property. But, most cities—including my hometown—have city, country and other public property, as well as church property, they cannot tax. Besides, all Federal buildings are maintained by other moneys.

Congress need look no further than across the street to find ways to start cutting Government waste and bureaucracy. We can start right here in Washington, DC. Instead of asking people in California to pay more taxes thereby taking away Federal support for police, prisons, and badly needed school programs, we should be asking others like Washington, DC, to pay their fair share first.

California pays far more to the Federal Government than it gets in return. Washington, DC, gets far, far more from the Federal Government than it pays. That's unfair. It's time for Washington, DC, to pay for itself.

Mr. Speaker, since the D.C. spending bill was passed by this House and is now over in the other body, I urge my fellow Americans to contact their Senators and demand real, serious cuts in the D.C. budget.

THE MIDWEST FLOOD DISASTER OF 1993

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

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take a few minutes this afternoon to report on my trip to Minnesota and the Midwest yesterday, June 30, 1993.

I traveled, along with four other Members of Congress and Secretary of Agriculture Espy, and visits were made

by Secretary Espy to Wisconsin, Iowa, South Dakota, and Minnesota. What he saw was hundreds of thousands of acres in America, some of the world's most productive farmlands, under water. These are farmlands that could not be planted in 1993, crops that were destroyed in 1993.

The loss in the Middle West is estimated to be at least \$1 billion in crops. In Minnesota alone the loss is estimated to be \$500 million.

□ 1700

There are areas which have been farmed for over 140 years. There are areas which have produced a crop every year. The farmers could get in the field and plant. This is the first year in the memory of some of these families that their farm could not be planted, and, according to their records they have maintained as a family, it is the first year since the sod was broken that the land could not be planted.

This is having a devastating impact on not just farmers, but also the neighboring communities. It is estimated that 10 to 20 percent of the farmers in the southern three tiers of counties in the district that I represent are at risk of losing their farms and will not be farming in 1994. This is not an exaggerated estimate that I received from distraught farmers themselves. These are estimates that come from bankers, county extension agents, and others.

The question is what do we do next? This part of the country is not looking for handouts. What we are looking for is a program, an insurance program that works. We are prepared to pay the cost of doing business in the farming sector, but we do not have a Federal crop insurance program that is effective to deal with this situation. Unfortunately, the program that we have is the only game in town. It is a virtual monopoly.

So in the interim some type of effective disaster assistance is needed. Adjustments in crop insurance are needed. Finally, we need to take the other existing Federal farm programs and tailor them, revise them, so that they meet the type of crisis that we are experiencing.

But this is not something that we need that we can afford to simply view as a 1993 issue. It is something that must be addressed so that we have effective programs to deal with these problems in years to come. A decent part of that is a decent farm price, a price for the products that are grown. We in this country have had what has been characterized as a cheap food policy. We need to move to a policy so that the agricultural sector is paid for the crops and the produce that it provides at a level that covers the cost of providing that produce.

Right now that produce is being produced and sold as if we are operating a discount warehouse, as if our margins

are adequate at 1 percent. When we have \$500 million crop losses, a 1 percent margin simply does not cut it. And that is why we face the prospect of thousands and thousands of farmers being driven from their occupation.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come for the United States to recognize that it has to have fairness in every sector of the economy. Included among that is the agricultural sector which for far too long has been laboring under this so-called cheap food policy, which is now laying us low.

REPRESENTATIVE SKELTON HONORED BY ARMY WAR COLLEGE

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, our colleague Representative IKE SKELTON of Missouri, was recently honored with the presentation of an honorary diploma from the U.S. Army War College at Carlisle Barracks, PA. He is only the 11th civilian, and just the 27th person, to be given this distinction.

The honorary diploma was given because of his "outstanding contributions to the American military, especially in the areas of reorganization and military education." IKE SKELTON is a great American and has worked throughout his career in Congress to maintain a strong national defense. This is a truly deserving tribute and I know all my colleagues join me in offering congratulations.

He was at the college to deliver this year's commencement address, which I also want to share with my colleagues.

THINGS I ALWAYS WANTED TO TELL THE ARMY

(By Ike Skelton)

Friend General Bill Stofft, Mr. Ambassador, distinguished faculty, graduates of 1993, family and friends, after an introduction such as that I can hardly wait to hear what I'm going to say.

This is indeed a thrill for me to be with you to share some moments of thought and words. When first asked to come up here and speak with you today, I thought I had a lot of interesting information to give you; but realizing that I'm the only thing between you and your diploma, my speech will be cut down to two hours.

It is a pleasure to be with you and to be with my friend through the years, General Stofft; I thank him for the kind invitation. He's truly a scholar and soldier. He understands fully the words of the late Sir William Francis Butler who once wrote, "the nation that will insist upon drawing a broad line of demarcation between the fighting man and the thinking man is liable to find its fighting done by fools and its thinking done by cowards." That is not the case in the United States of America.

So this, today, is a significant milestone in your military career and in your life. And I realize that there are a lot of smiles and happy faces with your relatives, your families, and your friends. I congratulate you along with them.

This chapter in your life is now closing and your military career moves on, another phase begins. I especially compliment our

foreign visitors and we hope that this will be a memorable year for you, so that you will not just carry back military education but you will carry back the warmth of friendship that you gained here.

In thinking of topics for today, there are a broad range of issues. I could speak of my role in the Goldwater-Nichols bill, and how it was my initial bill that finally became the law. The Pentagon was a bit upset with me because my initial bill eliminated the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The Armed Services panel on Military Education to which General Stofft referred, which examined all ten of our intermediate and senior war colleges. We can speak of the quagmire of troop intervention in Bosnia. Or, we could speak of my insistence that Ft. Leavenworth, Kansas offer courses in the American-Indian Wars, culminating in last week my joining several of those from Ft. Leavenworth on staff ride to Ft. Phil Kearney, the Fetterman Massacre, Crook's battle the Rosebud, and Custer's disaster at the Little Bighorn. And let me tell you if you ever do a staff walk at Crook's Rosebud Battlefield, I warn you ahead of time, it's a five mile trek—all uphill. We could speak of the Air Force study on airpower, which I served as a panel member, which ended with the conclusion that we should not do away with the United States Army as yet. But I realize that you've had so much of these studies, and these intellectual pursuits. And this being the rare opportunity that it is, I thought I would share with this prestigious audience that will go henceforth to lead the United States Army, and the other services, and other countries, and talk to you about "Things I Always Wanted to Tell the Army!"

Chapter 1.—I was a first year high school Junior ROTC student at Wentworth Military Academy in my hometown of Lexington. Staff sergeant Ryan, who somewhere out there in retirement land must still be living and I hope he hears this from this podium, SSG Ryan thought I was the dumbest map reader he had in the class, with good reason. But here I am, that same, dumbest, map reader in that class addressing the most prestigious army war college in the world. If he were here today, I'd tell him where to place his azimuth.

Chapter 2.—This is a story about Kevin, a young friend of mine who went to school in my hometown, later went off to college, later became a second lieutenant in the United States Marine Corps. I was very proud of him; he stayed in touch with me pretty well. And from time to time would ask my advice, and in my limited way I would give it. He did very well through the years, and he was stationed in Washington in a very prestigious captain's position. As you know that is the same as an O-3 for you from the Navy, if you don't understand.

Young Kevin was also assigned to the White House social detail. One day he called for an appointment and came to my office; he thanked me for my interest in him and then told me that he was leaving the United States Marine Corps. I asked him why and he said that he had run into a president of a major corporation at the White House and he had invited him to join his national corporation. And after talking with Kevin for a while I said, "what would it have taken for you to stay in the Marine Corps for a career?" And he looked right at me and said, "an encouraging word at the right time." That's a heavy lesson, and I hope that those of you who are in positions of leadership will look for those bright, young Kevins in the future, and give them that encouraging word

because we're going to need them to follow in your footsteps.

Chapter 3.—A number of years ago I was invited down to the Maxwell Air Force Base to address the Air War College which I did; and after the address I was invited to speak to a seminar of some 16 members of all services. There was an Army colonel, as well as someone from the Marines, and Navy, and of course most of them were Air Force. I went into the room and I saw at the far corner of the seminar table an Army colonel who obviously thought that this was a real joke to have a member of Congress come down there. And I saw and could read his lips about the snide remarks he was making about my coming to the Air War College. So I said to myself, "I'll fix you buddy." And I gave some opening remarks and I told them that I know that being lieutenant colonels and colonels and their equivalent that they knew all about the Constitution of the United States, the role of Congress, that we were the ones that would vote to declare war, we raised them and maintained them, that we wrote the regulations and rules by which they lived. And I thought, and I said it in my thought, that all of them, of course, knowing all these things would be glad to tell me who their member of Congress was. And I went around the room and not one person of the 16 could tell me who represented them in the United States Congress, especially that Army colonel. We got the names of two senators and one former congressman.

This caused me to think, on so many occasions those of you in the military live in your world and those of us in Congress live in ours. We must do a better job of communicating, you must do a better job of understanding the Constitution of the United States, your role as well as ours. We are not the enemies. We are there to work with you. We are the reflectors of the American public opinion. We hope that in the days and years ahead, and it is my sincere desire, that those of you who make the military your career, will cause those who follow you to understand full well our role, and your role, and how we can work together all the more closely.

Chapter 4.—My wife and I have a soldier, a son, in our family. As a matter of fact, two of our three sons wear uniforms. It was April, 1991, at the Washington, D.C. National Airport and my Susie and I went down to meet our soldier-son who just returned from the desert in Saudi Arabia and Iraq. Some of his friends were there with a big banner that said "Welcome Home Desert Dude," and others were there with balloons, looking forward to seeing him after quite a few months of separation. And when he came up the entrance way from the airplane, the some 150 people standing there waiting for others saw mother and dad go to a young soldier-son, and there was spontaneous applause in the airport for that young man. What a thrill for a soldier to come home and be appreciated.

Then I also spoke, not so long ago, with a young man who was serving during Vietnam in his ROTC unit at a university in our nation. He told me he dare not wear his uniform on the university campus during that era for fear of being abused, cursed, or even spat upon. That, of course, was so very, very, sad. Contrasting those in uniform from one era to the other. But it's not your job to seek, or not your role to seek appreciation. It's your role to do your best to defend your nation and to fulfill your calling. There are days in peace when you're not appreciated, nor will you be appreciated, but you must continue to do your work to defend your na-

tion. Rudyard Kipling said it best in his poem entitled *Tommy*:

Yes, makin' mock o' uniforms that guard
you while you sleep
Is cheaper than them uniforms, an' they're
starvation cheap;
An' hustlin' drunken soldiers when they're
goin' large a bit
Is five times better business than paradin' in
full kit.
Then it's Tommy this, an' Tommy that, and
"Tommy, 'ow's yer soul?"
But it's "Thin red line of 'eroes" when the
drums begin to roll—
The drums begin to roll, my boys, the drums
begin to roll.
O it's "Thin red line of 'eroes" when the
drums begin to roll.

Portrait of a lack of appreciation for those in uniform saddens me.

Chapter 5.—1923. Major George C. Marshall gave an address in Washington to a group of school students of military background. And in that address, MAJ George C. Marshall spoke of the infantry component of the regular Army and how it had increased through the years and decreased through the years with regularity. He spoke about the regular infantry having only 80 men immediately after the Revolutionary War, and how it increased before 1812, decreased, increased for the Civil War, then decreased; the same for the Spanish-American War, and then when the war was over and remember this was 1923. He spoke of 1920; there were 285,000 men in the infantry component, nine months later Congress cut it to 175,000, three months later 150, six months later to a 125,000 men. General Marshall said, "and just by the skin of our teeth we got through this last Congress without a further cut from 75,000." What we have seen through the years is the increase and decrease of our military which I think is one of the saddest chapters of American history. I think that we should do our best. That's our job in Congress, to keep the military at a sufficient level, to keep the bottom from dropping out so that young men and women like you, and those that follow you, can see that there is a bottom line that they can plan their future; that is our challenge. I hope that you, through the years ahead, will not get discouraged, that you through the years will do your best to stay the course, stay with the military. Because the days will come ahead when your expertise, your knowledge, and your leadership will be needed. It was the same George Marshall, who expressed in 1937, "the question of abandoning the possibilities of the next eight or nine years, so far as that pertains to a professional soldier. With the world in its present turmoil, no one can prophesize what the outcome will be. As I made my life occupation that of a soldier, I hesitate to take any decision which might leave me eliminated at the critical moment." My advice for you, in this chapter five, is for you to stay the course. For you, undoubtedly, in the years ahead will be needed.

Chapter 6.—This is an uncertain world in which we live. We don't know what the kaleidoscope of the future will be, we know there's turmoil, conflict throughout the world. Yes, we've won the Cold War, that's over. But there are uncertainties and tremendous pressures ahead. There will be a need for each military generation to pass the torch of freedom on to the next. It is important for you not only to stay the course, but to be prepared and to cause those soldiers, and sailors, and airmen, and marines to do the same.

I was nine years of age, in the fifth grade; my father, the best known orator in Lafay-

ette County, Missouri, a veteran of World War I, was asked to give the Armistice Day speech at the Odessa High School some 12 miles away from Lexington. And he was kind enough to take me out of school and drive me over to Odessa. And I sat in the back of that auditorium with the student body of the Odessa High School. And I remember on the stage there were those dressed in World War uniforms. I remember the beating of the bass drums behind the curtains to simulate artillery. And I remember my father's speech. He spoke about freedom, he spoke about the greatness of our country, and he spoke about those who had defended our interests in the great war of which he was a part. Then he said two things that burned themselves into my memory. The first was that he said that there are those in this student audience who well may have to protect the freedoms of America once again. That was November 11, 1941. Shortly thereafter the Japanese Empire attacked Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, and World War II was upon us. Also during that speech he ended it with a poem that came out of the war in which he served. And it went like this,

"In Flanders fields the poppies blow
Between the crosses, row on row,
That mark our place; and in the sky
The larks, still bravely singing, fly
Scarce heard amid the guns below.

"We are the Dead. Short days ago
We lived, felt dawn, saw sunset glow,
Loved and were loved, and now we die,
In Flanders fields.

"Take up our quarrel with the foe:
To you from failing hands we throw
The torch; be yours to hold it high.
If ye break faith with us who die
We shall not sleep, though poppies grow
In Flanders fields."

Well that poem has kind of lost itself in the years past that era. But those words still should ring true to you, because the torch has been passed to you and your generation of uniformed Americans. It's my hope, it's my prayer that you will be up to the task. So I am convinced that in this troubled and unsettled world you who are uniform today will be challenged to the best that is in you. May God go with you in days ahead. God Bless you.

MISCELLANEOUS SMALL BUSINESS AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1993

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

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Miscellaneous Small Business Amendments Act of 1993. It is not a lengthy bill, but its timely enactment is very critical to the small business programs it amends.

First, it increases the authorization for guarantees to certified development companies which, in turn, provide financing to small businesses for plant and equipment. This is a program which creates jobs. In fact, applicants are not eligible to participate in the program unless job creation or preservation requirements are met.

This program is extremely successful and requests for funding under it have increased substantially in the past several years. It is also a program of which we should be very proud. The subsidy cost of the program is approximately one-half of 1 percent, making this

a very cost-effective initiative which delivers a substantial return on the Government's investment. For each \$1 million in Federal moneys, the program provides \$2 billion in loan guarantees. And, in addition, banks and other lending institutions provide an additional \$2.5 billion in private loans, or a total of \$4.5 billion in financing to the small business community.

Second, this bill facilitates the commencement of the White House Conference on Small Business. Legislation requesting the President to convene such a conference was enacted in October 1990. Unfortunately, the conference remained dormant for more than 2 years. We could, of course, still try to meet the original schedule. But I believe that such a compressed agenda would detract from the high expectations we have for this endeavor. Thus I believe we should reschedule the conference for 1995 and request the President to commence preparations immediately.

Finally, the bill makes several technical amendments to the Small Business Development Center Program to facilitate its continued operation.

Mr. Speaker, I anticipate that the Small Business Committee will move promptly to consider this measure, and I am hopeful that it will be considered by the full House within the next few weeks.

An explanation of the bill follows:

Explanation of Miscellaneous Small Business Amendments Act of 1993

CERTIFIED DEVELOPMENT COMPANY AUTHORIZATION

Section 2 increases the total authorization for loan and debenture guarantees by the Small Business Administration in fiscal year 1993 from \$7.03 billion to \$7.155 billion and within these amounts it increases the authorization for debenture and loan guarantees for certified development companies from \$775 million to \$900 million.

It also increases the total authorization for loan and debenture guarantees by the Small Business Administration in fiscal year 1994 from \$8.083 billion to \$8.458 billion and within these amounts it increases the authorization for debenture and loan guarantees for certified development companies from \$825 million to \$1.2 billion.

WHITE HOUSE SMALL BUSINESS CONFERENCE

Section 3 delays the dates for the White House Conference on Small Business. The State meetings would begin not earlier than November 15, 1994 (instead of not earlier than December 1, 1992), and the national conference would be held between October 1, 1995 and December 31, 1995 (instead of between January 1, 1994 and April 1, 1994).

It also provides that the President shall appoint commissioners to oversee the conference, and that such appointments shall be made after the enactment of this act but not later than 30 days after the date of such enactment.

It also increases the authorization for the conference to \$7 million (now \$5 million).

SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTER PROGRAMS

Section 4(a) authorizes the Small Business Administration to fund Small Business Development Center information sharing systems (i.e., a library of materials) by making grants or cooperative agreements with one or more such centers instead of by issuing a contract after soliciting proposals.

Subsection (b) reduces the authorization for the Small Business Development Center

replication program in Central Europe for 1993 from \$8 million to \$2 million and authorizes a similar amount for each of fiscal years 1994 through 1996.

Subsection (c) strikes a provision of current law which prohibits the Small Business Administration from publishing regulations on the Small Business Development Center Program in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

DEMOCRACY MOVEMENT IN FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF NIGERIA

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

Mr. JEFFERSON. Mr. Speaker, today in the Federal Republic of Nigeria, a democracy movement is taking place that is comparable to the recent celebrated democratization movements in Poland, Germany, and Russia.

But in Nigeria, this sacred and risk-filled process of democratization, involving the destinies of well over 100 million people is being played out in relative obscurity, without graphic CNN reports. Yet the courage of the people of Nigeria is no less obvious than that of the people of Russia or Poland. And the heroism of its democracy leader, one M.K.O. Abiola, is just as inspiring as that of Lech Walesa or Boris Yeltsin.

Mr. Speaker, on June 12, 1993, the people of Nigeria elected Mr. Abiola their president through elections judged fair and free by international observer nations, including Great Britain. Yet his election has been annulled by Nigeria's military dictator.

Mr. Speaker, just as our Nation rallied to Yeltsin and his countrymen as they faced down tanks, let us now give our national commitment to Mr. Abiola and the people of Nigeria as they confront the guns of military rule and seek to take the reins of their Government.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under great duress, I ask unanimous consent that my 1-hour special order be given to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE].

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

There was no objection.

CONTINUED DISCOURSE ON TERM LIMITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] for his time.

This week, Mr. Speaker, we have had the opportunity to talk about term

limitation. It is something that the public wants, it is something that the public needs, it is something that everybody at the town hall meetings knows is a good idea and everyone seems to want but politicians, and that is understandable. We have a tendency to protect our own turf.

So this week we have devoted the week to bringing up some of the points so that we can better enlighten our colleagues and hopefully get something passed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER].

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE] for taking this hour tonight to again bring to the American public the attention that this term limit movement needs.

The very first bill that I filed in the House of Representatives was a bill to bring about this much needed change. My bill would limit the House of Representatives Members to 8 consecutive years and Members of the Senate to 12 consecutive years.

In the congressional district which I represent, 79 percent of the people who voted in November 1992 voted "yes" to the term limits initiative, 8 years for the House, 12 years for the Senate. These numbers are reflected throughout the State of Florida, as voters have said that enough is enough, and that Congress must be reformed.

I am committed, myself, to adhere to the 8-year term limit if my voters choose to keep me here that long, regardless of how it works here in the Congress. But I think limiting terms in the Congress is a step in the right direction to reform this Congress. That was something I was sent here to do, and I hope that the leadership would let this legislation come to the floor.

I would encourage other Members to sign the discharge petition so that we can have a fair debate and a vote on the floor of the House of Representatives on term limits.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman is a freshman. Yet the first bill she introduced was for term limits. Is that because she had so much support at home and there is that much of an outcry for it?

Mrs. FOWLER. It is because I deeply believe in term limits. I instituted a term limit movement when I served on the city council in Florida, in Jacksonville. I supported the Eight is enough movement in the State of Florida. I think it is healthy to have turnover in every elected body, that you need new ideas, new people, and I am an affirmative believer that good people will step forward to run when the opportunity presents itself.

Mr. INHOFE. I think that is good. It certainly says something about your State of Florida, because that is where the very first movement on term limitation came from. I joined the group

down there in 1976, and that was the first time they were even talking about term limitations. Of course, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. McCOLLUM] and others from Florida are very supportive. I think it is very important today that we have at a moment's notice all of these freshmen from all the way across the Nation, from Florida, to Maryland, to California, to New York, and all of them, with the same feeling and the same ideals and the same commitment that they have given to their people back home. I am sure that the gentlewoman as a freshman must have felt that commitment that she felt strong enough to introduce that as her first bill.

Mrs. FOWLER. Well, that is correct. That is why I wanted that to be my first bill. And I am going to continue working on it until we get this to the floor of this House. Because I know that is what the American people want. So I am pleased we have more and more of our Members supporting it, and I think we will succeed eventually.

Mr. INHOFE. I thank the gentlewoman very much.

We will move from the east coast to the west coast and hear from the gentleman from California [Mr. HUFFINGTON].

Mr. HUFFINGTON. Mr. Speaker, it appears there has been a misunderstanding on the part of the Democratic leadership. The American people overwhelmingly want congressional term limits. Even in the State of our distinguished Speaker, 52 percent of the voters chose to limit the number of terms he can serve. Now, don't you think a proposal supported by a majority of Americans deserves at least a fair hearing?

Even though the Democratic leadership will not allow me to vote on a term limits proposal, I am thankful that Californians gave me the opportunity to do so last November. I was one of 21 million Americans in 14 States who voted for term limit initiatives, and do you know how many States passed those measures? All 14. This brings the total number of States with a term limit provision to 15, which means 42 percent—181—of us are restricted in the number of terms we can serve in Congress.

Limiting congressional tenure was an issue that was raised by the delegates at the Constitutional Convention in 1787. Although the Committee of the Whole rejected the measure, an amendment to limit congressional tenure was in fact introduced. You see, the delegates had the foresight to know that politics would change and that citizen politicians would evolve into career politicians.

Our Founding Fathers were not career politicians. George Washington was a surveyor and Thomas Jefferson an architect, two professions for which these men would rather have been re-

membered. I am a businessman and want to remain so. I also want to bring back the concept of citizen legislator.

Those who oppose term limits say they would infringe upon the right of the people to determine who serves, and for how long. I say, when 68 percent—according to a New York Times/CBS News 1991 poll—of Americans want limited terms for Members of Congress, it appears the people have already decided. The opposition also says that term limits would increase the number of Congressmen with little to no experience. Well last year, 72 percent of the new Members elected to this body had prior political experience. That's 79 fresh but experienced legislators.

Mr. Speaker, from 1789 to 1992, 152 term limit proposals were introduced in the U.S. Congress and virtually all were killed in committee. This time let's get serious about reform. Term limits will provide a vehicle for citizen politicians to address the real needs and concerns of the American people.

□ 1710

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. Speaker, I really appreciate that, the gentleman from California. I have got to elaborate on that a little bit.

When you say that, how many do you say bills had been introduced for limitation of terms?

Mr. HUFFINGTON. One hundred fifty-two.

Mr. INHOFE. Let me tell you what happened to those bills. I am not speaking because I am more senior than the ones standing here, but I have seen this happen. There is a cute little trick that this body has done since 1931. They will take a bill that everyone at home wants like yours, 68 percent of the people in this country want term limitations, and then those individuals who want to go home and face those people will become coauthors of that bill. Then they will put it into a committee like the Rules Committee with the understanding that the chairman will not bring it up. And the only way to get it out of that drawer up there is during the regular hours that we are in session and to sign a discharge petition. It takes 218 signatures to sign a discharge petition.

I can remember in 1988, when we had H.R. 321, which was a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. We had 240 coauthors. Yet we could only get 146 signatures. That means there are 100 Members of Congress who wanted their names on the bill but did not want it out to vote.

I happen to have a discharge petition No. 2, which will reform this system. I think it is a corrupt system that has been here for the last 60 years. So I am glad you brought that up.

I would advise you, that is what happens to good legislation that the majority of people in America want. And yet, they wonder, why is it we cannot

enact that into law. With these reforms, we will be able to have term limits.

Mr. HUFFINGTON. I signed the discharge petitions No. 2 and No. 3. I hope we can make those names public someday.

Mr. INHOFE. I thank the gentleman from California very much.

I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER].

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to talk about term limitations without talking about other forms of congressional reform. When you talked about having to reform the discharge petition procedure, I agree with you. I think that is absolutely wonderful. Not only did we sign today the discharge petition that sits right over here in this drawer, but there is also a discharge petition for a constitutional amendment on the balanced budget.

Mr. INHOFE. There are three, as you well know. I am sure you have signed all three of them.

Mr. BUYER. Not until I came to this body did I realize about this discharge petition and the secrecy of the discharge petition. We can go sign this discharge petition, but we cannot disclose who has or has not signed the discharge petition. That process provides cover for Members of this body. They can go back to their districts and they can say to the American people, "I signed the balance budget amendment" or "I signed on to this particular bill, knowing full well that it will never come out of committee".

If they believed in it, if they believed, they could come right over here and sign on to this discharge petition, allowing the will of this body to be served.

Mr. INHOFE. Let me ask you a question. Are you aware of how severe the punishment could be if you disclosed the names to the public?

Mr. BUYER. I would be expelled from the Congress.

Mr. INHOFE. When I tell people that in town hall meetings, they are absolutely outraged. And yet, as well informed as you are, you were not aware of that until you came to Congress.

Mr. BUYER. There are a lot of things I was not aware of till I came here. Having never served in politics before, being one of a few who in the modern age can get up out of their chair at home and walk into the Halls of this Congress, you can call me naive, if you like, but I believe that that House floor right here should be the greatest arena of open debate and exchange of ideas in the world. And now that I have been here, I have to stand, as a U.S. Congressman, and say that this is one of the most undemocratic institutions I have ever seen.

We are going to change it. There are a lot of things that can be done in forms of optimism of reforms, not only for term limitations and campaign finance reform, but also changing the way the Rules Committee operates.

Mr. INHOFE. Let me ask you the same question I asked the gentleman from Florida. You also are a freshman. This is your first term here. You immediately got on the bandwagon for limited terms.

Mr. BUYER. The entire quest for term limitations, there is a cry out there among the American people. They recognize that well over 96 percent of the Congressmen and Congresswomen all across this Nation get re-elected no matter what they do. And when they look at that, they say, "Wait a minute, what is going on? Is there something wrong with the process?"

Then they think, maybe we could have campaign finance reform. That may or may not happen.

They recognize that the Congress does not do well at reforming itself and so when they recognize that Congress is not going to do it, the American people have taken control into their own hands. And that is why you now have 14 to 15 States that, in fact, have enacted term limitations. And that is good. We will do our part. We will try to do what we can here, and it is a complement to the American people that they are doing also their part.

The problem, in closing, is that we have 15 States out there that have enacted term limitations, but like the gentleman here from California, who can now only serve three terms, your State, sir, has now placed itself in jeopardy against other States who have not set term limitations. And when you presently operate under the present seniority system, we have a problem. And until we either change the seniority system or we have the constitutional amendment to set term limitations, we are going to continue to have a problem.

Mr. INHOFE. I appreciate very much the gentleman from Indiana for your contribution to this. And his reference to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUFFINGTON] was interesting, because the gentleman from California [Mr. HUFFINGTON] made a comment as to what this representative system used to be, that there was no necessity for term limitations because those people were out making a living. And I can remember, as recently as a few years ago, when I was first elected to the Oklahoma Legislature, at that time we met every 2 years, just once every 2 years, for no longer than 6 months.

And the thing that stands out in my mind, when I was a very young, impressionable State legislator, is that I would go on January 1, the first week in January, and everyone was so responsible and everybody was sitting around very much concerned about getting things done and getting out. By the time June came along, they would have people blowing smoke at them for so long that they no longer were reflecting the needs of the people at

home. You can be around here enough, talking to lobbyists, talking to think tank people, talking to bureaucrats, that you forget what real people back home are.

Mr. BUYER. It is the rotation that the gentleman from California [Mr. HUFFINGTON] also brought up of California and that you are alluding to, the rotation bringing in the new blood and new spirits but also, as the gentleman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER] referred to. When you bring in that new blood, you bring in new ideas.

The Republican freshmen were able to institute reforms through the rotation of committee chairs. What a radical idea to this place. And that is very good, because not only were people upset about how long someone serves here, but they also say, "Look how someone chairs a particular committee forever." So when you have rotation of the committee chairs, you bring in the new blood of leadership.

□ 1720

This really goes to the heart of how we define Americanism. I believe that is in that spirit of great minds of our initiative and our creativity. That is what will define us as a great society.

When we have that turnover, we bring in the new people and we can better our society.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. BAKER] I want to just share one story with the Members that actually happened. I think it illustrates it very well.

We have so many people in Congress who really are wonderful people, they are honest people, they are intelligent people, but they have not had experience in the real world. They have come straight from the fraternity house to Congress.

I always remember what happened to George McGovern when George McGovern had spent his entire career in Congress, and ran for President a couple of times. Finally he went out and decided he was going to fulfill a lifetime dream and start a hotel. I think it was in Connecticut, wasn't it?

Mr. BAKER of California. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BAKER of California. It was a bed and breakfast.

Mr. INHOFE. Something he had always wanted to do. The first thing that happened was, the EPA came down on him, the IRS came down on him, OSHA came down on him, the regulators came down on him, the health department. Finally he had to throw it into bankruptcy.

His statement, and this is not his exact words, but I will paraphrase it, he said, if I had known how tough it was in the real world, I would have voted differently in the U.S. Senate.

We need to have this rotation that the gentleman speaks of, and get this country back to a representative system.

I am glad to yield to the very eloquent gentleman from California [Mr. BAKER].

Mr. BAKER of California. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma very much. However, he forgot the liability suit from the person who faked a fall in front of his bed and breakfast.

Mr. Speaker, several polls have shown that more than 70 percent of the American people support term limits. If this is so, then why don't we have them?

Because the Democrats who control Congress are ignoring their constituents and prolonging their careers.

In fact, the leadership of this House would never even let it come up for debate. The House leadership is way out of touch and are doing everything they can to remain in Washington for life.

We need to return this Congress to its rightful owners—the American people.

That is exactly what term limits would do. We would have wider variety of citizens coming to Washington to represent their fellow Americans. We would have lawmakers who actually thought about the effects of their laws on the American people.

The Founders of this country meant for the Representatives to return to private life—not to become a separate ruling class.

A government of the people would ensure that legislation is not made in some ivory tower, but by the people and for the people.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the statement of the gentleman from California.

The fact that we have right now participating in this special order almost all freshmen is a message, because I think the gentleman came here with a message. I do not think there is one person who ran for Congress, of all the 110 freshmen who won, most of whom defeated incumbents, which is a rare thing now, but they did it, promising changes.

I am sure this is one promise that the gentleman made, that he would do all he could do to limit the terms of Congress and to get it to a representative system.

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Oklahoma, I did not. I was in the legislature for 12 years, and I did not believe in term limits, because this was a chance for different people to be elected in those districts, but I have never met gerrymandering the way I saw gerrymandering here, and the people that say, just let the folks at home decide, they have the right to keep somebody 100 years if they would like. Well, with the way they draw the lines and the way the computers do it now, and with

these minority districts, a person, once getting in those districts, can literally stay for life.

I have changed my mind, reluctantly, because I think now we have to have fresh faces and fresh blood if we are ever going to balance the budget.

Mr. INHOFE. So the gentleman came to this position?

Mr. BAKER of California. I came to this position reluctantly. I only do that because I believe that 12 years is enough. It will equal out with the Senate, which will have two 6-year terms. As Mr. Rudman, who was the Gramm-Rudman budget balancing costar, said as he left, it is impossible to balance the budget because we do not have enough people who want to.

As long as there are those who do not want to, who want to continue living in debt and squander the American people's money, then we are going to go down the rat hole. We have to get some new faces.

I have changed my mind reluctantly. I am here to support the gentleman, and support term limits. I have signed the discharge petition so we can get this issue out on the floor and debate it, and let the American people be heard.

As the gentleman mentioned, 15 States have brought up term limits. In my State of California it passed by two-thirds vote, enough to amend the Constitution and say, let us get some new blood in Congress. Let us make sure we have some people who want to represent the private sector and the people, and get this budget balanced, and get this horrendous debt off our backs.

Mr. INHOFE. Let me ask the gentleman from California one question before we go to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT].

The gentlewoman from Florida had mentioned that she introduced a bill that was 8 years for the House and 12 years for the Senate. I have seen 6 years and 12 years, and 12 years, and 12 years.

I do not think any of us are married to any particular number of years, at least in my position, as long as the person who is serving in Congress, in the House or the Senate, knows that some day he or she will have to go out and make a living under the laws they pass.

Mr. BAKER of California. That is correct. After the way we have spent money these last 22 years, not balancing the budget, perhaps we should have a 2-year term limit. Let us keep turning the people out until they do it right.

I really believe that this Ross Perot phenomenon that people talk about, the phenomenon of the silent American, is really based on the fact that we are living beyond our means. The American families cannot do it. This debt is burying us. We are adding, each morning that we get up, \$1 billion to

the national debt. This adds up. As one Member who spoke on the floor the other day said, if we take this at 7-percent interest over 30 years, we can triple the amount of debt, so every time we talk about this new necessary program that we want to add, with a \$1 billion increase, we are talking about \$3 billion over 30 years, because we do not have the money, we are just putting it on debt.

I really believe the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE] is right, and I appreciate his leadership in this area.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. Speaker, it reminds me of a speech made by Ronald Reagan in 1965 called "A Rendezvous With Destiny." In this speech he said, "there is nothing closer to immortality on the face of this Earth than a Government agency, once formed." Now the gentleman has seen that in action.

Mr. BAKER of California. I had to come all the way to Washington to see the gridlock, the deadlock, and the dead hand of Government which refuses to reform it. I will be happy to be part of that reform, and if it has to start with term limits, again, I am reluctant to tie the hands of the people and tell them that their sacred Representative could only serve 12 years, but if that is what it takes to balance this budget, I am for it.

I signed the discharge petition so we could get it out here on the floor and debate it before the American people, so they can see both sides of this issue.

Mr. INHOFE. I thank the gentleman. We are very honored to have the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT] here, and I yield to him.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman, it is interesting. Many of those 14 States that voted for term limitations had Representatives that had been here quite a long while. They kept sending them back, but they realized that was not the best thing for this country, so they voted for term limitations, and not to keep sending them back endlessly.

During the campaign, I campaigned very strongly for term limitations. I am one of the relatively few here who has never held a public office before. The vast majority of Americans that were on the ballot in 14 States, and 14 States that carried, they want term limitations.

I would just like for a moment to discuss with the gentleman one of the reasons that those who oppose term limitations use. They say that Government is so complex, that our laws are so complex, that if we do not have legislators who have been here for a long while, if we keep having new legislators because of term limitations, then what we are going to have is a big staff of people, a bureaucracy here, and we do have a lot of bureaucrats here; that

the bureaucracy is going to become more important, and that they are then going to run the institution, rather than the elected Representatives.

I would just like to wonder for a moment if Government really has to be so big and so complex and collect so many taxes and enact so many laws that it could possibly be true that for legislators who have been here for 20, 30 years, we need staff members.

I just think that we need to get our country back to what envisioned by our Fore Fathers. Thomas Jefferson said, "The government which governs best is the government which governs least." Abe Lincoln said it in another, very interesting way, that "Government should only do for its people what they cannot do for themselves."

I would ask the gentleman if he thinks that if we got our Government back, our country back to this dream of our Fore Fathers, that we would not need a big bureaucracy, that we could do with a citizen legislator; that we would not need these career bureaucrats and these career politicians?

Mr. INHOFE. I have often driven by the Old Executive Office Building and reminisced about the fact that all of our Government was once run out of that building. Our population was not that much smaller at that time.

Yes, the answer to the gentleman's question is a very emphatic yes.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Our bureaucracy tends to have two characteristics. One was mentioned by Ronald Reagan, and that is that once established, a bureaucracy tends to have immortality.

There is another characteristic, too, and that is that like a cancer, they just grow forever. I just think that with getting new blood in here, with term limitations, getting new blood in here, that we can turn that around; that we can come back to the kind of a Government envisioned by our Fore Fathers, which was not as pervasive, that was not as invasive, that did not have all of these regulations and laws that are burdensome to our industry and our businesses, and driving jobs overseas.

I just think that new blood with fresh ideas coming in here would help to turn our country around.

Mr. INHOFE. I can remember when the gentleman was kind enough to speak at our House prayer breakfast, and he talked a little bit about his background. I am hoping he can stay for a few minutes. I want to hear from the gentleman from New York, but the gentleman from Maryland has such a unique background that I think maybe we could share that with some of the people around here, some of our colleagues.

□ 1730

Because you bring a perspective, having had no politics in your background, but you have thought things ought to

change. And what else do we hear now around this country by Ross Perot and others who bring that same perspective, and people are interested in that.

So why not hang around for just a minute, I will ask the gentleman from Maryland, and we will get back to you.

We are honored today, of course, to have the chairman of our National Republican Conference Congressional Campaign Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAXON].

Mr. PAXON. Thank you very much, Mr. INHOFE. I want to commend you and all of those who have participated this afternoon and this evening in your special order. I think it was tremendous of you to take time and prepare this order. I wanted to join with you because I am very convinced that there is a tidal wave sweeping across this country, and frankly, it is a tidal wave that is going to engulf the Disney World of the North here in Washington, DC. It is a tidal wave that is built on the outrage of the American people over the abuses of this Congress and this Government over the problems of our debt and deficit that are not being addressed and have not been addressed in this House, certainly, and most of all the business-as-usual approach that has gone on for so long in Washington.

That tidal wave is being manifested by the single-most significant grass-roots movements that has hit this country since the tax revolt of the 1970's and 1980's, and that tidal wave is term limits.

When I came to Congress, much like my friend from California here, Mr. BAKER, who just spoke before me, I did not support term limits. I was convinced that there were less radical ways to accomplish the same goal of real change in Washington, that all we needed to do was sit down, and reasonable people could find reasonable ways to change this place. Unfortunately, after a couple of terms, maybe about 3 years in Washington, I realized that just was not going to happen, that the only way we were going to change this institution, and ultimately bring real change to the Government of the United States, was to enact term limits. So I sponsored those pieces of legislation and believe strongly that a 12-year term limit in the House and the Senate is the right way to go.

My feeling has been reinforced by the folks from my district who have attended countless town meetings. I have held about 40 so far this year, attended by about 2,000 or 3,000 of my constituents, and there is almost universal support at my town meetings for the notion of term limits, that people feel that they want that level of control that they know that the special interests and the perquisites of power will keep maintaining the Congress and the incumbents year after year, decade after decade. And only by limiting the amount of that time that Members can

spend will we see real change and real reform in the House of Representatives and in the U.S. Senate.

Of course, as some have mentioned, the statistics are certainly on our side. During the 1980's, the turnover in the House per election cycle averaged just 13 percent. Yet, in the 1990's, in the beginning of our Nation, turnover averaged some 37 percent. And while we were very pleased to experience a large turnover this last election in 1992, I think that was an aberration, frankly. I think as we look down the road into the end of this century and into the 21st century, unless we have term limits we will not see that type of turnover in the years to come. And we are going to need to make certain that the people have the chance to have turnover in their House of Representatives and give them real opportunity.

So again I want to commend the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE] and my colleagues like Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. McKEON who is here, and Mr. BAKER and others who have been here before for standing up and speaking out on behalf of term limits. I believe in them so strongly, I would say to the gentleman from Oklahoma, that when I was elected to the leadership, to serve as the chairman of the National Republican Congressional Committee, I voluntarily said, and I think I am the first leader of either party to do it, that I would only serve 4 years, that it was a time to have new leadership in our party as well as in the Congress as a whole, and that when people take on a job like chairing the Congressional Campaign Committee that it takes some new energy, and some new ability, some new cycles, and that I was going to after 4 years turn the reins over. And I think that stands as an example, that is more than just words and rhetoric, that it is action speaks louder than words. I hope in my time in Congress, and I do believe in my time in Congress that we will see term limits enacted. Frankly, I think it's in the next few years. The tidal wave is growing and growing and growing, and it is up to us to make certain that this Congress falls in line with the real feelings of the people of this country.

Mr. INHOFE. I thank the gentleman from New York. I would have to observe that I was thinking while you were talking about one of the arguments you hear against term limits is that the staffers would end up running Congress. But you know nothing could be further from the truth, because the first thing you do when you come is you bring your own people, and new ideas, and that is the whole idea of rotation, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER] was talking about.

Mr. PAXON. I would just point out, for example, on my own staff, we brought most of my staffers from the district down here, and it gives people

from the community a chance to come down and help us bring real change to Congress. And frankly, a lot of them have decided that after they get some experience, and they understand the ways of Washington, they want to go back to western New York and get back to the community. They wanted to help bring about some change, but they do not want to stay here and spend a lifetime here.

All too many Members of this Congress want to stay and spend a lifetime. And I do not believe for a moment that the staff will run this place. Like you, I believe that real change will occur, and of course I think if we have our way on the Republican side of the aisle, we will make sure that there are changes, because we want to reduce the amount of staff, and that is one of the basic tenets of House Republicans, to bring down the staffing level in this place, and bring about some quality management reforms here in Congress, reforms just like are instituted in the workplace.

Mr. INHOFE. That is right. And I had the honor last September of participating in a prime time ABC 1-hour talk show with Senator ALAN SIMPSON, and Senator HANK BROWN and one other person debating this same subject. Someone on the other side of the issue said well, you cannot limit terms because it takes someone in Congress 6 or 8 years just to learn the ropes. And I said that is my point. Once they learn the ropes they then become a part of the problem. And that is how you get cute little things like discharge petitions where you cannot publicize the names of the signatures.

Mr. PAXON. I want to mention that it is amazing that we have many candidates coming to Washington interested in running for Congress, and sometimes they say gee, I am a little concerned. Is it going to take me 2, 3, 6 years to understand the process. And I say to them that I think it will take you about 2 to 4 months to understand the process, and then after that you will know what has to be done, and you can fully participate. But there seems to be a misnomer out there. A lot of people are afraid to run for Congress because they do not want to give up their families, they do not want to give up their businesses and their community participation and come to Washington and spend many, many years. And I think it is a misnomer, because many are very effective in the first months and in the first years that they are in this body. We have to break that misunderstanding down and make certain people know that they can walk in this place and make a difference, and term limits will help make certain that happens.

Mr. INHOFE. When I get new interns in my office I give them a little indoctrination speech, sometimes, as to my narrow view. And I say that there are

three kinds of Members, there are those who are on the extreme right side, which is where most of us are, and then there are those on the extreme left, and then the mushy middle. And the goal of the mushy middle is to die in Washington, DC. So whatever they think they can do to stay here the longest, they will do, and they are really not tied to a strong political philosophy that emanates from their district back home.

Mr. PAXON. Again, I want to commend the gentleman for taking this time, and I certainly commend our colleagues who have taken time to be here and participate tonight.

Mr. INHOFE. I thank the gentleman from New York.

About a year and a half ago, in fact 2 years ago right now, I was flying an airplane around the world, and we came back and we did a 2-hour special order. And I did it with the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN]. And I always thought how can you talk for 2 hours about anything, but I found out if you have DORNAN as a partner, that is not a problem at all.

I would like to yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, what a pleasure to be back on the House floor with this distinguished body, this Parliament of ours. What I wanted to add, because I am getting kind of senior around here, is I never planned to spend more than 6 years here. I took note when I got here that President Kennedy had only been here 6 years, that President Nixon had only been 4 years and then he was off to the Senate for less than 2 years before he was chosen Vice President.

Sometimes if you want a career you ought to put your life in the hands of fate and see what God has in store for you. And I do not plan on homesteading, nesting in any one place. Then I came to realize that President Johnson, LBJ, everybody thought he was around here forever and in the Senate. And he was precisely 12 years here, 12 years in the U.S. Senate, and he was off to be Vice President.

So when I got here as a freshman out of our bicentennial 1976 election, I got here without having given a thought to term limits, except that I probably would not stay very long. And when I got here and began to observe, and I will say this slowly so people know that I mean it literally, that the Civil War, or out of deference to my pals south of the Mason-Dixon line, the war between the States was still affecting this body. When I got here our party did not exist in the South. We had outstanding individual stars like our long-time colleague here who went to glory in the Senate, TRENT LOTT of Mississippi.

□ 1740

But that term "yellowdog Democrat" still had a lot of power. They actually

had two parties in the South: the southern Democrats, the larger party; and then a small group of minority Congressmen—I don't mean ethnically, I mean liberal Democrat in the South was a rare breed. We just saw one disappear here in Georgia here in the U.S. Senate in a special election. They were from big cities, like Atlanta.

Then I looked around, I looked at the committee chairmen, and I thought, "Wait a minute, there is no second party of force in the South," Nixon's southern strategy had collapsed because of Watergate—I said, "How are we going to break the seniority system?" A lot of these distinguished southern gentlemen had defended our national security on the Armed Services Committees, so there is nothing personal—I said, "We have got to get, not young blood here, although that is important, but as the gentleman referred to the gentleman in the well who has a couple of months on me in seniority—new blood, that is what one of the gentlemen said, new blood.

Not trying to crank young people of the Woodstock generation; it is people who live life that we are trying to encourage, as President Kennedy said, to get senior people in experience into the Peace Corps. It was not cut out to be just college kids. As a result, Jimmy Carter's mother, long before he was President or Senator, was in the Peace Corps. So I looked at these people and said, "We have to have term limits."

Dan Quayle and I got together, and we put in a bill in 1977 and again every 2 years and in 6 years—not my decision, but being gerrymandered in the 1980 census, I was gone in 1982. So I cranked in my bill without even knowing that it would apply to me personally, the fact that you could come back with all loss of seniority if people in your district or in an adjoining district said, "We want you to go back in 2, 4, 6 years"—I do not care whether they make it a 4-year break or not—"but go back later in your life after you have had one or two more careers, that is fine." Then you have a former Member who could be selected veep, run for President, Vice President, dog catcher, assembly, State senate, you cannot be treated like a felon, that you could never come back. Let me take up something historical here, and then I will turn it back to the young membership here. Here is a book that sits in our little minority leadership office in the corner over there. I suggest every new Member take a shot at going in there and taking a look at this. It is an abbreviated compendium of statistical data on our budget. It is put out in January 1993. So, although it is put out under Clinton administration folks, and these were still the same people that were doing it for President Bush or President Reagan. It simply says "Budget Baselines, Historical Data, Alternatives for the Future." Now, I refer

to a senior Member of this House, a fine gentleman—

Mr. INHOFE. Before the gentleman proceeds, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. The gentleman came up with a good idea, and I think even though it is not germane, I have to announce this: That is that he discovered and initiated and started the grandfathers caucus. Since I am one of those blessed last April, getting two grandchildren, it is great. I say that because in a way it does relate to this. I have noticed that people who have children, or grandchildren, are much more concerned about the future of this country and are much less likely to vote these huge deficits that your grandchildren and my grandchildren are going to have to pay for.

I think that is consistent with our theme here tonight.

Mr. DORNAN. Well, national CBS "Evening News" here got religion recently a few months ago when Dan Rather then, and now Dan Rather and Connie Chung, started running these revolving, like a one-armed bandit in Las Vegas, the Government debt figures, trillions and trillions, \$4.4 trillion, then they will stop and say, "And each man, woman, and child in the United States, their personal debt is \$16,747," which was the last time I saw it a month ago. It is over \$17,000 now.

But let me close by pointing out that JAMIE WHITTEN, our distinguished colleague from Mississippi, former chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, came here in a special election right before Pearl Harbor. We have discussed this many times. He is still with us. So that is 52 years. He is here. He could have come back maybe seven times and still have some good sabbaticals in between those terms to pick up several Ph.D.'s when he came here—and these are in constant current dollars, fiscal year 1987—we took in \$6.5 billion in receipts, and because of Bundles for Britain and other things, we outlaid \$9.5 billion, and we had a deficit of less than \$3 billion. That was the entire Federal budget when he got here. He has watched this thing through what Senator Dirksen used to call, "A billion here, a billion there, and pretty soon that is real money," then come into the trillions.

We simply have to start rolling this place over for new blood.

I recommend everybody take a look at this book.

Mr. INHOFE. I feel compelled to make an observation. When the gentleman talks about those large figures, he talks about people who have been here for a long time, people who are not out earning a living in the system that we have, this overregulated system, they honestly believe in their own hearts that Government can run things better than the private sector. You know, it is really interesting when we look around the world today and see

what is happening with Lech Walesa, Vaclav Havel, and Carlos Salinas, all over they are using us as the example of less government and greater empowerment of the people. What are we doing at the same time? We are turning into what they have discarded as a failed system.

I would like at this time to yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKEON].

Mr. MCKEON. I appreciate that. While you all were talking, it reminded me of a lot of things. When we talk about new people and new blood, it brought back a lot of memories because a little over a year ago I was happily engaged in my business with my brothers at home, a good family, good surroundings, really enjoying life. Much like many others who decided to come here, I was upset with the things that were happening in Washington and made the run for Congress in a new district in California.

One of the things, after winning, I came back here to meet our new colleagues, and one of the things I was really concerned about was would I be involved with a bunch of political hacks. We had a meeting of the new freshman class, and men like ROSCOE BARTLETT, TIM HUTCHINSON, and others, I was really impressed with the caliber of people. We sat around in a room down the street in a hotel, and we talked about what it was that motivated us, that had driven us to do this. ROSCOE was 66 years old, first time in public office. He was the oldest of 48 new Republican freshmen. RICHARD POMBO from California, 31 years old, the youngest. We have a wide variety, a wide range of people. We have three women in our class; TILLIE FOWLER from Florida, who had been on the city council; DEBORAH PRYCE from Ohio, who had been a judge; JENNIFER DUNN from Washington, clear across the country, had served as a State committee chairperson. There was a wide variety, wide interests in life, wide degree of backgrounds. I had never served in a legislature. I had been on a school board and then city council, but all of those different people came with one thing in common, and that was reform with an idea to come here and make a change. One of those changes that was most important to us was term limits.

Now, I have met people who have been here a long time, and I have a lot of respect for them. One of the problems with term limits is we would lose some of those people. But there are a lot more people out there who would do well if they had the chance to come here. I think if we go back to what our forebearers had in mind when they founded this country and we all came here at a sacrifice to our lives back home, and served a period of time, and do our best, I think we can be effective and accomplish things.

I think you send capable people here—the idea that your staff would

run it, well, if that is the kind of people you send here, you are making a mistake. I think you send people here who are capable of running a staff, running an office. This is much like setting up a business. A person with a good business background knows what to do and can come here and make a change.

□ 1750

Then I think after living here and working and passing some laws, then we should go back and live under those laws that we passed and give somebody else an opportunity, because they will have a different idea. They will look at things a little bit differently.

I see some of these people who have been here a number of years. I do not question their integrity, their ability, their desire. It is just that they look at things a little bit differently.

We who are new have come fresh out of sitting around and talking to our neighbors. We have a different view of life of where the country should be than people who have been here in the Beltway for a long time.

In my campaign, I talked about the disease that happens to you as you cross that bridge out there and come across the Beltway. You lose common sense that seems to be out there in life.

I appreciate the opportunity of being associated with the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE], for the work that he is doing in this area. I have talked about the gentleman from Oklahoma back in my district. I told them that the gentleman from Oklahoma is a hero here, that he is a champion, and of the work that he is doing to overcome hypocrisy with his discharge petition effort.

I think this is a tremendous thing, and I want to thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. INHOFE. Let me ask the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKEON] a question.

First of all, we are so fortunate to have the gentleman serving here, someone with the gentleman's business background, someone who has done so well in the private sector and knows how tough it is to meet a payroll. We need a lot more of that in government and we would have a lot less government harassment and government control of our lives, so we are certainly the beneficiaries of the gentleman's service here.

Let me ask the gentleman a question, though. With the gentleman's broad background, was the gentleman aware before he came to Congress of the problems of the rules that regulate a discharge petition. Did the gentleman know anything about that before he came here?

Mr. MCKEON. I did not know anything about the Congress when I came here. It has been a great education.

But I think as the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAXON] mentioned be-

fore, in 3 or 4 months you can learn. You can learn a lot. I have learned about the discharge petition. I did not know how the Rules Committee ran things. I did not know how the committee process worked, but I have learned that, and I have only been here 6 months.

Mr. INHOFE. Was the gentleman aware that they would bundle up 25 or 30 totally unrelated things and put them in the same bill so that if you vote for one, you vote for all of them. You cannot pull them out with a closed rule. Was the gentleman aware of that?

Mr. MCKEON. That one I knew a little bit about, because I was a strong proponent of the line-item veto. I think you need to be able to look at things one item at a time.

Mr. INHOFE. We could do a lot of reforming with people like the gentleman from California participating in the system.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from my neighboring State of Arkansas. I feel an affinity toward him. One of my daughters teaches at the University of Arkansas, and they, are in the gentleman's district, so the gentleman is her Congressman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON].

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding to me.

I felt to come over and say a word when I saw the special order on term limitations. I want to commend the gentleman for organizing this special order.

I want to say a little bit about the Arkansas experience on term limitations. We just passed this 6-year term limit in the most recent election. I had some background in that in 8 years in the Arkansas Legislature serving under then-Governor Bill Clinton, who is now our President.

I think the term limitation movement is an indication of the great resentment and cynicism people feel toward their government.

I like what my good friend and neighbor, the gentleman from southwest Missouri [Mr. HANCOCK] said when one of his constituents came up and said that Congress ought to be limited to two terms, one in Congress and one in prison. I think that is certainly an extreme position, but it is indicative of the way so many people feel about this institution and the cause behind this swell for term limitations.

In 1985, my first term in the Arkansas Legislature, I introduced a term limitation bill that would have applied to the executive offices in Arkansas. We do not even limit our Governor to a 4-year term. We have no limitations to how long a Governor can serve. It never got out of committee.

In 1991, there were a whole group of us that introduced a term limitation

amendment that would have applied to all the State legislature, as well as our constitutional offices. Once again it never was able to get out of committee.

The same kind of institutional resistance that we are seeing in this Congress has been seen in State legislatures all over the country.

I told the State agencies committee in the Arkansas Legislature that if they refused to submit to the people a constitutional amendment limiting our terms, then sure enough the people of Arkansas would go out on a petition drive and they would put it on the ballot themselves. That is what they did, and they put one far more restrictive than that which we introduced in the Arkansas Legislature.

It is truly a movement of the people.

Mr. INHOFE. It is not just confined, you can look at the executive branch, there was a time in this country when we did not have term limits for the President of the United States, and those same arguments were used against it. Remember, FDR was there all the way through the war, and yet it has turned out now everyone has agreed this is a much better system.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Absolutely, and I am sure this has been addressed. One of the arguments against term limitations is that you are going to have the bureaucracy running the Government.

I attended a Southern Conference of State Legislators a few years ago that had a special seminar on term limits. I think I was the only advocate in the whole room, but the panel asked the question, "How many of you here oppose term limitations?"

Virtually every hand went up. Over 50 percent of the people in that room were from the bureaucratic part of government. They were from State agencies. It is not the bureaucrats who want to see term limitations as if it were going to benefit them. They like things the way they are.

Mr. INHOFE. And so do the lobbyists.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. It is very comfortable, and it is that comfort level that is one of the big problems in the U.S. Congress and in government in general, and term limitations will not only bring in new blood, it will bring in new ideas. We need some of that discomfort.

Mr. INHOFE. There is something I wanted to visit with you about in Arkansas, but first, I am afraid we might be running short of time here. I want to hear from someone who is not a freshman, but who is in his second term, the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE], and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I appreciate that the gentleman is sponsoring this special order on term limits. I think it is an issue that a lot of people in this country are very, very interested in.

Like other speakers before, I have not always supported term limits, although years ago in our State senate I did actually introduce a constitutional amendment to bring those about, and finally a few years later in the 1990 that did come about.

Coming to the House I think has reinforced my earlier belief that while term limits are not a panacea and are not necessarily going to be the complete cure to our problems, I think they are a part of the solution.

I guess the thing is, time and time again I am just reminded watching the proceedings in the House, and what I am about to say is a generalization. I do not mean to upset any of our Members here, but the generalization I see is that generally speaking the greater activity with good ideas and so forth is coming from the newer Members in the House.

Now, the irony of all this is that that is the complete antithesis of the way the seniority system works, so that by the time someone gets to be a ranking member or a chairman, they have been so co-opted into the system, more often than not, and there are notable exceptions; but more often than not, they are so worn down they become acculturated, shall we say, to membership in the club that they are not able to operate with the same efficacy and enthusiasm that they originally would have had when coming here.

I think it is interesting to note that the events in the last several years seem to be driven more by the newer Members.

Now, obviously, term limits is not going to replace completely the seniority system, but it is going to promote more of a turnover as Members reach the end of their terms in this proposal, 12 years, and then move on to something else and create those opportunities for people to move ahead.

I do not know as a practical matter how you would make your newly elected Members, say the chairman or the ranking members; yes, it is true they do not have the experience of having been in the legislative body and the familiarity necessarily with the way the process works completely or the issues and the way they have been addressed, but they do have something that I think is very valuable to this country. They have an understanding of the pulse, the heartbeat of America.

What we are most hurting from today is that we seem to be an institution that is unwilling, some would say incapable, I do not believe incapable, but unwilling to respond to the needs of the American people.

We have just elected a President, elected with a campaign theme that was very popular, but he appears to be unwilling now to implement it.

So the frustration levels of Americans across this country are rising dramatically.

I think these term limits are necessary. They are a part of the solution. If we do not have other changes, we are not going to see the improvement that we need, but they are part of the mix.

I think it is clear that most Americans want to give them a try. We sure see that everywhere they appear on a State ballot. I think we have at least 14 States, maybe more now, that have enacted some version of term limits for themselves.

□ 1800

And when it gets to the House of Representatives, I think, in order to make this work properly, so that some States that do not have it are trying to maximize their advantages under the seniority system, I think this needs to apply throughout the whole country.

Mr. INHOFE. The gentleman used a word, and I wanted to make sure that it did not slip by us, and that is "club."

As my colleagues know, the people at home refer to the Good Ol' Boys Club, the ones who have been here for a long time, the ones who do not want change, the ones who can participate in things like signing on as a coauthor of a bill and not signing the discharge petition, using all these things, these little tricks that we have around here, to not really vote the wishes of the people who sent them here in the first place, and the Good Ol' Boys Club has been referred to in my townhall meetings. They talk about that, and I think it is a refreshing change when you get people here who really want to limit the terms, to open it up, to rotate and have new blood coming in so that we would kill or close the club permanently.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Well, the gentleman mentioned tricks, and the gentleman knows the tricks are used so commonly around here. I think many of our colleagues actually believe them, like, for example, this discussion on how many billions of dollars we are going to save in, as my colleagues know, reducing the deficit.

Mr. INHOFE. What they call spending cuts which are not spending cuts at all.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. That is exactly right. I mean there are no spending cuts except perhaps in defense, and then, of course, the money is being transferred for massive new social programs.

Mr. INHOFE. We were supposed to have on the agenda and never got around to it his National Service Corps Program, just as an example. Here we are talking about this program that they passed over in the Senate, the largest single tax-and-spend increase in the history of America. It passed by one vote. That means each Senator who voted for it is responsible for it, and then they come dancing in here with such things as health care reform, which is not even covered. They do not even know what kind of funding levels

they are going to be looking at or what the sources of funding are going to be. The National Service Program by their own figures, they talk about, the President talks about, \$7.4 billion over a 4-year period with no indication about where that money is going to come from.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Well, if I told my son I had to cut his allowance for whatever reason, he would understand that he would be getting less the next month than he got this month, but in Washington, if we use the term "cut" in the way they use it, he could anticipate a 7-, 8-, 9-, 10-, 11-percent increase. That would be a cut in their parlance.

Mr. Speaker, the people read the newspapers, they hear all this rhetoric that is incorporated about the deficit and how many hundreds of billions we are going to be saving with our new 5-year plan, and the reality is they are spending billions more. I think in the next 5 years under President Clinton's plan we are going to add \$1.7 trillion, I believe, to the cumulative national debt. I hardly think that is a cut.

Mr. INHOFE. I think the Speaker of this House made the statement the other day that at the end of that period of time the increase in spending would be 45 percent. That is not a cut. That is an increase of 45 percent.

As the gentleman said, the only thing that is cut is our defense. We are going to be down below where we were in 1980 when we could not get spare parts for our military vehicles.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. And if the gentleman would continue to yield, and I am just about done, only inside the beltway in Washington do we deceive ourselves. I do not think we deceive ourselves, the gentlemen speaking here, but these people here in Congress deceive themselves about thinking they are getting away with this because the people out beyond the beltway are seeing past these tricks finally. They are done with it. They do not believe their Representatives anymore.

That is a sad commentary. They just do not believe them, and why should they, because for the most part they are not believable. They have lost their credibility, and that is why we see the tremendous level of cynicism, and indeed I might say anger, that is continuing to rise out there as people are just saying, "Enough is enough."

Well, maybe what we need is part of the mix then; in fact, not maybe. We do need, I believe, the term limits that the gentleman has called a special order to discuss. We are just going to have to have some turnover and hope that we can help move the cause of real change and reform along by changing some of the people here.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] and yield right now to another gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE], for yielding to me, and I would like to engage in a colloquy with my friend from Rockland by asking him specifically about this allowance situation with his son.

So, if you give your son \$5 a week, and the next year he asks you for \$7 a week, and you give him only \$6 a week, based on the mentality here in Washington, Mr. Speaker, that would be considered a cut in the allowance.

Am I correct in understanding it?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. That is a very good analogy. That would be a cut.

Mr. DREIER. I do not have a 14-year-old son. I do not have one at all. But I think I figured it out, and I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE] for having yielded to me.

Mr. INHOFE. One last statement, Mr. Speaker.

I think the way we started off, we talked about this country being in a lot better position and a lot better shape if the Members of Congress around this country knew that someday they would have to go out and make a living under the laws that they had passed.

THE 1993 FULL EMPLOYMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BLACKWELL] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BLACKWELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the leading citizens of Philadelphia, a scholar, a writer and an extraordinary thinker, is Mr. Samuel L. Evans. Mr. Evans has written and published a document that he refers to as, "The Second Phase of Democracy, An American Manifesto."

This profound and visionary work by Mr. Evans is a summary and revision of a book by the same name which he published in 1976, and it offers a thought provoking approach to resolving the economic problems of this Nation, particularly as they relate to unemployment.

It is my intent today to share with our colleagues in the Congress and the American people some of the pearls of wisdom contained within the pages of Mr. Evans' work. In addition, I intend to describe legislation that I will introduce which is, in part, an adaptation of some of the Samuel Evans proposals.

While the book was written nearly two decades ago, its focus on the economy and emphasis on job creation is amazingly timely. Some 9 million Americans are out of work. Another 6 million are underemployed, working at jobs which are either part-time or do not pay them what they are worth.

These are not just numbers. These are people. These are fathers forced to stand in unemployment lines, broken and bent because they have no health insurance. These are mothers, who must face the fear of high infant mortality rates in this nation of plenty. These are whole families, hungry and homeless, standing in the soup lines, sleeping on the

grates and in the subway stations of America. These are the victims of 12 years of policies which saw much of the wealth of this country shifted from most of the people to a few of the people.

Mr. Speaker, despite the bleak employment picture we face, it is interesting to note how labor is utilized.

An article which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer on March 18, 1993, is quite revealing. The article, titled, "As Jobless Wait, U.S. Factories Choose Overtime Instead," was written by a reporter with the Associated Press. The article begins by stating that, "Nearly nine million Americans can't find work. But many of those who still have jobs are putting in the most overtime since the government started keeping records in the 1950's. 'Factory workers are averaging 4.2 hours of overtime a week', the Bureau of Labor Statistics says. That means that more than one-tenth of all work done in the Nation's factories is being performed on overtime." Those are amazing facts and figures. The reporter, Mike Feinsilber, further noted, "If we could go back to the amount of overtime worked in 1982, we would create 3 million new jobs without increasing the federal deficit", said John Zalusky, an economist at the AFL-CIO." He also said, "Many workers were putting in extra hours for extra pay against their wishes." In essence, while the unemployment rate has remained stagnant for more than two years, those who have jobs are doing work which could be done by others. Worse yet, apparently many are unwillingly doing work that could be done by others.

UNEMPLOYMENT IN PHILADELPHIA

In the city I represent, Philadelphia, PA, the ravages of unemployment are deeply felt. In 1992, the unemployment rate, which like most other jurisdictions has also been stagnant, increased by almost 1 percentage point to 7.3 percent. Philadelphia last year had a 14.6-percent rise in the number of unemployed—from 156,500 to 179,400, compared to the State of Pennsylvania's increase in unemployment of 10 percent.

According to the Pennsylvania Business Survey, published by Penn State University's College of Business Administration, 7,900 building-related jobs were lost last year in Philadelphia. There are fewer construction jobs now than there have been over the last decade. Industrial power sales, which can be used to measure factory production, fell 2.8 percent last year. Jobs in industrial machinery and electronic equipment in Philadelphia declined by 4,500. Another 13,500 jobs in service producing establishments in Philadelphia were eliminated in 1992, leaving the lowest level of such jobs in the past 5 years. Job losses in Philadelphia had the second sharpest decline of nonfarm jobs among the 15 metropolitan areas in Pennsylvania.

In sum, Mr. Speaker, the people of Philadelphia have little tolerance for those who argue that we should do nothing about the economy, that we should let economic matters take care of themselves. Those who make that argument have jobs. They don't have to be concerned with whether they will be able to make the next mortgage payment or the next rental payment. They are certain about their next meal. They have health care coverage. Those

who argue that we should do nothing are among the few who benefited from the shift in wealth over the past 12 years.

The fact of the matter is that while the economy has experienced some growth, job growth has been totally inadequate. Indeed, job growth has been lacking altogether. And, if job growth is poor now, think of what we can expect if the growth in the economy does not continue. The Washington Post reported today that, last month, new home sales, the leading index of economic indicators, took its largest fall in 13 years. If times are better, I would hate to see bad times for America's workers. The unemployment rate for many States is far above the national average, and we expect more massive layoffs in 1993 like those we experienced in 1992. Indeed, more than 200,000 layoffs have already been announced by some of America's corporate giants this year, and more are expected. And, once again, the unemployment rate was unchanged during the month of May.

UNEMPLOYMENT IN AMERICA

On the national level, the unemployment and job loss picture is as bleak as that of Philadelphia. While unemployment dipped to 6.9 percent in May, over the past 2 years, unemployment has stayed around 7 percent, almost 2 percentage points higher than it was in 1990 when the recession began. Most of the new jobs have been part-time jobs only. More and more business firms are moving toward hiring temporary employees, seeking to avoid the burden of paying for benefits.

Since the beginning of the recession, we have recovered fewer than half of the jobs we lost. Long-term unemployment is a serious problem. One out of every five unemployed workers have been out of work for 6 months or more. Nearly half a billion construction jobs have been lost nationally since 1990. And, nearly 400,000 manufacturing jobs have been lost. The parade of layoffs in the first quarter this year have been devastating, with firms like Sears, Boeing, IBM, and McDouglas announcing thousands of job cuts. And, more firms have indicated similar plans. Reductions in defense spending and base closures add to the problem. While Philadelphia has largely been spared by proposed base closures, California, Virginia, and other States face massive job losses. The airline industry has been rocked by losses, and many of those airlines that have not gone under either have implemented plans or are considering significant cost-cutting measures, which typically means job cuts.

AN ECONOMIC RECOVERY PLAN AND NO RECOVERY

On February 17, 1993, President Clinton outlined his proposal for a comprehensive economic recovery program before a joint session of Congress. The President's plan had as a central feature putting people back to work at livable wages. The goal of the plan was to provide a higher standard of living for all Americans.

Under the plan, 8 million new jobs were supposed to be created. Incomes for working Americans were supposed to increase.

As part of the President's plan, there was an immediate stimulus program to spark the economy and bring some relief to the nine million unemployed Americans. The President wanted \$30 billion for the stimulus program,

however, the House, on March 19, 1993, passed the stimulus package by voting \$16.3 billion as an emergency supplemental bill, H.R. 1335. But, the Senate, on April 21, 1993, killed the package, with a fiercely partisan Republican filibuster, finally deleting all of the funds except the \$4 billion needed to pay for extension of unemployment insurance benefits. While the tax portions of the President's recovery plan remain in one form or another in versions passed by the House and Senate, the temporary, incremental investment tax credit is not included in the fiscal year 1994 budget reconciliation bill, H.R. 2264. Thus, the jobs expected from a vigorous increase in business development, as a result of the incremental investment tax credit can no longer be counted on. Different versions of a reconciliation bill have now passed the House and the Senate, and a conference will take place some time after the July 4th recess. Like the plan offered by Mr. Samuel L. Evans, the President's plan was built in large part around the need for job development and creation. The President pledged that no working parent will be forced to watch his or her family live in poverty, stand in soup lines and sleep on park benches. If a person has a job, the President said, there will be no reason to be hungry nor homeless. And, Congress has met the President's goal of deficit reduction by legislating some one-half trillion in spending cuts over the next 5 years. With deficit reduction, we are told that we can expect a drop in interest rates, a rise in consumer confidence and renewed economic activity. We are told that businesses will be able to afford loans to expand, working Americans will be able to afford to buy homes again, consumers will be able to afford cars and students will be able to afford college.

Yet, despite all of the good features of the President's Plan, despite the hope that it has generated, and despite its emphasis on jobs, the fact is that the plan, with all of its parts in place, still assumed continued unemployment in the range of six percent. Millions of Americans will remain out of work, without income, without health care, unable to afford decent shelter and without hope.

THE SAMUEL L. EVANS PLAN

The fundamental assumption of the Samuel L. Evans plan, under "The Second Phase of Democracy," is that all who want to work and can work, will work.

Mr. Speaker, so that I do not risk misquoting or misstating the essence of the Evans plan, I will insert into the RECORD his recently published "American Manifesto" in full. This 26-page document, as I have indicated, serves as the inspiration for the full employment legislation I plan to introduce.

THE SECOND PHASE OF DEMOCRACY—AN AMERICAN MANIFESTO

(By Samuel L. Evans)

Democracy manifesto.—The Greatest ever devised for the governing of people.—

The Second phase of democracy and democracy is one and the same.—

Thus, the goal and objective of the second phase is to bring the American democracy to the frontier of technocracy.—

The second phase, without dismantling any parts of its constitutional structure.—

For the main objective of the manifesto is to purify, remove false erosions and to retool

the basic structure to meet the needs of an automated technological society.

INTRODUCTION

Many forces affect the job outlook for American workers, ranging from changing life styles to international competition. But, one stands out above all: Automation and technological change, heralded by the accelerating impact of the computer in all of its manifestations.

All occupations in the world of work are affected, of course, but the impact is heaviest on the wage and salary workers closely associated with the production process, whether it be in the goods producing or service producing sectors of the economy.

What is in store for us, then, in the years ahead?

That picture has been drawn for us in all its detail by the U.S. Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics. Government estimates for the job outlook in almost 500 specific occupations make the impact of changing technology very clear right across the board: agriculture, fuel and power, transportation, communications, manufacturing, construction/demolition, finance and services.

Economists in search of answers to this contagious virus, that decreases demands for goods and services, agree that building and repairing the nations' infrastructure, bridges, highways, dams, affordable homes, is a band-aid solution which simply delays a major depression.

A clear cut example is represented by the almost five-million blue collar workers, again at all skill levels, ranging from the precision skilled electronic equipment assembler to the machine tool cutting operator to the hand grinder and polisher, all of whom work with metals and plastic to produce many, if not most, of the industrial goods in our society. Of the 41 specific occupations involved, more than half are projected to decline in employment and just about all the rest will show relatively weak growth, well below the national average, in every case, the major force at work is the impact of technological change.

A major point to make in this connection is that a significant amount of unemployment already has occurred in many of these fields and these projections are scheduled to take place on top of these developments. A good case in point is the communications industry where every one of the nine occupations listed by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in telephone, telegraph and related work is projected to experience major downturns in employment to the year 2005 ranging as high as a 60 percent cut. These very occupations already have and are experiencing significant "downsizing" as rewired installations, satellites, fiber optics, etc., etc., have diminished job opportunities.

The basic reason for this Manifesto is to establish new signposts and a code of ethics in the workplace and a new pattern of life among the people. Because of the need for continuous mass education and apprenticeships for present and future generations, it is essential that the Manifesto be written, spoken and explained on the level of the thinking and understanding of a child.

Simplicity is the guiding symbol of this Manifesto, free from intellectual charade and void of pretense. Unrecognizable because of its smallness and limitation in documentation and yet so powerful a Manifesto that it will equalize the American economy, create unity and understanding in the workplace, community, schools, homes and serve as an ideological pattern for other nations,

to replicate; thereby replacing political gimmicks of foreign aide, such as the Marshall Plan and others, to win friends.

The Manifesto, at its simplest, is to make two jobs out of one job thereby doubling the number of job slots and provide a job for every person able and willing to work.

To achieve this, Congress shall enact laws prohibiting an employee from working over 3½ hours out of every 24 hours or not more than 17½ hours out of each week.

Hidden in the crevice of this Manifesto, like the nucleus of the atom, is the explosive requirement of paying the worker for 7 hours for 3½ hours work. This payment shall be known as technocracy dividends.

The Manifesto seeks to purify and maintain all that is required in a true democracy. It identifies and recommends plans for dismantling all activities contrary to: The Declaration of Independence, Constitutional Laws and The Bill of Rights.

Beyond its goals and objectives in the workplace, the Manifesto touches the sensitive nerves of The Peer Review Systems of Scientists and Research Scholars: Sports and Athletics (amateur and professional); Mathematics, Science, Creative and Performing Arts, with increased emphasis on the Sacred Arts—with the hope that, by our being and living, all shall feel safe in our presence—Domestic and Foreign.

THE PROBLEM

The most persistent problem confronting democratic institutions is the fulfillment of human rights. Unemployment, welfare, poverty and a low level of human existence are deadly enemies to a democratic form of government. Poor people, hungry people, uneducated people and angry people, are the major suppliers of fuel that germinates foreign ideologies contrary to our constitutional form of government.

No one can deny that despite the military and ideology competition between the great powers to win the minds of the world's inhabitants, the Cold War and intrigue, nevertheless left a legacy of freedom from colonialism—in 1961, sixty-four nations were under colonial rule. In 1993, only eighteen were under colonial rule. Therefore, in 32 years, 46 nations were freed and of the 18 nations remaining, 10 are under the United Kingdom, 4 under the United States, and one each under France, New Zealand, Spain and Portugal. All of this was realized even at times of threats of Nuclear War on the Planet.

For over 200 years, the United States of America, under each Administration, has struggled in many ways to alleviate the problems of unemployment, poverty and the fulfillment of its Constitutional promises to its people. Beyond the enactment of laws for the achievement of human rights and justice for all people, the federal government's expenditure of funds, with a false concept of eliminating poverty, hunger and illiteracy has reached a terminal stage—10 million people unemployed, public education has reached a crisis—school dropouts over 42%—Drugs, crime and destructive behavior patterns of young Americans are the answer to the Nation's failure to pursue a quality education and equal opportunity in making democracy a reality.

It is inconceivable that mankind, despite considerable knowledge, scientific know-how and skills, does not understand the basic significance of the underlying global factors that threaten the democratic process of government, foreign and domestic.

In the year of 1993, we offer to the President of the United States, the Congress and

the People of the World, a simple plan, a mechanism, to rid the nation of unemployment, welfare, poverty, ignorance and divisiveness among its people. We call on the United States of America to move to the front line of leadership in promoting the implementation of the concept of this Manifesto to the people of the World who are living under many flags.

If the democratic nations of the world are to survive, the United States must double its efforts by orderly transfer of funds used for foreign aid and from other sources to aid and encourage people and nations to propagate and participate in the implementation of this Manifesto.

THE AMERICAN ECONOMY/FACT AND FIGURES

(The following information was derived from the United States Department of Commerce, Labor Force Statistics Division; United States Department of Health and Human Services, Social Security Administration; Bureau of Public Debt; and The Free Library of Philadelphia.)

As of July 30, 1992, the United States had a total indebtedness of \$4 trillion.

The population of the United States totals 248,709,873.

Divide the population into the total indebtedness.

The result is what each American—adult and child—would be responsible for paying, \$16,083.

The total amount of people employed in 1991 in nonagricultural jobs was: 108,310,000.

The total number employed in 1991 in agricultural jobs was 3,233,000.

The unemployment rate in 1991 totaled 8,426,000.

However, it has been estimated that the 1992 unemployment was 10,000,000.

In 1959, the total number of employed farmers and agricultural workers was 5,490,000.

The total number of farmers employed as of the first quarter of 1992 was 2,630,000.

Therefore, the total number of jobs farmers and agricultural workers lost from 1959 to 1992 is 2,860,000.

Where did these jobs go?

You guessed it! The machines.

As of 1991, the average American's pay was approximately: \$20,000 per year.

If 10,000,000 people are unemployed at an average annual salary of \$20,000 then 10,000,000 \$20,000 would equal a withdrawal from the consumer market of \$200,000,000,000.

UNITED STATES SOCIAL WELFARE ECONOMY

The total amount of money spent in 1991 on social welfare programs:

Public assistance: \$22,900,000,000.

Unemployment compensation—10.2 million people: \$25,148,000,000.

Social welfare benefits—41 million people: \$268,000,000,000.

Grand total: \$316,048,000,000.

UNITED STATES SOCIAL WELFARE ECONOMY

For the past two decades, the American economy has been slipping deeper into a recession leading towards a depression; suffering from over-production and under consumption: the basic causes for the Great Depression of 1929. Therefore, any decrease in the social welfare funds will add to the withdrawal from the consumer market and increase recession.

Further, when one speaks of jobs, turning America around, and taking Americans off relief rolls, one needs only to look at the above documented evidence and find that the stability of America's present economy is

based on social welfare. If the total social entitlement were to be withdrawn or if all the recipients on social welfare would strike today and refuse to accept the money, a panic would occur on Wall Street and in the stock markets around the world.

Many candidates running for public office place great emphasis on jobs-jobs-jobs for every American. However, the above figures regarding the number of farmers and agricultural workers indicate a reduction of 2,860,000 jobs. This means The Industrialized Machine Age has taken over the jobs, leaving the farmers and agricultural workers destitute and, in some cases, homeless. The profits from these machines are lining the pockets of the vastly growing number of millionaires and billionaires who have harnessed the nation's wealth. This group represents less than seven percent of the American population.

Surely, this is a violation of all laws of economics: the social science concerned chiefly with description and analysis of production, distribution and consumption of goods and services. An acceptable economy means the management of household or private affairs, especially expenses; a thrifty and efficient use of material resources. To achieve a successful goal, no better yardstick has been designed in millions of years on planet Earth to measure the equal distribution of life-preserving needs in a time of scarcity than "rations". An equal share to each is determined by the number involved and supply available.

At this juncture, let me say that the machine and its technological mechanism is "God's gift to humanity and living things". Today, there is no workplace in America for human slaves. The machine has lifted the burden off the oxen, mules, horses and human beings.

Nevertheless, we find the oxen on the table of the masters with large segments of humans in bread lines, on unemployment, in poverty, homeless and uneducated. This is attributable to the attitude that advanced technology, and the gains received, are considered to be the private property of the wealthy and powerful instead of benefits to be equally shared by all those who helped make advanced technology possible through their tax money; support of the education of scientists and scholars; financial aid to schools, colleges and universities; and maintenance of the American educational system in general.

In fact, all financial gain from advanced technology should be more equally distributed to each American as a dividend. Every machine invented to replace the service of human brains should be recognized as a slave, releasing humans for their continued education in advanced mathematics and science. This could totally eliminate and remove, as much as possible, the burden of human labor in the workplace.

Indeed, the educated opinion of many frontier economists polled indicates a belief that the American economy today can be equated with Herbert Hoover's 1928 campaign slogan, "A chicken in every pot; a car in every garage." Hoover's election failed to prime the economic pump. Thus, the country went into a depression with the numbers of the unemployed reaching 13½ million people.

When you look and study the social entitlement figures in this document, you will observe the lesson to be learned by everyone in this country. Americans who believe in justice, human rights and equality should make greater demands for their share of profit from the machines which are now and will be the major job holders.

Therefore, the greatest battle working Americans will be called on to win is the acquisition of equal gain from the machine. That victory can be used to usher in a new day and a new employees' society to be known as the Second Phase of Democracy.

Too often in the past, those who could have helped, stood by as uninterested observers of actions that crated divisiveness among the races; they tolerated scarcity. Instead, they could have helped develop and support programs that could elevate the economic and educational standards of the total society.

SIMPLE ECONOMICS/JOB RATIONS— TECHNOCRACY DIVIDEND

Since humans first appeared on Planet Earth millions of years ago wearing animal skins and making grunting sounds, no formula has been devised to take the place of rationing in times of scarcity—whether a shortage of water or food in time of famine. We have noted elsewhere in this document that across the board the major force at work in unemployment is the impact of technological change.

Indeed, it is internationally accepted that the basic tools of the economy are supply and demand, goods and services, then in simple terms, there can be no demands with an empty pocket:

Producers need consumers.
Consumers need producers.

The longevity and success of each depends on the other.

We live in an expanding universe . . . to keep pace with the great leaps of automation. "The Second Phase of Democracy—An American Manifesto" sets new guidelines and rules for the quality of life in the workplace now and for the future.

STEP 1.—RATION THE JOBS

The President of the United States shall work with Congress to establish laws prohibiting any person from working more than 3½ hours out of every 24 hours.

This means job slots will be doubled by requiring two workers to fill the job formerly held by one; thereby creating a job for every American able and willing to work.

STEP 2.—3½ HOURS WORK FOR 7 HOURS PAY

Congress shall include the following within the Act: The establishment of a Commission for administering the Act which will be known as the United States Employment and Dividend Commission.

The enforcement of the concept of 3½ hours will double the need for transportation, employees, facilities, fuel and power.

Congress shall include in the Act the requirement that the Commission shall pay an additional 3½ hours' pay to all employed workers. This amount would be equivalent to the salary being received from the employer. The additional pay to the employees shall be known as the The Employees Technocracy Dividend.

This means employees receive 7 hours pay for 3½ hours work. This should provide them with the time to achieve an education of high school level or higher. Note: Technocracy Dividends would be paid to employees through employers unless Congress or the Commission decides otherwise.

STEP 3.—SOURCE OF FUNDS

The funds for Technocracy Dividend payments to employees shall come from the following:

The total funds from social welfare entitlement, with the exception of social security, shall be transferred to the U.S. Employment and Dividend Commission. The social welfare

system shall be gradually phased out and dismantled as the number of people receiving gainful employment increases.

The Commission shall formulate plans to tax any and all machinery based on their production capacity and the number of employees replaced. This would accumulate the amount of funds needed from year to year to subsidize the Act.

STEP 4.—CONTINUED EMPLOYMENT AND EDUCATION

The Commission shall call a conference together with national, state and city officials and educators who represent public, parochial and private schools, together with businesses, colleges and universities. The purpose of the conference would be to establish plans for continuing education and apprenticeships for all workers.

This means setting up plans for continuing apprenticeships within the broad spectrum of business. All workers within the Dividend Plan will be required to complete a high school education or higher with the goal of providing the nation with a totally literate society within three decades. The emphasis would be on advancing greater knowledge in mathematics and the sciences.

The Manifesto requires an ongoing apprenticeship of hands-on learning, thereby resulting in a total dismantling of the welfare system through the orderly transfer—through education and training—to gainful employment within 3-5 years.

This means educational institutions shall benefit financially from vast expansion:

Enrollment of paying students.
Increased need for additional teachers and instructors.

Advancement of the building trade through construction of additional classroom facilities.

STEP 5.—ORGANIZED LABOR AND EMPLOYEE/ EMPLOYER RIGHTS

It is to be noted that it is not the intention of this Manifesto to address every minute question that may arrive about employers and employees. Absenteeism and tardiness would be handled according to the labor and management agreement. For it must be understood that the reduction of the hours in the workday does not change the procedures and agreements established between labor and management with the exception of those written in the Manifesto.

In establishing the Act, Congress shall mandate that nothing in the Plan shall prohibit the legal and Constitutional rights of organized labor or employers to carry out their duties and responsibilities now and in the future.

This means Union membership will be doubled and increased benefits will be received through technocracy dividends.

The enactment of laws and guidelines shall be established to form a lasting partnership in the workplace between organized labor and the employer. For they are the Pillars upon which the economic, social, educational standards and the equality of life must rest.

Congress shall enact laws limiting vacation, sick leave and holidays to one half of that previously received by employees. There should be no reduction in pensions, social security, health and/or death benefits, if any.

The need for law enforcement personnel, firefighters and employees in all parts of government, with the exception of executives, could also be doubled. As mass education becomes available, the vacant slots would be filled.

STEP 6.—DRUGS AND CRIME

Since the drug crisis is closely connected to the stability of the country, the workplace, supply and demand, it is essential that it be listed in this Manifesto for immediate action.

The President of the United States, with the cooperation of Congress shall declare war on the planting, growing, processing and trafficking of drugs in the western hemisphere. They shall declare those illegal actions as attacks on the United States government and its people.

The President of the United States shall call a conference of all nations within the western hemisphere and outline the determination of the United States to protect the health and safety of its people from the trafficking of drugs into the United States. Drugs are a greater harm to Americans than any of the previous wars in which the United States has been engaged. Therefore it is equally important to declare war on the drug peddlers who invade our country.

Further, the distribution of so-called "clean" needles to drug addicts is equal to giving them a gun to shoot themselves. The Act also calls for the establishment of institutional space and professional care for the cure of all afflicted drug users. The chance to live again is the cry of every addict. Indeed, a strong and firm Act is essential for the protection of the workplace, employees, communities and the nation.

STEP 7.—HEALTH CARE AND PREVENTIVE MEASURES

The advancement of nuclear weapons as an instrument of war has sent former scientists back to the blackboard to devise new instruments to equalize weapons of destruction. Therefore, today, germ warfare represents an equal threat to life on planet earth. The United States of America has not as yet formulated an acceptable plan to protect the American citizen from infectious diseases. If the United States was rated on a scale from zero to ten for prevention against the spread of infectious diseases, the United States would be rated zero among the other industrialized nations.

All of this raises grave questions because they involve the employee and the workplace. Consequently, they are not separate entities. For the health and security of the people represents the totality of the problem: the economy, unemployment, supply and demand.

Therein the signposts have been established, the problem identified and conclusions made that a preventive health plan is paramount within an acceptable medical care proposal to assure security of life and full health care from the cradle to the grave.

Therefore, the President shall establish a National Commission for the purpose of devising a National Health Plan available to and within the reach of every American.

Institute a mass frontier research for the prevention and cure of AIDS and other infectious diseases:

Since the spreading of infectious germs can be used by foreign enemies as a weapon of war, it is important that the United States establish methods of control to prevent catastrophic deaths resulting from contagious diseases: Isolation, annual health checkups, citizen health identification cards—all should be the subject of discussion and possible use.

This document is intended for the creation of an American nationwide movement by individuals and groups whose desire is to dedicate themselves to contributing their time and efforts to bringing the employees technological rights to the frontier of shorter

hours and double pay in the workplace. Then, the extra hours would be used for continued education.

EMPLOYEE BENEFITS

First, the Manifesto reduces and limits the working hours of an Employee to 3½ hours out of every 24 hours. The employee gets paid for 7 hours.

Second, the Employee has 20½ hours out of every 24 hours to participate in other activities, economic and educational advancement.

1. The Manifesto encourages a return to school to obtain professional or higher education; requiring at least a high school diploma.

2. The Manifesto encourages and permits self-employment under the plan; limits only to family participation.

3. The Manifesto encourages advanced teaching and participation in the performing and creative arts, painting sculpture, theater, ballet and music.

4. The Manifesto encourages participation in sports and athletics.

The main point to be emphasized here is that the Manifesto for the first time gives to employees time to learn and participate in across the board activities to enable them to equally climb the economic ladder and meet the requirements of a technological society.

It must again be stated clearly that employee participation in business ventures is limited only to family participation. This will play a major role in building wholesome family units and, at the same time, contribute to the expansion of the American Free Enterprise System.

EMPLOYER BENEFITS

First, the Manifesto reduces the average work day from 8 hours to 7 hours which means that the employer will pay for 1 less hour per day for the same amount of work.

For example:

1 hour per day.

108,000,000 job slots.

Average rate of \$15.00 per hour.

108,000,000 \$15.00 = \$1,620,000,000.

5 days per week = \$8,100,000,000.

Per Month = \$32,400,000,000.

Per Year = \$388,800,000,000.

Total Amount Saved by Employers in one Year.

Second, it is estimated that employees working 8 hours per day would use: 30 minutes of non-productive time going to restrooms, smoking, coffee breaks, etc.

Per day: 108,000,000 \$7.50 = \$810,000,000.

Per week = \$4,050,000,000.

Per month = \$16,200,000,000.

Per year = \$194,400,000,000.

Total amount saved by employers in one year of reduced and nonproductive hours: \$583,200,000,000.

Employers will have two persons working 7 hours instead of one, which should result in greater consistency and production.

Recent research reflects that an employee working seven to eight hours per day will use 30 minutes in non-productive activities such as coffee breaks, restrooms, smoking, etc. It is estimated that non-productive costs could be reduced by 70%.

Employers will also benefit by disbanding all fringe benefits with the exception of Health benefits, sick leave and Vacation for one employee will be reduced.

Prohibiting an employee from working over three and one-half hours out of every twenty-four hour period doubles the economy in travel, parking, fuel and power and general service.

It will take five to seven years to retrain, through apprenticeships and education, to

fully implement the Manifesto Plan. However, there is a large segment of City, State and Government workers that can be implemented in one to three years in such positions as: Sanitation Workers, Police Officers, Firemen, Transportation Workers, etc.

BENEFITS TO AMERICA—SUPPLY AND DEMAND/ SIMPLE ECONOMICS

The Manifesto requirement for two employees working 3½ hours per day each, in the same position but different times, would stimulate the economy by doubling the transportation and all other related areas.

The Manifesto brings together employers, organized labor, consumers, news and communication agencies under one umbrella where they serve as Pillars upon which the goals and objectives of the Manifesto must rest.

The Manifesto will abolish unemployment and provide gainful employment (a job) for all persons willing and able to work while largely increasing the income tax paying citizens.

The Manifesto goals and objectives will greatly eliminate poor people, hungry people, uneducated people and angry people.

The Manifesto gives to America an ideology that could be passed on to the nations of the world . . . a democratic way of life that could be won through the demonstration of our American pattern of being and living . . . through the spreading of democracy rather than the barrel of a gun.

The Manifesto would provide an opportunity for widening the circle for a greater participation of individuals and groups of Americans—as owners in business and commerce—the nuts and bolts of our free enterprise system.

The Manifesto propels America to the forefront as a world leader in making democracy a reality through the equal distribution of the goods, services and rewards made impossible through automation and industrial advancements.

SPORTS AND ATHLETICS/PLAYERS AND MANAGEMENT—THE UNSETTLED QUESTIONS/AMATEUR OR PROFESSIONAL

For many decades the AAU (Amateur Athletic Union of the United States) has laid down guidelines which separate and define:

A professional as one who performs for the love of the sport without compensation.

An amateur is one who performs for the love of the sport without compensation.

In the pure and idealistic definition of the term, an amateur is one who engages in sports merely for the enjoyment received from them and never capitalizes on athletic skills to any degree whatsoever. A professional is defined as one who makes a business for compensation of something that others do for pleasure.

AMATEUR SPORTS

In recent years, producers of college and university football and basketball athletics have created a vast commercial enterprise which brings in billions of dollars annually, yet still enforces the amateur rule against the player/performers.

These young people, sent by their parents for an education, immediately find themselves engaged in sports. This prevents them from achieving a first class education and at the same time they receive no compensation or financial gain for the performance of their talent in athletics.

Enforcement of such rules as the use of a person's time, labor and talent without compensation and under veiled threats of being dismissed from college for failing grades, raises legal questions as to a violation of the

13th Amendment prohibiting involuntary servitude.

Therefore, colleges and universities are producers whose promotion, through the sale of tickets, the hiring, at exorbitant cost, of professional coaches and managers, has all the trappings of a commercial business enterprise. With athletes as performers denied financial compensation and steered largely away from the academic direction for which educational institutions were founded and students enrolled—this constitutes false pretenses.

Yet educational institutions continue to prescribe rigid academic standards while at the same time pulling students out of classes to pursue commercial institutional athletic activities.

Indeed, it is an accepted fact that the various organizations established to govern amateur athletics are operating under rules, regulations and definitions that began thousands of years ago and today are just as outdated as chariots, beasts of burden, yoke of oxen or the horse and buggy at 3 miles an hour.

To attempt to apply and enforce an amateur rule on a free citizen while others are receiving compensation and benefits for their services is like garbing slavery in illusionary academic robes of pomp and splendor.

In the Purification of Democracy under this Manifesto, all charades shall be identified, exposed and dismantled, so that many may be enlightened by the mighty Woman with the Torch. Then the nation shall be strong. It must be, for together we stand.

Therefore, under this Manifesto, Congress shall enact laws requiring that colleges and universities who sell tickets to the general public and advertisements to the media industries, must declare as professionals the athletes who perform in league competition.

Such college and university athletes shall have the right to negotiate financial contracts on the same basis as other professionals.

Further, colleges and universities shall be obligated to carry out their educational responsibilities; thereby giving athletes equal access to all areas and fields of academia targeted for graduation by including academic tutors and instructors as an integral and essential part of the athletic team, either at home or away. The curriculum will be worked out by the colleges and universities.

PROFESSIONAL SPORTS

To prevent a monopoly of ownership in professional organized league sports such as football, baseball, basketball, etc., Congress shall enact laws requiring all organized sports to become stock-holding companies; thereby prohibiting any individual, family or related interest from owning more than 49 percent of a team. The remainder of the stock would be publicly owned.

Today, in many instances, the major sports constitute a monopoly and violate the Civil Rights statutes of equal opportunity for employment in positions such as managers, coaches, policy making and other front office positions. Selection of players should remain by proven ability only and the needs of the team. Making the Major Big League sport teams largely stock companies open to the general public would indeed create great interest in the sports and remove the conflict which now exists between team owners, players and special interest groups.

A major goal of this Manifesto is to Purify Democracy in its Second Phase by instituting and laying a principle foundation for safety and happiness.

For as we retool for the Second Phase of Democracy, each American will be better served in meeting their needs by dismantling the concepts of getting ahead of others and instituting a partnership for getting ahead with others.

Armed with such a concept, the ideology of the Manifesto could be passed on and shared by the nations of the world, as to what we mean by democracy by our being and living.

THE FREEDOM OF SCIENTIFIC INQUIRY VS. THE PEER REVIEW SYSTEM

It is a fact that the work of some of our greatest scientists and researchers has been limited by the Peer Review System and those who control funding. For years, it has been not what the scientist or researcher wanted to study. It has normally been what the people controlling the purse strings want to finance for study.

This Manifesto will bring Democracy to the Frontier within its various categories, leading towards purification. Therefore, it is hereby requested that Congress shall enact laws to make it a federal crime for a person or persons to withhold scientific knowledge and discoveries for personal gain that pertain to human development and security or to hinder through conspiracy, either verbal or written, unless such persons present facts to the contrary.

Under the Act, scientists shall have the right, if employed by another, to share equally in their findings, if such finding or discovery is distributed to individuals or the general public at a financial cost and gain.

Also, it shall be illegal and a federal crime to withhold or prevent any substance, subject or instrument, from commercial development or gain which is proven to be helpful or an advance beneficial to society.

Under the Act, it shall be a crime to continue expenditure of taxpayers funds for social, scientific, educational, economic, research and otherwise, or projects with long past records of long term failures and no accepted evaluation of success and no evidence or yardstick to prove that the project will work.

Finally, unless funds, knowledge and economic opportunities are equally distributed on all areas and levels, our democratic form of government will become a cesspool of the have and have nots. A Two Class Society—The Knowledgeable and the Unknownledgeable—The Rich and the Poor.

Indeed, all of this gives factual data and reason for dismantling the erosions of our democratic process and moving into The Second Phase of Democracy.

Because in The Second Phase of Democracy, to successfully implement the Goals and Objectives of the Manifesto, the governments backed by mass population must lean heavily on the Frontier Scholars of Science and Mathematics to maintain the continuous scientific research discoveries and inventions. To achieve this, the Scientist must be free to pursue the quest of the unknown without hindrance, fear or reprisals.

MATHEMATICS, SCIENCE, CREATIVE AND PERFORMING ARTS—THE PATHWAY TO DISCOVERY

Since the goals and objectives of this Manifesto are based largely on: Technocracy, the Machines and the Workplace, thereby elevating humans to a greater search for knowledge, it is essential that a larger segment of the population be engaged in the advancement of: Mathematics, Science, Creative and Performing Arts. For each represents the Pathway to Creativity, Inventions and Discovery.

America, in its First Phase of Democracy, evolved as a Super Power built on an escalat-

ing spiral of creating and maintaining the worlds greatest Army and Stockpile of nuclear weapons of war equal to destroying life on Planet Earth.

This Manifesto, The Second Phase of Democracy will unleash a Renaissance of the Arts and Humanities which will bring America to the forefront of world leadership through the arts rather than the barrel of a gun.

To achieve this end, it is hereby requested that Congress shall enact laws requiring that 25% of all City, State and Federal funds for education shall be earmarked for the advancement of mathematics, Sciences, Creative and Performing Arts. Included within the Act shall be laws mandating that all City, State and Federal Buildings be required to use funds for the installation of arts within such buildings and their surroundings. This will also include colleges, universities and any such buildings using taxpayers money.

Further, that the teaching of mathematics, sciences, creative and performing arts shall become integrated and recognized as a separate profession. The standards for the teaching profession shall be upgraded and salaries greatly increased to encourage excellence.

The Act shall require establishment of a Multidisciplinary Commission for the purpose of implementation, supervision and enforcement of the Arts in every segment of American society; cities, states, homes and communities. All of this can become a reality in The Second Phase of Democracy, An American Manifesto.

Indeed, if America is ever to become a world center and leader in the creative and performing arts, we will need to create and establish a haven where great artists the world over may seek to live, study and be free to fulfill their creative desires and financial needs. Religious leaders of all faiths should be interested in establishing in America a World Center for Creating the Sacred Arts. For Sacred Art has always had something of the highest to say to the living and to the deathbed of humankind.

EMPLOYERS, EMPLOYEES, CONSUMERS, COMMUNICATORS—THE PILLARS OF ECONOMY/SUPPLY AND DEMAND

To maintain and equalize the rewards from production and distribution and to realize a successful Supply and Demand Economy, the following groups must serve collectively as the Pillars upon which the goals and objectives of the Manifesto must rest:

Employers.
Organized Labor/Employees.
Consumers.

Journalists/News Media with all Constitutional Freedoms.

In order to maintain confidence and trust between each of the components and the general public and to avoid destructive attitudes, under the Act each will be required to establish a basic Code of Ethics. For the highest ideals of any profession are contained in its Code of Ethics. In the Medical and Legal professions, ethics are so highly developed and so clearly outlined that violations may cause a physician or lawyer to lose his/her practice.

Although journalism has come a long way toward developing high standards, as a whole, the profession has not yet developed the means for enforcing these standards or taking any action against members of the profession who violate them. Under this Act, journalists, employers, organized labor and consumers shall be required to create standards comparable to the Hippocratic Oath.

However, nothing in this Act shall abridge the Freedom of the Press, the Rights of Organized Labor, the Employer and Employee or Consumer.

We cannot repeat too often that Advanced Technocracy and its Mechanisms are God's Gift to Humanity and the Beasts of Burden and only through the partnership of the above component Pillars—Employers, Organized Labor/Employees, Consumers, News Media—can the multitude of benefits be realized. For the failure to implement the Manifesto, the machines will surely become a Frankenstein. For a consumer with an empty pocket cannot create a demand.

America is a humanological Garden, a Noah's Ark—and we must demonstrate to the world that our Constitutional way of life is the greatest instrument ever devised for the governing of a Nation, its People and Living Things.

TO DISSOLVE THE ECONOMIC CRISIS GOVERNMENT INSTITUTED

In putting this Manifesto to bed, I am indeed relieved to know that finding a substitute for it to equalize Supply and Demand is difficult, if not impossible.

We know now that, from the fright of unemployment and depression, many employers and employees will be driven back to the drawing board to seek what they think are the answers . . . they will toy with such words as "Job Sharing", "Reduction in Hours". But all will fail for the lack of the congressional laws required by The Manifesto, The Second Phase of Democracy.

A major point to make in this connection is that a significant amount of unemployment—10 million across the board—makes it a government responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, as you will note from his work, Mr. Evans seeks to stretch our minds to new dimensions. To some, his ideas may not be palatable. To others they may seem extreme or even dangerous. To those who have reaped the benefits of 12 years of wealth shifting, they will appear intolerable. It is my hope that, like any other ideas, we will take them, digest them, dissect them, discuss and debate them, sort them out in the marketplace of ideas and make use of those that help the human condition. It is the ability to say what one believes that makes America great.

THE BLACKWELL FULL EMPLOYMENT ACT

Soon, I will introduce the 1993 Full Employment Act. This act will have several provisions. First, the act will set as a goal for all Americans full employment by the year 1997. That provision will build on the Humphrey—Hawkins Full Employment Act of 1978, and pushes the institutions of America toward job creation. In order to accomplish this, as a practical matter, the act will provide for an emergency jobs program, not unlike the emergency jobs program Congress passed in 1983.

Second, the act will prohibit any one individual from working more than a certain number of hours during any 5-day work week. It is my view that the dysfunctional family, marked by division, divorce, drugs, and teen violence, is caused, in great measure, by parents who are forced to work and have little time to devote to themselves and their children. This provision will promote the family.

Third, the act will increase the minimum wage to an amount which will ensure that every working parent is above the poverty level. Regular and automatic adjustments will be provided for so that the minimum wage keeps pace with cost and price increases.

Fourth, the act will provide certain investment and tax incentives to those business firms that hire new employees, add new jobs, provide ongoing education and training to their employees, provide child care arrangements, undertake research, and establish certain types of health care plans for their employees.

Fifth, the act will encourage those who are currently on entitlement programs to seek employment, by providing for a higher income and making reasonable and affordable child care available.

THE NEED AND IMPORTANCE OF AN EMERGENCY JOBS PROGRAM

Federally created jobs are worthwhile. Not only do they ease the unemployment situation, but they also provide workers with marketable skills. Some experts believe that providing employment tax credits for employers is better than providing public service jobs because workers get jobs that offer them more readily transferable skills. They also argue that no new Government programs need to be created and, thus, no new administrative entities would be needed.

In the postwar period, Congress created, in 1962, the first effort to create publicly funded jobs as a way to combat rising unemployment. The Public Works Acceleration Act of 1962 targeted areas that had experienced substantial unemployment for at least 9 of the preceding 12 months. In 1971, Congress passed the Public Employment Program [PEP], which was authorized by the Emergency Employment Act of 1971. That program expended \$2.5 billion for antirecessionary public service employment. The Emergency Jobs and Unemployment Assistance Act of 1974 amended the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act [CETA], adding about \$15 billion over a 7-year period. This program created many jobs in a short period of time. Subsequently, Congress enacted the Local Public Works Capital Development and Investment Act of 1976 and the Public Works Employment Act of 1977. The Economic Development Administration allocated funds to States from a \$6 billion appropriation, based upon their unemployment levels and rates.

The most recent Federal job creation measure, however, was the Emergency Jobs Appropriations Act of 1983. That act provided roughly \$9 billion to 77 programs, administered by 18 Federal departments and agencies. In sum, we have had considerable experience with federally funded job creation programs. Some of the programs have met their goals, others have not. I believe the experience we have, however, provides a solid foundation upon which we can build and create an effective emergency jobs program.

We have also had some experience with a tax credit, aimed at promoting private sector job growth. In 1977, Congress enacted the new job tax credit, a subsidy program intended to increase employment among all workers. Firms were given credits against income tax liabilities for job growth above a specified threshold. Again, this experience provides a solid foundation upon which we can build in creating a tax credit program that works for all concerned.

THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM—THE NEED FOR REFORM

In addition to the Full Employment Act that I plan to introduce, I am also exploring the

possibility of introducing legislation to reform our central bank, the Federal Reserve System. No program to boost our economy and create jobs can be effective without the cooperation and support of the Federal Reserve System. Lower interest rates are critical to higher employment, higher production, and sustained economic growth. Indeed, President Clinton has made clear that a continued policy of low interest rates is essential to his plan for economic recovery, much of which has been embraced by the Congress.

The Federal Reserve System, operating through statutory authority as well as tradition, has evolved into the most powerful of the financial agencies of the United States. Consequently, its policies and actions have a significant impact on financial matters throughout the world. This unmatched power is due, in part, to the fact that the Federal Reserve System is probably the most independent of all central banks. Because of this independence, the economic health of all Americans and of most citizens in the world community is affected by the monetary policy of the Federal Reserve System. Other national policies in the United States, such as taxation, military spending, foreign spending, domestic spending, and others, are subject to the authority and control of Congress and to our system of checks and balances.

On the other hand, the Federal Reserve System, composed of a seven-member Board of Governors, Federal Open Market Committee made up of the Board of Governors and five Reserve bank presidents, and Federal Reserve banks from 12 districts, is not accountable to anyone. Indeed, it has grown to the point that it is self-funding and operates with autonomy within the Government. It earns approximately \$20 billion on its portfolio, holding almost 9 percent of the Federal debt outstanding. The budget of the Federal Reserve System does not require congressional approval, and, in fact, it contributes approximately \$17 billion to the U.S. Treasury on an annual basis. Not even the General Accounting Office, which can only conduct a nominal audit of the Federal Reserve System, has the authority to investigate how, when, where and by whom the public money controlled by the Federal Reserve System is used.

Perhaps most inconsistent with the manner in which our Government functions is the secrecy under which monetary policy decisions are made. Five of the voting members and seven of the nonvoting members of the Federal Open Market Committee represent the commercial bankers who own the Reserve banks. Reserve bank presidents are not subject to Senate confirmation. When interest rates are high, it is understandable that the public suspects that the Federal Reserve System is operating in the interest of those institutions represented by its members—financial institutions and banking organizations.

Under article I, section 8 of the U.S. Constitution, Congress has the power to "coin money and regulate the value thereof." It would seem, therefore, that Congress has the constitutional authority and responsibility to ensure that some control is exercised over the Federal Reserve System. A number of approaches have been suggested to achieve that control. Among the suggestions are: al-

lowing the General Accounting Office to conduct full audits, placing the Secretary of the Treasury on the Federal Open Market Committee, forcing the Federal Open Market Committee to publicly release its policy change decisions immediately, and requiring regular meetings with the public.

These and other proposals will be considered in the final draft of legislation that I expect to propose on this subject.

THE NEED FOR FREE TRADE LEGISLATION

One of the sources of continuing concern is the trade imbalance under which the United States and particularly its workers must suffer. Jobs continue to be lost to cheaper labor markets abroad. Capital flight is adding to the destruction of a large part of America's industries and institutions. This problem is perhaps best reflected in our relationship with Japan.

The United States trade deficit with Japan at the end of 1992 was an estimated \$48 billion, up by more than \$4½ billion from the 1991 figure. The trade deficit in motor vehicles and parts represents two-thirds of this deficit, nearly \$30.1 billion. During 1991, Japanese auto exports totaled 1.3 million units, or about 16 percent of the United States market. In 1991, Japanese imports accounted for 61 percent of the total sales of imported cars sold in the United States. At the same time, United States car sales in Japan represent less than 1 percent of the Japanese automotive market. In fact, Japan exports approximately 60 times more cars to the United States than this country exports to Japan. It is no wonder then that in 1992, General Motors announced plans to cut 76,000 jobs, close 6 assembly plants and 15 parts plants.

It is for these reasons that I intend to introduce free trade legislation. We need trade agreements with teeth in them. We cannot seriously discuss expanded employment in America while allowing jobs and money to escape our borders through a weak trade program.

THE NEED FOR TAX EXEMPT BOND REFORM LEGISLATION

There is another area of concern which may require a legislative initiative. As we implement the remainder of President Clinton's economic recovery program, those who are targeted for tax fairness, persons with income of \$100,000 or more, will seek ways to avoid their new tax liability. Just today, the Associated Press reported that, according to the Internal Revenue Service, 779 couples and individuals who earned more than \$200,000 in 1990, paid no Federal income tax. Those taxpayers earned a total of \$340 million. While tax avoidance is entirely legal, if these wealthy persons are allowed to use loopholes in the law to avoid the taxes contemplated by the economic recovery program, the revenue projections will not be reached and the recovery program will not work.

One such loophole that is expected to gain widespread popularity and use among the wealthy is the tax-exempt municipal bond. With this widespread popularity and use, we can expect considerable growth in the volume of tax-exempt bonds. I expect soon to introduce legislation to insure that tax-exempt bonds are truly used for the public purposes for which they are intended, legislation that will include targeting restrictions to insure that tax exempt bond financing is appropriately used.

This is another area where there is considerable experience in the Congress from prior legislative initiatives. I intend to build upon that experience in crafting any legislation that I may ultimately introduce.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, this Nation faces many problems—rising homelessness, deteriorating and unaffordable health care systems, vicious violence in our schools and in our neighborhoods, educational crises, shameful infant death rates, staggering unemployment, and more. Yet, we also face much promise—a new party is in power for the first time in 12 years, a new President with a genuine desire to do good, a Congress which seems dedicated to the end of gridlock and a swing in the mood of the country away from fear and toward hope. There is a sense that things can only get better.

A writer once noted that, "Even after a fire, something remains, a blade of grass, an idea." America has been burning under callous and uncaring leadership. Despite the devastation that has been caused, something remains. The remains may not be much—a blade of grass, an idea—nonetheless, it is enough to rebuild America. America can house the homeless, if we want. America can care for the sick, if we want. America can stem the violence, educate our young people, save our babies, and put people to work, if we want. That is the challenge for America. That is our agenda for the nineties. That is the goal of Samuel L. Evans. That is my goal, and I invite our colleagues to join with me in this endeavor.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has a responsibility to lead. Leaders must lead. That is why we were elected.

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. 115. Concurrent resolution providing for an adjournment of the House from the legislative day of Thursday, July 1, 1993, to Tuesday, July 13, 1993, and an adjournment or recess of the Senate from Thursday, July 1, 1993 or Friday, July 2, 1993, until Tuesday, July 13, 1993.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2118) entitled "an Act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes."

OXFORD STYLE DEBATE ON NAFTA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE], is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to take this time this evening to discuss

an issue which has been discussed on this floor at some length, both pro and con, but last evening it received a good dollop of debate. The subject is the North American Free-Trade Agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin my comments by noting that my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], is here again this evening. Last night he took a 5-minute special order to talk about the order of the judge yesterday affecting the submission of the North American Free-Trade Agreement implementing legislation to the Congress, and then that was followed by a 60-minute special order by the majority whip, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

I could not help but think, as I listened to that debate and watched it in my office as I was doing some other work that, if I was a member of the American public, and I had listened first to what the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] had to say, and then I listened to what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] and his colleagues from other States had to say in opposition to NAFTA, that somebody out there would have said, "Are these people talking about the same issue? Are we debating the same subject? Are we on the same planet?" That is because it hardly seemed that there was even any grounds for a debate.

So, the first thing that I wanted to suggest tonight, especially since the House of Representatives has been talking about changing some of its rules to permit a greater style of Oxford style debate on subjects, is this is a good topic for us to start on. This is one where we ought to engage in a serious debate on the floor of the House of Representatives during some special orders and debate some of the facts, and I am wondering if my friend from California, if he would agree with that.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] for yielding to me, and I thank him for taking out this special order. He is absolutely right. Last night I stood here in the well taking 5 minutes to basically respond to the so-called Ritchie decision which was made yesterday. Charles Ritchie is a U.S. district court judge who ruled based on a case that was filed by three environmental and consumer organizations that the negotiations for the North American Free-Trade Agreement could not proceed until an environmental impact statement is filed.

□ 1810

Well, this is the first time that such action was taken. Clearly I happen to believe that it violates the President's authority to proceed with international negotiations. And the fact of

the matter is, I took the well to praise President Clinton and Ambassador Mickey Kantor, who is the U.S. Trade Representative, stating that they are on the right track by proceeding with negotiations, No. 1, and, No. 2, by calling for a near immediate appeal to this case.

Well, I spoke specifically of the Ritchie decision, and then I left. I went home. Frankly, it was 11 o'clock at night and I had been up very late.

My friend from Tucson, who has been one of the most active leaders in behalf of implementation of the North American Free-Trade Agreement, was watching it on the television and saw our colleagues get up and proceed to trash a number of the statements that I had made, I am told. I have not read the RECORD yet. And then provide what I believe are some of the weakest arguments, some of the weakest arguments to try and defeat NAFTA.

So I join with my friend from Tucson by saying the North American Free-Trade Agreement should be the first Oxford style debate that we have right here on the floor of the House of Representatives. We should have Members of both parties who are proponents stand up and argue on behalf of the North American Free-Trade Agreement. Then we should have a rebuttal from members of both sides of the aisle who are opponents of the North American Free-Trade Agreement. Then I believe we should engage in the kind of exchange that we see in the so-called Oxford style debates.

Now, I serve as a member of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, and there has been a proposal which has come forward to proceed with this kind of debate format. I would say, by the way, just this evening we have an hour, and frankly I have another hour of special order. I do not plan to take that entire time. But if any of our colleagues who are on either side of the issue would like to come here to the floor, I know that my good friend Mr. KOLBE would enjoy an exchange with them. I know that I certainly would.

Mr. KOLBE. I appreciate the gentleman's comments. That is exactly right. As a matter of fact, as you may know, Mr. Perot has challenged in one of his statements Mr. Kantor to have a debate, Ambassador Kantor, to have a debate on this subject. I do not think he was really terribly serious. By my colleague Senator JOHN MCCAIN and I responded by challenging Mr. Perot, who is going to be in my state in a couple of weeks, to have a debate.

Let us have a debate on this subject. I think the same applies here in Congress. Let us have a debate on this issue. Get people down here to talk about this thing, to find out what the pros and cons are about job creation.

As you said, we have been talking in this House through this reorganization

committee that you have been such an active member of, and I think we are going to hopefully see some very good recommendations come from that. And here is a way we can test how that is going to work, right here during the course of the special orders.

So I would say my colleague and I would join in issuing a challenge to Mr. BONIOR or any of the others who might want to do this. We will formalize how we might do it, and let us have a real debate on this subject. And we can urge the American people to watch this. Because I think this is what the education process is all about. Our colleagues and the American people need to understand what the facts are about NAFTA.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding. I think that we have basically laid it out there. We are willing to stand here as Members of Congress and debate this issue any time, anywhere. And there are many people who are very involved. This is a very passionate issue, and there are people who feel strongly on both sides. I think we should get right into it.

What I would like to do right now is lay forth a challenge to my colleague. Let us begin talking about NAFTA right now and some of the arguments that were made here on the House floor last night.

Mr. KOLBE. I appreciate that. We are going to. That is exactly what I intend to do and why I took this hour, because I think some of the statements that were made last night were outrageous to say the least. They were certainly not factual. I believe they do need to be responded to.

I would like to begin talking about something that my friend from California took 5 minutes to talk about last night and began again this evening discussing, and that is the decision yesterday. Because there has been a lot of confusion. I have talked to my colleagues about what is the meaning of Judge Richey's order yesterday, which basically said that the U.S. Trade Office, U.S. Trade Representative, must conduct an environmental impact statement before, and I underscore the word before, the President can submit the implementing legislation on NAFTA to the Congress of the United States for consideration.

Well, I think several things need to be said about this. First of all, in a very narrow and technical sense, the order does not really apply to the North American Free-Trade Agreement, which is already completed and out of the hands of the U.S. Trade Representatives and in the hands of the President to submit to Congress.

Clearly the act, the NEPA act, does not apply to the action of a President, but rather to agencies. It was the ruling of the Judge that it applied to USTR because the Trade Office, he said, really is an independent agency.

Having listened to the debate last week we had on the floor on the budget for the Treasury, Post Office budget, dealing with the President's budget and what cuts might be made there, I find this a rather astonishing view to come to.

The Trade Office is very specifically, legally, and otherwise a part of the Office of the President, and for good reason. The President has exclusive authority over negotiating trade agreements and international affairs for the conduct of foreign policy, and that is why the President of the United States has the Trade Office as a direct part of the President's Office.

So I think the Judge's basic premise that he started from was a fundamentally flawed decision.

Mr. DREIER. If the gentleman would yield, I would simply like to underscore the fact many of us are concerned about the environment. I represent the Los Angeles Basin, which has the highest number of first stage fog alerts in the entire country, the Inland Basin area that I represent. Clearly it seems to me this judgment was able to come about because of the proliferation of so many laws and regulations which were imposed on the private sector of our economy.

While I support efforts to clean up the environment, I think this action does bring home the message to me, and I know to my colleague from Arizona, that we in the Congress passed these laws which allowed judges to come forward with decisions like this. So my message would be that we should be very, very careful as we proceed with the imposition of these kinds of constraints.

Mr. KOLBE. I think the gentleman is absolutely right. I am going to come back to the underlying issue of how we are going to improve the environment, particularly along the border. I also represent a border district and am very concerned about that issue. But the fact is NEPA was enacted by this Congress in 1970, the National Environmental Policy Act. The Trade Act, which is the fast track process under which we negotiate trade agreements, as my colleague knows, was first passed by this Congress in 1974. Since that time we have had, of course, the Tokyo round of GATT talks, we have had an Israel Free-Trade Agreement, Canadian Free-Trade Agreement, and scores of other minor free trade agreements, none of which have been subject to the environmental impact statement of NEPA.

Mr. DREIER. I think it is also important to note that since the fast track provisions were put into place, since 1974 there has not been a major international trade agreement in which the United States has been involved that has not been embarked upon on any process other than the fast track negotiating process.

Mr. KOLBE. The gentleman is absolutely correct on that. I think the bottom line of this decision yesterday, and, quite honestly, the opponent of NAFTA when they filed this suit, and one of them, of course, we know is Citizen Watch, is Ralph Nader's organization, which I think is less concerned about the environment than it is about their opposition to NAFTA. They shopped around to find a judge who has a history of limiting presidential authority, residential powers.

I read the opinion, or I read the judge's decision and some of the arguments, the briefs that were provided in that case, and I do not see how this thing can possibly stand up on appeal.

So I want to begin this evening by just saying that this is one judge, one district court. It is not the end of the process. It does not stall NAFTA. We will go ahead as Ambassador Kantor has made clear with the negotiations on the side agreements. We will go ahead with drafting the implementing legislation. The Justice Department will seek an expedited appeal of this, and I expect we will have this resolved before the legislation is ready to be considered by Congress.

Mr. DREIER. If the gentleman will yield on that, you know, at this particular side of the aisle regularly we hear criticism of Bill Clinton. I know my friend and I join in being very critical of many of the decisions that President Clinton has made over the past 6 months since he has been in office.

That is why I am always glad to seize the opportunity and stand in this well and say, as Teddy Roosevelt told us to do, when the President of the United States is correct, we should provide him with our complete support.

On the issue of the North American Free-Trade Agreement, his statement through his U.S. Trade Representative Mr. Kantor which came yesterday afternoon that they will appeal the process and proceed with the negotiations, is a very positive sign that the President does want to reduce those trade barriers. I am proud to stand here as a Republican Member of Congress and congratulate President Clinton and Ambassador Kantor for this decision.

□ 1820

Mr. KOLBE. I thank the gentleman for that statement, and he is absolutely right. President Clinton is right on this. He is right in his support of the North American Free-Trade Agreement, and I will stand up and support him.

I had an opportunity this afternoon to meet with some people from the White House on this subject. The point I tried to drive home to them is, they may have gotten off to a bad start with the stimulus package, the tax package, the budget, which my colleague and I certainly have not supported the President on, for good reason, we think it is

bad for the economy, but here is an opportunity for him to demonstrate, before he gets to the health care, which is going to clearly require bipartisan support, to build that bipartisan effort here in the Congress of the United States.

There is no way the North American Free-Trade Agreement is going to be enacted, we are not going to implement it, unless we have bipartisan support of Republicans and Democrats, House and Senate, easterners, westerners, north and south, people from all sides of this issue are going to have to join together in order to enact the North American Free-Trade Agreement.

Mr. DREIER. I think that having praised President Clinton, I make no bones about pointing to the fact that this was an initiative by President Bush. I congratulate President Clinton.

Mr. KOLBE. Signed by President Bush on December 17 of last year.

Mr. DREIER. President Bush signed it, and he came up with the idea. Frankly, the idea was first discussed by a former Ambassador from the United States to Mexico who served in the early 1980's, stating that moving in the direction of a North American Free-Trade Agreement was the way of the future. So I doubly congratulate President Clinton for recognizing that President Bush was right on target to proceed with the North American Free-Trade Agreement. And now he wants to implement it.

Mr. KOLBE. The gentleman and I might pat ourselves on the back just a little bit. Several years ago, before we began these negotiations, we introduced a resolution, a sense-of-Congress resolution calling for a Free-Trade Agreement with Mexico. I can recall that when I did that, we did not really get our phone calls returned either by Mexico City or downtown at the State Department or USTR.

So maybe we were a little bit ahead of our time, too.

In any event, it is a reality today, and I think the benefits are going to be very apparent, particularly as we go through this in the next few minutes.

Mr. DREIER. I should say for the RECORD that my friend from Tucson has been a bold and dynamic leader on the issue of free trade, and he has proceeded with this. He started the idea brewing here in the Congress, and now he not only gets his calls returned downtown in Mexico City, but they all roll the red carpet out for him because they know that he is the one who tries diligently to reduce these barriers to trade.

Mr. KOLBE. I would return the compliment. My friend, who has been a stalwart on the Rules Committee, which has joint jurisdiction, original jurisdiction over trade agreements, has certainly led the fight in that committee.

Mr. DREIER. It has been a lonely battle.

Mr. KOLBE. But we are making progress.

Before we get to responding to some of the things that were said in last night's special order, I want to comment just one more moment on the judge's order yesterday, particularly as it relates to the environment and the issue of the environment. As my friend from the Los Angeles area has said correctly, it is an issue which we are very concerned about. The environment is something anybody is concerned about that lives close to the border or lives in a place like the Los Angeles Basin where we have seen the problems that exist there. So along the border, we are very concerned with the environmental problems that have come from the rapid growth that we have had of trade and the rapid growth of population in the border cities. But the bottom line is, are we going to be better off, are we going to have more cooperation on trade, if we have a free-trade agreement, or are we going to have less. In other words, do we benefit the problems that exist in Tijuana and in Mexicali and in Nogales and Juarez-El Paso and Brownsville-Matamoros, do those environmental problems get better by not having a trade agreement.

Common sense will tell you that that is not true. If we have a trade agreement, we are going to have the basis for cooperation, and this agreement has environmental provisions written into it that no one trade agreement has ever had.

Mr. DREIER. I totally agree with what the gentleman has just said here. One of the items we need to underscore is if you look at an impoverished society, the ability to insist on an improved environmental standard is basically nonexistent, because we know that people who are downtrodden and living in substandard environmental conditions are not in the position to insist on that improved quality. Virtually everyone, even the opponents of NAFTA, have acknowledged that implementation of NAFTA is going to enhance the standard of living in Mexico.

We already, over the past 7 years, have seen a dramatic improvement in the standard of living in Mexico. We have seen a growth rate in Mexico which has been substantially greater than the rate of growth here in the United States. And as I say, even opponents to NAFTA acknowledge that we will, with NAFTA, see an improved standard of living.

That improved standard of living will lead the people of Mexico to insist on even greater improved environmental quality for their life. And that, obviously, is going to take place at the border, too.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. KOLBE. The gentleman is absolutely right. The fact is that Mexico has spent a great deal of its resources

recently on the environment. I think it is rather astonishing the kinds of things that have happened in recent years.

In fact, this last weekend, I was in Arizona with some environmental engineers, systems engineers, that do business in Mexico as well as other countries. They said in all of their experience they have never seen a developing country go as far or as fast as Mexico has in improving the environment.

There are a couple of reasons for that. One, they are conscious of it because they live next door to the United States, where a lot of attention is being given to the environment. But there is another reason, and that is Mexico City, where 20 percent of the population of Mexico lives, all the government, all the political, media leaders, business leaders of the country live there. It is one of the most polluted cities in the world, something that the gentleman from the Los Angeles area can relate to.

They are very cognizant of the problem they have and the need to deal with it from a health standpoint as well as simply from the quality of life that they have there.

Mr. DREIER. We know that one of the greatest developments that took place in the area of environmental concerns came when that very bold and dynamic President Carlos Salinas de Gortari proceeded to close down the largest oil refinery in the central part of Mexico City, which I hope my friend will correct me if I am wrong. It seemed to me there were 5,000 people.

Mr. KOLBE. Five thousand employees put out of work as a result of that.

Mr. DREIER. That was done in the name of improving the environment in Mexico City. The sense was that there would be an outcry because of that loss of jobs. Yet, because of the enhanced standard of living on an overall basis in Mexico, people were very supportive of the decision that President Salinas made to close that plant that was polluting heavily right in the center of Mexico City.

Mr. KOLBE. My colleague and I might wonder how many of our own politicians in this body would be so quick to support a jobs closure or shutting down a plant that supported 5,000 jobs in our district. That is very tough for any politician to do, particularly in a developing country like Mexico.

I think it is worth noting that the Mexican basic environmental law, which is patterned after our own Clean Air and Clean Water Act, is very good. It is, in fact, its provisions in many ways are tougher than our own.

They have lacked on enforcement. That is simply a matter of not having had the resources of a developing country.

The bottom line is, if the economy cannot improve down there, how are they going to have the resources to do it?

Mr. DREIER. One of the things that we have found is, yes, there are many very old plants and facilities in Mexico that have a difficult time complying with the new environmental laws that have been put in place there. That is why implementation of NAFTA is so key.

Within Mexico, they want new plants, new facilities built, because with those new plants and those new facilities, they will be better equipped with the environmental laws that exist there. So this clearly will be very beneficial on the pollution problems that exist at the border and on the overall environment within Mexico.

□ 1830

Mr. KOLBE. The gentleman is absolutely correct. Mexico's commitment to this, I think, is a very real one.

Let me just give the gentleman a couple more figures that I think are fairly impressive. They have added last year, they added more than 200 inspectors along the border region itself.

Here are some actions that have taken place in the 6 years from 1985 to 1991. They have had more than 8,900 manufacturing inspections, which led to a temporary or partial shutdown of 1,926 facilities and a permanent closure of 109 facilities. They have brought about the relocation of 36 major manufacturing companies to outside of Mexico City. They have increased threefold the number of inspectors throughout the country, and as I said, more than 200 within the border region alone.

There has been a very substantial increase in the amount of environmental protection. There is a long way to go, I think we all acknowledge that, but we have a long way to go in our own country. We have a long way to go in our relationship with Mexico on environmental protection.

We signed in 1983 the La Paz agreement. President Reagan signed the first environmental agreement with a foreign country. Not too many people recognize that. That was 10 years ago; in fact, 10 years ago this last month that President Reagan signed that agreement, in the first year of office, with President de la Madrid.

That agreement calls for a series in the annex, there is a series of things to be done, one of which, for example, deals with the disposal of toxic wastes that go from the United States to maquillos in Mexico and back to the United States, or they are supposed to come back to the United States to be disposed of.

The fact is, we have never developed a tracking system, so we can keep track of these hazardous materials that go down to Mexico, so we are partly responsible for the fact that we have not been able to decide what is going down there, to keep track of that, and make sure that we account for that as companies are supposed to bring it back.

Mr. DREIER. If the gentleman will yield, we have focused, and it is his special order, and I do not want to dramatically shift the subject, but last night there was not a great deal of talk about the environmental issues. This was not really a focus.

The key that our colleagues who seem to be opposing vigorously this plan raise constantly is the issue of jobs, and the flow of jobs from the United States to Mexico. They constantly say that, "With NAFTA we will see a dramatic increase in the flow of jobs," so if my friend would allow, could we begin talking about that jobs issue?

I do not want to interrupt, if the gentleman has another few points he wants to make on the environment.

Mr. KOLBE. I was going to change from the environment. I was going to concentrate our comments, as the gentleman suggested, on jobs. Before we do that, I would just like to raise with my friend, the gentleman from California, a couple of other items that were said early on in the special order last night.

He had the opportunity to travel in Mexico, and the gentleman has had an opportunity to meet with many of the political leaders down there. I dare say the gentleman has been as impressed as I have with the team that President Salinas has put together down there, perhaps the most impressive team of market-oriented, free enterprise oriented political leaders that I have ever seen.

Mr. DREIER. No doubt about it.

Mr. KOLBE. Last night, on the floor, it was said that we take in this country for granted the right to speak freely, the right to freely choose political and labor leaders, the right to organize for decent wages.

Then it went on to say that "in Mexico, it is a corrupt one-party political system, a political system that denies the right of the Mexican people to basic human and democratic rights."

First of all, we are not entering into an economic union. This is not Europe. This is not an economic union, this is a free trade agreement.

We give most-favored-nation status to Libya. They have embargoes to Libya, but they have most-favored-nation status. We are talking about trading, increasing our trade, the sale of our goods with Mexico, so it is, in a sense, a non sequitur. It is also simply a lie, a lie to talk about the Mexican political system in that regard.

Mr. DREIER. If the gentleman will yield on that point, I think it is something that we need to realize. My friend has heard me tell this before. I am sure I have probably stood here in the well and said it.

I came to this Congress in January 1981, and I had the privilege of being appointed my first year as a member of the United States-Mexico Interparliamentary Conference, and my friend,

the gentleman from Tucson, and I have over the past several years participated in the United States-Mexico interparliamentary meetings which have taken place.

At that first meeting President Jose Lopez Portillo stood up and proudly announced that he was ready to nationalize the banking system of Mexico. Needless to say, I was a little nonplussed and very disappointed.

We, in the early 1980's, and obviously for decades before that, have seen the things to which our colleagues last night referred in Mexico. We know that, really, since 1982 when the Institutional Revolutionary Party came to power, there have been many problems of corruption, human rights violations, violations of political freedoms.

People have got to realize that we have seen a change which has taken place over the past several years. Is it perfect? Absolutely not, but those who have been trying to argue regularly that we are dealing with this corrupt government where we have nothing but payoffs, it has changed. Again, it is not perfect, but we have seen a dramatic turn-around since 1986 in the waning days of the Miguel de la Madrid administration, when we saw those first steps made toward privatization, and then, of course, this dynamic leadership provided by Carlos Salinas de Gortari, in which he has brought about privatization of the banking industry and the telephone industry. He has moved the way of the world, toward freedom and opportunity, and political pluralism, clearly, is following.

Mr. KOLBE. Would the gentleman not agree with me that in a sense, this is very similar to what many of us have argued with regard to China, that if the economic changes are brought about in China, that the political system will change there? It seems to me that that is exactly what President Salinas is trying to do. He is saying, "Change the economy and the political reforms will follow."

It is the reverse of what happened in Russia. We have seen the problems that Russia has had with trying to get the economic reforms to follow the political changes made there.

Mr. DREIER. Absolutely, my friend is absolutely correct. Political and economic freedom are interdependent.

There are those of us, and I have been a supporter of most favored nation trading status for China, but I marched up to the Chinese Embassy following the Tiananmen Square massacre on June 4, 1989. I have been outraged by what we have seen from the butchers of Beijing, but the fact of the matter is that we are seeing improvement. It is not nearly as fast as I would like to see it take place in China or in other parts of the world, and frankly, I would like to see a greater degree of political freedom in Mexico than we have to this point, but we have seen improvement.

Of course, the election of National Action Party, the opposition party candidates, to governorships in the northern part of Mexico, in the state that adjoins Arizona, I know has been a very positive sign toward political pluralism.

Mr. KOLBE. Two states now have a governor of the PAN, the opposition party, and more than 100 municipalities are now controlled. There is a very large, well over one-third, almost 40 percent of the Chamber of Deputies in Mexico is now the opposition party's.

Mr. DREIER. From 1928 up until this point, the PRI party controlled the entire country. So while we listened to our friends who are opponents to NAFTA talk about the political corruption and the problems within Mexico, we are not about to say that the situation is perfect today, but we have to recognize that with two governors and, as my friend said, hundreds of municipalities, the mayor of Tijuana is of the PAN party, we have seen tremendous change take place.

I am convinced with the economic reforms that we have seen, coupled with the implementation of a North American Free-Trade Agreement, we will see even greater political freedoms within Mexico.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask the gentleman about one other thing before we go to the basic subject of jobs.

The statement was made last night in a very disparaging way about the fact that they, referring to Mexico, "are hiring the best firms on K Street, the best lawyers, the best consultants, the best lobbying firms, guys running around here in \$1,000 suits. It is the biggest lobbying group in this Congress that I have ever seen since I have been here."

Well, I am not sure that that is quite true, when we think about lobbying for a lot of special interests. We have all kinds. When we go out here and watch what is going on on the tax bill, and look at the people gathered out here, outside the Committee on Ways and Means or the Senate Finance Committee, we realize that there are a lot of lobbying groups that are being hired by a lot of people.

Mexico, until this North American Free-Trade Agreement debate began, it never had hired any lobbyist in Washington. They had relied entirely on their own Embassy to do everything. There were many of us, and I was one of them, that encouraged them to get some consulting support, others to give them advice on some things.

I frankly am not alarmed by the fact that Mexico has hired somebody to help assist them. Maybe it is unfortunate that we have too much of that here in Washington, but it is certainly not just Mexico that is doing that.

□ 1840

Mr. DREIER. If my friend would yield on that point, this has come up

several times. I have met with some of my constituents in California who are virulently opposed to NAFTA. I have talked to groups around, and there is this implication that somehow those of us in the Congress who are supporters of NAFTA are in the hip pocket of the Mexican Government and want to send the jobs of our constituents from the United States to Mexico. It is absolutely crazy.

I mean, I am proud of the independence I have shown here on a wide range of issues, independent of the so-called lobbyists, and it seems to me I know that my friends here have had the exact same pattern. Yes, we listen to information that comes from a wide range of sources, from telephone calls and letters that flow into our office from our colleagues who are experts on issues, from people who are involved here in Washington, and represent certain interests, but frankly, the credibility of someone who works here in Washington on an issue is thrown out the window if they misrepresent. So clearly those of us who support the North American Free-Trade Agreement do so in large part because we want to create jobs, jobs in the United States of America.

Mr. KOLBE. I appreciate what the gentleman is saying, and I think this evening what both of us are trying to say is that this is a debate that has to be conducted on a plane that talks about facts and statistics, and the basic philosophical differences that may exist. And I would recognize, and I know my friend would recognize that there can be differences on this subject.

But finally, before we talk about jobs, I would just say how distressed I was last night to hear the debate be reduced to the level where one of the speakers last night said they do not even know, and he was talking about academicians he called them, do not even know how to pronounce NAFTA. He said they call it "NAHFTHA", as if it was some fancy cheese or something.

This is far too important a debate to reduce it to that level. I do not know, but I think the gentleman would agree with that.

Mr. DREIER. I have been known to cast a few pejoratives around about those who have been opponents of NAFTA, and I am not going to do it here in the well myself. But I agree. I think that we should try to keep this debate on the highest level we can. Even this morning at a breakfast meeting that I had I cast a couple of names about some of the people who have been opposed, and I agreed that we should not do it, especially here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

But certainly this has become a very emotional debate. And I become emotional about this because I feel in my heart and my head, just as my colleague does, that this is in the best interests of the United States of America.

One of the most pressing problems that we have in the border States is the illegal immigration problem. Earlier today in the House we overwhelmingly passed, I am happy to say, an amendment that was designed to toughen up the Border Patrol. But frankly, we have to get at the root of the immigration problem that we have, the flow of illegal immigrants across the border into Arizona, California, Texas, and other States, which is overwhelming. And it seems to me that we have to recognize that improving the economy of Mexico is in the best interest of the United States as we try to get at the root of the problem of illegal immigration, because people leave Mexico for one very simple and basic reason: Economic opportunity, whether it is a job or welfare.

Mr. KOLBE. And improving the economy in Mexico, and providing jobs in Mexico does not mean that we have to lose jobs here. That is the fundamental fallacy that people on the trade issue always make, that it is a zero sum gain, that if one side is gaining, the other side over here has to be losing.

As we know from Adam Smith, and we know from economic theory, and we know from practical trade that it is not a zero sum gain. Both sides benefit. In fact, 70 percent, and that is going to get us to the bottom line here about jobs, 70 percent of the growth in the U.S. economy since 1987 has come from our exports, 70 percent.

Mr. DREIER. Seventy percent of the economic growth on a nationwide basis here in the United States has come because of our exports of goods throughout the world. And I think it is important for us to note that in 1986 we were running about a \$4.9 billion trade deficit with Mexico. Last year we had approaching a \$6 billion trade surplus, which has been a dramatic turnaround.

Mr. KOLBE. In fact, Mexico has moved until now it is our largest surplus of any country that we trade with. It is a very, very dramatic increase. More than 700,000 jobs in the United States depend today on the business that we do, the selling that we do with Mexico.

I wanted to talk a little bit about this issue first from the standpoint of Ross Perot talks about the giant sucking sound of jobs to Mexico. But I hear a giant sucking sound of American exports going down to Mexico, which means creating jobs here at home.

First it is said well, how can you compete with a country that has a minimum wage of 58 cents. The minimum wage is a benchmark. It is not the real wages paid in manufacturing, anymore than \$4.35 minimum wage in this country represents the real wages here.

Mr. DREIER. What is the average wage in Mexico actually?

Mr. KOLBE. The average wage is considerably higher than that in manufacturing.

Mr. DREIER. The average wage is \$2.35 an hour, is it not?

Mr. KOLBE. With all of the benefits added in, it is a little more. You see, Mexico has a system that is very hard to define, because they have things that are required of manufacturers that we do not have. There is a housing tax that has to go back into housing. There is a requirement, a mandatory requirement for a bonus at the end of the year. There is not only their Social Security that is provided, but there is also day care that is provided, and mandatory subsidization of meals in mequillos and in manufacturing plants. So they have a number of benefits that we do not historically give to people in our manufacturing plants here.

But it is somewhere in the range, as you suggested, of \$2.30. In the new Ford plant, with benefits added in it is very close to \$5 an hour.

Mr. DREIER. Yet we know that overwhelmingly the American worker continues to be more productive than the Mexican worker.

Mr. KOLBE. Of course.

Mr. DREIER. That is why we have to look at the strategy.

Mr. KOLBE. Higher education levels, better schools, more capital, that is, equipment that is available to them, high-technology equipment that they can do the job faster, and better training.

Mr. DREIER. The best evidence of that was the decision by General Motors, and I underscore "and" the United Autoworkers in concert moving their plant back to Lansing, MI, creating 1,000 jobs there in the United States, because we know that with the average tariff today on United States goods going to Mexico being 10 percent, and the average tariff on goods going from Mexico coming into the United States being only 4 percent, that they basically have a one-way free trade arrangement. So with NAFTA we are going to be able to have plants and facilities in the United States that will be able to take advantage of the 88 million strong Mexican market.

Mr. KOLBE. I always make the point if wage was the only factor which a company used to decide where they would locate, you would have every company in the world located in Haiti or Bangladesh.

Mr. DREIER. The industrial capital of the world.

Mr. KOLBE. The industrial capital of the Western Hemisphere would certainly be Haiti, yet we do not see too many manufacturing plants being located down there. And we laugh about that, but we know that the reason is that they lack infrastructure, they lack roads, they lack any kind of education system, and they lack anything that you need in order to have a manufacturing plant there.

Mexico is obviously much farther along than that. It is about where

Korea was 10 years ago. It is on the verge of taking off. And that is one of the things we have not really gotten to. We are talking about a market of 80 million people which has a propensity, the people of which have a propensity to buy more of their goods from the United States than any other country buys from a single country.

Mr. DREIER. Korea, Japan, at a greater rate than the people of Korea or Japan on a per capita basis. Based on income levels the people of Mexico spend much more.

Mr. KOLBE. On an actual basis Mexico buys, if my figures are correct, and I think my memory is correct here, about \$360 per capita from the United States, and in Japan it is \$380 where their per capita income is 20 times that of Mexico. So they buy an enormous amount of goods from the United States. It is just a tremendous amount.

I know the gentleman has another couple of things that he wanted to say. I just wanted on the wage thing to make one other point.

There was a study not long ago by I believe one of the large accounting firms where they asked companies to rate 20 different factors in terms of their decision about where they locate a plant, the geography, the proximity to market, transportation, job skill levels, education levels, ambience of the quality of life there, and wage came out as the 14th, the 14th most important factor. So it is only one of the factors which companies use in order to make their decision about where they are going to locate.

I mentioned earlier that 70 percent of the growth in our economy had come from exports, and my colleague from California has mentioned that in the last 5 years from 1987 to 1992 we went from a \$5 billion deficit to a \$6 billion surplus. So we have 700,000 jobs in this country that depend directly on the business that we do with Mexico.

I see my other good friend here from California, Mr. DORNAN.

Mr. DREIER. He represents Garden Grove.

Mr. KOLBE. Garden Grove, and he has some things that he wanted to add.

Mr. DORNAN. I thank my colleague from Arizona. And I want to say that I was listening attentively to everything both of my colleagues were saying, because this is the future that we are talking about. And we were together, I was there, Mr. DREIER was there when Ross Perot came up here to the Hill. I have known Ross Perot, or at least I met him in December 1969 when he was a 39-year-old billionaire in Time magazine. The very week I met him he flew an airplane out to Los Angeles to top it off with food, and medicine, and family packages, and greetings for our POW's in Hanoi. No one has ever questioned that mercy flight which first brought him to national attention. He actually went first to Vientiane, Laos, and the

North Vietnamese Embassy in that strange international city, and they said you go on to Copenhagen, and we will let you come into Moscow, if Moscow will let you deliver those packages.

□ 1850

It never happened. That was the very month that Clinton was a Rhodes Scholar touring Russia with 10 inches of snow on the ground and 29 degrees below zero. I say all of that to date me with Ross Perot. I say unabashedly that man is a patriot. His political participation in the process in 1992 got mixed reviews. This year he has gone on the road. The day we met him he was about to launch on a tour through Virginia and Maryland and starting here in the District. Now although he has some wonderful things to say about the political process that all three of us agree with, he is flat out wrong on NAFTA. Most of the people who are listening to him, who have joined the group with the beautiful title, United We Stand America—one of our conservative colleagues has joined because they are very strong in northern California. I said to him and the gentleman said it more forcefully than I did and Congressman MCCANDLESS also said it more forcefully, "Are you people trying to destroy my career on this one issue?" "Can McCandless" was one sign.

I would like to tell everybody, Mr. Speaker, across this country that Ross Perot said very clearly his organization is not out to wreck any Member's career, Senate or House, on one issue. He said we can agree to disagree on this. What I say and I think everybody has to say very clearly on this floor, you can make a case that there will be some pain with this in the short term, that a few jobs will be lost in the short term, very debatable how many. But if we are ever going to have vision in this Chamber and with our distinguished colleagues in the other body we have to look at a truly free world as the gentleman has been pointing out, with free trade.

Mr. KOLBE. The gentleman well knows, he has traveled a great deal in Latin America and all over this world, this is a trade agreement and it is with Mexico but it is more than just Mexico. I mean we have told the rest of Latin America "If you will reform, if you will open your markets, if you will privatize your companies there will be a reward, and the reward at the end of the rainbow is going to be more trade with the United States."

Now we are going to close the door if we defeat NAFTA, the hinge—they see Mexico as the hinge on that door for them. We are going to slam that door on them.

I cannot think of anything that would be a more catastrophic foreign policy disaster for this country than to

turn our back on Latin America and frankly with the rest of the world.

Mr. DREIER. I would like to respond to my friend from Garden Grove by saying that as far as the flow of United States jobs from the United States to Mexico the gentleman and I have witnessed the flow of jobs from southern California, due in part to our tax and regulatory burden, workmen's compensation among other things—

Mr. DORNAN. To?

Mr. DREIER. To Arizona, but also to Mexico. We have seen that. The case we make is that while, yes, there is nothing in the world today that prevents the flow of United States jobs to Mexico, implementation of NAFTA is the way to counter that. Why? Because they move to Mexico today and they may build things more cheaply and sell some goods in the United States, but they are able to have this one-way street of free trade across the border. We do not have free trade with Mexico today because we have, on average, a 10-percent tariff. So when we zero out that barrier between Mexico and the United States, it allows us to compete with those jobs that have gone to Mexico. The best example of course is the one to which I referred a few moments ago, the General Motors decision to move their plant from Mexico back to Lansing, MI, creating 1,000 jobs here in the United States. That is a first step.

Mr. DORNAN. Did my colleagues mention the positive effect it would have on reducing the illegal immigration?

Mr. DREIER. Absolutely.

Mr. KOLBE. We talked a bit about that. But I wanted to ask my colleague something about which he is very knowledgeable, on drug addiction. But before that may I just finish the thought that my friend, Mr. DREIER, was making, and it is a very important one, the bottom line. When you reduce all of this down to one phrase, one paragraph, it comes down to this: The free-trade agreement is about our being able to sell goods in Mexico. Companies can already move their plants to Mexico. They can move their jobs down there now. This is about selling more of our goods there.

Common sense will tell you when Mexico has an average 10-percent tariff and ours is 4 percent, if we reduce them both to zero, then we have a 2½ times greater advantage penetrating the market in Mexico for the sale of our goods than they do coming into the United States. They understand that and they know in the short term actually they are going to be hurt by the free-trade agreement. In the long term of course is the growth from having a free open market down there. They do understand this.

So the advantages are going to be enormous in opening up this market. The General Motors situation is a good example. It is not just the tariff there

but a very specific regulation in the AUTOPAC that Mexico has had for years which says, if you are going to sell one car in Mexico, you must export one car from Mexico. Therefore, the only way for General Motors, Chrysler, and Ford to sell in Mexico was to put a plant in Mexico for the export back to the United States. Now with NAFTA that is not necessary. If they can produce the cars more effectively in Lorain, OH, or in Detroit, MI, they can build them there and ship them down to Mexico and that is exactly why a thousand jobs are being moved back to the United States.

Mr. DREIER. On this drug interdiction issue is a big one that I know my friend from Garden Grove is very expert on so that I am sure he must have some thoughts. But a lot of people have argued that implementation of NAFTA is going to enhance the opportunity for the flow of drugs across the border.

Mr. DORNAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] and I went to Afghanistan together for one purpose, and we analyzed the drug situation while we were there. We went to see if the Afghans had the wherewithal to defeat the Soviet forces of the prior evil empire. The people in those areas if they do not have free trade, if they cannot make substantial goods to trade among themselves and with the rest of the world, they will turn, in the Golden Crescent or the Golden Triangle of Thailand, Burma, that area of the world, they will produce an illicit product that will end up with gunfights and people overdosing and dying in the streets of America. We talk about Latin America; Colombia is already almost destroyed as a nation. The way to rebuild it is with a good free market with all the countries trading in that area.

Venezuela's political instability has been caused by not having open markets. If you march right up Central America from the Panama Canal area to places to which we have traveled together in times of trouble with other insurrections based on ideologies, but in Nicaragua, El Salvador, Guatemala, and Mexico itself right to the border with these huge tracts of marijuana growing and coming in from secret airfields in the Chihuahua and Sonora areas into your secret airfields and that coming in on foot. And this recent tunnel that was discovered that was within days of completion to pump tons of illicit goods in, what is the best way to counter the growth and the production of things that tear apart the young people of this country? It is to produce the goods that normally should flow between countries with a free market.

Mr. KOLBE. I wonder if the gentleman would agree, I do not know if he has had an opportunity to talk with some of our people down in Mexico about the drug interdiction business or

not, but I go down there regularly and I have found in my latest visit—

Mr. DORNAN. The gentleman's district is on the border.

Mr. KOLBE. It is, but I am talking about going down and talking with our DEA people down there and our embassy people, and I must tell you the first several years the people from the State Department and the Embassy would give the official line that, yes, we have good cooperation with Mexico. Then you get the private briefing from the DEA people and they say that that is baloney. We are not getting any real cooperation.

The last time I was down there the DEA agent down there told me,

We have better cooperation today with Mexico than we have ever had. It is really outstanding.

Sure, there are problems with the local areas, maybe the local commander or something, but, he said,

We have better cooperation than we have ever had. Tracking flights coming up from Latin America, allowing our planes to refuel at La Paz so they can fly along the coast there.

All the things that they never allowed us to do before we are now getting done down there. I think it is outstanding the cooperation that we are getting.

Now if you turn you back on NAFTA, what incentive is there for the Mexicans to increase that cooperation?

Mr. DORNAN. Exactly. This is what is so sad about the temptation to demagogue this issue that we saw take place in part by some of our friends on this House floor last night. And the temptation for our pal patriot Ross, to oversimplify this and scare people in the short run and not realize that the simple words, which the gentleman was just discussing, is friendship, the growth of friendship that comes between us.

The one thing I like to say, and it sounds corny sometimes maybe overromanticizing it, but Canadians are Americans, they are North Americans.

□ 1900

These Mexicans are Americans, and everybody in South America from The Cone, except for one little remaining French colony, French Guinea, they are all Americans. They just happen to be South Americans. So these Mexicans developing these friendships are fellow Americans on this continent. This friendship is the one thing that will unravel quickly if this Chamber does not act.

Mr. DREIER. That is why we call it the North American Free-Trade Agreement, by the way.

Mr. DORNAN. Exactly, it is so obvious, and to unravel this in this Chamber for the short run of a political victory because they are scared of United We Stand America, it is going to unfortunately reverse the very thing that

brought these good citizens together in the cause that Ross Perot espoused.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of my good friend from Orange County, because the gentleman has really I think highlighted this, and the gentleman from California is one who has traveled down there and understands this problem very well. I think the gentleman has highlighted the need for building this relationship, probably in 150 years the relationship the United States has had with Mexico, something of a love-hate relationship, one that has been a pretty stormy marriage through the years.

We probably have never had a better relationship than with the present relationship that President Salinas has built. This is something we should build on. We should not try to tear it down. It would be tragic to me if that happened. It will be tragic from the standpoint of jobs.

I want to mention, bringing it back if I might to jobs, a story that brought it home to me just as clearly as it could be.

I went to Hermosillo, which is the capital of Sonora, the state directly to the south of my State of Arizona. I visited a plant that was under construction. It was just a shell at that point, but it was going to be huge, 170,000 square feet. It is a toy manufacturer. I think the name of it, the Mexican name is called Ken Mex. That is the Mexican subsidiary. It is a subsidiary of a very large Hong Kong toy manufacturing company.

Now, what they are going to build there, what they are going to make there are Barbie Dolls. They are moving all the Barbie Doll production in the world from the People's Republic of China back to Hermosillo, Mexico. The reason they are going to do so is that now they will be able to buy, because of the reduction in tariffs that Mexico has already imposed in anticipation of reducing it from 10 percent down to zero, they will be able to buy the plastic which is 85 percent of the value of a Barbie Doll. They will be able to buy that in the United States.

Instead, now, of course, they are buying it in Japan or Taiwan or South Korea, taking it to the PRC, making the Barbie Doll and selling it in the U.S. market. But this is the big market. They want to be close to this market. So they will come here to Mexico, but the 85 percent of the value of the Barbie Doll in the United States, assemble it down there or build and assemble it, if Barbie Doll is the right word, in Hermosillo and then, of course, ship it worldwide for sale.

Now, there is not going to be a sign up over that vat of plastic, I do not know if it is plastic made in Nevada or where it gets made, there is not going to be a sign there saying, this is going to Mexico, but the reality is that Dow or some other company in this country

is going to make millions of dollars and have hundreds of jobs created making this plastic every year going to this plant down there, jobs that did not exist before.

Mr. DORNAN. Good story.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, if my friend will yield, may I inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DEAL). The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. This special order is going to be ending in just a few minutes. I will say that I am up for the next special order. I do not plan to take the entire hour, but I will take a few minutes if we go over, because my friend from Tucson has given us, as I have repeatedly stood here in the well during the 1-minute speeches in the morning, and talked about some specific instances of job creation that has already taken place right here in the United States due to the export of U.S. manufactured goods and services.

I have talked often about some minority-owned businesses here in the United States in California and Texas and other areas.

I would like for a few minutes to talk about some businesses which are from parts of the country that has their representative often very critical of NAFTA, because there have been some large plant closures in those areas and some movement to Mexico.

One of them is a company called the Genpak Corp. which happens to be in Glens Falls, NY.

Now, Glens Falls, NY, is represented by my extraordinarily good friend and leader in the Rules Committee, Mr. SOLOMON.

Well, I was struck when I saw this here, because he has talked about the shift of his GE plant to Mexico. He has talked about the impact of Eastman Kodak and some others that have been moving, and I am very sympathetic with the concerns that many of his constituents have raised, but that is why I was very surprised when I saw this report from the Genpak Corp., located in Glens Falls.

Dick Daniels, the vice president for marketing for this company which manufactures disposal food service products, said:

Our Mexican sales have allowed us to increase the size and efficiency of our U.S. plants because we have needed to purchase more, newer, and better equipment to satisfy the burgeoning Mexican demand for our products.

So clearly, in Glens Falls, NY, jobs have been created in the disposable food service product area by the Genpak Corp. because of their export of goods to Mexico.

Now, think about it. On average there is a 10-percent tariff, and with that 10-percent tariff they still have had an increase. With the implementation of NAFTA, think about how many

more jobs they are going to be able to create there.

At Mount Kisco, NY, a battery manufacturer called Multiplier Industries Corp. has as its vice president, Elaine Ullrich saying:

There is a wealth of opportunity in Mexico for our type of industry. We are only hitting the tip of the iceberg in regard to exploring what's out there. If our business continues to grow with Mexico, we could easily be hiring an additional 15 people by June of this year.

That is right here in the United States, in Mount Kisco, NY.

Then locally here in Winchester, VA, Rubbermaid Commercial Products, and I met the president of that operation just recently when I was giving a speech downtown talking about some other issues.

In April 1990 they entered into an agreement with Grupo San Cristobal to market Rubbermaid products through its commercial division in Mexico.

So Rubbermaid is selling a wide range of products within Mexico. Those products are created by people in the United States of America who have jobs based on that.

We have heard time and time again that for every \$1 billion in exports, we create 20,000 jobs right here in the United States.

On average, the wage rate for those people who are manufacturing goods that are exported are 17 percent higher than those who are manufacturing items that are simply for domestic consumption here in the United States.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, may I ask just a quick question before the gavel comes down.

When will we get to debate this on the House floor, may I ask the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE]?

Mr. KOLBE. I think if the timetable holds true, we should have this submitted to the Congress shortly after we come back from the August recess and a vote on this in October of this year.

Mr. DORNAN. Then the million people who watch the proceedings here tonight have time enough to study this issue in depth and stay up with us.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank both gentlemen for their contributions to this debate.

FURTHER OXFORD STYLE DEBATE ON NAFTA

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take the entire time. I just want to use a couple minutes for some other salient examples.

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

Mr. DREIER. I am happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I have a couple points I would like to share, but I think the point that needs to be made in the ones the gentleman was talking about there, these are not big companies necessarily. This is not General Motors.

Mr. DREIER. Well, some of them are big. Rubbermaid is pretty big.

Mr. KOLBE. But they are not always big companies.

Here is a company called Stratus Specialty Vehicles in Kansas City, MO. They are an ambulance manufacturer.

Mr. DREIER. This is interesting. My original hometown.

Mr. KOLBE. Well, Cordsman Manufacturing in my town also rehabilitates ambulances for sale in Mexico. Virtually all their business now is in Mexico.

But here is Stratus. It is a small family owned ambulance manufacturer, made its first sale in 1989. It had a follow-up sale in 1990. Now it has more than a \$250,000 business, small potatoes in a lot of ways, but for Stratus it is a big amount.

The president of it, Gene Nicely said:

As a small company, it is hard to go after European dollars, but Mexico is close by. Free trade will really open a lot of doors in medical equipment and vehicle transportation. It could increase our volume and sales and, of course, jobs.

The point is if you are General Motors, if you are Du Point, if you are Procter & Gamble, you can afford the capital investment necessary to establish a plant down in Mexico; but if you are Stratus Specialty Vehicles, you cannot put a plant down in Mexico. You need to be able to do your business in the United States and sell into Mexico, and that is what the free trade agreement is about, selling our products in Mexico, taking the tariffs off our products to go to Mexico and being able to increase our sales in Mexico.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for his contribution.

I do not think there is an American who is not familiar with the "I Can't Believe It's Yogurt" operation. I see it out at Dulles Airport. I will tomorrow morning as I get ready to fly back to Los Angeles. We see them all over the country.

Jim Amos, who is the president of their international division, said:

Mexico is a natural extension of the U.S. market, especially for Texas companies. It's close geographically, and the Mexican economy is becoming more and more linked to the global business community. We anticipate continued increases in our Mexico business, and see our efforts there as a springboard to the rest of Latin America.

□ 1910

And I think one of the important points that needs to be made here is that there are some who are opponents to NAFTA who literally want to see us stick our heads in the sand and believe that we can be totally self-sufficient

here. You know, we have heralded the developments that have taken place since the revolution of 1989 due to satellite technology, and cellular telephones, and fax machines, and CNN, and all of these things that helped bring down the Berlin Wall, and the world has shrunk. We have seen the emergence of the largest economic bloc in the history of the world with EC-92. We see our friends in the Pacific rim coming together, and, if we think that we can stand alone here in the United States without taking advantage of both labor forces and markets in this hemisphere, we are doing it to the detriment of the United States of America, and clearly this agreement will, based on virtually every assessment that I have seen, create upwards of a half a million jobs right here in the United States of America.

I support NAFTA because I want to increase jobs in the United States and decrease the flow of illegal immigration from Mexico to the United States, and I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. I think that is the bottom line of what both of us are talking about here today.

It occurs to me that one of the places we have seen a lot of opposition to the North American Free-Trade Agreement is if a State like South Carolina where Roger Milliken, one of the major textile apparel manufacturers, has opposed vigorously the free trade agreement, but in reality most of the textile industry in the United States will benefit tremendously from the export of fabric, thread, equipment, to Mexico, and I notice here one company, Textile Machines Imports Exports Co. of Roebuck, SC. It is a minority-owned company, and Victor Leblond, who is the president of this company, he has been exporting textile machinery to Mexico for 18 years. It is a minority-owned company, employs about 20 people who rebuild textile machinery for export. It sells to a lot of other companies, in Asia, in Latin America. But 20 percent, 20 percent of his \$4 million sales; that is about \$800,000, goes to Mexico. So, you could say roughly, if you translate that into 20 people, 20 percent of four of the jobs in his company depend on the sales that he is doing with Mexico, and he expects to increase that substantially over the next couple of years down there in Mexico.

So, the opportunities for providing new jobs for people in the textile industry, for minority workers in the inner city, for people in the Midwest, on the border, in the Southwest and all over this country are very, very tremendous.

Mr. DREIER. I would like to point to another couple of very important examples in my State of California, one further north. There is a man called Roger Baccigaluppi who happens to be the president and CEO of Lou Diamond

Growers, the tree nut marketer, and one of the interesting things we have heard is some criticism from some in the agricultural industry, especially in my State, and I know some in Arizona who are concerned about this, and yet the statement that Mr. Baccigaluppi made on this is very interesting. He said: "As one of the major exporters in the United States, Blue Diamond depends on International trade to remain competitive. Almonds are California's largest food export and the sixth largest U.S. food export. Current tariffs," and this is what we have been talking about for the last period of time here, the average 10-percent tariff on goods going into Mexico—"Current tariffs restrict the quantity of United States almonds into Mexico. The elimination of tariffs, through a free trade agreement, would result in increased exports for U.S. growers."

And then we look at the lumber industry, Cal State Lumber Sales in San Ysidro, CA.

Mr. KOLBE. By the way, that is an extraordinarily interesting company. I have worked with that company on a lot of things, some environmental things. They have had some very interesting case studies with that as to how they have dealt with the environmental problems.

Mr. DREIER. This is Cal State?

Mr. KOLBE. Cal State, Cal State.

Mr. DREIER. It is amazing that the director of international relations is someone with whom I am sure you met, Mary Alice Acevedo.

Mr. KOLBE. She is terrific. I am sure you have met her at the Border Trade Alliance meetings. She is a wonderful person.

Mr. DREIER. She really is, and her statement on this particular issue is key. She says Mexico has allowed us to remain competitive because of supplier contracts with two Mexican firms in Tijuana. Sales, and remember this is a U.S. business, sales have increased by 700 percent and employment by 30 percent. The free-trade agreement will open up that market even further. Everything we purchase from lumber to equipment is U.S. made. We buy lumber from the several mills. These jobs which are destined for Mexico have helped the mills—these sales, excuse me, these sales which are destined for Mexico, have helped the mills keep United States workers on the job, and that is why, you know, as we listen to these arguments constantly that jobs have fled to Mexico, we acknowledge that many jobs have gone to Mexico today. But the reason for that has been the opportunity to take advantage of the U.S. market and, by zeroing out the tariffs that exist between the two countries, it is clear that this is what we like to describe as a win/win situation.

As my friend said, it is not a zero-sum gain. There can be benefits to both sides.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his contributions. He said it more succinctly than I think anybody else could say it, and I would just close with one other little anecdote or story. It is a personal one from that same trip that I took to Hermosillo. I was being taken around to see some of the projects that are being done down there, and one of them was the construction of a country club in Hermosillo. It is going to be really the first de luxe class country club. They are trying to build this entire 18 hole golf course and put in the infrastructure for fairway homes in the course of 10 months time. There were on the day that I was there more than 100 pieces of Caterpillar equipment rushing, roaring around the place, moving earth here and there. It is the first construction job in Mexico done by Peter Hewitt who I think the gentleman may know is one of the largest contractors in the United States. They are fascinated—they are not fascinated. They are watching this project very closely because they intend to stay in Mexico if this is successful because they know the kind of construction work that is going to be done down there. So, here is a hundred pieces of Caterpillar equipment. They are going to be staying down there in Mexico doing other road jobs, other sewage treatment plant jobs, other hotel construction jobs, other fairways, and golf courses and country club jobs. There is a hundred pieces of equipment from Caterpillar that is going to be staying down there, and the bottom line is in 1991 Caterpillar sold 360 million dollars' worth of equipment that went to Mexico.

That is one company, one country: \$360 million. A lot of jobs in Decatur and Peoria, IL, depend on doing that business with Mexico.

Mr. DREIER. As they say on the television programs, my friend has had the last word. I want to thank him for his participation in this and say that we do look forward to having a full debate with our colleagues who are clearly opponents, and we respect those who oppose NAFTA. We look forward to having an exchange with them.

I thank my friend from New York and my friend from Colorado for their forbearance.

RADIO AND TV MARTI FUNDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to address the House on a matter that has really been brought to the public's attention through a press release that was put out earlier today by the Cuban-American National Foundation with respect to event that occurred in the House and debate and action ear-

lier this afternoon on the appropriations bill for fiscal 1994 for the Commerce, Justice, State Department and the Judiciary, and I need to set some background in getting into the real subject matter this evening.

As we are all quite well aware, this is a very difficult budget year for us to work in. We are faced with an absolute cap on discretionary spending, less next year than this year, and on for the next 5 years. Each of the appropriations subcommittees, therefore, has really been put to the test of trying to prioritize, find places to save money, identify lower priority programs so that we are able to shift funds to programs that we feel are more vital to the national interest.

□ 1920

In connection with going through the programs within the jurisdiction of the Commerce, Justice, State Subcommittee on which I am a member, I looked at a whole range of potential areas for reductions in spending and came up with a total of about \$200 million that I proposed in cuts so that we could accomplish our mission this year under the limits of the Budget Act.

Among the cuts that I proposed to my colleagues on the subcommittee were the funds that had been tentatively identified for Radio Marti and TV Marti broadcast services financed by the United States Government directed at Cuba.

It is really the issue of funding for Radio and TV Marti that prompted the events that I want to address from earlier today. I think it is important, first of all, to establish some of the reasons that it seemed to me that both of these programs were reasonable candidates for elimination, so that we might have more FBI agents or have more efforts made in applied technology or a whole range of other programs that were otherwise going to be shorted more than they already are in the Commerce, Justice, State bill.

TV Marti, very briefly, a particularly dubious program that was being broadcast through a tethered balloon down off the Florida Keys into Cuba, only able to be broadcast between 3 and 6 a.m., the signal being jammed fairly effectively most of the time by the Cuban Government. We were broadcasting on a channel that was allocated to Havana television. Legitimate questions were raised because of our membership in the International Telecommunications Union whether or not we were in violation of international telecommunications requirements in conducting this activity.

It was very expensive per program hour. To top it all off, the programming really was of a very questionable standard, things like, I am told, Pop-eye cartoons and the lives of the rich and famous, things that probably are not going to make a great deal of dif-

ference in an informed political climate in Cuba.

So that was one program I proposed for elimination in subcommittee. My colleagues went along with the suggestion.

They also agreed to eliminate funding for Radio Marti. Let me just again lay a little bit of the groundwork as to why the several million dollars that were proposed for Radio Marti also struck me as a very likely candidate for reductions in funding, given this very difficult budget year we are in.

First of all, it costs too much. The National Association of Broadcasters reports, for instance, that the average commercial radio station is large markets in this country spends about \$5 million a year. Radio Marti, on the other hand, was spending over \$20 million a year. Even at the reduced level that was ultimately suggested by the full Committee on Appropriations last week, we would be paying double the private sector standard for the broadcasts going out of Radio Marti.

Its 1994 budget contains a number of seemingly excessive or unnecessary expenses. For instance, some \$300,000 for talent involved in panel discussions and commentaries. Certainly by my experience I think most of us know that most reputable commercial news agencies do not have to pay for guests or interviews.

Some \$8 million for its employees. With some 150 employees, that is an average salary and benefits of over \$50,000 a year. And \$342,000 for audience research. With the audience in Cuba, it is questionable, it seems to me, how you are practically able to apply those funds to that purpose. Close to \$1 million for technical operations, for which the average radio station in this country pays some \$40,000 a year. I wonder why Radio Marti needs to spend so much for a transmitter? A transmitter is a transmitter, regardless of where it is broadcasting. Even on a percentage kind of calculation, Radio Marti's engineering costs were extraordinarily high.

They were also proposing to spend over \$200,000 for domestic interviewers. I am not sure what those folks do. Anyway, there were substantial costs associated with this program.

If it were a unique program and one of proven effectiveness that was providing a service that was not being furnished in any other fashion, we might be able to rationalize those kinds of costs. But I think it comes up short there as well.

The Federal Communications Commission estimates there are 23 commercial radio stations in south Florida that reach Cuban listeners. Nine of them broadcast in Spanish, and five of the Spanish language stations have primarily a news or a news-talk format, presumably a source of much the same kind of public information, news, and

analysis that is the mission of Radio Marti.

Radio Marti also thinks that these stations reach Cuba, in that it has leased time itself on two of them to broadcast its own programs.

The signals of Radio Marti are often jammed, and that jamming sheds some doubt on the claim that 70 percent of the Cuban population regularly listens. According to their budget request, overcoming jamming has become Radio Marti's top priority, one wonders if that is the problem, again given the other sources of free radio signals into the Cuban market, whether this is a particularly cost effective program.

Its assertion of audience size is also quite questionable. There is no way of validating this, obviously. There is no Nielsen ratings for Cuba. But the widely quoted statistic that 70 percent of the Cuban people listen to Radio Marti seems to be based primarily on a 1991 survey of some 487 Cubans seeking asylum in this country, which may not be an entirely objective pool of respondents.

The quality of programming for Radio Marti has also raised numerous allegations of unsound practices and questionable contracts, incompetence, and censorship. Violations of Federal rules and regulations appear to be a serious problem there.

The former director of Radio Marti, Ernesto Betancourt, who resigned in 1990, charges that he was ousted because he refused to promote the political aspirations of Cuban-American hardliners. The former director of the Office of Cuban Broadcasting also resigned earlier this year, citing conflicts within TV and Radio Marti over their coverage of the Cuban-American community in Miami.

Finally, a reporter in my area of the country who was recently in Cuban for an extensive assignment reports that from the interviews done by this reporter, anyway, the Cubans are really a pretty sophisticated media audience; that they discount or distrust all government-generated media, whether it comes from Cuba or the United States; and they do in fact rely mainly on other sources of information, including a very effective underground grapevine that taps into CNN signals and newspapers coming in from Miami and so forth.

Anyway, for all of those reasons, it just seemed to me, given our shortages of funding for a whole range of vital national programs, that these were two programs that could well stand to be eliminated without seriously jeopardizing our national interest.

So in view of that, I was particularly startled earlier today when my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART], approached me on the floor of the House and expressed his strongest possible objection to my plan to try to delete funding for Radio

Marti from this appropriations bill which we had under debate earlier this afternoon. He said that he did not intend to threaten me, but that if I followed through with my plans, he would do all he could to go after everything he could find that was important to me.

He argued that I should back off of my objection to Radio Marti funding because it was the most important program to him and the Cuban-Americans that he represents, while cutting the program I conceded was certainly not the most important issue in the world for me, although I thought it was the appropriate thing to do.

I attempted to explain that this involved matters of national interest because of its obvious fiscal and foreign policy dimensions, and that therefore this was not just a project in a Member's district about which arguably he was due some particular deference, but rather that each Member of the House had a legitimate basis to address the issue. I told Mr. DIAZ-BALART that I planned to proceed with my challenge to Radio Marti funding.

□ 1930

Later this afternoon, he proceeded to raise a point of order against some \$62 million in construction funding for the National Institute of Standards and Technology, known by its acronym NIST, about half, less than half of which was probably going to NIST facilities in the district I represent in Colorado.

As the Speaker is aware, that point of order was sustained and the money was stricken from the bill. Sometime later, the work on this bill was suspended before the House had even reached the portion of this appropriations bill involving funding for Radio Marti. We are expected to resume it when we return from the Fourth of July work period on July 13 or 14.

In any case, I was greatly disturbed and saddened that the normal legislative business of this House should have been subjected to this kind of retributive tactics and would not have requested this time on special order but for the fact that the Cuban-American National Foundation proceeded to issue a press release crowing over the success of Representative DIAZ-BALART in attacking a program presumed to be important to me because of my stated intention to deal with funding for Radio Marti.

As the press release reads,

Colorado Rep. David Skaggs' opposition to peaceful U.S. radio broadcasting to Cuba has apparently cost his district \$23 million in federal funds. The money was earmarked to build a national Institute of Standards and Technology facility at a Boulder-area university. During today's House debate on the fiscal year 1994 appropriations bill, Mr. Skaggs announced his intention—

By the way, I did not so announce, in any case.

Announced his intention to eliminate \$8.7 million in Federal funds for the continuation of Radio Marti.

It goes on,

The NIST project was subsequently excised in a point of order by Cuban American Rep. Lincoln Diaz-Balart (R-FL), a firm backer of Radio Marti and freedom for Cuba, after Rep. Skaggs rebuffed Rep. Diaz-Balart's attempts to reach a compromise on cutting Radio Marti.

Let me just say, I wish there were grounds or an opportunity for compromise. It was basically my understanding of my colleague's proposition to me that I either back off or else. There was not much of an opportunity to compromise.

Perfectly legitimate for Mr. DIAZ-BALART to raise the point-of-order that he did. The program, the NIST construction money that he attacked, has not been specifically authorized in statute so, under the rules of the House, there was nothing intrinsically improper about the move against the NIST funding.

It is troubling, though, that given this press release, his motivation seems to be not that he objects to funding for the National Institutes for Standards and Technology but that he objects to me and the way I try to carry out my responsibilities as a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

I think it is sad and unfortunate that given the necessary give and take of the legislative process in the House, with Members' deeply held views and principles in the balance, that matters might degenerate into any kind of vindictiveness along these lines.

Certainly, the alliances and the antagonisms that exist in this House shift and realign day to day, as different issues come before us. I think we all have to keep in mind that those with whom we may disagree today will be our allies on another issue tomorrow, and it is essential to and really critical for us to keep in mind the paramount requirement for civil discourse, if this legislative body is to carry out its responsibilities in a respectful and respectable way.

To use the old aphorism, we need to be able to disagree without being disagreeable.

My colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO], has been kind enough to join me on the floor this evening and has some substantial experience of his own with respect to these issues.

I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO].

Mr. SERRANO. First of all, let me commend the gentleman on two points that I think are extremely important.

First of all, for his ability to stay totally calm, cool, and collected during what I know is a very difficult situation, a situation which requires for many Members to be very concerned about the kind of actions that were

taken today and, actually, to be very upset.

But at the same time, I also feel that it was important for him to take the time to put forth this information.

The problem, having said those two things, is that I am almost tempted to sort of smile a little bit and say, "Welcome to the club." There is a situation that exists in our country which is well known in some communities and totally unknown in others, that there is a group called the Cuban-American National Foundation which uses difficult, difficult tactics whenever you disagree with them on any policy that has to deal with the Island of Cuba, its present, its future and, in many cases, even its past.

This group is one that is funded through private contributions as well as receives government monies. It receives grants from the National Endowment for Democracy. It receives grants in an indirect way through Radio and TV Marti, because the chairman of the Cuban-American National Foundation is also the chairman of the board of TV Marti and the chairman of the board of Radio Marti. And so it all becomes a conglomerate, more or less, used to put forth a policy, a philosophy towards bringing about political changes in Cuba.

That is OK. Interestingly enough, if we were to discuss it, the gentleman from Colorado, myself and members of the Foundation would agree on political changes in Cuba. What we do not agree on and what the gentleman is now a member of the particular club is that if you disagree in any way, shape, or form, you are questioned not on that particular action you took, in this case Radio and TV Marti, but in many cases you are labeled.

I cannot tell you how many times people I know are labeled on Spanish radio as being Communists because they may oppose, for instance, the embargo, the trade embargo on Cuba.

Article after article and publication after publication will indicate that this Foundation continues to attack anyone who disagrees with them.

Just last August, the Americas Watch and the Fund for Free Expression conducted a study within our borders of human rights and civil rights violations. These are organizations that traditionally tell us what is going wrong in other countries.

These two groups said that in Miami, there was an abuse of human rights, documenting a campaign of intimidation and terror and criticizing U.S. Government encouragement primarily through funding of groups that are closely identified. And this group, in particular, with efforts to restrict freedom of expression. And the principal example, says the report, is money granted to such groups as the Cuban-American National Foundation.

On the issue of Radio and TV Marti, I have stated before in public and

taken extreme amounts of heat for it that this is an electronic toy created for this Foundation to put forth their policies towards what the future of Cuba should be like.

If my colleague would permit, I think that if anybody in this country wants to get an electronic toy, they should get a Radio Shack credit card and not come here and get funded and then use this little toy to promote a policy without giving full support to people who may have a different view.

Now, we are not discussing the policy of Cuba. Let us take a second to talk about that, because I think that is important. It is at the bottom of all this.

□ 1940

For 30-odd years we have had an embargo on Cuba. Radio and TV Marti are part of a failed policy. Why is it a failed policy? Simple. If the intent of all our acts on foreign policy toward Cuba was to bring about a political change, we failed. There has been no political change. The political change that may come will come as a direct result of political changes in the Soviet Union which can no longer assist the Cuban economy.

It was not our policy that created that, it was the lack of somebody else's future policy that created it.

As the gentleman has stated, in Miami right now there are about five radio stations that beam into Cuba on a daily basis. Those radio stations, because of the Foundation's influence in Miami, I will tell the Members, are not allowed to spend 1 minute of the day saying that anything positive could be going on in Cuba, or worse, that there could be a new American policy to solve the problem of the relationship between Cuba and the United States.

What is the need for TV and Radio Marti? Only that it is a tool for some people to stay in power, locally. These people make no secret about the fact that, should there be a political change in Cuba, they want to return and establish themselves as the new government. This is what we are talking about here.

The gentleman is courageous enough to stand up and say, "We are in a cost-cutting mood. There are changes that have to take place." For the first time this year, I joined the gentleman on the Committee on Appropriations, and was saddened to see that, as a Representative of the poorest district in the Nation, the South Bronx, the poorest district in the Nation, the moneys were extremely short in talking about housing and social services and education.

Now we are spending all these dollars for what is a failed policy and a waste of time. He was correct in bringing up those questions. What he did not anticipate, perhaps, is that now he finds himself on the list of enemies for the Cuban-American National Foundation,

and the lack of tact, the lack of democratic principle to immediately put a press release into a Member's district and to try to intimidate him in that way—they have a right to do that, this is a democracy. Unlike them, we believe that you can do that whenever you want, but we believe you can disagree.

The gentleman disagreed, and for that, they will try to make him pay a price. Again, welcome to the club. There are so many of us who, any time we turn on the radio, find attacks about what we stand for.

I want to really congratulate the gentleman for putting forth today's conversation, and to tell the gentleman that I stand shoulder-to-shoulder with him in making these questions and continuing to make these questions, and to alerting people, perhaps starting today, that there exists within our borders a group of people who have set policy—past administrations have allowed them to set policy toward Cuba, and that has to end; that they can become part of a lot of voices who will determine what the future of Cuba should look like, including people who live in Cuba right now.

Mr. SKAGGS. I am very grateful for the gentleman's comments. Let me just say, I do not think there should be any question or doubt left in the minds of anyone that may be listening to us this evening, that no one is here to suggest that anything but our wholehearted endorsement of the need for change in the government and the economic policies of Cuba. I want to make sure that there is no doubt about that. I am a strong supporter for free institutions there, as we all are elsewhere in the world.

The question in my mind was the effectiveness of spending millions of dollars on these programs to accomplish that purpose, and clearly, that effectiveness had not been demonstrated. In these difficult budget times, it seemed to me that there was an area where we could save some money and not jeopardize our national interests.

I am grateful to the gentleman. I believe he feels the same way about our basic objectives here. It is not what our goals are with respect to a free Cuba, but how we use scarce taxpayer dollars to effectuate those goals.

Mr. SERRANO. I am totally in agreement. One of the things that I had mentioned to the gentleman before is that if you happen to listen to short-wave radio, you will hear there is a lot of communication between the United States and Cuba. This, as he well pointed out, is something that is not necessary.

Interestingly enough, not that we negotiate with individuals we do not deal with, that we do not recognize as leaders, anyway, but when TV Marti came in it created such a difficulty in Cuba that the Cuban Government then started jamming Radio Marti, and on many

occasions had said, "If you lift TV Marti, we will stop jamming Radio Marti."

So to that extent, what we are doing is creating another layer on top of what we already had because we were not allowing either one of our institutions to get in.

As you well know, TV Marti at times is ridiculous. A balloon up in the air is called Fat Albert, and every so often it gets loose and we have to chase it all over the Florida Keys and the Everglades to bring it back so they can broadcast Popeye cartoons at 3 o'clock in the morning.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BLUTE (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today, on account of bringing home his first baby from the hospital.

Mr. HOUGHTON (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today, on account of attending a funeral.

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. KOLBE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MCCOLLUM, for 60 minutes each day on today and July 13, 14, 20, and 21.

Mr. KOLBE, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. DREIER, for 60 minutes, on today and July 15.

Mr. KIM, for 5 minutes, on July 14.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MINGE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MINGE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LAFALCE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BLACKWELL, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. TOWNS, for 60 minutes, on July 13 and 14.

Mrs. CLAYTON, for 60 minutes, on July 27 and 29.

Mr. OWENS, on July 1, 2, 13, 14, 15, 16, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 26, 27, 28, 29, and 30.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. MINGE) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SKAGGS, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KOLBE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CAMP.

Mrs. ROUKEMA.

Mr. ROTH.

Mr. MOORHEAD.

Mr. SOLOMON.

Mr. HOKE.

Mr. GOODLING in two instances.

Mrs. MORELLA.

Mr. STUMP.

Mr. FIELDS of Texas.

Mr. GALLEGLY.

Mr. DICKEY in two instances.

Mr. SCHAEFER.

Mr. BEREUTER in three instances.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.

Mr. GINGRICH.

Mr. GEKAS.

Mr. GILMAN in two instances.

Mr. ROHRBACHER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MINGE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. NATCHER.

Mr. SWETT.

Mr. SAWYER, in two instances.

Mr. BARCIA.

Mr. TOWNS.

Mr. ROSE.

Mr. ROWLAND.

Mr. STARK, in three instances.

Ms. SLAUGHTER.

Mr. GLICKMAN, in two instances.

Mr. RANGEL, in two instances.

Ms. BYRNE.

Mr. KANJORSKI, in two instances.

Mr. FAZIO.

Mr. HAMILTON, in four instances.

Mr. ENGEL, in two instances.

Mrs. KENNELLY.

Mr. DEFazio.

Mr. LANTOS, in two instances.

Mr. FORD of Michigan.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

Mr. LAFALCE.

Mr. MAZZOLI.

Mr. ORTIZ.

Mr. MINGE.

Mr. DE LUGO.

Mr. RICHARDSON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SKAGGS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HUGHES.

Mr. KREIDLER.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.

Mr. KLEIN.

Mr. MICHEL.

Mr. MARKEY.

Ms. MOLINARI.

Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.

Mr. KILDEE.

Mr. FAZIO.

Mr. TRAFICANT.

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

Mr. LEHMAN.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. CHAPMAN.

Mr. GILLMOR.

Mr. GUTIERREZ.

Mr. CONDIT.

Mr. PORTER.

Mr. GONZALEZ.

Mr. KENNEDY.

Ms. PELOSI.

Mr. BILBRAY.

Mr. FINGERHUT.

Mr. LIPINSKI.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 88. Joint resolution to designate July 1, 1993, as "National NYSP Day."

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROSE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 765. An act to resolve the status of certain lands relinquished to the United States under the Act of June 4, 1897 (30 Stat. 11, 36), and for other purposes.

H.R. 1876. An act to provide authority for the President to enter into trade agreements to conclude the Uruguay Round of the multilateral trade negotiations under the auspices of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, to extend tariff proclamation authority to carry out such agreements, and to apply congressional fast track procedures to a bill implementing such agreements.

H.R. 2118. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY, JULY 13, 1993

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DEAL). Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 115 of the 103d Congress, the House stands adjourned until 12 noon, Tuesday, July 13, 1993.

Thereupon (at 7 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 115, the House adjourned until Tuesday, July 13, 1993, at 12 noon.

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

"I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true

faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 103d Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

PETER W. BARCA, First District, Wisconsin.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1520. A letter from the Chief Financial Officer, Department of State, transmitting a violation of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 1517), pursuant to Revised Statutes; section 3679(e)(2); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1521. A letter from the Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's Defense Manpower Requirements Report for fiscal year 1994, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 115(a); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1522. A letter from the Acting President, Thrift Depositor Protection Oversight Board, transmitting the annual report of the Board, pursuant to section 21A(k)(4) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1523. A letter from the Acting President, Thrift Depositor Protection Oversight Board, transmitting the annual report of the Oversight Board on the Resolution Funding Corporation for the calendar year 1992, pursuant to Public Law 101-73, section 511(a) (103 Stat. 404); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1524. A letter from the Acting President, Thrift Depositor Protection Oversight Board, transmitting the audited financial statements of the Resolution Trust Corporation as of December 31, 1992, and for the year then ended, pursuant to section 21A(k)(1)(A) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1525. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Army's proposed lease of defense articles to Australia (Transmittal No. 7-93), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1526. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Navy's proposed lease of defense articles to Australia (Transmittal No. 8-93), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1527. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of Air Force's proposed lease of defense articles to the Coordination Council for North American Affairs (Transmittal No. 6-93), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1528. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed license for the export of major defense equipment sold commercially to the Republic of Korea (Transmittal No. DTC-29-93), pursuant

to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1529. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed license for the export of major defense equipment and services sold commercially to the United Kingdom (Transmittal No. DTC-33-93), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1530. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed license for the export of major defense equipment and services sold commercially to Taiwan (Transmittal No. DTC-23-93), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1531. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed license for the export of major defense equipment and services sold commercially to the Netherlands (Transmittal No. DTC-31-93), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1532. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on missile proliferation, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776b(a)(1); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1533. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report on U.S. peacekeeping contributions and the use of U.S. Armed Forces in Somalia (H. Doc. No. 103-107); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1534. A letter from the Director, U.S. Information Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "United States International Broadcasting Act of 1993"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1535. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting notice of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1536. A letter from the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements, transmitting the 1992 annual report of independent auditors who have audited the records of the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements, a federally chartered corporation, pursuant to Public Law 88-376, section 14(b) (78 Stat. 323); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1537. A letter from the Counsel, National Tropical Botanical Garden, transmitting the annual audit report of the National Tropical Botanical Garden, Calendar Year 1992, pursuant to Public Law 88-449, section 10(b) (78 Stat. 498); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1538. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report entitled "Value Engineering on Federal-Aid Projects," pursuant to Public Law 102-240, section 1091(b) (105 Stat. 2024); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

1539. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting an informational copy of a lease prospectus, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 606(a); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

1540. A letter from the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the 1993 annual report on the financial status of the railroad unemployment insurance system, pursuant to 45 U.S.C. 369; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

1541. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting a report entitled "Comprehensive Report to Congress: Proposals Received in Response to the Clean Coal Technology V Program Opportunity Notice"; jointly, to the Committees on Appropriations, Energy and Commerce, and Science, Space, and Technology.

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. ROSTENKOWSKI: Committee on Ways and Means. H.J. Res. 208. Resolution disapproving the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (most-favored-nation treatment) to the products of the People's Republic of China; adversely (Rept. 103-167). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FORD of Michigan: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 1804. A bill to improve learning and teaching by providing a national framework for education reform; to promote the research, consensus building, and systemic changes needed to ensure equitable educational opportunities and high levels of educational achievement for all American students; to provide a framework for reauthorization of all Federal education programs; to promote the development and adoption of a voluntary national system of skill standards and certifications, and for other purposes, with amendments (Rept. 103-168). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HUGHES (for himself and Mr. BERMAN):
H.R. 2576. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to provide an exclusive right to perform sound recordings publicly by means of digital transmissions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLARD:
H.R. 2577. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the operation of certain visitor facilities associated with, but outside the boundaries of, Rocky Mountain National Park in the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BEVILL:
H.R. 2578. A bill to ensure fair resolution of commercial disputes between United States firms and Saudi Arabia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA (for himself, Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. PENNY, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. SARPALIUS, Ms. LONG, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. MINGE, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. BARLOW, Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. MCKINNEY, Ms. THURMAN, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. FARR, Mr. WILLIAMS, Ms. LAMBERT, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. GUNDERSON, and Mr. NUSSLE):

H.R. 2579. A bill to extend to 1993 and subsequent crops the disaster assistance provisions of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation,

and Trade Act of 1990; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KOPETSKI, and Ms. FURSE):

H.R. 2580. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act relating to Federal facilities pollution control; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 2581. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to make a grant to the State of Tennessee for the purpose of erecting a highway sign to inform motorists of the location of the Living Heritage Museum in McMinn County, TN; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

H.R. 2582. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to make a grant to the State of Tennessee for the purpose of erecting a highway sign to inform motorists of the location of Blount Mansion in Knoxville, TN; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself, Mr. HAMBURG, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. SCHENK, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. OWENS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. STOKES, Mr. FILNER, Mr. STARK, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BEILENSEN, Mr. MINETA, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. DIXON, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. TORRES, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. BECERRA, and Ms. WATERS):

H.R. 2583. A bill to establish a California ocean protection zone, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Public Works and Transportation, and Natural Resources.

By Mr. FOGLIETTA (for himself and Mr. BORSKI):

H.R. 2584. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide equity in medical benefits for retirees in multiemployer plans; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Education and Labor.

By Mr. GEKAS:

H.R. 2585. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 and the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to provide for fixed deficit targets to reduce the deficit to zero by the end of fiscal year 2000; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. GLICKMAN (for himself, Mr. GEKAS, and Mr. KANJORSKI):

H.R. 2586. A bill to reorganize the Federal administrative law judiciary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GLICKMAN (for himself, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. SLATTERY, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PENNY, Mr. TANNER, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. EVANS, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. FINGERHUT, and Ms. DANNER):

H.R. 2587. A bill to amend the International Air Transportation Competition Act of 1979; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. HINCHEY:

H.R. 2588. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of qualified acupuncturist services under part B of the Medicare Program; and to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for coverage of such services under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and

Means, Energy and Commerce, and Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 2589. A bill to improve under the title II of the Social Security Act and to increase the Social Security benefit and contribution base; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota (for himself, Mr. MINGE, and Mr. PENNY):

H.R. 2590. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to require the Secretary of Agriculture to make prevented planted disaster payments for wheat, feed grains, upland cotton, and rice under certain circumstances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. KENNELLY (for herself and Mr. PICKLE):

H.R. 2591. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt services performed by full-time students for seasonal children's camps from Social Security taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KREIDLER (for himself, Mrs. UNSOELD, and Mr. McDERMOTT):

H.R. 2592. A bill to establish a clearinghouse of information concerning telecommunications technologies that are useful in distance learning programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LAFALCE (for himself, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. MFUME, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. DANNER, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. MEEK, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. TORRES, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD):

H.R. 2593. A bill to establish minimum standards of fair conduct in franchise business relationships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAFALCE:

H.R. 2594. A bill to amend the Small Business Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. LAFALCE (for himself, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. MFUME, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. DANNER, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. MEEK, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. TORRES, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 2595. A bill to revise current Federal law and procedure to provide consumers with comprehensive and accurate statistical information about franchising and franchise practices, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2596. A bill to strengthen current Federal law and regulation to protect consumers in connection with the representation and sale of franchise businesses; to facilitate increased public disclosure regarding franchise opportunities, to enhance common law remedies for purchasers of franchises, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MACHTLEY (for himself, and Mr. KOPETSKI):

H.R. 2597. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit to small employers for the cost of implementing health promotion and disease prevention programs for their employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACHTLEY (for himself, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. WALSH, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. GALLO, and Mr. HINCHEY):

H.R. 2598. A bill to extend and improve the adjustment assistance program for firms under the Trade Act of 1974; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Ms. MOLINARI, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. FINGERHUT, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BEILENSEN, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. FILNER, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. HUGHES):

H.R. 2599. A bill to prohibit the use of outer space for advertising purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KANJORSKI (for himself, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. ORTON, Mr. KLEIN, Mr. MORAN, and Ms. KAPTUR):

H.R. 2600. A bill to promote economic growth and credit formation by facilitating the development of a secondary market for business, commercial, and community development debt and equity investments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 2601. A bill to redesignate the Environmental Protection Agency as the Department of Environmental Protection; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MAZZOLI (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. McCOLLUM):

H.R. 2602. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to improve immigration enforcement and antismuggling activities, to reform the asylum law, and to authorize appropriations for the Immigration and Naturalization Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts (for himself and Mr. MOAKLEY):

H.R. 2603. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide transition relief for nonprofit student loan funding corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ORTIZ:

H.R. 2604. A bill to establish a Wetlands Center at the Port of Brownsville, TX, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ORTON (for himself, Mr. FROST, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. SOLOMON, and Mr. WALSH):

H.R. 2605. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to provide that a person purchasing a home with a mortgage insured under the FHA single family mortgage insurance program may, under such program, borrow amounts for the downpayment from family members; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 2606. A bill to amend the Public Service Act to provide for the conduct of expanded studies and the establishment of innovative programs with respect to traumatic brain injury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RICHARDSON (for himself, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. KING):

H.R. 2607. A bill to establish the Professional Boxing Corporation, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Education and Labor.

By Mr. SAWYER (for himself and Mr. MYERS of Indiana):

H.R. 2608. A bill to make permanent the authority of the Secretary of Commerce to conduct the quarterly financial report program; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mrs. ROUKEMA):

H.R. 2609. A bill to establish a Presidential commission to investigate and propose solutions to reduce the broadcasting of violence

on television; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STARK:

H.R. 2610. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a Mediplan that assures the provision of health insurance coverage to all residents, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 2611. A bill to delay the effective date of certain proposed amendments to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STARK (for himself and Mr. FARR):

H.R. 2612. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to the treatment of certain charitable risk pools; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STARK:

H.R. 2613. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny certain tax benefits in the case of buildings constructed with Japanese services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming:

H.R. 2614. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands of the Shoshone Federal reclamation project, Wyoming, to the Big Horn County School District, Wyoming, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming (for himself, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. POMBO, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. DELAY, Mr. STUMP, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HERGER, Mr. SKEEN, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 2615. A bill to limit the acquisition by the United States of land located in a State in which 25 percent or more of the land in that State is owned by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H.R. 2616. A bill regarding the payment of interest with respect to certain reliquidated entries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.J. Res. 224. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to prohibit the death penalty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILMAN:

H.J. Res. 225. Joint resolution designating the third week of July 1993 as "Captive Nations Week," and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mrs. MINK, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. VENTO, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. FROST, Mr. GORDON, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HYDE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. McCOLLUM, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MANTON, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. OLVER, Mr. STOKES, Ms. WATERS, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. McNULTY, Mr.

HOYER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. MILLER of California, and Mr. TORRICELLI):

H.J. Res. 226. Joint resolution to designate the second Sunday in October 1993 as "National Children's Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TORRICELLI:

H.J. Res. 227. Joint resolution calling upon the President to initiate discussions with members of the United Nations for the purpose of entering into agreements providing for an equitable sharing of responsibility among those members relating to armed forces available to the United Nations Security Council, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GEPHARDT:

H. Con. Res. 115. Concurrent resolution providing for an adjournment of the House from the legislative day of Thursday, July 1, 1993 to Tuesday, July 13, 1993 and an adjournment or recess of the Senate from Thursday, July 1, 1993 or Friday, July 2, 1993 until Tuesday, July 13, 1993; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CAMP:

H. Con. Res. 116. Concurrent resolution calling upon the President to discontinue further economic assistance to the Government of the Russian Federation until all pertinent documents from the archives of the Communist Party of the former Soviet Union relating to the fates of American prisoners of war and missing in action have been provided to the United States Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LEHMAN (for himself, Mr. STARK, Mr. WILSON, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. SARPALIUS, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. CANADY):

H. Con. Res. 117. Concurrent resolution relating to improved United States-Mexico cooperation in controlling illegal immigration; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SOLOMON:

H. Con. Res. 118. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that any limitation under Federal tax law on the deductibility of compensation exceeding \$1 million paid to executives individually should be expanded to apply to compensation paid to entertainers and athletes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 43: Mr. FOGLIETTA.
H.R. 44: Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. CAMP, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. COYNE, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. HOYER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KLEIN, Mr. KLINK, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. PAXON, Mr. POMBO, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. SWETT, Mr. TANNER, Ms. THURMAN, Mr. TORKILDSEN, and Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 58: Mr. WELDON.
H.R. 65: Mr. TANNER, Mr. COX, and Mr. VOLKMER.
H.R. 68: Ms. THURMAN.

H.R. 115: Mr. TORRES.

H.R. 140: Mr. BROWDER, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. ISTOOK.

H.R. 145: Mr. PETRI and Mr. KIM.

H.R. 147: Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H.R. 214: Mr. DELAY and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 245: Mr. STUMP.

H.R. 285: Mr. LANCASTER.

H.R. 303: Mr. VOLKMER.

H.R. 322: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. WYNN, Mr. KREIDLER, and Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 378: Mr. PAXON.

H.R. 436: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. McDADE.

H.R. 512: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H.R. 558: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin.

H.R. 591: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 647: Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas.

H.R. 649: Mr. SHAW, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. HAMBURG.

H.R. 662: Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H.R. 703: Ms. NORTON and Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.R. 763: Mr. DOOLEY.

H.R. 767: Mrs. CLAYTON and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 786: Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. TANNER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 789: Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. GILLMOR.

H.R. 794: Mrs. MORELLA.

H.R. 799: Mr. GILCREST and Mr. MICHEL.

H.R. 827: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. EVANS, Mr. LEACH, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. PAXON, Mr. GILLMOR, and Mr. ROGERS.

H.R. 830: Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. QUILLEN, and Mrs. MORELLA.

H.R. 864: Mr. ROHRBACHER.

H.R. 911: Mr. LEWIS of California and Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 916: Mr. GIBBONS.

H.R. 930: Mr. BROWN of California.

H.R. 942: Mr. UPTON, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. STUDDS, and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 962: Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. TEJEDA, and Mr. UNDERWOOD.

H.R. 967: Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. GOODLING, and Mr. STEARNS.

H.R. 977: Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 982: Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1017: Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 1036: Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. SWIFT, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1103: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota and Mr. CHAPMAN.

H.R. 1126: Mrs. LLOYD.

H.R. 1127: Mrs. LLOYD.

H.R. 1141: Mr. SKELTON and Mr. REED.

H.R. 1155: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 1246: Mr. BEILENSEN.

H.R. 1251: Mr. LIVINGSTON and Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 1304: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 1349: Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina.

H.R. 1380: Mr. PARKER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 1406: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. BISHOP, and Mr. BLACKWELL.

H.R. 1419: Mr. FISH.

H.R. 1431: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.

H.R. 1438: Mr. SAXTON and Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.R. 1440: Mr. SCOTT and Ms. BYRNE.

H.R. 1442: Mr. FISH.

H.R. 1500: Ms. NORTON, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.

H.R. 1517: Mr. OLVER, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. MANTON, and Mr. REED.

H.R. 1541: Mr. CLINGER, Mr. BALLENGER, and Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 1555: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 1595: Mr. ROBERTS.

H.R. 1608: Mr. CAMP, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 1697: Mr. SCOTT, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. HORN, and Mr. HALL of Texas.

H.R. 1722: Mr. UPTON, Mr. KLING, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BONIOR, Ms. MALONEY, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. WYNN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. KOPETSKI, Ms. DANNER, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. REED, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. FROST, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. TORRES, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. PARKER, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. FISH.

H.R. 1733: Miss COLLINS of Michigan.

H.R. 1734: Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H.R. 1738: Mr. EMERSON.

H.R. 1793: Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. FILNER, Mr. STARK, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. COYNE, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. FROST, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. COLEMAN.

H.R. 1804: Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. DE LUGO.

H.R. 1913: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. HOUGHTON.

H.R. 1915: Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. FROST, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. REED, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. EVANS, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. DEUTSCH, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1924: Mr. FISH.

H.R. 1950: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. ISTOOK, and Mr. INHOPE.

H.R. 1952: Mr. BORSKI, Mr. FINGERHUT, Mr. FROST, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 1981: Mr. DREIER, Mr. VISLOSKEY, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. HAYES, Mr. EVERETT, Mrs. MINK, and Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma.

H.R. 1994: Mr. KLEIN.

H.R. 2012: Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. McCANDLESS, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MINETA, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. TORRES, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. DARDEN, Mrs. MINK, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. HOYER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. OLVER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SABO, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. SWETT, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. ROSE, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. TRAFFICANT, Mr. BREWSTER,

Mr. McCURDY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. TANNER, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. OBEY, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. DE LA GARZA and Mr. LIVINGSTON.

H.R. 2043: Mr. HASTINGS and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 2121: Mr. FALOMAVEGA, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. YATES, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. CANADY, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. WOLF, Mr. LINDER, Mr. COX, Mr. KYL, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. MICA, and Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 2134: Mr. CASTLE.

H.R. 2136: Mr. MOORHEAD.

H.R. 2139: Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 2140: Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 2159: Mr. INSLEE.

H.R. 2191: Mr. PARKER, Mrs. CLAYTON, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 2192: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 2263: Mr. STUPAK, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 2285: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. KOPETSKI.

H.R. 2286: Mr. EMERSON, Mr. INHOPE, and Mr. SUNDUKIST.

H.R. 2292: Mr. BISHOP and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 2307: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.

H.R. 2319: Mr. FISH, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. HAMBURG, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. HUFFINGTON, Ms. MOLINARI, and Mr. TUCKER.

H.R. 2331: Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. KOPETSKI.

H.R. 2338: Mr. LEVY.

H.R. 2353: Mr. HILLIARD.

H.R. 2375: Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H.R. 2393: Mr. KYL, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. CAMP, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. CANADY.

H.R. 2394: Ms. SCHENK and Ms. SHEPHERD.

H.R. 2395: Ms. SCHENK and Ms. SHEPHERD.

H.R. 2399: Mr. CLYBURN.

H.R. 2433: Mr. POMBO.

H.R. 2434: Mr. KASICH and Mr. KING.

H.R. 2456: Ms. MOLINARI.

H.R. 2488: Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 2535: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BISHOP, Ms. LONG, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, and Mr. TEJEDA.

H.R. 2556: Mr. COX.

H.R. 2572: Mr. WAXMAN.

H.J. Res. 106: Mr. STOKES and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.J. Res. 137: Mr. MANN and Mr. KLEIN.

H.J. Res. 157: Mr. COYNE, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. KASICH, Mr. KING, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MARTINEZ and Mr. NADLER.

H.J. Res. 162: Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MEEK, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. PORTER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. McDADE, Mr. VALENTINE, Ms. DANNER, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. STOKES, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. KLING.

H.J. Res. 178: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. CRAMER.

H.J. Res. 190: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. FAWELL, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. KING, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. QUINN, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. REGULA, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. WALSH, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. EWING, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. KLEIN, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. INHOPE, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr.

LEVY, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. LEACH, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. CARR, Mr. COX, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GRAMS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. WOLF, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. McCANDLESS, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. PORTER, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. TALENT, Mr. THORNTON, Mr. COYNE, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. STENHOLM, Ms. MALONEY, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. TEJEDA, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mrs. MINK, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. GALLO, Mr. GILCREST, Mr. PETRI, Mr. PAXON, Mr. OWENS, Mr. HORN, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MORAN, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. HEFNER, Mrs. MEEK, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. HOYER, Mr. WELDON, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. DEAL, Mr. DELAY, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ROTH, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. HERGER, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. HALL of Ohio, and Ms. LOWEY.

H.J. Res. 204: Mr. CAMP, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. WELDON, Mr. TEJEDA, Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.J. Res. 208: Mr. ABERCROMBIE and Ms. MOLINARI.

H.J. Res. 212: Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. BATEMAN, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H. Con. Res. 7: Mr. MOORHEAD.

H. Con. Res. 26: Mr. MARKEY.

H. Con. Res. 52: Mr. DIXON, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. PASTOR, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. WYNN, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. LAMBERT, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. BISHOP, and Mr. FISH.

H. Con. Res. 79: Mr. CRANE, Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, Mr. ZELIFF, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, and Mr. ISTOOK.

H. Con. Res. 84: Mr. HASTINGS.

H. Con. Res. 100: Mr. SLATTERY and Mr. ANDREWS of Maine.

H. Res. 11: Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H. Res. 86: Mrs. THURMAN.

H. Res. 127: Mr. BACHUS of Alabama.

H. Res. 128: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. BORSKI, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Ms. LOWEY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. ORTON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. TUCKER.

H. Res. 165: Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. ROSE, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. STEARNS, and Mr. ROWLAND.

H. Res. 175: Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. GILCREST, Mr. CRANE, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H. Res. 188: Mrs. MINK, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. FISH, Mr. KLEIN, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

