

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, July 13, 1993

The House met at 12 noon.

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

We remember in gratitude and praise, O gracious God, those people who inspire and strengthen and whose motivation in life is to encourage and assist. Each of us can recall those whose words have quieted our concerns and whose grace has eased any hurt. May each of us learn from these people who are dedicated to helping others and whose acts of charity and good will strengthen the bonds of peace and understanding in our lives and in our world. This is our earnest prayer. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

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

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

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SKELTON 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 bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 412. An act to amend title 49, United States Code, regarding the collection of certain payments for shipments via motor common carriers of property and nonhousehold goods freight forwarders, and for other purposes.

S. 464. An act to redesignate the Pulaski Post Office located at 111 West College Street in Pulaski, Tennessee, as the "Ross Bass Post Office."

S. 1197. An act to make miscellaneous and technical corrections to the Immigration and Nationality Act and related provisions of law.

S. 1205. An act to amend the Fluid Milk Promotion Act of 1990 to define fluid milk processors to exclude de minimis processors, and for other purposes.

S. Con. Res. 28. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding

the Taif Agreement and urging Syrian withdrawal from Lebanon, and for other purposes.

### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 6968(a) of title X, United States Code, and the order of the House of Thursday, July 1, 1993, authorizing the Speaker and the minority leader to accept resignations and to make appointments authorized by law or by the House, the Speaker on Friday, July 2, 1993, did appoint as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Naval Academy the following Members of the House: Mr. HOYER of Maryland; Mr. MFUME of Maryland; Mrs. BENTLEY of Maryland; and Mr. SKEEN of New Mexico.

### APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO U.S. DELEGATION TO THE PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY OF THE CONFERENCE ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 169(b) of Public Law 102-138, and the order of the House of Thursday, July 1, 1993, authorizing the Speaker and the minority leader to accept resignations and to make appointments authorized by law or by the House, the Speaker on Friday, July 2, 1993, did appoint to the U.S. Delegation to the Parliamentary Assembly of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe the following Members of the House:

Mr. HAMILTON of Indiana, Vice Chairman; Mr. HOYER of Maryland; Mr. GEJDENSON of Connecticut; Mr. LANTOS of California; Mr. MCCLOSKEY of Indiana; Mr. CARDIN of Maryland; Mr. MORAN of Virginia; and Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York.

### APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 93-304, as amended by section 1 of Public Law 99-7, and the order of the House of Thursday, July 1, 1993, authorizing the Speaker and the minority leader to accept resignations and to make appointments authorized by law or by the House, the Speaker on Friday, July 2, 1993, did appoint to the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe the following Members of the House:

Mr. HOYER of Maryland, Cochairman; Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts; Mr. RICHARDSON of New Mexico; Mr. MCCLOSKEY of Indiana; Mr. CARDIN of Maryland; Mr. PORTER of Illinois; Mr. SMITH of New Jersey; Mr. WOLF of Virginia; and Mr. FISH of New York.

### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, July 13, 1993.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5 of Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on Friday, July 2, 1993 at 10:41 a.m. that the Senate passed without amendment: H.R. 588; H.J. Res. 213 and appoints additional conferees: H.R. 2264.

With great respect, I am  
Sincerely yours,

DONNALD K. ANDERSON,  
*Clerk, House of Representatives.*

### CLINTON BUDGET TO PROMOTE SMALL BUSINESSES

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

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, when it comes to the restoration of the economy, no one will dispute the importance of small businesses.

President Clinton's budget package recognizes the vital role that small businesses play in an expanding economy. Without the Clinton budget, small businesses will not reach their full growth potential.

First, the Clinton budget will prolong lower borrowing costs so businesses can expand.

Second, small businesses will benefit from a special capital gains tax cut. This too will aid growth.

Third, small businesses will also receive the 25-percent deduction for health care premiums. This will hold the line on costs.

Fourth, businessmen and businesswomen who invest in their own firms will receive tax benefits.

Under the Clinton budget, revenue collection will be unaffected for the overwhelming majority of small businesses.

□ 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 fact, 96 percent of the small businesses that file individual returns will not have an increase in their individual rates.

And 100 percent of the small businesses will not experience any change in the higher corporate rates.

Mr. Speaker, the Clinton budget is good for small businesses and it is good for America.

#### COST OF GOVERNMENT DAY

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

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, today is a day of celebration—it is Cost of Government Day, the day when Americans have finally earned enough income to pay off their share of the combined costs of taxes, Government spending, and regulation. It is the day when the money we earn is finally entirely for us, and not for the Government.

As Grover Norquist, president of Americans for Tax Reform, stated:

Over 53 percent of the average American's income will be consumed by Federal, State, and local government in 1993. Tax Freedom Day, when Americans have earned enough to pay their share of the tax burden, is May 3. But the burden is not then lifted. More than 2 more months of work are necessary until we work for ourselves. Just because we don't see these costs on a pay stub or sales slip doesn't mean they don't exist or are harmless. These costs are very real and they have real consequences—jobs killed and economic growth strangled.

As chairman of Cost of Government Day, today I am introducing a resolution establishing July 13, 1993, as Cost of Government Day. Twenty-two of our colleagues have joined me as original cosponsors of this resolution, and I invite all of my colleagues to do so as well.

This Government is too big and costs too much. It is time to reform it and give it back to the people it belongs to—American taxpayers.

#### DISASTROUS FLOODING IN THE MIDWEST

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

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, we are experiencing disastrous flooding in the Midwest. The Missouri River and the Mississippi River and their tributaries combined with unprecedented rains to flood towns and farms throughout Missouri. Last week, from a National Guard helicopter, I saw counties and homes and businesses and fertile fields covered with water. "Devastation" hardly describes the flood damage in my State.

Agencies—local, State, and Federal—are responding quite well, but most important, Mr. Speaker, I witnessed Mis-

sourians working together, filling sandbags, moving household furniture, neighbor helping neighbor, all with incomparable "show me" attitude.

Soon, Mr. Speaker, this Congress will be asked to provide assistance to those who have suffered great loss. I hope we will be able to do our best, not only to relieve the suffering but to help those Missourians become productive Americans once again.

#### COST OF GOVERNMENT DAY (CONTINUED)

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

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, today is Cost of Government Day; that is to say, this is the day when Americans earn enough income to pay off their share of the combined costs of taxes, government spending, and regulation. Rather ironic—don't you think—when you consider what the budget conferees are considering.

If the conferees agree with what has barely slipped through the House and the Senate, then the Cost of Government Day will be a lot later next year.

□ 1210

The budget reconciliation bills passed by the House and the Senate, said by their advocates to be a balanced combination platter of revenue increases and spending cuts, are really platters which are very heavy on the tax gravy.

In the House version, tax increases outweigh spending cuts by more than 5 to 1. In the Senate version, there is a slight improvement. It is 3 to 1.

What is more, both bills are the largest tax increase in American history.

Mr. Speaker, because our Government is supposed to be of the people, by the people, and for the people, not on the backs of the people, it is time to cut taxes, cut spending, cut Government regulation. It is time for a freeze on most Government expenditures, taxes, and regulation.

#### PRESIDENT CLINTON, STAR OF THE TOKYO SUMMIT

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton was the star of the Tokyo summit and hit several home runs that mean jobs for Americans. But those international victories can be meaningless if we fail to pass his economic plan here at home. He struck a tariff reduction deal with Canada, Japan, and the European communities that reinvigorated the stalled Uruguay round. He got Japan to commit to reduce its \$50 billion trade surplus with a

framework agreement. He solidified support for Boris Yeltsin, probably insuring his survival. And he sent a strong message that Asia is an important national security priority for the United States and that North Korea should be careful. In short, President Clinton was Presidential and handled his second summit with great skill.

His foreign policy team, headed by Secretary of State Warren Christopher, deserves enormous credit.

As the line goes, President Clinton comes home with momentum and a strengthened hand to face the daunting challenges here at home. Let us not let him down.

#### COST OF GOVERNMENT DAY

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, today is Cost of Government Day, that day on which Americans have worked long enough to pay all their taxes and worked long enough to pay for all the cost of regulations at all levels of government.

You may not be aware that today all levels of government consume 43 percent of the Nation's net income in taxes. Governments at all levels also impose costs on the cost of our goods and services in America, costing Americans another 10 percent of their net income; so government at all levels is consuming today 53 percent of the Nation's net income.

And guess what? They are all broke. The Federal Government is even more than broke. We are \$4 trillion in debt.

And guess what, all levels of government are trying to find more ways to get into your pockets and raise taxes.

It is time for all of us in government at all levels to reexamine what our priorities ought to be. We ought to have a government that is smaller and more effective, a government that works with the American people and not against them.

We wonder why the economy is not growing, yet 53 percent of the Nation's net income is being absorbed by taxes.

No wonder there is no money for investment or job creation.

#### AMERICAN PEOPLE DO NOT LIKE NAFTA

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, why is our Trade Representative in such a hurry to push the North American Free-Trade Agreement through the Congress?

Two weeks ago, Judge Richey issued an order telling the President of the United States to slow down, to provide

us with an environmental impact statement.

Even a 2-mile highway project in Elyria, OH, requires an environmental impact statement.

Reports this week are that the environmental side agreements that the Trade Representative's office is negotiating are far, far short of what the American people want.

I say to the President, slow down and get it right. Get it right for American business; get it right for American workers; get it right for American jobs.

The more the American people learn about the North American Free-Trade Agreement, the less they like it.

Mr. Speaker, the next time I address the House of Representatives, I will discuss how NAFTA affects truck safety.

#### PRESIDENT'S TAX BILL PUTS SMALL BUSINESSES IN LINE OF FIRE

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

Mr. BACHUS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, there is a new Clint Eastwood movie out now called "In the Line of Fire." The movie reminds me of President Clinton's tax bill, which puts small businesses in the line of fire.

The difference, of course, is that small business will not take a bullet for the President. It will take a bullet from the President.

Under the President's plan, the effective tax rate for most small businesses will increase by 60 percent, killing thousands of jobs.

The Clinton White House seems to be saying to small business: "Go ahead, punk, make my day. If you are successful at making money in your business, we are going to tax you at a deadly rate."

Mr. Speaker, this is a curious way to treat small business, the most productive job-creating sector of our economy.

When it comes to taxing small businesses, I have this advice for the administration. I urge the President, "Hold your fire."

#### WORST THING TO DO ON BUDGET IS TO DO NOTHING

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

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, following the recent successful G-7 summit in Tokyo, the very worst thing that we can do in Congress is to do nothing whatsoever about the deficit reduction and economic growth plan which is now pending in the House-Senate conference. We can and will debate the issues and we can and will even quibble

over some of the details in those plans which have to be reconciled in the conference.

But basically the plans are easily dovetailed, because they both devote most of the earnings that are saved to deficit reduction. They both have a deficit reduction trust fund. They both primarily are progressive, trying to assign most of the revenues raised to those who can afford to pay the most.

There are many differences, Mr. Speaker, but there are many similarities. There is much that can be built on, but once again, the worst thing that we could do for the world's economy, the worst thing we can do for the U.S. economy, the worst thing we could do for ourselves as Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle, is to do nothing. So let us do something. Let us pass the budget conference report.

#### CLINTON TAX-AND-SPEND BILL WILL DEVASTATE SMALL BUSINESSES

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, today on Cost of Government Day let us recall that the Democrat-controlled House has passed a tax-and-spend budget bill which will absolutely devastate small businesses and cost jobs in this country. The Democrat-controlled Senate has passed a bill which will absolutely devastate small businesses and cost jobs in this country. And the Democrat President is telling us that he's confident he'll get an even better bill out of the conference committee. Given his track record, that's kind of scary.

Small businesses generate the bulk of this Nation's new jobs. And they will be the hardest hit by the Clinton tax-and-spend budget. Because, when you raise taxes, you kill jobs. When you raise taxes, consumer prices inevitably rise, demand falls off, and small businesses begin to collapse.

Each and every Member of this body represents small businesses. We have an obligation to defend them and the jobs they create. We have an obligation to protect them from the largest tax increase in American history.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to talk with their small business constituents and their employees. Listen to what they say. And remember them when you vote on the Clinton tax grab.

#### ACHIEVING A FAIR DEFICIT REDUCTION PLAN

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, our President has just completed a very success-

ful G-7 meeting. His hand was strengthened by the prospect of a deficit reduction package that is working its way through Congress.

It has been a long time since Americans and those who look to America have seen a fair and honest deficit reduction plan.

President Clinton's plan calls for a \$500 billion deficit reduction in 5 years, \$100 billion more in deficit reduction than the Republican plan.

While President Clinton plans to help seniors, the middle class, small business, students, and children, the Republicans seek to help the wealthy.

Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Washington Post entitled "The Republicans Fake It" says very clearly about the Republican deficit reduction plan, and what was the object of all this? It was mainly to save or to grandstand in the name of saving the richest people in the country from the higher top income tax bracket rate the Democrats would rightly impose to achieve the necessary deficit reduction fairly.

□ 1220

#### CLINTONOMICS ALL-STARS

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

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the "Cardinal" rule this All-Star Week is whether this Congress will be "Brave" and cut spending first or be "Dodgers" and deal three strikes on the American economy: "Giant" taxes, "Exponential," "Astro"-nomical new spending, and a river of "Reds" ink.

Well, com-"Padres," I am not optimistic. With the Clinton administration's "Rocky" start and the fact that the Senate can't "Phillie"-buster away all those unpopular Clinton taxes, the House-Senate conferees, economic "Pirates," and tax-and-spend "Twins" will "Brew" up a makeshift tax plan to "Sox" all Americans with new taxes, from the oldest "Indian" chief to our youngest little "Tiger" "Cubs". We must do better. I say to my friends, it will take all the "Angels" in Heaven and "Rangers" on Earth to send President Clinton and this liberal Congress a message. Until Washington cuts spending first, even the "Marlins" in the sea and the "Blue Jays" in the air will know this Government will not have "Met" the challenge. Now play ball.

#### CONGRESS IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE LOSS OF JOBS IN AMERICA

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, Nike basketball shoes are made in Indonesia.

Nike basketball shoes are made in Indonesia.

Mr. Speaker, Nike workers are paid 19 cents an hour.

Just think about this:

Those sneakers are sold in America for \$125 a pair, and it takes 19 cents, about 1 hour, to make them, and \$125 to buy them.

Mr. Speaker, we have got all of these free-traders saving all our jobs who are saying, "If we don't have these cheap imports to keep our prices down, you're going to lose your job." Beam me up, Mr. Speaker.

My colleagues, what are the sneakers made out of? Solid gold? These Nike executives are dunking and dribbling all the way to the bank, and they are saying, "Don't worry. Congress will do nothing. In fact, Congress is going to approve a free-trade agreement with Mexico, and they are paid much higher, 50 cents an hour."

I say, Mr. Speaker, that American jobs will be wearing Nike sneakers and sprinting out of our country, and Congress ought to be ashamed of itself. Congress is responsible for the loss of jobs in America.

#### CLASS WAR IS HELL

(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, class war is hell. Especially on the economy.

I wish the President would keep that in mind as his tax plan goes to conference.

President Clinton has said that only the wealthiest will pay the bulk of the taxes.

What he has not said is that small business owners will be hit the hardest. In fact, 80 percent of all small businesses file as individuals.

If the President's plan to hit those making over \$200,000 is enacted, it will hit those small businesses like a Tomahawk missile.

The result will be lost jobs, lower productivity and slow economic growth.

Tax fairness is a two-way street. If we raise taxes on small businesses, they will be forced to lay off workers or go out of business.

Class war is, indeed, hell. I urge the President to give up the fight and work to expand economic growth.

This tax bill does not have to be.

#### NATIONAL SERVICE TRUST ACT

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

Mr. SWETT. Mr. Speaker, the National Service Trust Act is one of the most positive and hopeful initiatives the 103d Congress will consider. It will

build community spirit by promoting community involvement, education, and the participation of our young people in our national life. Through the incentive of financial assistance to help cover education costs, our youth will be encouraged to become involved in and contribute to the life of their communities through service opportunities.

Too often our youth have wanted to contribute to our society, but have been limited by economic realities that constrain their choices. The National Service Trust Act will give them that chance. It will enable our young people to serve and contribute to our national life, and at the same time to have part of their collegiate debt burden eased. It will provide a wonderful opportunity for your youth to find fulfillment through meaningful employment opportunities, and build a sense of community spirit, which this country desperately needs.

Robert Kennedy once said that youth is "not a time of life, but a state of mind—a temper of the will, a preponderance of courage over timidity." Young people can be motivated with this special kind of program which can use that youthful courage and energy in service which benefits both themselves and our Nation. I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this visionary legislation—the National Service Trust Act.

#### THE NEW HAMPSHIRE INTERNATIONAL SPEEDWAY

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

Mr. ZELIFF. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, I had the privilege of attending my first Winston Cup NASCAR race. The "Slick 50" 300 was held at the New Hampshire International Speedway in Loudon, NH.

The most amazing part of the race was that it even took place. Only a couple of years ago the raceway was nothing more than a pile of tires. The Bahre family had a vision for the speedway and they turned that pile of tires into one of the finest speedways in America. The drivers themselves said the track was one of the best on the NASCAR circuit.

While some people talk about economic development, the Bahre family has created economic development. More than 65,000 people poured into the State for this event and spent over \$150 million, giving a much-needed boost to the New Hampshire economy. This is the kind of economic development that creates jobs without putting the Federal Government further in debt.

Today I rise to salute the Bahre family and their vision, and on behalf of the people of New Hampshire, I want to thank them for their efforts in strengthening our State's economy.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to express my deep sadness at the passing of Davey Allison, who I spent time with on Sunday, and who died this morning as a result of a helicopter crash in Alabama yesterday. I am sure I speak for the whole body when I express my sympathy to the entire Allison family.

#### BALTIMORE'S FIELD OF DREAMS

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

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, today is a joyous day for Maryland and particularly the Third Congressional District. Baltimore—the city that brought the world Brooks Robinson, Cal Ripken, Jr., Jim Palmer, Frank Robinson, and Earl Weaver, the city that gave birth to the legend of Babe Ruth, the city whose team the Orioles, has won three world championships, six American League pennants and seven American League Eastern Division titles in only 39 years, the home of the Negro League Elite Giants, Homestead Grays, and Baltimore Blacksocks—tonight Baltimore will proudly host major league baseball's 64th midsummer classic at its own field of dreams, Oriole Park at Camden Yards.

There won't be players popping out of Iowa corn fields tonight, but all the stars from Cal Ripken, Jr., to Barry Bonds to Ken Griffey, Jr., will be on hand as we watch the game while remembering past All-Star highlights like Pete Rose crashing into Ray Fosse in 1970, Carl Hubbell striking out future Hall of Famers, Lou Gehrig, and Marylanders, Babe Ruth and Jimmy Foxx consecutively in 1934, and the Babe hitting the first home run in All-Star history back in 1933.

In addition to hosting the All-Star Game, my district is honored to host this year's All-Star FanFest. The FanFest has been called "a magical baseball theme park" by its organizers. FanFest features include the world's largest baseball memorabilia collection outside of the Baseball Hall of Fame in Cooperstown, NY.

So, tonight, have a hotdog and some peanuts in Maryland's Third Congressional District, and at 8:30 p.m., when the world's eyes will be watching, my constituents and I will be proud to welcome you to Baltimore's field of dreams.

#### DO THE RIGHT THING

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, the heat is on in Washington. It is not just the mercury in the thermometers; the tempers of the American people are also on the rise. As official Washington comes back to town—the people who pay our

salaries are hot under the collar as they watch to see how much the tax and spend Democrats will cost them in higher taxes.

President Clinton will have to utilize all his persuasion and muscle—in addition to the ongoing White House media blitz—to get necessary support from the Hill because Americans know more taxes and spending are not the answer. I voted against my own party's President the last time the tax-and-spend Democrat Congress misled this Nation into trading higher taxes now for empty promises of spending cuts later. And it was not easy for me. But it was the right thing to do. I urge House Democrats to do the right thing. Vote "no" on higher taxes. Cut spending first. Polls show 9 out of 10 Americans disapprove of the House economic package. This is unmistakable heat.

#### MIDWEST FLOOD VICTIMS DESPERATELY NEED OUR HELP

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

Ms. DANNER. Mr. Speaker, never before have I, or the people of Missouri's Sixth District, seen such devastation as that caused by the flood we are experiencing.

Homes and businesses have been severely, some irreparably, damaged. Our rich farmland is under water. People are struggling to save themselves and their loved ones. But the spirit of the people of north Missouri is strong, and they will survive. But they, and all the victims of the Midwest flood of 1993, desperately need our help—and they need it now.

There is no way yet to know the full extent of the damage. Conservative estimates in Missouri alone place the cost at between \$500 million and \$1 billion—and the waters continue to rise. As a matter of fact, more rain is forecast for Missouri today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues' support for emergency flood relief for all victims of this most devastating of natural disasters.

□ 1230

#### LIMITED MILITARY INVOLVEMENT IN MACEDONIA—A RECIPE FOR DISASTER

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

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, why is President Clinton putting American combat troops into Macedonia? One would think that with all of America's experiences with Lebanon and now Somalia, President Clinton, who is supposedly so brilliant, would be more circumspect.

The Balkans is a pile of kindling wood. The policy there makes no sense. It is like putting gasoline in your attic when there is a raging fire in your kitchen.

So why is the President doing it? The Washington Post in an article said something like this: "The U.S. forces are arriving amid some skepticism from U.N. officials and troops here. There is speculation that the Clinton administration is shouldering its way into Macedonia for political purposes."

This is serious business. Why is Congress not involved? Why are the Members of Congress not questioning this policy? Why have the American people not been informed?

Mr. Speaker, this is a dangerous step for our troops and our country. President Clinton owes an explanation to this Congress and to this country now.

#### MANY RECOGNIZED FOR HEROIC EFFORTS IN DISASTROUS MID- WEST FLOODS

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I have seen first hand the awesome devastating power of Mother Nature. During this past week I toured flood ravaged counties in my district and never have I seen the extent of flooding and damage which is occurring all along the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers at the present time.

This year alone in Missouri we have seen a 100-year flood and now a 500-year flood all within a few short months. There are 15 counties in my district that have been declared major disaster areas and several thousand individuals have been forced from their homes and businesses with many of their belongings and memories left behind to be washed away by the swollen rivers. Thousands of acres of farm land are underwater, as well as many businesses having been destroyed. However, the spirit and will of those who live along the raging rivers has not been broken.

I want to take this opportunity to thank the Army Corps of Engineers, the Missouri National Guard, and all of the volunteers for their outstanding work in combating the flooding. Without their combined, extraordinary efforts the flooding and damage would be more extensive. Again, I want to extend my thanks and praise to everyone who has volunteered their time and resources to assist those who are threatened by the flooding.

#### A STRANGE VIEW OF TAX FAIRNESS

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

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton has a strange view of tax fairness.

He would prefer to raise taxes on small business by 60 percent, while increasing the rate on large corporations by only 1 percent.

Is that really fair to the American economy and the American people?

Between the years 1988 and 1990, businesses with fewer than 20 employees created 4.1 million jobs. During that same period, big corporations with over 500 employees had a net loss of a half a million jobs.

Under the Clinton plan, small business, the most productive, job-creating sector of our economy, gets hit the hardest.

Corporate America, perhaps because it signed on early to Clintonomics, gets hit only a little.

The administration's tax fairness punishes success and rewards failure in the business community.

That may sound good to the President's political advisers, but it is a prescription for disaster for our economy and work force.

Let us not punish those who create the vast majority of jobs in this country, Mr. Speaker.

#### FOR U.S. WORKERS, NAFTA MEANS FEWER MANUFACTURING JOBS, MORE BURGER JOBS

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

Mr. APPELGATE. Mr. Speaker Japan violates every trade agreement that we have with them, and we lose jobs. China floods the American market with slave-labor and child-labor-made products, and we lose jobs. The United States is now taking action against 19 nations for dumping steel into this country, and we have lost jobs from that dumping. Russia is dumping aluminum into the United States, and we are losing jobs.

We are now asked to give Mexico a free reign through the North American Free-Trade Agreement.

What is going on in America? We cannot continue to be a sugar daddy to the rest of the world. NAFTA must not pass. America is going to lose more jobs, more manufacturing jobs, and will only gain more burger jobs.

Mr. Speaker, NAFTA is a cockamamie idea whose time has not come, and Congress must say, "No more."

#### THE ADMINISTRATION'S ECONOMIC PRONOUNCEMENTS— DOUBLESPEAK AT ITS BEST

(Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming asked and was given permissions to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, it is disappointing that the

American taxpayers are required to decode and decipher the statements that come from their own Government. It is more than disappointing, Mr. Speaker, it is wrong.

The administration continues to tell us that we are going to have an economic growth plan and continues to tell us that there will be cuts in spending and a reduction in debt. That is doublespeak in its most advanced form.

The folks at home, however, have translated it pretty well. Spending cuts are on the President's verbal menu. Usually one would think that a spending cut means you had spent more last year than you are going to spend this year, and that you would spend less the next year. Wrong. There may be some programmed cuts out in the future, but in fact spending will go up \$200 billion next year more than we spent last year.

Deficit reduction usually means the debt will be reduced. In fact, the national debt will grow at the same pace as it did last year. The national debt is scheduled to grow a trillion dollars a year in each of the next 4 years.

Mr. Speaker, that is doublespeak at its best. We need straight talk from our Government, and we deserve it.

#### CUTTING THE INTELLIGENCE BUDGET

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, the cold war is over. The Soviet Union no longer exists. Russia and other former enemies are now seeking admission to NATO.

Given that context, given a \$4 trillion national debt and enormous unmet social needs at home, I find it incredible that an intelligence authorization bill is making its way to the floor of the House—which maintains funding for the CIA and other intelligence agencies at about the same level as last year.

Mr. Speaker, we must develop a rational sense of priorities in this country. We must significantly cut CIA spending and address the real needs of our people.

Over the past few weeks, we've seen major cuts in the administration's proposals for funding student financial aid—we passed an appropriations bill that cut student aid by \$1.4 billion below the President's request. We cut employment and training programs to put Americans back to work by \$1.9 billion. We cut funding for summer jobs for youth, small business loans and funds for wastewater treatment plans—programs that could put our people back to work and help rebuild America. We passed a reconciliation bill which would cut Medicare by over \$50 billion over the next 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, it is absurd to cut education, environmental protection, job training, and the needs of our senior citizens while maintaining a bloated and unnecessary CIA budget. In the weeks to come, I look forward to working with my colleagues in cutting the CIA budget and restoring sanity to our priorities.

#### LIMITED FIREBREAK FORCE IN MACEDONIA TERMED A MISTAKE

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I share the concerns and sentiments of my colleagues from Missouri about the flooding in our region, but I must speak about the deployment of United States troops this weekend in Macedonia.

Mr. Speaker, this Member supports and indeed recommended President Clinton's decision to deploy American troops to the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. However, the decision to deploy only 300 troops to that nation, lightly armed, under U.N. control, and with a limited mission that amounts to being observers, is a recipe for disaster. These United States troops are now, by their sharply limited mission, armament, size, and ambiguous command, inviting and very vulnerable targets for anyone who wants to kill an American or escalate the unrest in that region of the Balkans. Indeed, this is a more vulnerable force than the marines who were slaughtered at the Beirut airport some years ago.

Mr. Speaker, there should be at least 10 times as many United States troops deployed in Macedonia, heavily armed, under direct United States command and control, and with stated rules of engagement which would permit them to defend themselves and strike back with overwhelming force. Furthermore, it should be clear that this firebreak force is deployed to Macedonia in our national interest to avert the further internationalization of the warfare, and to defend Macedonian sovereignty. We need to make it clear that United States troops in Macedonia will be protected by the full and immediate military force of the United States. Not only are the lives of United States troops at stake, a failure to perform this mission well may damage the success and credibility of future United States or multilateral peace keeping or deterrent actions.

Mr. Speaker, those of us in Congress must immediately urge President Clinton and the Clinton administration to immediately rectify this mistake in deploying our troops.

#### MEXICO'S LOW-WAGE, HIGH-SKILL WORKERS ARE COSTING UNITED STATES JOBS

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, in the last 2 years, my State of Connecticut has lost 180,000 jobs. Good jobs. Jobs for high-skill, high-wage workers. Working people cannot afford to have this trend continue. Yet if we approve the North American Free-Trade Agreement, the United States will lose many of its best jobs to Mexico.

NAFTA supporters have argued that Mexican workers cannot compete for high-skill jobs. But that myth was recently exploded in a study done by University of California economist Harley Shaiken.

Shaiken points out that Mexico's workers produce a number of high technology products. For example, Mexican workers quickly mastered the sophisticated skills and machinery needed to produce car engines, and made Mexico the world's largest automobile engine exporter. And as for quality, a Nissan plant near Mexico City achieved the lowest number of defects of any Nissan plant worldwide.

Mexico has deliberately pursued a low-wage, high-skill strategy that has so far taken away an estimated 600,000 jobs that might have been located in the United States, and NAFTA will dramatically speed the process of shifting jobs from the United States to Mexico.

We cannot let NAFTA send hundreds of thousands of our best jobs south. I urge my colleagues to oppose NAFTA and save the high-skill jobs that are the backbone of the American way of life.

□ 1240

#### COST OF GOVERNMENT DAY—REGULATORY OVERKILL

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

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today, July 13, marks the first annual Cost of Government Day—this is the day when Americans have finally fulfilled their total financial obligation to government in terms of the cost of taxes plus the cost of regulation.

Mr. Speaker, my home State of New Jersey has lost its manufacturing base at a rate four times the national average. Businesses that leave or shut down cite high taxes and onerous inefficient regulations as the deciding factors.

I believe that many of our regulatory programs have vitally important goals, such as cleaner air and water. But too often, mandates are passed by Congress

and regulations enacted by Federal agencies with no consideration of their impact on jobs. Until this changes, too many Americans will find themselves out of work.

#### NORTH AMERICAN FREE-TRADE AGREEMENT WILL COST AMERICA JOBS

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, the North the North American Free-Trade Agreement may well be decided by this Congress within the next 4 months—and with it, the lives and livelihoods of hundreds of thousands of American workers.

I have fought this sweeping agreement since negotiations began, and I will continue that fight for one simple reason—jobs.

NAFTA is not a free-trade agreement. It is a free, greedy, short-view investment agreement that would cost American jobs.

Whatever benefits might emerge from NAFTA would come at the cost of American workers—primarily manufacturing workers in places like my own home State of Michigan, where jobs now paying good, decent wages would be lost.

The world leaders who met last week at the G-7 summit spent much of their time bemoaning flagging economies and talking about the need for jobs, jobs, jobs.

They were right. Creating and stabilizing jobs are the most important factors we must consider. And that means turning our backs on agreements like NAFTA that would leave the United States measurably weaker and poorer for thousands upon thousands of Americans.

For the sake of American workers, we cannot afford to pursue such disastrous policies.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues not to pass NAFTA.

#### COST OF GOVERNMENT DAY

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to note that this is a sad day indeed. The Americans for Tax Reform Foundation calculates that not until today, July 13—Cost of Government Day—has the average American worker earned enough income to pay off Federal, State, and local government imposed financial obligations.

I am astonished that in this climate of regulatory and tax overkill, the President wishes to further increase the financial burden on our citizens.

A November 1991 study by Ronal Utt for the Institute for Policy Innovation

concluded, "The combined effect of all government regulations may be costing Americans between \$400 and \$500 billion annually, or a staggering \$4,000 to \$5,000 per household per year."

And, of course, President Clinton's tax bill promises to increase that burden even more. How much more can we stand, Mr. President? How much more?

#### TRIBUTE TO JAMES A. HUDSON

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in tribute to a special man, a Vietnam veteran who survived that war, but nevertheless died in service to his country, here on July 5. James A. Hudson's 8 years as a much celebrated National Park Service employee earned him the classification "temporary."

As two front page Washington Post articles and an editorial this morning recount, Mr. Hudson was well known for his devoted work attending the great Lincoln Memorial statue. He suffered a heart attack on duty after working three shifts over 2 days during the busy July 4 weekend heat wave.

James Hudson worked 8 long years, for longer hours than most Americans, as a temporary employee. Thus his wife Marlene and their seven children are not entitled to life insurance and retirement benefits.

Mr. Hudson's tragic death points out the exploitation of 150,000 temporary Federal workers who are denied health care and other vital benefits.

James Hudson's sacrifice warrants the effort I am making to make him an exception to the rule. Changing the rule sanctioning a second-class Federal work force, however, is the only appropriate memorial to James A. Hudson.

#### CONGRESSIONAL ALL-STAR BASEBALL TICKETS

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

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. Speaker, Major League Baseball offered Members of Congress the opportunity to buy tickets to tonight's All-Star Game in Baltimore.

Major League Baseball assured us this was not an attempt to influence Members of Congress on legislation dealing with baseball's antitrust exemption.

It is just a coincidence, that baseball's antitrust exemption is being considered this year. It is just a coincidence that this is also the first year that All-Star tickets have been offered to Congress. Sure.

Major League Baseball, with a chuckle and a smile, assured us that the opportunity to buy \$60 tickets could not be considered a bribe.

And that does make sense. Unless you read the Washington Post's classified ads.

In the classifieds, All-Star tickets are in fairly high demand.

Here's six seats—600 bucks each.

Here's four, in a row, for \$4,400.

And here—two seats, congressional box seats, for sale for \$1,000 each—or best offer.

Mr. Speaker, that is probably just a coincidence too.

#### MISSISSIPPI RIVER NATURAL DISASTER

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have grown up along the Mississippi view this great river as a thing of beauty, a source of recreation, and the most important inland waterway in America. But on occasion the good Lord reminds us who is in charge, and the mighty Mississippi and its tributaries today reflect his fury.

We have all seen the damage and devastation reported in the press. Today I want to salute the survivors and those who struggle. Even as I speak, the level of stress along the flooded Mississippi rises with the water. I want to acknowledge the fine work of government agencies at all levels, the Salvation Army, the Red Cross, and scores of local charities who sustain the victims. The indomitable spirit of the people who live through this disaster will endure, but those of us who live in the Midwest would like to offer a little prayer to God that he would at least save his rain for a few weeks.

#### DEFICIT REDUCTION? OR SLIGHTLY REDUCED SPENDING INCREASES?

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, there has been much discussion about the President's deficit reduction package as passed by both the House and the Senate. Despite the rhetoric, the only reduction in Federal spending is the difference between the projected increase in spending and the President's plan which is a slightly lower increase.

Under the so called deficit reduction spending cut bill going to conference spending actually increases. Compared to the current spending level of \$1.45 trillion, the budget packages adopted by the House and the Senate would increase annual spending to \$1.75 trillion in just 5 years.

The fact is that the House- and Senate-passed plans increase spending every year. Spending would increase 21

percent by 1998. There are some spending cuts, but they are more than offset by other spending increases.

Slowing the growth of spending from the CBO baseline and reducing the amount we might have overspent is too often viewed by the media as spending cuts and deficit reduction.

I have two graphs that show how Congress has failed to reduce spending, or reduce the growth in the public debt. Federal spending increases while the total public debt continues to rise in spite of the record high tax increase.

Growth in Federal Spending—Increases: 1993 to 1994 \$60 billion increase; 1994 to 1995 \$60 billion increase; 1995 to 1996 \$50 billion increase; 1996 to 1997 \$70 billion increase; and 1997 to 1998 \$70 billion increase.

Growth in Public Debt—Increase: 1993 to 1994 \$372 billion increase; 1994 to 1995 \$366 billion increase; 1995 to 1996 \$356 billion increase; 1996 to 1997 \$359 billion increase; and 1997 to 1998 \$370 billion increase.

Remember, if everything goes as planned under the House- and Senate-passed bills, without any supplementals, without any interest rate increase, without any reductions in anticipated revenues, the public debt would increase \$1 billion a day for the next 5 years. In 1998, we will be talking about our \$6.2 trillion public debt.

□ 1250

#### DEMOCRATS HAVE A PLAN

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

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, the message was clear in my district. When my colleagues head back and the congressional recess is over, it is time to get the budget process over as well.

I think the previous speaker illustrates well the differences here. The difference is that while they can complain about the budget plan, they do not have a plan. They can complain about taxes, but they do not tell us that three-quarters of those taxes that are proposed are on the upper income, the 6 percent, the folks that have had a good time for the last 12 years.

They can complain that there are not cuts, but there are \$250 billion worth of cuts, and in their package, they use Democratic cuts for their specific cuts and then use broad-based "We do not quite know where we are going to go but how about caps" for their cuts.

The Democratic package had targeted incentives to create jobs. Did you forget about them? They did, because they did not have targeted incentives.

The Democratic package has targeted investments to spur growth. Did you forget about them? They sure did, because they do not have them in their package either.

The fact is, they have got nothing and we have got something. It is time to get on with it.

#### TAX FREEDOM DAY

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

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, the foregoing political announcement was brought to you without much blush, because if you are taxing Social Security recipients that make \$25,000 and you live in an urban area, you do not consider yourself rich and neither do the people. That is why this plan is going down in the polls that will be held in 1994.

Mr. Speaker, many Americans are familiar with Tax Freedom Day, the symbolic day in May when the overburdened taxpayer is finished paying taxes for Big Government.

Today, however, we are celebrating a day that represents the true cost of Big Government—the cost of Government Day.

This day includes more than just taxes—it includes other costs passed on to taxpayers, such as user fees, regulations, and mandates.

The cost of Government Day this year, as calculated by the Americans for Tax Reform Foundation, is today, July 13—the latest it has ever been. In other words, taxpayers and businesses are paying more than ever before for an inefficient and wasteful Government.

In fact, Americans for Tax Reform calculates that the true cost of Government, takes 53 percent of our net national product. That is 53 percent of our economy that the private sector cannot invest to create growth and new jobs.

Mr. Speaker, American small businesses and American taxpayers need relief. We need to reduce the cost of Government and commit to an agenda of lower spending, lower taxes, less litigation, and less regulation. And the time to do it is now, before it is too late.

#### GOVERNMENT IS NOT WORKING

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

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, today I ask that this Congress look back into the heartland of America and really listen to what the people are saying.

I think you will find—at least in the fourth district of Arkansas—the people are saying "cut Government spending—please, please do not raise our taxes."

The cost of managing this bureaucracy is at the highest level ever—and the solution just recently passed by this body was not to reduce out-of-control spending, but instead to ambush

the middle class with a devastating Btu tax.

The average American has to work 193 days—more than half a year—to pay for all these regulations, programs, and taxes.

What has been the return on their investment? We see loss of jobs, crime soaring, schools deteriorating, and social values declining.

Well folks, more government has not worked yet—and at least 218 members in this body need to learn that the more control you take away from the American people, the more damage and destruction you do to the heart and soul of this Nation.

#### SMALL BUSINESS TAX BURDEN

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, have you forgotten where 77 percent of the new jobs created in America come from? Of course, it's from small business. But how long can small business last with Clinton's tax and spend plan?

The administration has proposed new tax increases on business, a Btu tax or gas tax or whatever it's called today, and of course new regulations and more paperwork.

Small businesses cannot shoulder the burden alone. Our economy needs incentives such as tax credits or reductions in capital gains taxes. Give entrepreneurs the freedom to create jobs and build America.

Small business will be stopped cold with up to 49 percent marginal taxes.

All small business owners are asking the familiar question "Where is the debt reduction?"

This budget reconciliation is better named America's job destruction plan. Let us cut spending, first.

#### COST OF GOVERNMENT DAY

(Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the resolution of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] establishing today, July 13, 1993, as Cost of Government Day.

Cost of Government Day incorporates Government spending, Federal regulatory costs, and State regulatory costs.

The cost of Government in 1993 is the highest ever and accounts for a full 53 percent of net national product. This leaves far too little to encourage business and so it is no wonder that when the cost of Government goes up, the economy slows down. When the cost of Government is low and declining, the economy grows.

Regulations cost jobs. It is estimated that Federal regulations have cost approximately 6.6 million jobs.

Regulations cost people time. The Department of Interior estimates that Americans spend about 12 billion hours per year simply dealing with Federal forms. That is about 120 hours per worker.

These statistics confirm the belief of most Americans that Government costs working men and women far too much and spends that money recklessly. We do not need more regulations. We do not need more taxes.

The stimulus we need is to have less regulation and less taxes. That will get our economy going.

#### COST OF GOVERNMENT DAY

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is Tuesday, July 13, 1993. Today, a Big Mac will cost you \$1.89; Mom's apple pie from the bakery: \$6.99; a Chevrolet Corvette: \$35,000; and a medium-sized home in the suburbs: \$120,000.

That is what your money buys today in America.

"OK" you ask, "but what about the Government? How much will Uncle Sam and all his relatives set me back this year?" The answer, courtesy of the Americans for Tax Reform, is \$3 trillion.

Mr. Speaker, when you buy a Corvette, you get the fastest production automobile in the country. When you buy a Big Mac, you get the most popular sandwich in the history of the world. And when you buy mom's apple pie, you get a little piece of home. But what do we get for \$3 trillion?

This year we will spend \$250 billion on public education. Are your children smarter?

We will spend \$320 billion on public health care. Are Americans healthier?

Finally, over the past 25 years, we have spent \$2.5 trillion on the war on poverty. Are the poor better off?

Mr. Speaker, Bill Clinton thinks we should increase the cost of Government. He thinks we do not spend enough on Uncle Sam. I disagree. I think Uncle Sam's overpriced. And it's time we started cost-cutting. Not raising the expense of Government.

□ 1300

FORBES' ADVICE: SELL U.S. STOCKS, BUY EUROPEAN AND ASIAN

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

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, have the Members seen the cover of the latest edition of July 19 of Forbes magazine?

It says "Bullish On America: Sell U.S. Stocks, Buy European And Asian," says Morgan Stanley's Barton-Riggs. Then, going inside to page 102, Mr. Riggs said, "We want to get our clients' money as far away from Bill and Hilary as we can," Barton-Riggs, Chairman of Morgan Stanley Asset Management, tells Forbes. "The President is a negative for the U.S. market. I am embarrassed that I voted for him and contributed money to his campaign."

That is really cold. What is it that Morgan Stanley is recommending? They are saying, sell American stocks, buy shares in European and Far Eastern companies, and why? Because the tax increases and the so-called spending cuts simply will not shrink the Federal budget deficit close to the half a trillion dollars that Clinton claims.

Who is going to be hurt by this sham and this charade, Mr. Speaker? Surely not Barton-Riggs or the multimillionaire clients that he represents; surely not you, surely not me, but those at the bottom of the economic ladder who are trying to enter the mainstream, who are working hard and trying to get a piece of the American dream.

#### PROVIDE AMERICANS WITH BETTER SERVICE AT OUR NATIONAL PARKS

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, across the country, the school year has ended and millions of American families are preparing to hit the open roads and visit our national parks.

When they arrive, they will have the opportunity to experience soaring mountains, cascading rivers, and remarkable wildlife—the best nature has to offer. Unfortunately, they probably will not receive the same level of satisfaction from the food or souvenirs on sale at the parks.

Of course, many concessionaires provide high quality goods and services to park visitors, but this is not often the rule. Too much merchandise at national park concessions is outdated and overpriced. Food choices are limited and of mediocre quality. Consumers at our national parks are often treated with a captive-audience mentality, not with the customer-is-always-right mentality.

To address this problem, I have introduced H.R. 2146, the National Park Concessions Policy Reform Act of 1993. This bill would require regular competitive bids for concessions contracts in the parks, and provide an additional portion of winning bid fees to improve park programs and maintenance, and help our environment.

I would like to encourage my colleagues to cosponsor H.R. 2146 and make the services at our national parks as good as the scenery.

#### UNITED STATES TROOPS IN MACEDONIA

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

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday most of the 300 United States ground troops arrived in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia without a clearly defined mission.

The Danish commander of our troops clearly revealed that they will serve as a tripwire when he said, "If the Serbs attack, then I want the Americans there."

Mr. Speaker, it's clear that 300 United States troops, and a total U.N. force of 1,000, are obviously no match for a Serbian assault and would not be in a position to defend the 260-mile border which separates Macedonia from Serbia and Albania.

As Gen. Colin Powell has stated, the first rule of U.S. military engagement should be this: Before deploying U.S. forces anywhere and putting American lives at risk, it is absolutely imperative to first define their mission.

Today I will introduce a resolution expressing the strong concerns of Congress with the administration's unilateral troop commitment without a clearly defined mission.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor my resolution and let President Clinton know that American troops must not be used as symbolic pawns anywhere in the world.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot let American troops be sitting ducks anywhere.

#### THE DEMOCRATS SHOULD LISTEN TO THEIR CONSTITUENTS

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I like to come down to the well and listen to all of the Democrat speeches before I say anything, because it gives me food for thought. It ought to give every American food for thought. They say that the Clinton budget is good for America's small business people.

Last week they all went home to parades for the Fourth of July and talked to their constituents. I can tell the Members that their constituents are not for these big tax increases, that their constituents want to cut spending first. Yet they come down here and tell us what they are offering, what President Clinton is offering, is good for small business and good for America.

It is going to create more joblessness, it is going to create bigger deficits, and it is going to create a huge national debt. As a matter of fact, projections show that the deficit is going to go up each of the next 5 years under the Clinton plan, with all these huge taxes, the

largest in history, by \$300 billion a year, and the national debt is going to go from \$4.3 to \$6.5 trillion. That is the Clinton plan.

The Democrats ought to listen to their constituents. Defeat the Clinton budget and come back with one that will work, that will get this economy moving.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules, and following consideration of House Resolution 215.

#### AUTHORIZING TRANSFER OF NAVAL VESSELS TO CERTAIN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2561) to authorize the transfer of naval vessels to certain foreign countries, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2561

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

#### SECTION 1. AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER NAVAL VESSELS TO CERTAIN COUNTRIES.

(a) ARGENTINA.—The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to transfer to the Government of Argentina the auxiliary repair dry dock (ARD 23). Such transfer shall be on a grant basis under section 519 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321m; relating to transfers of excess defense articles).

(b) AUSTRALIA.—The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to transfer to the Government of Australia the "CHARLES F. ADAMS" class guided missile destroyer GOLDSBOROUGH (DDG 20). Such transfer shall be on a sales basis under section 21 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2761; relating to the foreign military sales program).

(c) CHILE.—The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to transfer to the Government of Chile the auxiliary repair dry dock (ARD 32). Such transfer shall be on a sales basis under section 21 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2761; relating to the foreign military sales program).

(d) GREECE.—The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to transfer to the Government of Greece the "CHARLES F. ADAMS" class guided missile destroyer RICHARD E. BYRD (DDG 23). Such transfer shall be on a grant basis under section 516 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321j; relating to transfers of excess defense articles).

(e) TAIWAN.—The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to transfer to the Coordination Council for North American Affairs (which is the Taiwan instrumentality designated pur-

suant to section 10(a) of the Taiwan Relations Act) the auxiliary repair dry dock WINDSOR (ARD 22). Such transfer shall be on a sales basis under section 21 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2761; relating to the foreign military sales program).

(f) TURKEY.—(1) The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to transfer to the Government of Turkey the "KNOX" class frigates REASONER (FF 1063), FANNING (FF 1076), THOMAS C. HART (FF 1092), and CAPODANNO (FF 1093). Such transfers shall be on lease basis under chapter 6 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2796 and following).

(2) The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to transfer to the Government of Turkey the "KNOX" class frigate ELMER MONTGOMERY (FF 1082). Such transfer shall be on a grant basis under section 516 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321j; relating to transfers of excess defense articles).

#### SEC. 2. WAIVER OF REQUIREMENTS FOR NOTIFICATION TO CONGRESS.

The following provisions do not apply with respect to the transfers authorized by this Act:

(1) In case of a grant under section 516 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, subsection (c) of that section and any similar provision.

(2) In case of a grant under section 519 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, subsection (c) of that section and any similar provision.

(3) In case of a sale under section 21 of the Arms Export Control Act, section 546 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1993 (Public Law 102-391) and any similar, successor provision.

(4) In case of a lease under section 61 of the Arms Export Control Act, section 62 of that Act (except that section 62 of that Act shall apply to any renewal of the lease).

#### SEC. 3. COSTS OF TRANSFERS.

Any expense of the United States in connection with a transfer authorized by this Act shall be charged to the recipient.

#### SEC. 4. EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.

The authority granted by section 1 of this Act shall expire at the end of the 2-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, except that leases entered into during that period under subsection (f)(1) of that section may be renewed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON].

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

Mr. Speaker, let me just explain briefly what this bill is about and why we are considering it today.

This bill authorizes the transfer of 10 naval vessels: 1 each to Argentina, Australia, Chile, Greece, and Taiwan, and 5 to Turkey. These vessels either have been, or are on the verge of being decommissioned by the Navy. This transfer authority was requested by the administration.

Under section 7307(b)(1) of title 10 of the United States Code, these transfers require congressional authorization. This requirement applies to the sale,

lease, or grant to a foreign country of any naval vessel in excess of 3,000 tons or less than 20 years of age. It is necessary for the House to act on this legislation today in an effort to ensure that the transfer of naval vessels to the Government of Turkey will occur prior to the retirement dates of those particular vessels. The U.S. Government will incur \$6.5 million in immediate retirement costs for these ships if these vessels are not transferred shortly. If there is delay in this legislation it will cost the taxpayers \$6.5 million. Hence we are trying to act expeditiously on these transfers.

The United States will receive \$15.8 million in leasing fees over the next 5 years from the Government of Turkey. It will receive \$7.4 million from the sale of naval vessels to the Governments of Australia, Chile, and Taiwan.

The net budget impact of this transfer is \$29.7 million in the black for the U.S. Government. It is not often that we have the opportunity to have such a clear, positive impact on the budget.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the committee indicated, the purpose of this legislation is to authorize the transfer of 10 ships to six countries—Argentina, Australia, Chile, Greece, Taiwan, and Turkey.

Three of the proposed transfers—one repair dry dock to Argentina, one Charles F. Adams class guided missile destroyer to Greece and one Knox class frigate to Turkey—will be grant transfers pursuant to section 516 and 519 of the Foreign Assistance Act. The United States will incur no costs as a result of these transfers.

Three of the proposed transfers—two repair dry docks to Chile and Taiwan and one Charles F. Adams class guided missile destroyer to Australia—will be sold pursuant to section 21 of the Arms Export Control Act. As a result of these sales, the United States will receive \$7.4 million.

And four of the proposed transfers—Knox class frigates to Turkey—will be leased pursuant to section 6 of the Arms Export Control Act. The United States will receive \$15.8 million from Turkey over the initial 5-year lease period. I might also add that the U.S. Navy expects that by proceeding with these leases, the United States will accrue an additional \$180 million in training, supplies, support, and repair costs over the period of the leases.

Finally, I understand that the U.S. Navy strongly supports the transfer of these vessels to advance the valuable, cooperative relationships that we have developed with each of these nations' navies.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

□ 1310

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

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the legislation being considered.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the Congress that the U.S.S. *Capodanno* is to be decommissioned from the U.S. Navy on July 30 of this year. The legislation we are considering today, H.R. 2561, will transfer the U.S.S. *Capodanno* to the Turkish Navy.

This ship was named for the Reverend Vincent Capodanno, a 38-year-old Navy chaplain and native of Staten Island, NY. Reverend Capodanno died while ministering to wounded marines during a battle in Vietnam in September 1967. He received posthumously the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry above and beyond the call of duty.

In an interview in the field a year before his death, Father Capodanno said:

I want to be available in the event anything serious occurs; to learn firsthand the problems of the men and to give them moral support. I feel I must personally witness how they react under fire—and experience it myself—to understand the fear that they must feel.

Wherever the marines went in battle, so did Father Capodanno to offer moral support and comfort in the most troubling of moments in life. And Father Capodanno was there for his fellow man, when he lay dying on the battlefield, to administer the last rites. He was always there for his fellow marines. In his final moments of life he was doing what he felt he was called to do, offering comfort and administering to fellow soldiers who lay on the field of battle.

Mr. Speaker, it is a fact that ships out live their usefulness and so are decommissioned. The U.S.S. *Capodanno*, its officers and crew have served the U.S. Navy, with honor and pride much as Father Capodanno served his Nation. It is time for them to go on to new assignments. But the memories of valiant individuals like Father Capodanno will live on. His memory is alive in the hearts of the people he served with and in the hearts of all Staten Islanders who are proud to call him ours.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAM-ILTON] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2561, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## MARINE BIOTECHNOLOGY INVESTMENT ACT OF 1993

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1916) to establish a marine biotechnology program within the National Sea Grant College Program, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1916

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

## SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Marine Biotechnology Investment Act of 1993".

## SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) the oceans have for millennia been a source of food, minerals and other natural products;

(2) molecular biology and biotechnology hold tremendous potential to expand the range and increase the utility of products from the oceans;

(3) marine biotechnology can improve the condition of marine ecosystems by developing substitute products that decrease the harvest pressure on living resources, improving the production of aquaculture, providing new tools for understanding ecological and evolutionary processes, and improving the techniques for remediation of environmental damage;

(4) the United States is currently preeminent in marine biotechnology but its competitive edge is threatened by inadequate public investment compared with other leaders in this field; and

(5) in order to support job creation, stimulate private sector investment, and maintain preeminence in marine biotechnology, the United States should establish a national program for marine biotechnology within the National Sea Grant College Program and greatly increase its investment in this promising new area of research and development.

## SEC. 3. MARINE BIOTECHNOLOGY PROGRAM.

The National Sea Grant College Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1121 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 205 the following:

## SEC. 206A. MARINE BIOTECHNOLOGY PROGRAM.

"(a) DEFINITION OF MARINE BIOTECHNOLOGY.—As used in this section and section 203(4), the term 'marine biotechnology' means the application of molecular and cellular biology to marine and fresh water organisms for the purpose of identifying, developing, and enhancing products derived from those organisms.

"(b) MARINE BIOTECHNOLOGY PROGRAM.—Subject to the availability of appropriations under section 212(c), the National Sea Grant College Program provided for under section 204 shall include a marine biotechnology program under which the Secretary, acting through the Director, shall—

"(1) make grants and enter into contracts in accordance with this section; and

"(2) engage in other activities authorized under this Act;

to further research, development, risk assessment, education and technology transfer in marine biotechnology.

"(c) ADMINISTRATION.—In carrying out the marine biotechnology program, the Secretary shall—

"(1) coordinate the relevant activities of the directors of the sea grant colleges and the Marine Biotechnology Review Panel established under subsection (f); and

"(2) provide general oversight of the review process under subsection (f)(1) to ensure that the marine biotechnology program produces the highest quality research, development, education, and technology transfer.

"(d) GRANTS AND CONTRACTS.—

"(1) APPLICATIONS.—Applications for grants and contracts under this subsection shall be—

"(A) made in such form and manner, and include such content and submissions, as the Secretary shall by regulation prescribe;

"(B) forwarded through the appropriate directors of sea grant colleges to the National Sea Grant Office; and

"(C) reviewed by the Marine Biotechnology Review Panel in accordance with subsection (f).

"(2) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—Any reference in subsection (d) of section 205 or in the last sentence of subsection (a) of section 205 to grants and contracts provided for under that section shall be treated, as the context requires, as including any grant applied for or made, or contract applied for or entered into, under this section.

"(3) AWARDING OF GRANTS AND CONTRACTS.—

"(A) PANEL RECOMMENDATIONS.—Subject to subparagraph (B) and subsection (e), the Secretary shall award grants and contracts under this section on the basis of the recommendations for award made by the Marine Biotechnology Review Panel under subsection (f).

"(B) GENERAL EXCEPTIONS.—The Secretary shall not award a grant or contract if the Secretary determines that the award—

"(i) is based on a recommendation from the Panel that may involve a conflict of interest;

"(ii) fails to meet the requirements of this section; or

"(iii) fails to comply with relevant governmental or institutional procedures for the management of external grant or contract programs.

"(C) EXCEPTION RELATING TO GENETICALLY MODIFIED ORGANISMS.—The Secretary shall not award a grant or contract involving the release of genetically modified organisms, as defined in subsection (e)(1), unless the activities proposed in the grant or contract that involve genetically modified organisms—

"(i) have been reviewed and approved under other applicable Federal law; or

"(ii) are found by the Secretary, based on a written assessment, to pose no significant environmental risk.

"(D) DOCUMENTATION.—The Secretary shall document, and promptly inform the Panel of, each recommended award that is rejected under subparagraph (B) or (C).

"(E) FUNDING.—Grants made, and contracts entered into, under this section shall be funded with moneys available from appropriations made pursuant to the authorization provided for under section 212(c).

"(e) RESEARCH ON GENETICALLY MODIFIED ORGANISMS.—

"(1) DEFINITION.—As used in this subsection, the term 'genetically modified organism' means a living marine or freshwater organism in which the genetic material has been purposely altered at the molecular or cellular level in a way that could not result from the natural reproductive process of that species.

"(2) SAFE CONDUCT OF CERTAIN RESEARCH.—The Secretary shall ensure that any activity funded by the National Sea Grant College Program involving genetically modified organisms complies with—

"(A) the guidelines for research involving recombinant DNA molecules published in the Federal Register on May 7, 1986 (51 F.R. 16958 et seq.); and

"(B) when promulgated (unless paragraph (3) applies), the performance standards for safely conducting research involving genetically modified finfish and shellfish developed by the Agricultural Biotechnology Research Advisory Committee.

"(3) SEA GRANT PROGRAM PERFORMANCE STANDARDS.—The performance standards referred to in subparagraph 2(B) shall not apply

if the Secretary publishes in the Federal Register performance standards for the National Sea Grant College Program for safely conducting research involving genetically modified finfish and shellfish.

"(4) **TERMINATION OF AWARD.**—The Secretary shall promptly withdraw any award of the National Sea Grant College Program for activities involving genetically modified organisms if the Secretary determines that the grantee or contractee in question has failed to abide by the guidelines and applicable performance standards referred to in this subsection.

"(f) **MARINE BIOTECHNOLOGY REVIEW PANEL.**—

"(1) **ESTABLISHMENT AND DUTIES.**—Subject to the availability of appropriations under section 212(c), the Director, in consultation with the directors of the sea grant colleges, shall convene a panel, to be known as the Marine Biotechnology Review Panel, that shall—

"(A) review, on a competitive basis, the applications made under this section for grants and contracts to determine their respective scientific, technical, educational, and commercial merits and likely contributions toward achieving the purposes of this section; and

"(B) on the basis of the review under subparagraph (A), and with due regard for the overall balance and coordination of the marine biotechnology program, make recommendations to the Secretary regarding the awarding of grants and contracts under this section.

"(2) **COMPOSITION.**—The Marine Biotechnology Review Panel shall—

"(A) consist of not more than 15 individuals with scientific or technical expertise in marine biotechnology or relevant related fields, including at least 1 qualified individual with expertise in marine or freshwater ecological risk assessment;

"(B) reflect a balance among areas of expertise consistent with the purposes of this section;

"(C) not include Federal employees or directors of sea grant colleges; and

"(D) reflect geographic balance, consistent with the primary objectives of a high level expertise and balance among areas of expertise.

"(3) **ALLOWANCES.**—Each member of the Marine Biotechnology Review Panel shall receive travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in accordance with sections 5702 and 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

"(4) **FACA NOT APPLICABLE.**—The Federal Advisory Committee Act does not apply to the Marine Biotechnology Review Panel."

#### SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 212 of the National Sea Grant College Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1131) is amended—

(1) by striking out "209," in subsection (b) and inserting "209 but not including section 206A,";

(2) by redesignating subsections (c), (d), and (e) as subsection (d), (e), and (f), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

"(c) **MARINE BIOTECHNOLOGY PROGRAM.**—

"(1) **GRANTS AND CONTRACTS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of section 206A (other than for administration) an amount—

"(A) for each of fiscal years 1994 and 1995, not to exceed \$20,000,000; and

"(B) for each of fiscal year 1996 and 1997, not to exceed \$25,000,000.

"(2) **ADMINISTRATION.**—There is authorized to be appropriated for the administration of section 206A, an amount—

"(A) for each of fiscal years 1994 and 1995, not to exceed \$200,000; and

"(B) for each of fiscal years 1996 and 1997, not to exceed \$250,000."

#### SEC. 5. DEFINITION.

Section 203(4) of the National Sea Grant College Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1122(4)) is amended

by inserting "marine biotechnology," after "marine technology."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1916, the Marine Biotechnology Investment Act of 1993. If enacted, this bill would stimulate research and development and allow the exploration of the great promise of marine biotechnology in food production, pharmaceuticals, and industrial applications.

H.R. 1916 gives the green light to an industry with incredible potential to produce the high-wage, high-skill jobs that our Nation so badly needs. In addition, by increasing the production of aquaculture and creating better methods of environmental remediation, this technology can help heal our wounded oceans.

But along with great promise comes certain risks. With biotechnology, we now have the capability to create organisms far different from their wild ancestors.

The bill before the House today ensures that genetically modified organisms cannot be released into the environment without a review of the potential environmental impacts of that release. In addition, the bill requires that all Sea Grant research on genetically modified organisms comply with guidelines to safeguard against the accidental release of these organisms.

The potential of this technology is great. The key is in using it wisely. H.R. 1916 promotes the wise use and development of marine biotechnology and I urge my colleagues to support it.

At this point I would like to include a letter from our distinguished colleague and chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, GEORGE BROWN, on a jurisdictional issue related to this legislation.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE,  
SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY,  
Washington, DC, July 13, 1993.

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS,  
Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Ford House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has indicated its intention to bring to the floor H.R. 1916, the Marine Biotechnology Investment Act of 1993, under suspension of the rules. While the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology has certain jurisdictional interests in the bill, I have no objection to the bill moving on the suspension calendar at this time.

As you are aware, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology has jurisdiction over scientific and environmental research under the Rules of the House, and pursuant to this jurisdiction, has received referral of bills relating to marine bio-

technology research (H.R. 5922, the Marine Biotechnology Research Act [101st Congress]) and biotechnology research in general (see, e.g., H.R. 4502, the Biotechnology Science Coordination and Competitiveness Act of 1988 [100th Congress]).

Since H.R. 1916 is drafted as amendment to the National Sea Grant College Program Act, which is under the jurisdiction of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology does not intend to assert its jurisdictional claims at this time. However, this agreement should not be construed to waive the Committee's jurisdiction over aspects of the bill. I would ask that a copy of this letter be inserted in the record of the debate on this measure in the House.

I am pleased to be able to cooperate on this legislation and look forward to continued close cooperation in the future on issues of mutual interest.

Sincerely,

GEORGE E. BROWN, Jr.,

Chairman.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am speaking on behalf of the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries on H.R. 1916, the Marine Biotechnology Investment Act of 1993.

I appreciate the cooperation that the committee staff has shown in developing the text of this bill and, apparently, the committee all feel highly supportive of the bill. As you may recall, there were significant issues raised by members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, on both sides of the aisle, regarding a balance that the bill struck between the environmental concerns as associated with the release of genetically altered organisms into the marine environment and the need to fund research in this promising and cutting-edge field.

The amendment that has been offered today does recognize the arguments made by both camps on this issue and resolves it nearly to everyone's satisfaction. The only other alternative would be to not fund this type of research, and I do not think such a drastic step is called for, given that genetically altered marine species have not proved to be a threat to marine ecosystems. With this type of research, it has tremendous potential in improving aquaculture and the health of our native fisheries.

Again, I want to congratulate the committee on this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON], a member of the committee.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1916, the Marine Biotechnology Investment Act of 1993. I am proud to be a co-sponsor of this legislation, the first bill

scheduled for floor action this Congress, originating from the Subcommittee on Oceanography, Gulf of Mexico, and the Outer Continental Shelf, where I serve as ranking Republican member.

Our marine environment constantly faces a number of growing and devastating pressures that impact our natural resources. As a result, problems such as overharvesting of our fish resources, coastal and marine pollution, and the destruction of coastal habitats have occurred. This, coupled with other growing problems, indicate that it is time to develop effective management and enhancement programs that are designed to improve our marine ecosystem. Marine biotechnology does just that.

In addition, the marine environment has proven to be a veritable bounty of useful drugs and other products. For example, a group of chemicals have been isolated from sponges and used to combat certain viruses and cancers, as well as provide relief from arthritis and gout. Other cancer-fighting compounds have been found in sea squirts, and coral has been used to aid bone grafts. And let us not forget that old medicine chest remedy, cod liver oil.

President Bush initiated a marine biotechnology research drive through the National Sea Grant College Program in the 1980's. While small, this program has been an effective inducement in developing research ideas. The time is now to expand the program and elevate marine biotechnology so that it receives the attention it deserves. This legislation does so.

I also want to commend Chairman STUDDS for the effort he has made to accommodate those who are concerned about the possible environmental risks posed by marine biotechnology which involves the release of genetically manipulated marine species. While we have not quite developed to the point where we can have an underwater Jurassic Park, there is some real concern that improper containment of modified marine organisms could disrupt marine environments. I also understand the concerns of the research community that placing prohibitive restrictions on such work is unnecessary. I find that the compromise presented here in Chairman STUDDS' amendment is a reasonable one.

We should all commend Chairman GERRY STUDDS and Chairman SOLOMON ORTIZ of the Oceanography Subcommittee for their leadership in this fascinating and worthwhile area of research. I urge support for the bill and the committee amendment.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Republican Member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] for his pertinent remarks.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Ms. SCHENK].

Ms. SCHENK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for the Marine Biotechnology Act. First, I want to commend Chairman STUDDS for sponsoring this important and timely legislation. We hear everyday about advances in genetic research that seem like miracles. Unfortunately, one aspect of genetic research that has not received the support it deserves is marine biotechnology. H.R. 1916 helps to remedy that, and I am thankful for Mr. STUDDS' insight and leadership on this issue.

The promise of genetic research was recognized in President Clinton's budget, which earmarked some \$4 billion for biotechnological research in fiscal year 1994. However, only about 1 percent of those funds are directed toward work at marine research facilities. Overall, funding for marine biotechnology has not increased for 5 years.

Other countries have not been standing idle. Under the direction of the Ministry of International Trade and Industry, Japan will invest almost \$200 million in marine biotechnology this decade. Other Pacific rim countries are following their example. We cannot expect to retain our lead in this vital technology if we do not make investments in research.

The Marine Biotechnology Investment Act is a big step forward. It establishes a broad-based program within the sea grant system. It incorporates a process to ensure that proposals are funded on the basis of scientific merit, and it promotes public-private cooperation in research by requiring a one-third match of Federal funds from other sources.

H.R. 1916 represents the kind of forward-looking investment in blossoming new technologies that this country needs if we are going to compete in the global market of the 21st century, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, it can be argued that over the next few decades no other science or technology will match the potential of molecular biology to transform our lives. Today molecular technologies are being applied to the study of marine organisms, but we have just begun to tap their promise. The purpose of the existing Sea Grant Program is to better people's lives through the appropriate use of marine and coastal resources. The Sea Grant Program has achieved important successes, which only hint of future possibilities. The Marine Biotechnology Investment Act is an important improvement to the Sea Grant Program.

The development of biodegradable, nontoxic water treatment chemicals based on the natural inhibitors of crystallization found in oyster shells; methods to control the mobility of herbicides and decrease their contamination of our waters; the possibility of genetically altered algae which can remove heavy metals from wastewater;

are just three examples of ways marine biotechnology can help us clean our environment.

Other biotechnology applications that are coming to fruition include new classes of anti-inflammatory drugs, vaccines to combat microbial diseases in salmon and other fish, gene probes for the detection of contaminated seafood or ocean waters, and microbes for bioremediation of oil spills.

H.R. 1916 will tap the scientific and commercial potential of genetic research in marine organisms by creating a program of grants from marine biotechnology research and development. The program will be administered by the National Sea Grant College, using Federal funds to stimulate State and local governments and the private sector to invest in marine biotechnology. In keeping with Sea Grant's mission, a mixture of research, development, technology transfer, and educational projects would be supported in each funding cycle. In this program, marine biotechnology proposals would compete only against others in the field.

Sea Grant is an ideal conduit for stimulating the development of private sector biotechnology. Sea Grant will provide vital support with product identification and development. It will provide assistance in adapting the results of basic and applied research to industrial uses and will generate jobs. In addition, advances in aquaculture and the production—on land—of products derived from the sea will relieve the pressure of excessive harvesting on natural marine stocks.

In San Diego, the University of California and the Scripps Institution of Oceanography are already taking the lead in marine biotechnology. This spring, UCSD established the Center for Marine Biotechnology and Biomedicine, devoted exclusively to research and commercialization of marine biotech. The center's goal is to make marine biotechnological discoveries easily available for commercial use by initiating a joint project between Scripps Institution of Oceanography, the UCSD School of Medicine, and other UCSD programs which have a biotechnology focus. We hope that this center can become the core of a statewide California consortium for marine biotechnology.

H.R. 1916 will provide much needed assistance to programs like UCSD's new center. I look forward to seeing the important scientific advances generated by this bill.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I commend Chairman STUDDS and all the members of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee who worked to bring this bill to the floor, and I urge all my colleagues to support it.

□ 1320

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished chairman

of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ORTIZ].

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1916, the Marine Biotechnology Investment Act of 1993.

I would like to recognize the leadership of Chairman STUDDS in introducing this legislation and the hard work he has put into bringing it to the floor.

I believe that this bill addresses a very important area of research which provides tremendous potential for economic payoff.

This program will establish Sea Grant as a national leader in marine biotechnology research.

Sea Grant has made a real difference in my State of Texas, not just conducting quality research, but taking this research to communities and private industry where it can be applied to create jobs, businesses, and enhance utilization and management of our marine resources.

Mr. Speaker, we are currently in jeopardy of losing our competitive advantage in marine biotechnology to other countries, who invest more than \$180 million per year in this area of research.

I think that this legislation is just the kind of effort which is needed to make good on our investment in marine biotechnology, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ORTIZ], the distinguished ranking member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] and the members of both sides who have once again in the typical fashion of this committee produced a bipartisan product of which we are all very proud.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague and chairman of our committee for his effective leadership on this issue, and my colleague and chairman of the subcommittee with whom it is a sincere and great pleasure to work with on oceanography and Outer Continental Shelf issues.

We do have one speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM]. I know he wanted to speak on this issue. He has been very actively involved, but we will simply place his comments in the RECORD under general leave.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1916, the Marine Biotechnology Investment Act of 1993. The marine environment off the coast of the United States faces many challenges in the future. Virtually the entire population of southern California is affected by the use and management of the ocean for jobs, for goods and services, and for recreation. Therefore, the intelligent use and management of the ocean's resources are of vital concern to me and all Californians.

In realizing the importance of this vital resource, marine environment and biotechnology

has proven to be a field of vast possibilities. The University of California Scripps Institute of Oceanography is a leader in the field of oceanography and the development of new marine products. Its marine chemistry and pharmacology program has collected and tested the biological activity of over 800 compounds for marine organisms. Of these, approximately 17 are viewed as being novel and pharmacologically potent enough to warrant patent application. One such compound, pseudopterosin, derived from a Caribbean soft coral, not only is an effective anti-inflammatory drug, but also is a potent pain-reliever.

My colleague Mr. WELDON mentioned that President Bush initiated a marine biotechnology research drive through the National Sea Grant College Program in the 1980's. This was an excellent place to start, however, it is time to move forward to bring this type of research the attention that it deserves. I am proud to state that the California Sea Grant Program is the largest State program in the Nation, and legislation such as the marine biotechnology bill will enable our institutions to further the important studies that are needed for this critical natural resource.

Mr. Speaker, we in San Diego are particularly proud of the work done at the Scripps Institute of Oceanography, part of the University of California at San Diego. Scripps has achieved global recognition for its pioneering work in oceanography.

I also want to commend Chairman STUDDS for the effort he has made to assure that this legislation make it to the floor today. It was my privilege to spend some time with the chairman last week in San Diego where we had a committee field hearing. It is so important that the work being produced at such institutions continue. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the cooperation you and your staff have shown in developing the text of a bill that we can all feel good about. As you recall, there were significant issues raised by members of our committee on both sides of the aisle regarding the balance that the bill struck between environmental concerns associated with the release of genetically altered organisms into the marine environment and the need to fund research in this promising and cutting-edge field.

I think the amendment that you will offer today does recognize the arguments made by both camps on this issue and resolves them nearly to everyone's satisfaction. The only other alternative would be not to fund this type of research. I don't think such a drastic step is called for, given that genetically altered marine species have not proven to be a threat to marine ecosystems and that this type of research has tremendous potential for improving aquaculture and the health of our native fisheries.

Again, I congratulate you on this legislation. I am proud to be a cosponsor and I look forward to its quick passage.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The question is on the

motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1916, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous matter, on H.R. 1916, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

#### NATIONAL AVIARY IN PITTSBURGH

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 927) to designate the Pittsburgh Aviary in Pittsburgh, PA as the National Aviary in Pittsburgh.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 927

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

#### SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The Pittsburgh Aviary in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania is designated as the "National Aviary in Pittsburgh".

#### SEC. 2. LEGAL REFERENCES.

Any reference in any law, regulation, document, record, map, or other paper of the United States to the aviary referred to in section 1 is deemed to be a reference to the "National Aviary in Pittsburgh".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 927 which designates the Pittsburgh Aviary as the "National Aviary in Pittsburgh." The bill was introduced by Congressman COYNE, requires no Federal funds, and simply authorizes a name change.

We have a National Zoo and a National Arboretum in Washington, a National Aquarium in Baltimore, and I hope to see the day when we have a national Marine Mammal Stranding Center somewhat north of here. However, there is no National Aviary. And other than through this legislation, I know of no efforts to establish one.

The Pittsburgh Aviary is the only free-standing, indoor aviary in the

United States—all others are operated as parts of zoos. I know of no aviary more deserving of this designation, and I urge Members to support the bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 927 a bill to designate the Pittsburgh Aviary in Pittsburgh, PA, as the "National Aviary in Pittsburgh."

The people of the city of Pittsburgh can and should be proud of this excellent locally funded facility. The Pittsburgh Aviary has the unique status of being the United States only freestanding, indoor aviary, not associated with a larger zoo. The aviary is also a nationally respected conservation center and breeding facility for endangered and threatened bird species.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know of any opposition to this bill and again would like to point out that there is no Federal funds associated with it. I would also like to compliment my colleague, WILLIAM COYNE, for the introduction of this bill, and Chairman STUDDS for moving this bill through the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I support adoption of H.R. 927.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the author of the bill, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COYNE].

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 927, a bill to designate the National Aviary in Pittsburgh.

First, I want to thank Chairman STUDDS and the members of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee for approving this bill and reporting it to the House. This action is greatly appreciated by friends of the Pittsburgh Aviary and by the city of Pittsburgh.

H.R. 927 seeks to recognize the outstanding work done by the Pittsburgh Aviary by renaming this institution the National Aviary in Pittsburgh. This designation simply provides that any future reference to the aviary in Pittsburgh, PA, in any law, regulation, document, record, map or other paper of the United States shall be deemed to be a reference to the "National Aviary in Pittsburgh." Simply stated, this bill puts Pittsburgh's Aviary on the map as the National Aviary in Pittsburgh.

The aviary is the largest indoor aviary in the Nation independent of a larger zoo, and was one of the world's first zoos to feature its collection in large, walk-through, natural habitat enclosures. The aviary currently features nearly 450 birds of over 250 species, including 15 endangered and 25 threatened species.

The aviary is fully accredited by the American Association of Zoological Parks and Aquariums. This institution also participates in the international species survival program and is home to breeding pairs of a number of endan-

gered species from around the world. Finally, the aviary has placed birds raised or bred in Pittsburgh at zoos around the world.

Designation of the National Aviary in Pittsburgh follows the precedent set for establishing the National Aquarium in Baltimore. It should be noted that this new designation does not involve the expenditures of any Federal funds for the aviary in Pittsburgh nor does it convey to the Federal Government any liability for the operation of the aviary. This bill does, however, recognize in an appropriate manner the premier role played by Pittsburgh's Aviary in the exhibition, study and conservation of birds.

The aviary in Pittsburgh already is host to visitors from across the United States and around the world. Of the nearly 100,000 visitors who tour the aviary annually, fully 60 percent come from outside the city of Pittsburgh. The aviary in Pittsburgh should be designated the National Aviary in Pittsburgh.

Mr. Speaker, designation of the National Aviary in Pittsburgh would ensure that the American people have an enhanced opportunity to enjoy one of the United States' great natural treasures. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 927. This bill is a simple, yet important bill, which designates an aviary in Pittsburgh, PA, as the National Aviary in Pittsburgh. Similar designations were made for the National Zoo here in Washington, DC, and the National Aquarium in Baltimore, MD.

The aviary is home to nearly 450 birds, representing over 220 species from almost every continent. I am particularly impressed with the fact that the aviary is nationally recognized as a conservation and research center, specializing in preserving endangered species. We should be encouraging the captive breeding of threatened and endangered species wherever we can, whether they are birds, reptiles, mammals, or even fountain darters.

This legislation does not provide Federal funds of any kind but its official designation as the National Aviary should raise the public consciousness as to the significance and stature of this institution.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge that my colleagues join in supporting this bill.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 927.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 927, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

#### PANAMA CANAL COMMISSION AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1994

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1522) to authorize expenditures for fiscal year 1994 for the operation and maintenance of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1522

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Panama Canal Commission Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994".

#### SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF EXPENDITURES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Panama Canal Commission is authorized to make such expenditures within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to it in accordance with law and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations, as may be necessary under the Panama Canal Act of 1979 (22 U.S.C. 3601 et seq.) for the operation, maintenance, and improvement of the Panama Canal for fiscal year 1994.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—Expenditures under subsection (a) for administrative expenses shall be limited to \$51,742,000, of which not to exceed—

(1) \$11,000 may be expended for official reception and representation expenses of the Panama Canal Commission Board of Directors;

(2) \$5,000 may be expended for official reception and representation expenses of the Panama Canal Commission Secretary; and

(3) \$30,000 may be expended for official reception and representation expenses of the Panama Canal Administrator.

(c) REPLACEMENT VEHICLES.—Available funds may be used, under the authority of subsection (a), for the purchase of not more than 35 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only (including large heavy-duty vehicles used to transport Commission personnel across the Isthmus of Panama). The purchase price of each vehicle purchased under this subsection may not exceed \$18,000, and each such vehicle purchased by the Commission must be built in the United States.

#### SEC. 3. EXPENDITURES IN ACCORDANCE WITH OTHER LAWS.

Expenditures authorized under this Act may be made only in accordance with the Panama Canal Treaties of 1977 and any law of the United States implementing those treaties.

#### SEC. 4. EMPLOYMENT OF EMPLOYEES OF THE PANAMA CANAL COMMISSION WHO ARE NOT CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES BY AGENCIES AND ORGANIZATIONS AFFILIATED WITH THE GOVERNMENT OF PANAMA.

(a) CONSENT OF CONGRESS.—Subject to subsection (b), the Congress consents to employees of the Panama Canal Commission who

are not citizens of the United States accepting civil employment with agencies and organizations affiliated with the Government of Panama (and compensation for that employment) for which the consent of Congress is required by the last paragraph of section 9 of Article I of the Constitution, related to acceptance of emoluments, offices, or titles from a foreign government.

(b) **CONDITION.**—Employees described in subsection (a) may accept employment described in that subsection (and compensation for that employment) only if the employment is approved by the designated agency ethics official of the Panama Canal Commission designated pursuant to the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, and by the Administrator of the Panama Canal Commission.

#### SEC. 5. LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS.

Section 1271(a) of the Panama Canal Act of 1979 (22 U.S.C. 3701(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking "and" after the semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (2) by striking "supervisors;" and inserting "supervisors; and"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:  
 "(3) any negotiated grievance procedures under section 7121 of such title 5, including any provisions relating to binding arbitration, shall, with respect to any personnel action to which subchapter II of chapter 75 of such title applies (as determined under section 7512 of such title), be available, in accordance with their terms, to the same extent and in the same manner as if employees of the Panama Canal Commission were not excluded from such subchapter under section 7511(b)(8) of such title."

#### SEC. 6. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subsection (b), this Act shall take effect October 1, 1993.

(b) **SPECIAL RULE.**—The amendments made by section 5 shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply with respect to any grievance arising on or after such date.

The **SPEAKER pro tempore.** Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support on H.R. 1522, the Panama Canal Commission Authorization Act for fiscal year 1994. This bill authorizes the Commission to spend money from the Panama Canal revolving fund necessary to maintain, improve, and operate the Panama Canal during the coming fiscal year.

The Panama Canal Commission, an agency of the United States Government, was established by the Panama Canal Treaty of 1977 to operate and maintain the canal and provide for its smooth transition to the Republic of Panama on December 31, 1999.

The Panama Canal Commission is a unique Government agency—it actually pays for itself. The Commission collects tolls from merchant, passenger, and recreational vessels transiting the 51-mile-long canal, and

deposits these revenues in a revolving fund in the Treasury. H.R. 1522 authorizes the Commission to use this money to pay for operating and maintenance expenses. The Commission expects to collect approximately \$542 million in the upcoming fiscal year.

The bill, as amended, includes two provisions requested by the Commission to address its unique personnel issues. Both provisions are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, have been reviewed by that committee, and Chairman CLAY has no objection to their inclusion. I wish to thank the distinguished chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee for his help and cooperation and request that his letter on this matter be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE  
AND CIVIL SERVICE,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, June 16, 1993.

Hon. GERRY E. STUDDS,  
Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of June 8, 1993, concerning H.R. 1522, the Panama Canal Commission Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994.

You advise that H.R. 1522 was introduced without two employee-related provisions originally requested by the Panama Canal Commission because of our Committee's jurisdiction over those matters. One of the provisions concerns the right of Commission employees who are not citizens of the United States to accept civilian employment with agencies and organizations affiliated with the Government of Panama. As pointed out in your letter, this proposal requires the consent of Congress under the Emoluments Clause of the Constitution.

The other provision reinstates the right of nonpreference-eligible bargaining unit employees of the Commission to challenge adverse personnel actions through a negotiated grievance procedure.

You are prepared to offer both of the proposals in question as amendments to H.R. 1522 when such legislation is considered by the House.

We have reviewed the two employee provisions as well as the supporting documents furnished by the Panama Canal Commission. We agree that the provisions are reasonable and, therefore, we have no objection to your offering them as amendments to H.R. 1522.

We would appreciate your including a copy of this letter in your remarks on H.R. 1522 when such legislation is considered by the House.

Your cooperation with respect to this matter is appreciated.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM L. CLAY,  
Chairman.

FRANK MCCLOSKEY,  
Chairman,  
Subcommittee on the Civil Service.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1522, the Panama Canal Commission Authorization Act for fiscal year 1993.

Mr. Speaker, the Panama Canal Commission is charged with operating and maintaining the Panama Canal for the

world's shipping community. Every year the canal provides safe passage for over 13,000 vessel passages, and over 190 million net tons of cargo.

It is refreshing to note that this independent U.S. Government agency does this at no cost to the U.S. taxpayer. It is a tribute to the personnel of the Panama Canal Commission that the Commission is able to maintain this important waterway from the collection of tolls and other revenues from the users of the canal.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us today authorizes the Panama Canal Commission to obligate funds for the operation and maintenance of the canal for fiscal year 1994. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

□ 1330

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I know that the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Navigation, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN] wishes to speak, but I do not see him here, so he will have to put his remarks in under general leave.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1522, the Panama Canal Commission Authorization Act For Fiscal Year 1994 and wish to express my appreciation to Committee Chairman STUDDS, committee ranking member FIELDS, and subcommittee ranking member COBLE for their assistance and leadership in this matter.

The Panama Canal Commission is the U.S. executive agency established pursuant to the Panama Canal Treaty of 1977 and the Panama Canal Act of 1979. The Commission is charged with the responsibility to manage, operate, and maintain the Panama Canal until the termination of the treaty on December 31, 1999.

Currently, 89 percent of the canal's work force are Panamanians. That figure will reach 100 percent by 1999 when the canal is transferred to the Government of Panama. In the mean time, it is the committee's responsibility to assist in any way possible with the proper operation and maintenance of the canal. The committee amendment being considered today is H.R. 1522 as reported by the Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Navigation and the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. The amendment includes two additional sections discussed in detail at the subcommittee and committee markups and offered today with the approval of the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Both new sections deal with the rights of canal personnel. Because canal employees are U.S. Government employees, both new sections fall within Post Office Committee jurisdiction.

H.R. 1522 is a straightforward authorization which authorizes the Panama Canal Commission to take from its tolls and other revenues moneys necessary for the operation and maintenance of the canal during fiscal year 1994.

The Commission is authorized to borrow in emergencies but no taxpayer funds go to the Panama Canal.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1522 is a good measure in support of the Panama Canal, the Panama Canal Treaty of 1977, and the many men and women who dedicate their lives to the operation of this modern engineering wonder.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleague's support for H.R. 1522.

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1522 is the Panama Canal Commission authorization for fiscal year 1994. As a cosponsor of this legislation, I rise in support of the bill. It is a very straightforward piece of legislation and it deserves the support of the House of Representatives.

As many of my colleagues know, the Panama Canal Commission is an independent U.S. agency which operates entirely on tolls and other revenues generated by canal operations. No taxpayer funds are used by this agency to operate the canal. This is an important fact that should be remembered, but regrettably is frequently overlooked.

The Commission has a treaty obligation to maintain and operate the canal in a sound manner. It also has responsibilities to the world's shipping community to keep this vital waterway open for vessels and cargo.

I am pleased to report that the Commission has done such a superb job of maintaining the canal, and their work force deserves tremendous credit their outstanding efforts over the past 15 years.

Mr. Speaker, at the appropriate time, the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee will be offering a committee amendment which incorporates two additional modifications to H.R. 1522. These additions involve two employee relations issues and they were requested by the Panama Canal Commission. The provisions are under the jurisdiction of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee and I am pleased that our two committees have exchanged letters allowing these provisions to be incorporated within this legislation.

The first provision will allow Panamanian employees of the Panama Canal Commission to accept civilian employment outside the Commission with an agency or organization which is associated with the Government of Panama. With the Panamanian employment within the Commission reaching almost 90 percent, this change will be helpful to those individuals who have been offered positions, such as with the University of Panama, which they are currently unable to accept.

The second provision would reinstate the ability of certain Commission employees to challenge adverse actions through a negotiated grievance process. As I stated earlier, both of these provisions were requested by the Panama Canal Commission and have been thoroughly examined by both the Merchant Marine and Post Office and Civil Service Committees.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor of H.R. 1522, I am pleased to rise and join Chairman TAUZIN in support of the Panama Canal Commission Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994.

As the ranking Republican member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee

on Coast Guard and Navigation which has jurisdiction over the Panama Canal, I am pleased to support the authorization of a Federal agency which funds itself without taxpayer assistance. The Panama Canal Commission is an independent Federal agency which relies on user tolls and revenues for its operating expenses.

Our subcommittee approved this legislation on May 20 and the full Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee adopted the bill on May 26.

I will also support two additions to H.R. 1522 which deal with employee relations. Both of these provisions were requested by the Panama Canal Commission and were approved by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee which has jurisdiction over these issues. One addition would allow the Panamanian employees of the Panama Canal Commission to hold outside employment with agencies or organizations affiliated with the Government of Panama. The other addition reinstates the right of Panama Canal employees to challenge adverse actions through a negotiated grievance process.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation to reauthorize the Panama Canal Commission.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1522, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous matter, on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2010, NATIONAL SERVICE TRUST ACT OF 1993

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 215 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 215

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2010) to amend the National and Community Service Act of 1990 to establish a Corporation for National Service, enhance opportunities for national

service, and provide national service educational awards to persons participating in such service, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed three hours equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor. After general debate the Committee of the Whole shall rise without motion. No further consideration of the bill shall be in order except pursuant to a subsequent order of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. DREIER], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 215 provides for 3 hours of general debate on H.R. 2010, the National Service Trust Act of 1993. This rule has been recommended to the House by the Committee on Rules as a means to start the debate on this important policy initiative. Amendments to the bill, however, will not be considered by the House until Thursday.

I should note that when the Committee on Rules met to consider H.R. 2010 before the July Fourth district work period, Chairman FORD stated that it was his intention to ask the Committee on Rules to report an open rule but to also require preprinting of amendments. To prepare for such an eventuality, the committee announced and circulated a "Dear Colleague" suggesting that all proposed amendments to H.R. 2010 be printed in the RECORD prior to consideration of the bill for amendment. All Members were afforded the opportunity to prepare amendments to the reported bill during the recess and to print them in the RECORD yesterday and today in order to assure that their amendments will be eligible for consideration.

Mr. Speaker, as I stated at the outset, the rule before us today provides for general debate only on H.R. 2010. However, in order to consider the bill, the rule also waives points of order against its consideration for failure to comply with section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act. Section 302(f) prohibits the consideration of any measure which would cause the appropriate ceilings to be exceeded. H.R. 2010 contains some provisions which impact on section 302(f) of the Budget Act. For example, section 194 contains technical violation of the Budget Act, by creating positions which are to be compensated by level IV of the Executive Pay Schedule. Another example would allow Peace Corps and certain VISTA volunteers who later become Federal

employees to credit time served in their computation of retirement benefits. The Committee on Rules has recommended the waiver in order that this important policy initiative be brought to the House for full discussion and debate.

House Resolution 215 provides for 3 hours of general debate which is to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor. These 3 hours of debate will afford the House ample opportunity to debate the issues associated with creating a Corporation for National Service.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the rule provides that after general debate, the Committee of the Whole shall rise without motion and no further consideration of the bill shall be in order except pursuant to a subsequent order of the House.

I urge adoption of the rule in order that the House may begin its debate on this most important initiative.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule. Once again our Committee on Rules has chosen to employ a two-part rule to deal with a very important piece of legislation.

As I have noted in the past, two-part rules are bad floor procedure. This rule separates the general debate on this expensive national service legislation from the very important amendment process. This detracts from the debate of important issues that surround this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to our Committee on Rules meeting which will take place upstairs, and I hope that we will eventually honor the request of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], and the distinguished ranking member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], by granting an open rule on this bill. However, Mr. Speaker, at this time I would urge Members on both sides of the aisle to reject this rule because of this procedure.

The National Service Act is an important piece of legislation. It has the potential to become a multibillion-dollar political and budgetary hot potato in the years to come. There is such a wide array of concerns surrounding the bill reported by the Committee on Education and Labor that I can barely even mention all of them.

For example, the bill creates a paid service program that pays better than millions of private sector jobs. It creates a new \$20,000 per student educational assistance program at a time when we are cutting Pell grants back from a mere \$2,400 per student. It creates a new and exclusive make-work jobs program that is certain to be

abused as political patronage. It provides labor unions, for the first time, with an official role in deciding whether certain service jobs can be filled. And it creates another Federal spending program that is not needs based. Each of these problems deserves ample debate under an open amendment process.

Mr. Speaker, there was a worthy goal that gave birth to the National Service Trust Act. It was to encourage more young Americans to engage in service to their communities and Nation. The problem is, in trying to fashion a Federal Government program for what should be a voluntary decision, we are proposing to pay young people more than they can earn if they go into the private job market.

This bill proposes to pay each participant a stipend of up to \$7,400 a year, \$5,000 a year in educational vouchers, health care benefits, child care benefits, and family leave benefits. It is estimated that the program might cost up to \$20,000 a person.

With the child and health benefits, the community service program is handing out \$10-an-hour jobs paid for by the Government. This is not a bad deal for someone just out of high school. Where is the spirit of community service when the alternative for most young people will still be to take college loans, and work lower paying part-time jobs, while going to college? Of course, these generous Federal benefits will only be available to a small fraction of potential students, a lucky 3 percent in 1997.

With this bill, working to help the environment, promote public safety, teach children, or meet human needs is not community service. It is a good job. The problem is, most hard-working Americans have to go out and find jobs in the private sector, rather than be handed jobs with excellent benefits from a Government program. It is really just another example of the make-work job creation mentality of the Clinton administration. Rather than encourage people to attain productive private sector employment, this administration continues to promote big Government programs that spend lots of taxpayer money on inefficient make-work Government-sponsored jobs.

Mr. Speaker, the noble endeavor of promoting community service has been lost in this mix.

□ 1340

This bill is a priority of the President's, so we should take our job very seriously. If we pass a bad bill, it will become law and we will be forced a few years from now to undo the problems it creates.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, let us do our community service by defeating this rule and correcting this bill before it is too late.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield 5 minutes

to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, let me say to the Members of the House and to the people of this Nation that today we open a historic debate on what role American citizens should play in giving back to their country some effort on behalf of this country for problems that have all too long seemed insoluble, that have been neglected, and that have not been dealt with.

President Clinton has summoned the best of our country and the best of our young and asked them to come forward and give service to this country, and in exchange for that he would provide a minimum stipend while they work over that year's period of time or 2-year period of time. He would also allow them to receive the possibility of paying for part of their college education or their job training, as they see fit to do in their coming years.

This is an effort to engage in a unique American experience where rich and poor and middle class work alongside one another to help all of our communities across the board, to help our elderly, to help our young, to tutor our schoolchildren, to revitalize our natural resources, and to rebuild the infrastructure of our national parks and our wilderness areas and our national forests in this country.

I am somewhat alarmed when I see my colleagues from the other side of the aisle say that this is nothing but make-work jobs. I would invite him to visit the San Francisco Conservation Corps or the East Bay Conservation Corps or the California Conservation Corps that have now received the overwhelming support on a bipartisan basis of the Governors of the State of California, the mayors of the large cities, and the communities, to see the kind of work that these people do when our State is hit with floods, as it was last year, when our State was devastated by earthquake, as it was a number of years ago, to see the kind of work they come forward and are able to present to the cities when the cities are in trouble, to see the kind of discipline they have, and to see the kind of self-esteem that is adopted by these individuals as they provide service on behalf of the people of California.

I would invite my colleagues to visit Teach America, to see the young people who are going into our schools to teach for a year in some of the toughest schools in this Nation, to try to impart their skills, their knowledge, and their ability to others who are less fortunate. That is not a make-work job; it is a real tough assignment. The slogan of the Peace Corps, I believe, is something like this: "The toughest job you'll ever love."

This summons the very best of the young people of our Nation to come forward, those with advanced degrees,

those who are just out of high school waiting to go to college or to job training, and to mix that in, to mix that experience, to mix that educational attainment, to mix those skills on behalf of this Nation. That is what this debate is about, whether or not we should participate in that effort.

To suggest somehow that if we abandon this bill, those needs will be filled is simply not the case. America need only look around to its cities and its suburbs, around to its communities and around to its natural resources, to understand that with all the wonderful volunteerism of today, we cannot meet those needs.

This is not a volunteer program. This is a program where you sign up to do your work for a year's period of time, and if the fire comes at 2 a.m. or the flood comes in the middle of the morning, if some community is in trouble, you promise to be there. You do not say, "Well, it's a little late in the morning," or "It's a little early at night. I can't quite be there."

This is not what this is about. This is about signing up to deliver your skills, your education, your ability, your values, and mix them with others to improve our communities and the natural resources of this country. We all know of the wonderful, wonderful examples we have heard about, but the brilliance of the Clinton program is this: that he is not creating a bureaucracy. This administration is not trying to create a Federal Youth Service Program. They are building on what we already have within the administration, within the Government of the United States, and adopting and allowing to expand 1-year city programs, conservation programs, Teach America programs, and Urban Youth Corps programs across this Nation. And this should be a job that provides reward because the work is tough.

I would invite all my colleagues over the August break to go out and spend time with the young people and to meet and to know their leaders and to understand the experience that they are imparting to others and that they are imparting to the communities they are helping, and then come back and tell me about the make-work jobs, because that is what this is not about. This is about Americans helping Americans, rich and poor, minority and majority, across all lines to make this a better country to live in.

Mr. Speaker, this is the beginning of a great national debate. I think it is also going to be the beginning of a great national program.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say that my friend, the gentleman from California, has very correctly pointed to the fact that we want to see a level of community service. We want to see people involved. We want to see people take on responsibility.

What we should be doing is labeling this measure exactly what it is. It is a jobs-creation program which is compensating at levels which far exceed the levels that are presently out there, and it seems to me it is far too expensive at this time for us to get into it at this kind of an advanced rate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from the downtown San Dimas, CA, area for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for general debate only on the national service bill. I am pleased that we will have 3 hours of general discussion on this legislation, because, frankly, I think few people really understand the provisions of this bill or its potential budget consequences.

During Rules Committee testimony we heard many times that this measure was a major priority for President Clinton and represented a cornerstone campaign promise. I have consistently applauded the President for his commitment to national service, and I am hopeful that he agrees the issue deserves our careful attention.

I would certainly hate to see us rush into this complex new program without adequate deliberation—simply to ensure a successful White House photo opportunity to announce a campaign pledge fulfilled. I believe a well-thought-out and carefully designed National Service Program could give our young people a valuable sense of civic and national pride, while improving their quality of life and providing an opportunity to defray the ever-increasing cost of higher education. If done properly it should create some real jobs and real productivity.

Unfortunately, I am not sure this bill will accomplish these goals. Instead, the National Service Trust Act appears likely to bureaucratize philanthropy and turn volunteers into Government workers. I have serious philosophical differences with a program which attempts to give Government a monopoly on good will.

To be honest, I do not know whether this particular bill is a jobs bill, a community service bill, an education bill, or a new entitlement bill. One thing we do know is what this bill is not: This is not a bill about volunteers—in fact when Mr. PORTER of Illinois presented an amendment pertaining to volunteers he was apparently told by the Parliamentarian that he could need special permission from the Rules Committee because "this bill is not about volunteers."

To be sure, under the provisions of this bill participants completing at least 1 year of full-time service or 2 years of part-time service would be paid a minimum wage stipend, health and child care benefits, plus a \$5,000

educational award. This could cost the taxpayers \$20,000 for each national service volunteer job. The entire program will cost an estimated \$7.4 billion after 4 years.

By anyone's standards this bill creates a massive new Federal program with potentially enormous Federal obligations for the outyears as people who participate claim their reward from the Government. We should proceed with extreme caution—I fear creating a major new Federal program at a time when our country is struggling with a serious budget crisis will come back to haunt us.

While I am glad for the time on general debate and I appreciate Chairman FORD's willingness to request an open rule for amendments, I note that today's rule provides a waiver of the Congressional Budget Act, something this Member is always loath to do. We are told this waiver is needed for a very minor purpose—something about a new payroll position with the Federal Government that violates pay-as-you-go procedures. Nonetheless, it is my belief that we should not be waiving the Budget Act—especially when our Nation is already more than \$4 trillion in debt.

Mr. Speaker, I am hesitant this huge new bureaucracy will strangle the enthusiasm that currently energizes private initiatives in our communities. While President Clinton obviously has good intentions, he may be too eager to provide a costly, big government answer to the question, "What can I do for my country?" This bill needs a lot of work—let us take the time to do it properly.

□ 1350

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that my friend from Florida [Mr. GOSS], made a very important point. This rule waives the Budget Act. It is a two-part procedure. It seems to me that it should be defeated, and I am going to urge my colleagues to defeat it.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules will meet later this week and will hear the case for various amendments. Obviously there are amendments that will be considered during consideration of this bill. This just provides for general debate.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further request for time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). 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, 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 239, nays 159, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 322]

YEAS—239

Abercrombie	Green	Ortiz
Ackerman	Gunderson	Orton
Andrews (ME)	Gutierrez	Owens
Andrews (NJ)	Hall (OH)	Pallone
Andrews (TX)	Hall (TX)	Pastor
Applegate	Hamburg	Payne (NJ)
Bacchus (FL)	Hamilton	Payne (VA)
Baesler	Harman	Pelosi
Barca	Hastings	Penny
Barcia	Hayes	Peterson (FL)
Barlow	Hefner	Peterson (MN)
Barrett (WI)	Hilliard	Pickett
Becerra	Hinchey	Pickle
Bellenson	Hoagland	Pomeroy
Berman	Hochbrueckner	Poshard
Bevill	Holden	Price (NC)
Bilbray	Hoyer	Rahall
Bishop	Hughes	Rangel
Bonior	Hutto	Reed
Borski	Inslee	Reynolds
Boucher	Jacobs	Richardson
Brewster	Jefferson	Roemer
Brooks	Johnson (GA)	Rose
Browder	Johnson (SD)	Rostenkowski
Brown (CA)	Johnson, E.B.	Rowland
Brown (FL)	Johnston	Roybal-Allard
Brown (OH)	Kanjorski	Rush
Byrne	Kennedy	Sabo
Cantwell	Kennelly	Sanders
Cardin	Kildee	Sangmeister
Carr	Klecicka	Sarpalius
Chapman	Klein	Sawyer
Clay	Klink	Schenk
Clayton	Kopetski	Schroeder
Clement	Kreidler	Schumer
Clyburn	LaFalce	Scott
Coleman	Lambert	Serrano
Collins (IL)	Lancaster	Sharp
Collins (MI)	Lantos	Shays
Cooper	LaRocco	Shepherd
Coppersmith	Lazio	Sisisky
Costello	Lehman	Skaggs
Coyne	Levin	Skelton
Danner	Lewis (GA)	Slattery
Darden	Lloyd	Slaughter
de la Garza	Long	Smith (IA)
Deal	Lowe	Spratt
DeLauro	Maloney	Stark
Derrick	Mann	Stenholm
Deutsch	Manton	Strickland
Dicks	Margolies-	Studds
Dingell	Mezvinsky	Stupak
Dixon	Markey	Swett
Dooley	Martinez	Swift
Durbin	Matsui	Synar
Edwards (CA)	Mazzoli	Tanner
Edwards (TX)	McCloskey	Tauzin
Engel	McCurdy	Tejeda
English (AZ)	McDermott	Thompson
English (OK)	McHale	Thurman
Eshoo	McKinney	Torres
Evans	McNulty	Torricelli
Farr	Meehan	Traficant
Fazio	Meek	Unsoeld
Fields (LA)	Menendez	Valentine
Filner	Miller (CA)	Velazquez
Fingerhut	Mineta	Vento
Flake	Minge	Visclosky
Foglietta	Mink	Volkmer
Ford (MI)	Moakley	Washington
Ford (TN)	Montgomery	Waters
Frank (MA)	Murphy	Watt
Frost	Murtha	Waxman
Furse	Nadler	Wheat
Gejdenson	Natcher	Whitten
Geren	Neal (MA)	Williams
Gibbons	Neal (NC)	Woolsey
Glickman	Oberstar	Wyden
Gonzalez	Obey	Wynn
Gordon	Oliver	Yates

NAYS—159

Allard	Goodling	Nussle
Archer	Goss	Oxley
Armey	Grams	Packard
Bachus (AL)	Grandy	Paxon
Baker (CA)	Greenwood	Petri
Baker (LA)	Hancock	Pombo
Balenger	Hansen	Porter
Barrett (NE)	Hastert	Portman
Bartlett	Hefley	Pryce (OH)
Bateman	Hefner	Quillen
Bentley	Hobson	Quinn
Bereuter	Hoekstra	Ramstad
Billirakis	Hoke	Ravenel
Billey	Horn	Regula
Blute	Houghton	Ridge
Boehner	Hunter	Roberts
Bonilla	Hutchinson	Rogers
Bunning	Hyde	Rohrabacher
Burton	Inglis	Ros-Lehtinen
Buyer	Inhofe	Roth
Callahan	Istook	Roukema
Calvert	Johnson (CT)	Royce
Camp	Johnson, Sam	Santorum
Canady	Kim	Saxton
Castle	King	Schaefer
Coble	Kingston	Schiff
Collins (GA)	Klug	Sensenbrenner
Combust	Knollenberg	Shaw
Crane	Kolbe	Shuster
Crapo	Kyl	Skeen
Cunningham	Leach	Smith (MI)
DeLay	Levy	Smith (NJ)
Diaz-Balart	Lewis (CA)	Smith (TX)
Dickey	Lightfoot	Snowe
Doolittle	Linder	Solomon
Dornan	Livingston	Spence
Dreier	Machtley	Stearns
Dunn	Manzullo	Stamp
Emerson	McCandless	Sundquist
Everett	McCollum	Talent
Fawell	McCrery	Taylor (NC)
Fields (TX)	McDade	Thomas (CA)
Fish	McHugh	Thomas (WY)
Fowler	McInnis	Torkildsen
Franks (CT)	McMillan	Upton
Franks (NJ)	Meyers	Vucanovich
Gallo	Mica	Walker
Gekas	Michel	Walsh
Gilchrest	Miller (FL)	Weldon
Gillmor	Mollinari	Wolf
Gilman	Moorhead	Young (AK)
Gingrich	Morella	Zeliff
Goodlatte	Myers	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—36

Barton	Ewing	Mollohan
Blackwell	Galleghy	Moran
Boehler	Gephardt	Parker
Bryant	Henry	Smith (OR)
Clinger	Huffington	Stokes
Condit	Kaptur	Taylor (MS)
Conyers	Kasich	Thornton
Cox	Laughlin	Towns
Cramer	Lewis (FL)	Tucker
DeFazio	Lipinski	Wilson
Dellums	McKeon	Wise
Duncan	Mfume	Young (FL)

□ 1412

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Tucker for, with Mr. Smith of Oregon against.

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.

**ARMORED CAR INDUSTRY RECIPROCITY ACT OF 1993**

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1189) to entitle certain armored car crewmembers to lawfully carry a weap-

on in any State while protecting the security of valuable goods in interstate commerce in the service of an armored car company, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Senate amendment: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the "Armored Car Industry Reciprocity Act of 1993".

**SEC. 2. FINDINGS.**

Congress finds that—

(1) the distribution of goods and services to consumers in the United States requires the free flow of currency, bullion, securities, food stamps, and other items of unusual value in interstate commerce;

(2) the armored car industry transports and protects such items in interstate commerce, including daily transportation of currency and food stamps valued at more than \$1,000,000,000;

(3) armored car crew members are often subject to armed attack by individuals attempting to steal such items;

(4) to protect themselves and the items they transport, such crew members are armed with weapons;

(5) various States require both weapons training and a criminal record background check before licensing a crew member to carry a weapon; and

(6) there is a need for each State to reciprocally accept weapons licenses of other States for armored car crew members to assure the free and safe transport of valuable items in interstate commerce.

**SEC. 3. STATE RECIPROCITY OF WEAPONS LICENSES ISSUED TO ARMORED CAR COMPANY CREW MEMBERS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—If an armored car crew member employed by an armored car company has in effect a license issued by the appropriate State agency (in the State in which such member is primarily employed by such company) to carry a weapon while acting in the services of such company in that State, and such State agency meets the minimum State requirements under subsection (b), then such crew member shall be entitled to lawfully carry any weapon to which such license relates in any State while such crew member is acting in the service of such company.

(b) MINIMUM STATE REQUIREMENTS.—A State agency meets the minimum State requirements of this subsection if in issuing a weapons license to an armored car crew member described in subsection (a), the agency requires the crew member to provide information on an annual basis to the satisfaction of the agency that—

(1) the crew member has received classroom and range training in weapons safety and marksmanship during the current year by a qualified instructor for each weapon that the crew member is licensed to carry; and

(2) the receipt or possession of a weapon by the crew member would not violate Federal law, determined on the basis of a criminal record background check conducted during the current year.

**SEC. 4. RELATION TO OTHER LAWS.**

This Act shall supersede any provision of State law (or the law of any political subdivision of a State) that is inconsistent with this Act.

## SEC. 5. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act:

(1) The term "armored car crew member" means an individual who provides protection for goods transported by an armored car company.

(2) The term "armored car company" means a company—

(A) subject to regulation under subchapter II of chapter 105 of title 49, United States Code; and

(B) holding the appropriated certificate, permit, or license issued under subchapter II of chapter 109 of such title, in order to engage in the business of transporting and protecting currency, bullion, securities, precious metals, food stamps, and other articles of unusual value in interstate commerce.

(3) The term "State" means any State of the United States or the District of Columbia.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the initial request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, while I have no intention of objecting, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS], the chairwoman of the subcommittee, so she may have the opportunity to explain the purpose of her unanimous-consent request.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, as the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Consumer Protection, and Competitiveness of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and as a cosponsor of the legislation, the gentleman has provided great assistance in the development of this bill.

I would also like to thank the members of the committee, the former ranking Republican member of the subcommittee, Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina, and the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OXLEY] for their cosponsorship of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, on May 18, 1993, the House passed H.R. 1189 by voice vote. The bill, which provides reciprocity for weapons licenses for certain armored car crew members, is a noncontroversial bill. On June 30, the Senate passed the bill with several technical amendments. These technical amendments improved the bill, and the purpose of this unanimous-consent request is to concur in those amendments.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would like to thank the gentlewoman for her explanation. I have enjoyed working with the distinguished chairwoman of the subcommittee on this legislation.

This legislation is a commonsense bill which was forged in a true spirit of bipartisanship. It passed the House earlier this year without opposition, and the Senate amendments make no significant substantive changes.

Mr. Speaker, I do not oppose the gentlewoman's unanimous-consent request, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the initial request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### NATIONAL SERVICE TRUST ACT OF 1993

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Pursuant to House Resolution 215 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2010.

□ 1417

#### 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. 2010, to amend the National and Community Service Act of 1990 to establish a Corporation for National Service, enhance opportunities for national service, and provide national service educational awards to persons participating in such service, and for other purposes; with Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] will be recognized for 1 hour and 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] will be recognized for 1 hour and 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, before yielding any time, pursuant to an informal agreement with the minority, I ask unanimous consent that the majority yield 15 minutes of its time, and the minority yield 15 minutes of its time, to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON], who shall have the authority to control that time period.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes from this side.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds, in the interest of getting an opportunity for all the people who wish to speak, an opportunity to speak, on the bill during general debate.

Mr. Chairman, throughout Bill Clinton's 1992 campaign, one issue touched Americans of all backgrounds and political persuasions unlike any other. It was an issue that bound together several of our highest ideals. The urge to help solve crushing social problems. The call to serve our fellow citizens. The desire for a better education.

That proposal is now before us. H.R. 2010, the National Service Trust Act of 1993, rewards individual responsibility, and builds community by encouraging Americans of all ages to work together to tackle our common problems. It will also expand educational opportunity for those who participate.

This legislation, in its broad aim, has precedents. After the Second World War, the GI bill gave a generation of returning servicemen the opportunity to educate themselves and help launch America's unprecedented era of prosperity. The GI bill rewarded military service, irrespective of the status of the participant. Its benefits were equally available to all returning servicemen.

As the GI bill's social and economic benefits continued to unfold, President Kennedy appealed to our sense of service in launching the Peace Corps, a mission that secured America's reputation as the most generous nation on Earth. It remains the most admired program of the 1960's.

H.R. 2010 builds on the legacies of these two historic programs, and on the Peace Corps' domestic counterpart, VISTA, the Volunteers in Service to America. From its modest start in this legislation, national service will, we hope, nurture a more compassionate, public-spirited consciousness among our citizens and help to rebuild the sense of community we seem to be sorely lacking.

The diversity of support for the bill is impressive. We have received corporate endorsements ranging from Archer Daniels Midland Co. to Zenith, from Ben & Jerry's to Dow Chemical. The dozens of nonprofit supporters include the American Association of Retired Persons, the Child Welfare League of America, the Close Up Foundation, the National Governors Association, United Way of America, and the Fraternal Order of Police.

On July 9, I received a letter from Elizabeth Dole, president of the American Red Cross, in support of H.R. 2010. I quote:

We understand that community service is neither a panacea for the nation's problems nor a substitute for traditional volunteerism. However, your bill will enlarge the means by which individuals can make a difference in their community.

I am particularly pleased that the Red Cross has joined so many others in support of this bill.

H.R. 2010 would allow any individual at least 17 years of age to apply to the national service program to serve—not volunteer—on pressing educational, environmental, human and public safety problems. Participants would tutor school children, run recycling programs, aid homebound individuals, and serve in projects dedicated to solving hundreds of other problems that simply are not being addressed.

In return for a year of full-time service, participants would receive a \$5,000 educational award, the current VISTA subsistence allowance of \$7,400, and health and child care

benefits as necessary. Awards could be used to repay loans for higher education or to pay for tuition or approved job training. Individuals could receive up to two \$5,000 awards for each 2 years of service.

Qualifying service programs would be operated by Federal agencies, States, local governments, school districts, colleges, or community-based not-for-profit organizations. The National Service Trust, a Government corporation, would help local organizations qualify for the initiative and ensure that their public mission is up to standards of usefulness of participants and communities.

Thus, the bill would establish no new Federal bureaucracy to run programs but rely on existing, local networks. The initiative relies on locally driven programs, allowing participants flexibility and stimulating competition among sponsoring organizations.

H.R. 2010 would authorize \$394 million in 1994 appropriations, creating 25,000 to 30,000 slots, and such sums as may be necessary in 1995 and 1996. We would expect that if this program succeeds, if it strikes in reality the nerve it has as a proposal, then national service will grow in the years ahead. If it fails to fulfill needs both for participants and the communities we expect them to serve, we will be prepared to pull the plug on it.

The bill also would reauthorize the school-based service-learning programs for grades K-12 and college youth, for \$45 million; the VISTA and Older American Volunteer Programs under the Domestic Volunteer Service Act, for \$319 million; and the civilian community corps and the Points of Light Foundation. All out-year authorizations are for such sums as may be necessary.

Mr. Chairman, in recent days, I have seen an issues brief circulated by the House Republican Conference about national service. I want to correct some misstatements in that paper for my colleagues.

First of all, H.R. 2010 has nothing to do with the direct lending proposal that is part of the budget reconciliation bill.

As I have noted, the bill before us does not provide a multi-billion-dollar authorization. This was originally proposed by the administration, but was modified after consultation with Members on both sides of the aisle.

As Congress is to provide appropriations, the National Service Act would establish no entitlement. No one is entitled to participate in the program, and no program is entitled to receive funds. All programs will be selected competitively. Grants will be evaluated frequently and bad programs will be weeded out. Finally, the administration never proposed to create an entitlement.

Because funds are to be appropriated through the HUD-VA subcommittees, national service will not compete with funding for Pell grants and other education programs that are provided through the Labor-HHS bill. We are not taking away money from poor students to fund national service.

Further, the Labor-HHS bill that passed the House restored the major part of campus-based aid funds and we have been assured by the administration that it will continue to work with the appropriators to fully fund campus-based aid programs.

In its formulation in the White House, Members may recall, some were concerned that

the benefits of national service would exceed those of military service. Military service people receive more than participants in national service. And military pay is considerably higher than that proposed for national service participants. I want to acknowledge the role played by Chairman MONTGOMERY in this regard and to note that he is an original cosponsor of the bill.

There are concerns that this bill would create another bureaucracy on top of existing programs that support community service. In fact, we would streamline these dispersed programs and merge the old ACTION and the Commission on National and Community Service. The Corporation for National Service is modeled on the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, an entity that spreads authority to local agencies. We are not creating a new bureaucratic monster.

Some of my colleagues may be wary that national service would displace paid jobs or be a threat to unions and their members. Unions endorsing the bill include the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees and the American Federation of Teachers, Service Employees Union, as well as the FOP. The bill would require consultation with employee representatives to ensure it does not displace wage-earning workers.

Finally, some suggest that a lottery should be held to allocate national service slots. That is impractical, since programs have different requirements and participants different interests. Under the bill, the programs—the people on the ground, working on these tasks—would select participants on a nondiscriminatory basis.

National service is not a make-work program. It is not welfare. It is not an entitlement. It does not replace voluntarism. It is a trade—education aid in return for service of important and lasting community value.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the bill.

□ 1420

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY].

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2010. Among other provisions, H.R. 2010 consolidates the administration of existing service programs; such as ACTION, VISTA, and the Peace Corps; with the administration of the new national and community service programs provided in this legislation. Provisions of the legislation relating to compensation and personnel practices within the new Corporation for National Service are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

I want to express my appreciation to the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, Mr. FORD, the sponsor of this bill and chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Resources, Mr. MARTINEZ, and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Select Education and Civil Rights, Mr. OWENS, for their willingness to work with the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to improve this legislation. I also want to express my appreciation to the administration. The legislation before us not only promotes national and community service, but ensures that the service programs will be competently administered by professional staff

on a nonpartisan basis. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2010.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield what time he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], the minority leader.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, what we are going to be debating today is not just the details of H.R. 2010, although they are important, but the very concept of national service.

We all agree that it is a good thing to inculcate in our young people what have been called the habits of the heart, the predisposition to serve the large community voluntarily. Indeed, we all want to capture the idea of community itself, an idea which has fallen on hard times of late.

But the proposal before us today is a step away from voluntary community service, because it is a system of government rewards for those who serve.

The true purpose of community service should be for the individual voluntarily to put aside his or her private goals in order to serve the needs of others.

I am reminded of the story of the man who came upon a volunteer working in a hospital ward dealing with the most horrible of burn cases. And the man seeing the horror all around him said to the volunteer, "I wouldn't do your job for a million dollars." And she replied: "Neither would I."

That is the true spirit of community service. If we cannot get this idea across to our young people, and if we settle for the idea in this proposal, what we will have told our young people is: Do not perform community service unless you are reimbursed for it in some economically beneficial way, or receive a reward for it.

The proposal, in my view, is yet another example of a persistent and troubling pattern of this administration. We get inspirational campaign rhetoric, in this case with a Kennedyesque ring to it, about a desirable goal. But the administration has not the foggiest idea of how to translate that rhetoric into an effective program to reach the goal.

What we get in the end is another big government program in which Big Daddy creates a system of rewards. But Government-run community voluntarism is a contradiction in terms.

And why are we considering a potentially massive new spending program at this time when the budget debate has not yet been completed? Does it really make sense to provide a very limited number of persons, not defined by income category or age, with a minimum wage job, health benefits, child care, and education benefits totaling \$15,000 per year per person when we are not yet fully funding our Pell grants for truly needy students?

Should the community service jobs be open ended, or should they be targeted more directly to serve a real need in our communities?

Someone once said a tragedy may be defined as the "killing of a beautiful theory by an ugly fact." The ugly facts just have not been considered by the administration, intoxicated as it is by its own rhetoric.

Let me say to those who support this concept, the habits of the heart cannot be inculcated by bureaucratic disbursement of tax dollars. The idea of community cannot be enhanced by looking to Washington to tell us what community service is, or indeed what community itself is.

Only when millions of individual volunteers in tens of thousands of America's communities tell Washington through their actions what community service is can we truly reflect the strength of this Nation of communities.

This proposal, in my judgment, misses the point of voluntarism entirely. It is not effective as an aid to education and it tells young Americans that they should always look for a payoff when helping their community.

But in America, for 200 years, the idea of helping the community itself has been the payoff. And I would urge my fellow colleagues not to weaken or destroy that great concept by putting it in the hands of another governmental bureaucracy.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 seconds.

For Members who are still in their offices and Members on the floor, the gentleman who just spoke indicates to me that he has not had time to look at what we have before us. We have a 302-page bill, a piece of proposed legislation. We have a 341-page explanation of the bill, and I call Members' attention particularly to page 83 and following which recites in two pages the full history of how this bill got here, where it comes from, and maybe we will not have a repeat of the misinformation that the gentleman from Illinois just gave us.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ], the principal sponsor of the bill and chairman of one of the subcommittees with jurisdiction over it.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Chairman, I can see two reasons for H.R. 2010. One is to instill in young people today the spirit of our forefathers for community service. And the other is to provide an opportunity for these same people to receive higher education without the cloud of enormous debt hanging over their head when they finish their schooling.

Mr. Chairman, in every desperate era, the Government—in living up to its mandate of promoting the general welfare—has provided the policy leadership and programs necessary to that end. For my older brothers, it was the CCC's of the 1930's—for those of you too young to remember, those years were the height of the Depression.

That program—replicated in this bill—took young people out of ghettos and gave them a small stipend and room and board in exchange for community service—but the money they received was not their reward—the community service experience was their reward. It gave them a sense of being a part of their community and a pride that changed their lives forever.

In this bill we provide that opportunity for both rural and urban youth. And we do much more than that.

This bill also reinvents government by consolidating and streamlining the existing Federal administration of service and volunteer programs.

It abolishes the Action Agency and the Commission on National and Community Service and delegates the functions of both agencies to the Corporation for National Service. Thus allowing for a flexible and quality-driven personnel system that may very well redefine merit-based Government service.

At the same time, it gives full consideration to the employees of the Action Agency for their years of invaluable service by retaining their competitive status protection as employees of the new corporation.

Mr. Chairman, one of my colleagues claims that participants in this program won't learn the service ethic because they are " \* \* \* being paid a healthy sum to do the service." I only remind my colleague that no one can argue that the Peace Corps participants didn't learn the service ethic—the evidence is overwhelming to the contrary.

I would also like to remind my colleagues that Peace Corps cost are comparable to this program. The big difference is that the community service provided in this bill is done here, not in a foreign country. It's one way of putting our people first.

Mr. Chairman, I, like many of us here, feel fortunate to have been born when I was. Most of us have had the best of all worlds. We, as children raised through a depression saw our parents live the tough life of providing a better life for us.

In turn we lived our parenting time thinking we would provide a better life for our children, but the world changes and now we find the bad economy and the education requirements of a high tech society are making it tougher for our children to succeed.

Mr. Chairman, a member of the Rules Committee's objection to the bill was that we are doing too much for young people and the Government can't afford it. I guess the inference was that young people today don't have the gumption to do for themselves.

Mr. Chairman, I don't believe that it's that simple. In most cases we have not provided the opportunity to them to work for their own gratification and to develop expectations for themselves.

Mr. Chairman, my dad used to say that most people only appreciate and value the things they work for and earn themselves. In this bill we provide the opportunity for young people to earn and learn—to develop a sense of community and have confidence in themselves and others.

Mr. Chairman, beyond earning and learning, we provide the opportunity for young and old to serve as well as be served and finally let me state emphatically that the components of this bill are based on proved concepts. I urge my colleagues to support the National Service Trust Act of 1993.

□ 1430

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman and Members, I rise in support of the National Service Trust Act. I do that as a Republican because I think, first of all, this is a test of whether this Congress, Republicans and Democrats alike, can work with this President in a bipartisan manner to get something done when the President is willing to meet us halfway.

I also rise in support of this legislation because, very frankly, it is a real test of this Congress as to whether or not we are going to have the courage and the ability to redesign some of our Federal delivery systems, to find ways in which we can solve local and national problems and, quite frankly, a more cost-effective way than the present delivery system.

Let us understand what national service is and what it is not. National service is not student financial aid; national service is not paid voluntarism. National service is a public partnership from the Federal, State, and local level to meet a unique and urgent local or national need with particular opportunities for professional and personal growth for those young people involved.

Mr. Chairman, we have worked with the administration through this legislation. This is not the original Nunn/McCurdy proposal that required all students who receive financial aid to give national service. This is not the entitlement program the President talked about in the campaign.

This is a dramatically redesigned program that is going to be subject to the legislative and budget priorities of this Congress every year.

This bill, as we deal with it today, is a program which combines the best of, frankly, the Democratic Party's ideals for public service, with the Republican Party's ideals for efficiency, for local control, in that delivery system. We have a bill today that is a small beginning, not a big new entitlement.

It is a bill that says, "You ought to work; you are not just going to get free grant money." It is such sums, not entitlements; it is controlled at the State and local level, not the Federal level; it

requires local cost shares. It even requires subminimum wages if they design it and the program is taken on a competitive review process.

Participants are not a part of the Federal civil service system; they are unique applicants and participants for a short period of time.

So, what we have done in this legislation is bring together what we believe can be the beginning of a way in which we can better meet those local needs when we are cutting Medicare and Medicaid, when we are cutting CDBG's and our other programs.

I urge all of my colleagues, take a look at this, it might meet your test.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MCCURDY], the longest continuous and most ardent proponent of national service among all of us here on the floor today.

Mr. MCCURDY. Mr. Chairman, this is a proud day for those who have labored for years, through the Democratic Leadership Council and other forums, to keep the idea of national service alive.

Bill Clinton was elected last year in large part because he promised that he would be a new Democrat. The President's national service plan is the most powerful symbol of the philosophy of mutual obligation that he promoted during the campaign.

National service represents a new approach to social programs, an approach emphasizing individual responsibility. National service views Government as a partner in, rather than manager of, efforts to address our social problems.

To a great extent, American Government has become detached from the individual. From State houses and from Washington, our governmental institutions assess taxes, create programs, and enforce rights, often in ways that are bewildering to the average American. But with detachment comes disenfranchisement, and an abdication of responsibility. Without a stake in their community or a voice in their politics, many Americans have abandoned both.

According to a recent Atlantic magazine article, less than half of all Americans now believe that sacrifice for others is a moral virtue. And yet millions of us look to Government—that is, to our fellow citizens—for security against unemployment, ill health, and retirement.

It was against this background that Bill Clinton introduced his notion of a New Covenant. In his vision, citizens and Government would be bound by a new commitment to shared principles, to the building of local and national communities, to the reinvigoration of the national economy, and to the rebirth of the idea of service to others.

National service lies at the very core of this agenda. This legislation will challenge Americans to repay their debt of opportunity with service to

their country. It will allow our young people to recall their sense of obligation and to choose commitment over apathy, involvement over disenfranchisement, community over individualism.

The administration's national service plan is too often described as a student loan program. It is not. The educational benefit offered to those who volunteer is important, but the basic purpose of national service is to allow young Americans to exercise their responsibilities as freely as they exercise their rights.

A broad-based national service plan can make many contributions to our society. It can help rebuild our infrastructure, protect our environment, tutor our young, and care for our old. It can enrich the lives of its participants by demonstrating the satisfaction to be gained from giving to others, instilling young people with valuable life-management skills, and bring people together from diverse backgrounds.

National service will accomplish these goals while promoting a new, participatory model of Government activism. By using an independent corporation for management, tapping the American spirit of voluntarism, and focusing on grassroots organizations, national service will address social needs without an expanded Government bureaucracy and at relatively low cost.

This message transcends traditional Republican and Democratic philosophies. It goes to the core of what is wrong with American politics and, at a deeper level, American society. If national service helps to create a new sense of community in America, it will make a profound contribution to our political system and our society.

Those who believe that the American ethos need a new infusion of responsibility, of duty, of concern for others, should support this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, the gentleman from Michigan, [Mr. FORD] for his stewardship of this legislation through his committee; the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ] for his long-standing support of national service; and I want to commend my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, the gentleman from Connecticut, [Mr. SHAYS] and the gentleman from Wisconsin, [Mr. GUNDERSON] for their dedicated leadership and strong support for this initiative.

It is a program that has bipartisan support because it does capture the true spirit of America, and that is, giving something back for your country, to your country, and abandoning this philosophy of having something for nothing.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER], a member of the committee.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Chairman, I am all for the idea of service, I have served in the Navy Air Corps and volunteered for every local program. So what could be better than service on a national scale? But if we are honest here, H.R. 2010 has very little to do with service. The students who participate will receive not only an educational benefit, but a living stipend, child care and health care. This sounds like a new welfare program to me.

It is simply not the responsibility of the Government and the American taxpayers to create jobs and then pay for the living and educational expenses of students working in those artificially created jobs, all under the auspices of a national service program.

If this were truly a service program, the students would perform voluntarily for the purpose of helping others, not earning a living. They might still be regarded with an educational stipend, but that would be incidental. The motivation for joining the program would be to meet the needs of the community, not earn a living and an education at the expense of others. I do not understand why this new program is allegedly necessary. Many private and Federal volunteer programs are already in place which have significantly contributed to our communities. Now is simply not the time to undertake a new spending program.

One particularly troublesome facet of this bill is the blatant conflict-of-interest provision involving labor unions. The bill requires grant applicants to consult with, and in some cases receive the concurrence of labor unions, who may apply for those same grants. The unions have the power to influence the outcome of grants to nonunion applicants, while they themselves may apply for those same grants. This distinct advantage given to labor unions, over other applicants, is ludicrous.

It seems that there has been some confusion over the eligibility of labor unions to apply for grants. In a legislative summary sent to some offices, the Democratic Study Group focused on the provision in this bill that states that labor unions may not apply for a grant with the intent to use that money to pay volunteers to help the union organize union workers. However, the DSG did not mention that the national service bill explicitly states that labor unions may apply for grants if the grant would be used to provide for community service. It is not ethical if one of the applicants is given a distinct advantage over the other applicants. And yet that is exactly what this provision in the bill would do.

I plan to offer an amendment to delete this obvious conflict-of-interest giving unions an unfair advantage over other applicants. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment. It is essential to delete this provision that is rife with the potential for abuse.

□ 1440

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the ranking member of the committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER].

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Chairman, in the debate over the National Service Trust Act, the word volunteer has inspired as much rhetoric as any specific provision of the bill. Opponents have used it to criticize the proposal, because national service volunteers will receive a basic level of benefits in return for their service.

However, we readily refer to our armed services as an All-Volunteer Force. We use this term even though military personnel receive many benefits and rewards. We use it because we recognize that the job of defending our Nation requires real personal sacrifice. To do that work for little or no pay would be above and beyond the call of any American's duty in peacetime.

It is true that national service participants would receive a basic living allowance, plus health and child care benefits, if necessary. They could also acquire marketable skills and credentials. And yes, they would be eligible for modest educational awards, regardless of their family income.

But we offer nothing less to the men and women of our Armed Forces. No one would argue that soldiers and sailors live in luxury, or that they are doing make-work jobs. But we understand that some basic level of compensation for service is necessary if the Nation is to remain strong.

The National Service Trust Act is based on this principle. It would strengthen the Nation by encouraging and rewarding service in our communities. That service—the day-to-day work of teaching our children, making our streets secure, and reviving our most troubled communities—is of undeniable importance to the Nation.

Several amendments will be offered to this bill that would limit the reasonable benefits it would provide. Some will seek to eliminate the funding for living allowances or other basic needs. Others will seek to lessen the educational reward. I believe both of these approaches not only reduce the incentive to engage in service, they imply that the service performed is of lesser value. We do not means-test benefits earned during military service. We should not devalue service in our communities by requiring participants to exhaust all other avenues of educational funding before they can receive even part of the reward they have earned.

We rightly provide for, and reward, the men and women who voluntarily defend our Nation. We should do no less for those who will voluntarily help to rebuild it. I urge my colleagues to oppose amendments that would reduce our commitment to them, and to support the National Service Trust Act.

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

Mr. Chairman, if we were to enact this legislation in its present form, it would probably be one of the most immoral acts that this Congress has ever perpetrated upon the American people. Immoral is the only term I can use, because it is Robin Hood in reverse. If ever there was Robin Hood in reverse, you have it in this legislation.

I do not have any problems with national service, public service, whatever you want to call it. We have 30-some Federal service programs going on at the present time.

In fact, it is over a billion dollars that we spend. It might be a good idea sometime to get all those together and see what it is we are doing, and what we are not doing, and what we should be doing in the area of national service.

My problem with this is that it is Robin Hood in reverse. We are now finding that we must cut grants to States for needs-based higher education assistance. We are finding that we must cut work study programs. Many colleges and universities, as a matter of fact, require their students to go out and do public service in their college work-study programs. You do not have to create a new bureaucracy to do that. If you want to do it, use the bureaucracy that is there, mandate that a certain percentage of the people who receive work study grants serve the community in which they go to school.

You are saying to those who cannot afford an education, over 3 million who presently receive some funds from the Federal Government to get a higher education or a post-secondary education, you are saying to them, "Sorry, we don't have money for you. Sorry, we have to cut work study. Sorry, we have to cut State grants. Oh, but we just happen to have \$15,000 a year to anybody, no matter what your family's income may be. We cannot help those of you in need, but boy, we sure can throw out \$15,000 a year to those who are not in need."

Now, you are going to get the cry that, oh, when you do a program like this, you have to have a cross section. Well, let me tell you about the cross-section. The last bill we passed, the higher education bill, depending which college or university you go to, that takes you up to \$70,000 or \$75,000. That is a pretty good cross section. I do not believe you need to go out and hunt a cross section. You have to take care of those in need before you take care of those who are not in need. That is the big problem with the legislation.

I will offer an amendment to try to do something about that when we get to that point.

Now, to those who like, somehow or other, to mix this up with GI benefits—GI benefits—can you imagine vol-

unteering for this National Service Program and then, somehow or other, saying it has something to do with serving in the military? All of a sudden to be called up and go to the Middle East, all of a sudden 300 going to Macedonia. How would you like to be one of 300 going to Macedonia? You will be a pigeon there, waiting for them to pick you off. It is criminal to do something of that nature.

We are not talking about the same kind of benefits. We are not talking about the same kind of pressures, the same kind of death threats, and so forth, that all those people who serve in the military go through.

Read what the American Legion is saying about the legislation. They are not jumping up and down in delight and somehow comparing apples and oranges, as people would like to do here.

One other thing we are doing with the legislation, now you are going to get people going this route, rather than volunteering for the military service.

Let me tell you, if we are going to wipe out Korea tomorrow, and we are going to defend Macedonia today, and we are going to do something else to Yugoslavia the next day, we better have a force there, and not a force who are sitting there, as I said, like ducks waiting to be picked off. They should be protected.

We have to look at this legislation for what it is. First of all, we have to needs test the educational part of these benefits.

How can you tell 3 million in need that you have to go through a needs-test program, but you do not have to do it if you join this program?

Positively, you should have to go through that same procedure and then it would be fair to all.

So Mr. Chairman, I hope that some of the amendments that are available for this legislation will become law, or I have to repeat what I said at the beginning, to pass it in its present form is immoral at the best.

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY].

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the National Service Trust Act.

National service will change lives. More of our young people will be able to gain education and training beyond high school. And, as they volunteer to better their own lives, they will improve the lives of others.

At the same time, important and meaningful volunteer programs will receive new life and new assistance to meet unmet social and community needs.

Mr. Chairman, I am particularly pleased that the National Service Trust Act does not restrict volunteers based on income. At a time when too many Americans define themselves by their differences, I value this opportunity to bring together young people

from diverse backgrounds. Youth from middle-class families will have the opportunity to work side-by-side with peers from the very communities they are serving.

President Clinton conceived of national service as a way to build a new sense of community in America. I support this goal, and I urge my colleagues to do so, as well, by voting for the National Service Trust Act.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA], a member of the committee and a good friend who has worked hard and close with us on this bill.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my support for the National Service Trust Program. This legislation will give people from a variety of walks of life the opportunity to serve their communities in exchange for awards to attend post-secondary schools of their choice.

This program will enable people from all over the country from a variety of ethnic, economic and educational backgrounds, to work on some of the most pressing needs facing their local communities.

This experience is not only sure to change their communities, but also change the participants in a dramatic way.

□ 1450

I would like to stress that I do not believe that this program will replace volunteer programs that are currently taking place, but will, instead, support them and allow them to flourish. While some participants will work in new programs, many more will serve in existing programs, existing programs that have been dreaming about expanding the roles that they are playing in their local communities. What they will now have is access to young volunteers who are willing to work 40 hours per week to support their programs. They may also use their participants to expand into new areas that they simply have not had the ability to tackle before, and these local agencies will be the best informed to address and identify the pressing needs within their communities.

During the first year of operation, Mr. Chairman, this program would allow an average of 500 volunteers per State. I would gladly put all 500 that will be in Michigan to work in my district alone. They could work with latchkey kids in an after-school program. They could buy groceries and provide other services for shut-ins. They could teach at a youth volunteer corps fine arts camp for inner city youth. They could build and renovate new homes with Habitat for Humanity. They could participate in environmental cleanups along the shores of Lake Michigan, and the list goes on and on.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge my colleagues to look carefully at this legislation asking young people to give of their time and energy before they receive financial assistance from the government. It is a new concept and, I believe, very American. I am, therefore, supporting the National Service Trust Act of 1993 and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2010, the National Service Trust Act of 1993. The establishment of a program of national service is one of President Clinton's highest legislative priorities, and I congratulate him for sending us this excellent initiative.

The program created under H.R. 2010 will provide the opportunity for thousands of young men and women, and citizens of all ages, races, and income levels, to come together and take an active part in the improvement of their neighborhoods, towns, and cities. This program will foster a new level of public spirit, and all participants will be even better citizens as a result of their national service experience.

Under the program, Mr. Chairman, young people will have the opportunity to earn education benefits in exchange for working to improve their communities. The benefit level established under H.R. 2010 is reasonable, and I really do not expect the national service program to interfere with the ability of the armed services to recruit the high quality men and women that we do need.

That is a very important point to make here today, Mr. Chairman, that I do not believe this will interfere with the recruiting of persons that come into our military service as they do it on a voluntary basis, so this is a good bill, and I support it, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, for some time now I have been listening to this debate more with amusement than dismay, but I think dismay is winning out.

It was merely amusing to learn that all these pressing, unmet needs supposedly blighting our Nation can only be solved by a new Federal spending program devised by 25-year-old Harvard graduates and run by Washington bureaucrats. My experience is that a bad idea can only be born in a bad environment isolated from reality. Which explains this bad idea. It came from the universities directly to Washington, and remains isolated in the only two communities that will benefit from it: The academics and the politicians.

But heck, this is the big-government solution to everything. I would almost

be disappointed if I did not hear it in this Chamber.

My amusement began giving way to dismay when I was told, "This bill is going to make college education affordable again—if you're one of the 1 percent lucky enough to be included, but for the rest it doesn't reduce the costs of college one penny." In fact, Mr. Chairman, by pumping more money into universities, it will probably drive the cost of college up for everyone.

But the argument that brings me to the floor today is the assertion that this bill is necessary to revive the American spirit of service alleged to have been smothered during the so-called Reagan era of greed, and how are we going to revive this spirit of service? By dangling \$20,000 in cash and benefits before the noses of America's young idealists.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a noble attack upon greed. It is more akin to a welfare program for the aspiring yuppies of America.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this bill because it displaces private charity with government-managed, well-paid social activism, based on the elitist assumption that community service is not taking place right now. To my mind, community service is working hard, earning a paycheck, feeding and schooling your children, paying your taxes, and taking part in your church and your community—not some government-paid service job.

The truth is, 80 percent of Americans already perform some form of voluntary service—free of charge. Unfortunately, some in Washington cannot see something happening unless a government program is making it happen. And, of course, they miss the best of what is happening in America. Like the fact that in 1991 individual Americans gave \$103 billion in charitable contributions—a 58-percent increase over what they gave in 1980—and \$176 billion in volunteer time. Corporations gave \$21 billion—a 52-percent increase over what they gave in 1980. So the American people gave a total of \$300 billion in charitable effort in that one year alone, and yet we are supposed to believe that another \$7 billion in government spending over 4 years is going to reawaken the dormant spirit of service in our land? What an affront to the American people.

This bill also has an identity crisis. Is it a service program or a loan program? To the professional service crowd, it claims to meet pressing, unmet needs through meaningful service, but to the labor unions, it promises not to displace any real workers who are busy meeting real needs. And this bill cannot even bring itself to decide who deserves the larger monetary reward—college students raking leaves, or veterans who have served this Nation's flag.

From first line to last, this bill seems calculated to increase the American people's dependence upon, and gratitude to, big government. I wonder whether that might not be the only real unspoken motive behind this legislation.

Remember, Mr. Chairman, the politics of greed. If I might borrow a word the Democrats believe they own, the politics of greed is always best served up when wrapped in the language of love. Mr. Chairman, from my point of view, the worst thing about this bill is it is so darned undignified. I say to my colleagues, do yourself a favor and vote against it.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS].

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2010, the National Service Trust Act. Finally the gridlock has been broken, the gridlock between theory and implementation has been ended. I congratulate President Clinton for his speedy action. This legislation unites, streamlines, and reinvigorates what was a fragmented and moribund policy on national service. It has been developed with bipartisan support and in close consultation with a wide array of constituencies. This process of dialog and collaboration has yielded a bold initiative to renew and strengthen the commitment of Americans to serving their communities and each other. The legislation includes provisions to ensure that individuals will be able to participate in full-time national service, regardless of their socioeconomic circumstances. Those who live in the communities where help is needed will be able to work alongside those who come from the outside.

There are some among us who would lead you to believe that we are instituting a system to pay for volunteers. However, the truth is that this bill establishes a national core of people willing to give of their time, energy, talent, and most importantly, of themselves, in service to others. This legislation has reignited the spirit embodied by John F. Kennedy's VISTA initiative in which the philosophy of giving and sharing of oneself within the greater context of the community has one ultimate goal, helping others to help themselves.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Select Education and Civil Rights, the subcommittee of jurisdiction over the ACTION Agency and the VISTA Program, I am particularly pleased that the intent and integrity of VISTA has been so well preserved. President Clinton is one of the many supporters of VISTA who recognizes the importance and power of the VISTA ideal, which relies on the essential dignity and hard work of people within their own communities to encourage growth and development, of both the individual and the community. It is this ideal upon

which the National Service Trust Act is founded.

The ACTION Agency has administered the VISTA Program and the Older American Volunteer Programs for over 20 years. The employees of this agency will continue to contribute their many years of experience with community service programs as part of the new Corporation for National Service. The Corporation will also include a decentralized field structure, similar to the one already in existence at ACTION. This structure provides vital assistance and coordination at the State and local levels. This type of contact is essential to the success of national service, for while this initiative is national in scope, it will be nourished and sustained by local roots.

I want to thank Chairman FORD, Mr. MARTINEZ, and the members of the Committee on Education and Labor and their staffs for their diligent work and dedication in making this legislation more reflective of our concerns. I urge my colleagues to vote favorably for the National Service Trust Act.

□ 1500

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI], a member of the committee.

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my support for President Clinton's goal of encouraging all citizens to engage in service for their Nation and their community.

In fact, 7 months after I was sworn in as a Member of Congress, I strongly supported the National Service Act of 1990, legislation authored by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MCCURDY], which helped stimulate national service at all levels of government.

However, today, in its current form, the National Service Act has created more problems than it solves. Relative to salary, educational benefits, and guarantees of child care and health care at a time when the Federal Government is struggling to find the money to support worthwhile and proven projects, it seems inappropriate and unwise to create a costly new program, one which will be able to serve a small fraction of individuals who will qualify. And there is another way.

Let me say that \$389 million has been requested for this year to allow 25,000 participants to serve. The administration states that by 1997 the program will allow another 150,000 individuals to participate, costing at today's numbers close to \$4 billion.

That, Mr. Chairman, is less than 3 percent of the students eligible for aid. Not everyone will be allowed to participate. Those most in financial and social need may not be allowed, and those who are currently truly volun-

teers without remuneration can well say, "What's the point?" And those who will be paying the bill can ask the question, "Who is going to pay?"

There is another way, Mr. Chairman. Later this week we will be offering amendments to talk about ways that national service can be brought together for some compensation, but not the type we are talking about today.

Mr. Chairman, national service is a terrific goal, perhaps the most noble one we together can create. But it is a goal, I believe, that can be met without an exorbitant price tag. It is a goal that can be met without a salary and without several benefits. It is a goal that can be met by inspiring our citizens, by calling upon our citizens to help one another and by allowing them to redefine their future.

Mr. Chairman, I truly believe that most Americans will consider that the best paycheck they will ever earn.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NEAL], a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I speak from fond experience when I rise to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2010, the National Service Act. In 1990 the Service to America Act was the first piece of legislation I helped to author that became law. This legislation was based on a community service learning program I established as mayor of Springfield, MA. I am proud to say that many cities and towns have modeled their service program after this most successful plan. I only hope that this plan on the national level will be as successful as the program in Springfield.

This legislation will bring a sense of civic responsibility to thousands of Americans. Those willing to join will have the opportunity to work toward solving problems in their own communities. For many it will be their first encounter to work with people of different races, creeds, and economic backgrounds in the pursuit of a common goal.

What this legislation does is recognize and reward those who put the greater good of their community ahead of their own self-interest. It will provide additional funding for college students without strict regard to financial means. While this legislation will help students afford higher education we must never forget its most important contribution. As president Wilson stated over 70 years ago, "There is no cause half so sacred as the cause of a people. There is no idea so uplifting as the idea of the service of humanity."

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA], who has been a long-time advocate of national service.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to add my voice to those of my

colleagues in support of H.R. 2010, the National Service Trust Act. This legislation aims to involve every young American, from kindergarten to adulthood, in service. To learn that Service is rent we pay for living.

H.R. 2010 would create opportunities to connect our young people to their communities, and enable them to make meaningful contributions to society. This act would open the doors to a higher education by offering financial awards to students in return for community service to help those individuals and programs most in need: children, elderly, sick, homeless, providing programs to assure public safety.

I have long been an advocate of providing financial assistance to students in return for service. In the 100th Congress, I introduced legislation to provide scholarships to students in return for service in the Peace Corps: A Peace Corps ROTC.

The Peace Corps Volunteer Education Demonstration Act was approved by the 101st Congress, as part of the National Service Act. And students in the Peace Corps helped by that program are now promoting peace and friendship while fighting hunger and poverty in developing nations.

Participants in the National Service Program would be like the Peace Corps volunteers, taking a year or two of their lives to devote themselves to service projects.

In my own district of Montgomery County, MD, the Community Year Program, under the able auspices of Molly Callaway, is a working model of the National Service Trust initiative. Under the Community Year Program students between the ages of 17-23 work from September until June, on community projects around Montgomery County.

In exchange for their service, each participant receives a \$5,000 scholarship. Young people from diverse backgrounds, from college graduates to at-risk youth, work together in teams, building ramps for the physically disabled and working in shelters for the homeless.

The National Service Trust Act, like the Community Year Program, would promote opportunities for young Americans from different backgrounds to work together toward a common goal, building mutual respect, and learning tolerance for diversity.

The Community Year Program is funded, in part, by a grant from the Commission on National and Community Service. The National Service Trust Act would strengthen this Commission through its Serve-America Program, which would incorporate service-learning in the curriculum of every school in America.

All over America, there is a new spirit of community service. Meeting and talking with young people in my district, I see an idealism and an eager-

ness to help others. I see an interest in working together to meet the social and technological needs of the future.

The time has come to provide American students with a program which channels their youthful energy and challenges them to discover the untapped resources within themselves.

We must encourage this spirit of service in our country by passing the National Service Trust Act. Linking academic study and community service will prepare our Nation's youth for a world where compassion and a willingness to help others will strengthen America and indeed make a difference.

□ 1510

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GENE GREEN], a sponsor of the bill and a member of the committee.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the National Service Trust Act of 1993. As a cosponsor to this bill, I am working to ensure that it is passed and becomes a permanent part of our education and job training environment and also provide a service to fellow Americans.

This bill moves us in the right direction by providing options for our graduates and opportunities for them to serve the community and repay their financial obligations. This bill picks up where our economy leaves off. Since we have shortages in important areas such as teaching and health care, this bill opens the doors to these careers to students who might otherwise be unable to afford them. No longer will students face the burden of large student loan payments and the threat of default if they cannot find a job. These students will pay their debt and grow in the process to gain work experience and return something to their community. This is a triple win.

In the district I represent in Houston, there is an incredible need for increased education opportunities, health care services, and more police protection. By implementing this plan we can meet these needs at the same time we provide education and job skills to young people.

Again I would like to state my support of this bill and my appreciation to the President, the Chair, and members of the Education and Labor Committee for their hard work on this important piece of legislation.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT], a member of the committee.

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2010, the National Service Trust Act.

I believe this bill is an assault on our existing national volunteer system, because it reaches into our local commu-

nities and federalizes the idea of volunteerism.

We are saying to 94 million American volunteers—you know, you have not been doing a good enough job, so we are going to pay 150,000 people to do your volunteer work. So, pack your bags, go home, do not worry, big brother Government is here to help.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, this bill creates a cadre of volunteer elite in this country. All the work of the Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, the Red Cross, the Salvation Army, Boys Clubs, the United Way, community improvement volunteer groups, the YMCA, the YWCA, literacy councils, church groups, the Optimists, the Kiwanians, the Rotarians, the Jaycees, chambers of commerce, just is not good enough.

No, your big brother is going to be taking care of midnight basketball games, helping people to read, cleaning up the park, teaching English, the local food bank, the YMCA, the Toys for Tots campaign, and Bible school.

So, go home. But we will be sending you, the American taxpayer, a \$7.4 billion bill in the mail, for the tab that has been run up by the volunteer elite.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to reject this notion of creating a corps of volunteer elite. If we really want to bring the community together and help our fellow Americans, we should reduce Federal spending, rather than adding to the huge national debt.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, might I inquire how much time remains on each side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] has 55 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] has 54 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON] has 23 minutes remaining.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KLINK], a member of the committee and a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2010, the National Service Trust Act.

Like 220 other Members of the House, I am a cosponsor of H.R. 2010. This legislation will help to realize the vision of the President, and many others, of a nation where an expensive education will not dictate the kind of job one must take. Those who choose to can repay their educational debt through service.

This bill will provide opportunity, both to learn and to serve. It will make it easier for young people to afford to choose lower paying public service jobs and create incentives for many Americans to serve their country and their communities. The ultimate result will be a supply of fresh energy in the neighborhoods and new ideas for old problems.

This renewed national commitment to national and community service will

benefit local communities and schools, health clinics, and public safety and environmental programs.

This bill will offer equal opportunities for service. It will benefit urban and rural communities, the young and the old, and men and women of all racial, ethnic, and religious backgrounds. I believe it will also promote cooperation in the community and provide participants with a sense of real achievement and civic pride.

I commend my colleagues on the Education and Labor Committee: Chairman MARTINEZ for introducing this bill and Chairman FORD for moving the bill quickly to the floor. I look forward to the National Service Trust Act becoming law in the near future.

I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 2010, the National Service Trust Act.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 2010, the National Service Trust Act, and I commend the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ] for introducing this important measure. Additionally, I would like to thank the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON] for their leadership role on this measure.

As the cost of higher education continues to escalate, the National Service Program has been viewed as one of the better opportunities for young people to fund their education. Students who are graduating with a heavy burden of loan indebtedness will have the opportunity to forgive part of their loans by serving their communities. In addition, this program will allow those not yet in college to earn money toward their education.

H.R. 2010 will benefit both our Nation's youth as well as the Nation as a whole. Under the National Service Program, young Americans will have the chance to advance themselves, as they tackle many of our Nation's ills. I strongly believe that our Nation's youth possess the knowledge and energy to work on projects that will combat illiteracy, aid the homeless, and revitalize our neighborhoods.

Mr. Chairman, as we know, the cost of higher education is skyrocketing, placing an enormous financial burden on students and their families. H.R. 2010 allows us to help provide educational opportunities by reducing that financial burden, and, at the same time, allows our young people to help provide unmet needs in our environment, for our human needs, education, and public safety.

Accordingly, as a cosponsor of this bill, I urge its adoption.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Guam [Mr. UNDERWOOD], a valuable new member of the committee.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman. I rise to express my support for this bill. I am proud to be an original cosponsor of H.R. 2010, the National Service Act. This is a bill that invests in our young people; it is awashed in optimism and believes in the essential goodness of human beings. Edmund Burke once stated, "There never was a bad man that had ability for good service." This bill believes that we have many more good men and women than bad men—but we need to give them increased opportunities to provide service to the community. This bill represents innovative public policy founded on traditional American values of offering educational opportunity, demanding personal responsibility, and making a contribution to the community. This initiative will rebuild America by providing community leadership through a new domestic Peace Corps which brings Americans together to tackle pressing national problems such as unmet educational, environmental, and public safety needs. The bill also supports and strengthens a number of outstanding programs such as Youth Conservation Corps, VISTA, and senior citizens programs.

□ 1520

I am pleased that Guam and other Territories will be active participants in this program. We want to be participants in bridging the gap between generations, between the rich and poor and between ethnic groups and help build a society marked by a sense of community, mutual respect, and service.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise this afternoon in opposition to the National Service Trust Act. I think it is important to be very clear about what we are talking about here. This is not an education program nor is it about voluntarism. It is nothing more than an expensive, \$3.4 billion, program and paid service.

At a time when the House Budget Committee predicts that our deficit will run about \$300 billion a year, it is ludicrous to assume that we can afford a program like this. I think we all recognize the value of community service. It is an important part of our national heritage. As someone who has participated in any number of volunteer programs and boards in my own community, I fully understand and share the value and importance of voluntarism. I believe my involvement in community service has provided me with a well-rounded background to be here today. It put me in touch with people from all walks of life in my area. In addition, I

have encouraged by own children to participate in community service, as they work their way through college. So, I am no stranger to the value to both the giver and the receiver of volunteer community service activities.

There are already any number of Federal programs supporting community service ranging from the Youth Service Corps to the RSVP Program for senior citizens. The total cost of the existing programs to the Federal Government now is \$1.5 billion annually. So we do not need, nor can we afford to pay for more paid community service.

And, just how is the Federal Government supposed to decide which activities constitute community service? The act establishes the new Corporation for National Service to dole out federally subsidized compassion in direct competition with the many wonderful, long-established nonprofit community service organizations already meeting many of the needs of our communities. We do not need to create a bloated expensive bureaucracy to provide services our private, voluntary sector organizations are already doing.

In a year when we have not been able to fully fund popular student aid programs such as the Pell grant, why should we take on this liability? The promise that this program will expand education opportunities is a myth. About 25,000 students could benefit from the program in 1994, and that would increase to 150,000 people by 1997—less than 1 percent of the 16 million students currently enrolled in post-secondary education.

The Federal Government currently helps students pay their education expenses through the guaranteed student loan program and through the Pell grant program. Combined Government grants and loan programs serve 6 million students today.

It is rather startling to note that the average cost of the national service program per student, which includes a stipend and other benefits, is estimated to be over \$20,000 per year. But, only \$5,000 for each year of participation actually goes toward education expenses.

On top of the outrageous costs, participation in the program is not based on need. Efforts in committee to qualify participation were defeated. Financial assistance is given to everyone, including the rich, and takes away funds from those that truly need financial aid.

In short, the national service program is ill-conceived and poorly timed. We do not need it, and we cannot afford it.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I want to applaud the President and Chairman

FORD and the members of the Education and Labor Committee for advancing a bill that speaks to the best of what our Nation is and what our Nation can be. With national service, we open a new world of hope and potential for a new generation of Americans.

As we look to the future and the challenges we face, two things are certain: We need to come together in common purpose; and we need to maintain the right of each American to a good education.

With a strong commitment to these basic principles we can face the future with the confidence that has always helped us succeed. That is what national service is all about.

At the heart of this bill stands the belief that every young American should be given the opportunity to reach their full potential, while at the same time nurturing the values that have made our Nation great—responsibility, community service, and respect for one's fellow citizens.

This bill promises those who seek it the opportunity to obtain a higher education linked to a higher purpose: solving our Nation's pressing unmet social needs.

With national service we can rejoin our citizens to their communities, rekindle the bond of common purpose, the belief that each of us has an obligation to help others help themselves, while giving a new generation the opportunity to obtain the education necessary to meet the challenges they will confront as adults.

If we are to succeed in building a well educated, highly skilled work force, we must have an educational system that is open to all, not just to the few who can now afford it. This bill takes an important step in that direction—it tells our young people that they will be given the opportunity to receive a higher education in return for hard work in service to their Nation and community.

The bill says that our Nation is willing to help those who are willing to help their country. In this way, we will build an America that once again understands that its future is a shared one, held together by a bond of shared aspirations and shared obligation.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN].

Mr. HORN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the National Service Trust Act, H.R. 2010, as reported by the Committee on Education and Labor. I am a strong advocate of this program and was one of the original co-sponsors.

The purpose of the National Service Program is to provide financial assistance to postsecondary students, of all ages, by utilizing their skills in the community to address unmet edu-

cational, environmental, human, or public safety needs. In return for 2 years of full-time service, students who participate in the program will receive up to \$10,000 in the form of an educational grant to be paid directly to the institution which they attend.

I strongly support President Clinton in this bipartisan effort to develop a program that incorporates the spirit of volunteerism in the community with the spirit of discovery that exists in our universities and colleges across the land.

This is not a new idea on our campuses. As president of California State University, Long Beach, I stressed community service in my first remarks to the students and the community in the fall of 1970. Over 8,000 students, interns and volunteers did service during each year.

Our States, cities, and neighborhoods are suffering from the breakdown of the family structure, the culture of gangs and drugs, and a recession which has affected all of us. This program takes a positive step toward using the resources of students for the betterment of our communities.

In return, participants will not only have made a valuable contribution to their communities, but will also have acquired a unique education which can only be derived from actively giving of oneself to the benefit of others; from learning by doing.

This legislation has bipartisan support. It deserves that support. I encourage my colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, to vote for the National Service Trust Act of 1993.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support for H.R. 2010, the National Service Trust Act. I have long been an advocate of this concept and am delighted its day has come.

The national service goes to the heart of what it means to be an American. It is true our Nation faces a variety of economic and social problems. Yet, all too often we forget that we are still such a fortunate Nation. However, with the advantages and privileges of being Americans comes responsibility.

This bill asks our young people and our seniors to dedicate themselves to a higher standard of excellence. It asks them to respond to this challenge of responsibility, to give back to this great country and to fulfill the promise that is America. As a Member of Congress, as an American, I believe in civic obligation. I believe in helping the less fortunate; I believe in helping each other. And I know there are more like me who believe this as well. We believe in hard work, and equal sacrifice for the common good. These values are key to our stature in the world, our survival, and our future.

There can be no doubt that there is a real need for voluntarism. As we begin the 1990's we face a budget crisis that severely limits the Government's ability to respond to needs. National service asks all Americans, both young and old, to involve themselves in positive activities. By doing so, they help both their country and themselves.

We are entering a period in the United States when we will be called upon to provide additional services. These services, as we know, are costly, time consuming, and require extensive manpower. But we need day care, we need a reformed welfare program, and we need to make health care available and affordable. We can pass progressive proposals that address these problems, but in order to finance them and provide the facilities and people to make them work, we need a pool of workers to draw from. National Service gives us that pool.

Mr. Chairman, this measure incorporates much of President Clinton's proposal for a program in which participants who agree to work on community service programs could receive up to \$10,000 to pay for their education. Importantly, these programs will be carried out by already existing Federal, State and local agencies, non-profit organizations, and colleges. The President stressed his commitment to national service during the campaign last year. I commend Chairman FORD of the Education and Labor Committee and its members for their hard work.

I have long supported national service, and have even sponsored national service legislation, and I stand with great pleasure today to support this proposal. This bill signals the renewal of commitment, by both the young and old, to our families, our communities, and our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the National Service Trust Act.

□ 1530

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP].

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2010, a bill to establish a National Service Program. This bill has a superficial attractiveness which fades quickly upon closer examination.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee and the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I am concerned that the nonmilitary National Service Program offers a better level of education benefits than the armed services, and threatens to decimate recruitment.

The competition for the best and brightest of our young people grows increasingly intense because the pool of 18- to 25-year-olds is shrinking at a time when schools, industry, and the military all need to attract qualified

new entrants. President Clinton's national service plan adds another competitor whose attractiveness is defined by this legislation.

This competition would only compound increasing recruiting difficulties resulting from a widespread misconception among young people that the armed services are not recruiting because they are being reduced in size. Certainly the numbers of men and women in uniform are being reduced, but the United States will continue to maintain one of the world's largest standing military forces and will continue to rely on volunteers to fill its ranks.

The Army this past spring for the first time in many years had to accept some volunteers who tested low in mental aptitude to meet its quotas. Commanders are concerned, since the Army cannot readily use many of these soldiers on the high technology battlefield. They are unable to master complex weapons systems fast enough to do most jobs. Military recruiters say that the overall quality of recruits remains high for now, but that they doubt it can be maintained with a superior National Service Program education benefit added to the obstacles they already face.

The GI bill provides \$4,800 in education benefits per year for up to 3 years, but the service member must commit to 3 years of service and pay in \$1,200 of his or her own money during the first year of service to qualify for the benefits. Refusal to complete the service commitment is a crime.

Compare this with the national service plan, which would provide \$5,000 in education benefits per year for up to 2 years to students who need not put up a dime, who commit to only 1 year and who can walk away at any time. This stark contrast does not even take into account the fact that a service member faces the dangers, hardships and separations from home which are unique to military life.

Mr. Chairman, the best and brightest will not have any trouble figuring out which is the better deal. For many of them, the education benefit will be the deciding factor. This is especially true because the Clinton administration has simultaneously proposed to increase the up front pay reduction to qualify for GI bill benefits and to freeze military pay.

The American Legion in a May 4, 1993, letter to Members of Congress, expressed its disappointment and deep concern about the inequities between the national service plan and the GI bill.

It stated in part:

The National Service Plan provides our young people a better option for receiving funding for education than does the current GI Bill for those young people who deployed to the Persian Gulf to support Operation Desert Storm or to Somalia or may possibly be sent on air strikes to Bosnia.

If H.R. 2010 becomes law, the national service plan will siphon off many of the recruits our armed services would otherwise attract. The All-Volunteer Force has achieved the highest quality armed services in history. That quality could quickly be lost and would take years and enormous cost to regain.

Mr. Chairman, I have other concerns as well. How would the Government pay the 5-year cost of \$2.9 billion in Federal outlays for the program? The program's funding mechanism, the Corporation for National Service, is apparently to be placed in the same appropriations subcommittee allocation as veterans, the Environmental Protection Agency, NASA and HUD, to mention just a few. We have no assurance the allocation would be increased by \$2.9 billion, and I doubt additional funding is suddenly going to appear to pay for a new education entitlement. This is precisely the kind of out of control, don't know where the money's coming from spending which got us into the deficit mess we face today.

The first year cost alone for the startup phase of the program would be \$389 million for fiscal year 1994. Some of the money for the National Service Program, if authorized, is likely to come from existing programs. The big question is, Which ones? Not veterans, hopefully, because they are already seriously underfunded, as I pointed out in some detail on June 28, 1993, during consideration of H.R. 2491. To take money from veterans' programs, perhaps those helping Vietnam veterans, to fund the President's national service plan would be especially ironic. Rest assured, veterans' advocates will be watching carefully.

Not only is this very expensive, it is also anything but cost effective. Estimates vary on the per volunteer cost, but most are in the range of \$15,000 to \$20,000 per year. America needs volunteers, to be sure—the old fashioned kind who give old fashioned contributions of time and effort to worthy causes they select. For VA medical centers alone, 94,000 volunteers, who were real volunteers, performed 14.3 million hours of national service in 1992.

The community services selected by this administration may not be what many of us had in mind. I don't see anything in this bill to prevent Federal funds from being funneled to all sorts of controversial groups, such as those supporting abortion rights under the heading of family planning, those supporting the homosexual agenda under the heading of civic pride, those supporting needle exchanges for narcotics addicts under the heading of AIDS prevention, those supporting condom distribution to high school students under the heading of community health, and on and on.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, as others may have pointed out, this program

would not come close to offering every American the opportunity to obtain \$10,000 for college expenses and generous benefits while serving. At its projected peak, it would be open to a select group of only 150,000 individuals. Who would be chosen among an estimated 10 million college age students? We have no idea.

Mr. Chairman, the national service plan advanced by the administration is fundamentally flawed. It discourages military service, its specifics are opposed by many veterans, and it sends the wrong message to our young people about the nature of community service and true voluntarism. It is also overpriced and I urge my colleagues to reject it.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2010, the National Service Trust Act of 1993.

This landmark legislation will provide the opportunity for thousands of young people to serve their country in return for educational and job training benefits. In the best tradition of U.S. domestic service with VISTA and the international success of the Peace Corps, this new National Service Program will call on Americans to help address unmet environmental, educational, and public safety needs. In the tradition of the GI bill, national service will provide important benefits to help young people pay for their college education or get more job skills. I commend President Clinton and Office of National Service Director Eli Segal for their vision and hard work in developing the National Service Trust Act, and my colleagues, led by Chairman BILL FORD on the Education and Labor Committee, and I urge positive action by the House and Senate on this important initiative.

I am especially pleased that the reported version of H.R. 2010 contains language to establish a Public Lands Corps in the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture. This section is based on legislation I introduced along with Representative GEORGE MILLER, chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, and Representative PAT WILLIAMS, chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations. I would like to thank Mr. MILLER, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Chairman FORD for their work which led to the inclusion of the Public Lands Corps in the National Service Trust Act.

The Public Lands Corps will help address unmet environmental and conservation needs on national and native American lands while providing young people with new skills training and education gains and importantly, an appreciation of our natural and cultural heritage, and the opportunity to

pay back college loans or get job training through the national service initiative. One-third of our Nation is national or native American lands. Our parks, forests, wildlife refuges, historic sites and Indian reservations are experiencing intense use, too often inadequate maintenance and a deteriorating infrastructure. Interior Secretary Babbitt and Agriculture Secretary Espy have both testified about the huge backlogs in labor intensive work on Federal lands and about the opportunities of the national service initiative to address these unmet needs. This new initiative will address real needs that will go lacking if the present status prevails. It will supplement not supplant existing efforts on national and State lands.

The Public Land Corps Act builds on a long and proud tradition of conservation service on Federal lands dating back to President Franklin D. Roosevelt's Civilian Conservation Corps. The CCC enlisted 3 million young Americans in a peace time army to plant trees, fight fires, maintain trails, and build shelters in parks and forests across the United States. More recently, the Youth Conservation Corps in the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture have provided hundreds of thousands of young people with skills and experience while accomplishing valuable conservation work worth \$1.50 for every \$1 spent.

Today the CCC boys, as they refer to themselves, are celebrating their 60th anniversary and the memory and positive impact is still serving represented in the values, celebration, and life long association that these old CCC boys represent.

While the Public Land Corps Act has its roots in this rich tradition of conservation service, it also embodies the most contemporary thinking about national service. All of the provisions regarding length of service, educational benefits, matching funds and non-displacement of the National Service Trust Act would apply to the Public Land Corps. Like the National Service Trust Act, the Public Land Corps bill employs a nonbureaucratic partnership approach in terms of its organization and administration.

The purpose of the legislation is to give greater authority and flexibility for the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture to both participate in the National Service Program and to increase conservation service opportunities on Federal lands outside of the confines of the National Service Program. There is a demand for conservation service opportunities. A recent public opinion survey by the Roper Organization found that 6 out of every 10 Americans would like to volunteer in some sort of environmental protection activity. Existing conservation corps often have to turn away hundreds of participants because of a lack of funds.

The bill establishes a year-round Public Land Corps for 16- to 25-year-olds. Participants would carry out conservation, restoration, and rehabilitation projects on Federal and Indian lands such as tree planting, fire-fighting, trail construction, erosion control, and historic preservation. There clearly is a need for this kind of work. A Congressional Research Service report concluded that there was over 900,000 years of labor intensive backlog work which could be done by the conservation corps in the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture. These are certainly not make work projects, nor are they projects which put existing employees out of work. They are projects which need to be done but which never will be done unless there is a new infusion of labor.

The authority to establish the Public Land Corps is necessary because the current Youth Conservation Corps is only a summer program open to 15- to 18-year-olds and the President's National Service Program is for people 17 and above and is a year-round program. Once the National Service Program is enacted, the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture can compete with other Federal and nonprofit agencies for funding and positions from the National Service Trust Program. Common sense dictates that a federally funded national service effort should allow for some portion of the national service work performed to be of benefit to Federal lands which are managed on behalf of present and future generations of Americans. However, the Public Land Corps could also exist outside the confines of the National Service Trust Program.

Last Friday I had the opportunity to work with members of the Minnesota Conservation Corps on the Minnesota River flood cleanup project in my district. I was very impressed with the accomplishments that this Minnesota Conservation Corps has made in its 12-year existence. The Public Land Corps will expand opportunities for the Minnesota Conservation Corps and other State and local corps throughout the country by encouraging the development of contracts and cooperative agreements between Federal agencies and existing State, local and nonprofit youth and conservation corps to carry out projects on Federal lands. This provision would provide service opportunities to many young people who may not be participating in the full-fledged National Service Program. The past decade has seen an explosion of new State and local conservation corps. Currently, some 25,000 young people are enrolled in 75 youth service programs in 27 different States, and this number continues to grow. These State and local conservation corps provide direct assistance and opportunities for economically disadvantaged populations. Many of these conservation corps are

located near Federal lands and would greatly benefit from increased opportunities to carry out projects on Federal lands. State, local or nonprofit organizations would be required to provide a 25 percent match in the form of funds or services for the cooperative agreements authorized under the act.

The Public Land Corps Act has a long legislative history dating back to the early 1980's, when then Congressman John Seiberling introduced legislation to establish the American Conservation Corps. This legislation had strong bipartisan support in Congress but was regrettably vetoed by President Reagan in 1984. Modified versions of this legislation were considered in subsequent sessions of Congress and a small portion of the ACC legislation was included in the 1990 National and Community Service Act. When the 1990 legislation went a long way toward furthering civic responsibility and assisting in the development of State and local conservation corps, the bill did not include a direct role for the Federal lands or the Federal land managing agencies in conservation service programs. This omission in an otherwise fine law would be rectified by the passage of the Public Land Corps Act.

The Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands, which I chair, held a hearing on opportunities for conservation service on February 18, 1993. Witnesses from the National Park Service, the Fish and Wildlife Service and the Forest Service indicated their support for legislation which would give them greater flexibility in their youth programs by allowing older participants and year-round conservation service opportunities. The Public Land Corps Act was developed on the basis of recommendations presented in this hearing, past legislative efforts in this area and consultation with Federal agencies, the National Association of Service and Conservation Corps, the Student Conservation Association and other interested groups. It has the support of all of these organizations as well as the major environmental organizations.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would remind my colleagues that today across this Nation are marginalized in our society today, the National Service Program and the Public Land Corps initiative will help provide a means to connect young Americans and to build upon the success and values that still is alive in the 1930 era CCC boys in the 1990's.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the National Service Trust Act.

I include for the RECORD a copy of a letter and organizations referred to.

NATURAL RESOURCES COUNCIL OF  
AMERICA,  
Washington, DC, July 6, 1993.

Senator \_\_\_\_\_,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR \_\_\_\_\_: We, the undersigned organizations, members of the Natural Resources Council of America, write to convey our strong support for the Public Land Corps Subtitle within the National Service Trust Act of 1993 (S. 919). This amendment to the Youth Conservation Corps Act of 1970 provides the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture with new incentive and authority to engage young people in much needed conservation, restoration and rehabilitation work in our national parks, forests, wildlife refuges and other public lands. Moreover, it will ensure that conservation activities on federal public lands are an important part of the national service landscape—a critical component thus far overlooked in the provisions and implementation of the current National and Community Service Act.

The new Subtitle encourages and authorizes the public land management agencies to expand their own youth conservation corps programs and to enter into contracts or cooperative agreements with state and local youth corps and other non-profit organizations to accomplish the substantial backlog of work on public lands. It enables the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior to apply to the new Corporation for National Service for partial funding of these endeavors and to develop innovative sources of new support.

We believe that the Public Land Corps will greatly increase opportunities for young people to serve their country, while developing an appreciation for the natural environment and their future employment skills. And, of course, their hard work will bring vast benefits to the nation's public lands. Finally, the Public Lands Corps complements and in no way duplicates or conflicts with the Civilian Community Corps—a military-style residential youth service demonstration program, established in the 1992 Defense Authorization Act.

We urge you to vote for the National Service Trust Act and to retain the Public Land Corps Subtitle.

The Natural Resources Council of America is an association of over 80 diverse non-profit groups dedicated to the professional management, conservation and protection of the nation's natural resources.

Sincerely,

J. MICHAEL McCLOSKEY,

Chair.

John Herrington, Executive Director, American Chestnut Foundation.

Charles W. Sloan, President, American Hiking Society.

R. Neil Sampson, Executive Vice President, American Forests.

Kevin J. Coyle, President, American Rivers.

Betsy A. Cuthbertson, Director, Government Affairs, American Society of Landscape Architects.

Richard Martyr, Executive Director, American Youth Hostels.

David G. Startzell, Executive Director, Appalachian Trail Conference.

Patrick F. Noonan, President, The Conservation Fund.

Rodger Schlickeisen, President, Defenders of Wildlife.

I. Garth Youngberg, Executive Director, The Henry A. Wallace Institute for Alternative Agriculture.

John Grandy, Vice President for Wildlife & Habitat Protection, The Humane Society of the United States.

Maitland Sharpe, Executive Director, Izaak Walton League of America.

Jean Hocker, President, Land Trust Alliance.

Ron Tipton, Vice President for Governmental Relations, National Audubon Society.

Paul C. Pritchard, President, National Parks and Conservation Association.

Ginger Merchant, Executive Vice President, National Wildlife Refuge Assn.

James W. Giltmier, Executive Vice President, Pinchot Institute for Conservation.

George Lea, President, Public Lands Foundation.

David G. Burwell, President, Rails-to-Trails Conservancy.

Norman A. Berg, Washington Representative, Soil and Water Conservation Society.

Norville Prosser, Vice President, Sport Fishing Institute.

T. Destry Jarvis, Executive Vice President, Student Conservation Assn.

Steve Moyer, Director of Government Affairs, Trout Unlimited.

Charles Howell, President, Trust for the Future.

Thomas M. Franklin, Vice President for Conservation, The Wildlife Society.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes and 30 seconds to my colleague and friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON].

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I am not afraid to step up to the plate and oppose any President, Republican or Democrat, when I think that he is wrong. I also will not hesitate to step up to the plate and support a President when I think that he is right.

I thank this President and his administration for working with the Republicans on this particular issue. We need to help families whose children want to go on to higher education. Unfortunately, college costs are quite a bit higher than when all of us went. In fact, I did a little checking with my own situation. For myself, I went to a State University, an in-State student, and I paid about \$300 a semester.

Today at the University of Michigan it costs \$4,500 a year, not to include boarding, food, and housing. At Kalamazoo College, a wonderful college in my district, today tuition for a year is \$15,135, and again, room and board is another almost \$5,000. At Western Michigan University, a great State school, again, in my district, the cost for an in-State student is \$7,700 per semester.

Mr. Chairman, these costs have far outpaced inflation. This bill provides a constructive alternative to help ease the burden for the students and their families to cope with the increasing costs. The youth of today are going to need strong skills and an excellent education to compete as future leaders. I know this is a goal we can accomplish, and the legislation we are debating today goes a long way toward meeting that goal.

Thousands of college students across our land will benefit from this bill, be-

cause they will have the chance to better themselves and to better their community. By stressing community, responsibility, and opportunity, all young students can use their energy and talents to make a lasting change in the lives of their fellow Americans.

My Republican colleagues, I would echo the statement of both the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON], that this bill really is a Republican bill because it builds upon existing service programs, therefore preventing the growth of a huge Federal bureaucracy. By having a viable and vigorous competition for funds, only the most efficient and productive groups will receive money.

Decisions on what works best will be made at the local and State level, not by out-of-touch bureaucrats or Government agencies trying to impose one-size-fits-all. This act is an effective means to coordinate and expand service programs and opportunities throughout the Nation. It is a program full of diversity and challenge. I hope my colleagues will vote "yes" on this legislation to promote sound public policy while helping young Americans achieve the dream of a college education.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 15 seconds, and ask him if he would yield to me.

Mr. UPTON. I yield to the chairman, the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the express purpose of thanking the gentleman for this fine demonstration of bipartisan concern. Since we come from the same State, I am not out of line when I tell the gentleman that I am proud of him. He has joined our new Member, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA], in demonstrating that we can work together in our State. I thank the gentleman for his fine statement.

Mr. UPTON. I thank the chairman.

□ 1540

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ].

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the National Service Trust Act. This bill represents a real turning point for this Congress and the new administration. It is the fulfillment not only of a promise by the President, but also of the promise that we, as Americans, have made to ourselves and our children: that through hard work, we can make a better life. That is an American tradition. It is the American Dream.

But these days, that is often just not the case. Thousands of students each year work their way through college, accruing thousands of dollars of debt along the way. After graduation, they can spend years paying off these debts

with every spare penny, or worse, defaulting on their loans.

In fiscal year 1994, the National Service Trust Act can help up to 25,000 students go to college in exchange for their work. That means 25,000 more Americans serving America. Twenty-five thousand diplomas in the hands of 25,000 Americans who will be able to make better lives for 25,000 families. In future years, we hope to be able to extend that opportunity to 150,000 students a year.

But this is about more than students aid. This bill emphasizes our new priorities. It brings young Americans face to face with the needs of the country, and asks them to work to meet those needs. It demands responsibility from young people, and rewards those who can rise to the occasion.

Americans have always rewarded hard work and service to country. Millions of American men and women who have served their country in the military have earned money for higher education. The National Service Trust Act would extend that opportunity to thousands more. It is an invaluable opportunity both for the country and for each individual who participates.

Our future as a nation depends on our competitiveness. Our competitiveness depends on our commitment to rewarding hard work and a desire to learn. These are the qualities which define the productive American worker. These are the qualities which we strive to instill in our children. We must not abandon the promises we have made to them and to ourselves. We must not allow our commitment to hard work and education to wane. I urge each of you to recognize this landmark legislation as the fulfillment of our promise to our children and support its passage.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I had a wonderful statement set up here, and I am not going to deprive Members of that because I will put it in the RECORD. But I sat here and listened for a good length of time, more than you usually listen in a debate of this kind, and frankly, I am amazed at what I am hearing.

I am an advocate of voluntarism. I have spent my life working with volunteers. But they were genuine volunteers who volunteered to do something they were not paid for by the Government. I have been so interested in voluntarism, as matter of fact, that I have spent some time studying about de Tocqueville who came to this country to see what it was that was unique about a democracy, and one of the things was volunteers, people who did things in their communities by themselves. But they did not do it because

they were paid for by a Federal program. They did not do it because there was a bureaucracy that decided what they were going to do.

I am amazed at what I am hearing. I am an advocate of voluntarism, but I also have a philosophy, and the philosophy is that we did not get to where we are in the private sector by having a government agency decide what kind of voluntarism we were going to do. I cannot believe it.

I hope the sponsors of the bill will talk a little bit about what the costs will be over time. It is going to be \$7.4 billion the first time, and that is a very small percentage of eligible people. What is it going to cost a little later? Does it take away from other programs? I understand it takes away now from the conventional programs we have.

Where does this \$7.4 billion come from? Do we take it away from Pell grants? I think we ought to talk a little bit about that.

One of my friends mentioned that there is no bureaucracy, that we already have a system to do this. That is a surprise. Where are we going to have a bureaucracy to manage this thing in all of the communities in this country?

Mr. Chairman, I am very much surprised, and obviously I rise in opposition to the bill. It is the perfect example of something that makes a great sound bite on MTV during the campaign, but it translates into terrible policy. It reminds me a little in the West of a guy who was a cowboy who was all hat and no cows, and that is kind of what I think this program amounts to.

I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue.

I rise today in opposition to this legislation.

This bill is the perfect example of good intentions gone astray.

I don't argue with the goals of this legislation. We all support the idea of voluntarism assisting in higher education—in fact it's been a proud tradition of our country since its inception.

Anyone who has watched the news of the last week knows the American ethic of voluntarism is alive and well. Entire communities have banded together to help their neighbors through terrible circumstances in the Midwest.

The commitment we see during times of trouble can be found in smaller doses in communities throughout America every day. We see it in the soup kitchen lines, hospital waiting rooms, classrooms. Literally everywhere we look in America we can find folks giving of themselves—spending time to help people in their community.

Unfortunately, it's my belief that this bill will undermine that great tradition. It strikes at the very heart of the idea of true voluntarism and service, and at a great cost to the taxpayer.

There are several reasons why I can't support this legislation:

First, the program costs too much: \$7.4 billion over the next 5 years. That's money we don't have.

Second, the idea of a national service plan ignores the service millions already do on behalf of their Nation. The vast majority of Americans perform some form of true volunteer work right now, without direct aid from the Federal Government.

A national service plan will be destructive to that volunteer spirit in the long run. Programs that aren't chosen to participate in the national plan will be at a disadvantage. For those that are chosen to participate, the program furthers the entitlement mentality of big government.

I've already received calls in my office from folks who wonder how they can volunteer somewhere for a couple hours a week to pay off their student loan. Instead of reinforcing that attitude, why don't we concentrate on creating real jobs for these folks?

Third, the national service plan is in direct competition for funds with established Federal student financial aid programs targeted on the poorest students. If our goal is to make college more affordable, we can help many more students using the existing programs.

Simply said, this program doesn't deliver what was promised.

At first we heard this program would help students pay for college. Surely there are better ways to do that than spend \$7.4 billion for the benefit of 1 percent of the eligible population.

Then we heard this program would encourage the idea of community service. In reality the program would divide the volunteer community into the haves and the have-nots and undermine the true spirit of service.

This is a perfect example of something that makes a great sound bite on MTV during the campaign, but translates into terrible policy.

This plan reminds me of the cowboy who's all hat and no cattle, and it deserves to be defeated.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the National Service Act. Today we have an opportunity to clearly stand behind a fundamental principle in our society, a fundamental principle in our country, and that is opportunity, because this legislation gives all of our people an opportunity to learn and also an opportunity to serve.

It also provides a forum by which we can stress not only the rights we enjoy as citizens, but our responsibilities to reach out and to help other people in our community. That is happening right now across this country.

In my home State of Rhode Island the campus compact is directing college students to go out and serve in the communities to help other people as mentors, to get involved. This National Service Act will provide a more concentrated, comprehensive, and focused approach to those efforts, and it will indeed also complement ongoing Federal efforts to provide assistance, financial assistance to students who seek to better themselves through Pell grants and through Stafford loans, through a range of programs.

So today we have a real opportunity to move forward consistent with the very core values of our society: giving everyone a chance, an opportunity, not just for selfish interests, but for community service, and not just for self, but for others. This is a wonderful bill and I strongly urge its adoption. And I proudly am a cosponsor of this wonderful legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2010, the National Service Trust Act of 1993.

When I was elected to Congress, I requested a seat on the Education and Labor Committee because I believe improving our country's educational system must be one of our highest priorities. This legislation is an exciting initiative, one which marks a substantial Federal commitment to expanding service and educational opportunity.

Our country has entered a new era, one in which our citizens are concerned about difficult domestic problems—economic performance, violence and drugs, racial tension, and the plight of the underserved. The President's national service bill creates a system of service which builds on the spirit of community service that has multiplied throughout the country in recent years.

Having graduated from the U.S. Military Academy, I certainly recognize the value of service and civic responsibility.

At the heart of this proposal are the dual goals of providing needed services and building an ethic of civic responsibility across socioeconomic lines. When people serve, they make a substantive contribution to their communities and/or underserved areas in addressing unmet needs. And in the act of serving, they often make a decisive difference in their own lives—developing their own knowledge, skills, character, and self-esteem.

As I travel throughout Rhode Island, the various unmet needs in our communities are all too obvious. This legislation will encourage the provision of services in communities which need them the most. Rhode Island has already begun to tap its resources through programs such as the campus compact based at Brown University and the University of Rhode Island. This program is a network of colleges and universities around the country that promotes mentoring programs and supports innovative community service projects. I am also pleased that City Year of Boston will be expanding into Providence next year.

While I support rewarding needed service with educational awards to make college more affordable for thousands of young people, I cannot stress enough that we must not lessen our commitment to the Federal financial aid programs—including SSIG, Pell grants, and Federal guaranteed student loans—that have enabled generations

of needy students to attend college. This national service program should not replace needs-based financial aid.

As President Clinton noted in his speech in New Orleans when he unveiled his national service proposal, "Over the last 10-12 years, the cost of a college education is about the only essential thing that has risen even more rapidly than health care costs." Now more than ever, Congress must increase its commitment to reducing the growing gap between family resources and college costs and to providing equal educational opportunity to all Americans.

This legislation represents one step toward empowering our citizens and strengthening our communities. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the other gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. MACHTLEY].

Mr. MACHTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2010, the National Service Trust Act.

It is now mid-July and the new graduates all across the country have left their college campuses, eager to enter the work force. But along with their diplomas, many of them will carry a significant financial debt. And let us not forget the students who are not even lucky enough to have that debt—the students who could not even afford to enter college.

The Government will be providing education grants, as well as health benefits and basic living expenses. But this is not a welfare program. Each participant who receives an education grant in this program will be required to serve 1,700 hours of community service. These hours of service will be spent teaching our children, fighting to save the environment, or helping provide shelter to the needy. This program is value received.

We need to pass this legislation to send two messages: First, that our youth will have an opportunity to attend college through meaningful community service, and second, that this Congress is ready to start investing in the long-term success of our Nation.

This bill represents a compromise in the truest sense. Some Members did not want direct lending, so direct lending was dropped. Some Members did not want this to undermine the GI bill, so the voucher amounts were reduced. The National Service Program calls for a maximum \$10,000 for students over a 2-year period. But eligible participants in the military can receive \$15,000 over 3 years, or \$10,500 over 2.

Some Members didn't want a huge Federal bureaucracy in charge of this program, so the Federal bureaucracy was kept to a minimum by giving the States greater roles.

The members of the committee should be commended for making this bill's journey to the House floor relatively conflict-free.

This bill should not be seen as a conflict between military and civilian service or a conflict between Republicans and Democrats. The idea is to work for the good of the community, not to tear it apart.

We've heard other critics of this legislation complain about the cost. But this Government has got to start being able to distinguish between pork and prudence. This plan is an investment in the future of our children and the future of this country.

The National Service Program reinforces the bipartisan belief in personal responsibility—and not Government handouts. It will give students a stake in their future and instill in them a commitment and dedication to their community. The National Service Program is a wise investment, for both the individual and for this country.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 2010.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY].

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the National Service Trust Act. I want to commend President Clinton, Chairman FORD, and Chairman MARTINEZ for this visionary and innovative legislation. It would guarantee that the foremost criteria for higher education is one's will, not one's wallet.

The bill would establish an education trust fund and a long overdue domestic peace corps.

□ 1550

By funding higher education, the trust fund would fortify our young people with the skills to compete and win in a global economy. In return, those young people would enrich our communities, our inner cities, our barrios, by tackling problems that we otherwise cannot afford to solve.

This bipartisan initiative would help to solve many local and national problems in a more cost-effective way and rely on locally driven initiatives catered to individual communities across this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this bill. It would be the best money we have ever invested.

I thank the gentleman for yielding. Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I believe the delegation from Rhode Island has gone. I just wanted to report to them that the entire delegation from Wyoming is in opposition to the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS].

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chairman, today I rise reluctantly to oppose H.R. 2010, the National Service Trust Act.

I say reluctantly, because most of us have participated in true volunteer efforts throughout our lives and we understand their value to our great Nation. Today, millions of Americans

contribute to their schools, hospitals, and communities in a variety of ways, all without pay.

Indeed, Thomas Jefferson expressed the American ideal of service when he wrote that, "A debt of service is due from every man to his country." I do not think he intended this kind of pay for such service.

H.R. 2010 would enable participants to earn educational benefits of up to \$10,000 for 2 years of community service, regardless of financial need. In addition, participants are eligible for a minimum wage stipend and health and child care benefits, placing the cost per participant per year at better than \$15,000.

Mr. Chairman, there are already at least 24 existing volunteer programs throughout six Federal agencies at a cost to taxpayers of \$1.2 billion. During a time in our Nation's history when this Congress is being forced to cut money available for Pell grants, which go to financially needy college students, it seems a dubious extravagance to create a new 5-year, \$1.2 billion program.

I am also extremely disturbed by the negative impact this program could have on programs affecting our Nation's veterans. First, I have been told that the money for this program will come out of the VA-HUD appropriations bill, rather than from the bill funding education programs. This will force the VA to compete with yet another domestic program.

Over the years, the VA budget has been a victim of the budget deficit. Federal spending on veterans' programs when adjusted for inflation has not increased in more than a decade, and the overall share of Federal spending dedicated to VA programs has been steadily decreasing. This year, we have been forced to cut veterans' programs by an additional \$2.5 billion. I fear that adding another major national program to the VA-HUD appropriations bill will compound the funding shortfalls currently plaguing the VA system.

Moreover, many veterans service organizations have expressed strong concerns about the inequities between the benefits paid under the President's proposed national service plan and the Montgomery GI bill. The President's proposal would give education awards of \$5,000 a year to people age 17 or older who perform community service. On the other hand, a person who has served his country under the sacrifices of absences from family, low pay, career interruption, and so forth, and decides to use the Montgomery GI bill receives considerably less for their military service.

The national service plan provides our young people with a better option for receiving funding for education than the current GI bill. Consequently, the national service plan would be in

direct competition with the Department of Defense recruiting efforts for highly talented young men and women.

How can our Armed Forces attract bright, hard-working individuals if the Government offers an education package for national service that is superior to the GI bill? How can we explain to a young soldier who survived a Scud attack on his barracks in Saudi Arabia that he is not entitled to as good an educational benefit program as a college student who is cutting grass in a State park?

Mr. Chairman, community service is a national tradition, one we should applaud and honor. However, I believe efforts to bureaucratize this American instinct is ill-advised, especially in these tough budgetary times, when other educational programs aimed at needy students are being cut, and so, Mr. Chairman, we must defeat this well-intended but ill-written legislation.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON], the former chairman of the Hispanic caucus, and a deputy whip.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I thank the gentleman for his authorship of this legislation, and I thank the bipartisan nature of this legislation. I think this is a bill that we are all proud to support amidst all the divisiveness that has occurred this year.

Mr. Chairman, I think credit also should go to Eli Segal, of the White House staff, who performed an excellent job in a bipartisan way, getting the people and ideas together.

I think the compromise was struck with the veterans, with the number of Republicans in this body that makes this legislation probably one that will pass with, hopefully, one of the strongest votes we have had.

It also gives President Clinton credit for starting a new idea, a new idea almost in the vanguard of a Peace Corps, which was started by President Kennedy years ago. This bill has been called the Domestic Peace Corps. I think also it is one of the most important educational bills that we have passed in a long time, providing college tuition in exchange for community service.

We need in this country to increase voluntarism, to give our young people ideals, to make sure they participate in the political process. What we have now is a bill that combines the best of voluntarism and educational experience.

This act promises to boost our Nation's Community Service Corps significantly. Currently, there are 35,000 people working full time in volunteer national programs. Under this proposal, an additional 25,000 individuals could participate in fiscal year 1994 and could expand to about 150,000 by 1997.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good program, a good new idea, a good new pro-

gram that deserves strong bipartisan support from this body.

This act initiative embodies the new direction represented by President Clinton and the new face of Democrats in Congress. National service underscores the values of family, hard work, and education, as well as a vision of government which creates opportunity but expects a commitment in return.

By providing educational awards in exchange for participation in national service programs, this act will give hope to our Nation's youth and spur a renewed sense of community across our country. During the past two decades, college tuitions have skyrocketed, saddling parents and children with huge debt, and placing higher education out of reach for a growing number of youth.

It is the middle class, and lower income families, who have had to deplete their savings in order to help their children cover their college tuitions. By offering an educational benefit of \$5,000 in exchange for year of community service, this legislation will make college financially feasible for thousands of American families.

The National Service Trust Act promises to boost our Nation's Community Service Corps significantly. Currently, approximately 35,000 people work full time in volunteer national service jobs. Under this proposal, an additional 25,000 people could participate in fiscal year 1994, and this number could expand to 150,000 by 1997.

Passage of the National Service Act will fulfill President Clinton's pledge to create increased educational opportunity for our Nation's youth, while providing our country with an able corps of community service workers. Finally, this act will serve our Nation's long-term interests by creating a better educated generation of youth. I am proud to lend my support to H.R. 2010 and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to a distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAZIO].

Mr. LAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the National Service Trust Act of 1993. I have supported the concept of national service since the earliest days of my efforts for this seat and I am proud to be an original co-sponsor of this legislation. I believe that the National Service Program will offer educational opportunities, demand personal responsibility, and build American communities by mobilizing citizens to tackle common problems.

Nothing so discredits government, however, as a program that begins in idealism and ends in a bureaucratic nightmare. It will be imperative for those who run the umbrella agency to shut down bad programs fast and build in ways of detecting failure early. It is also imperative that Congress provide effective oversight. I pledge to do my utmost to ensure that the National Service Program is both administrable and accountable.

This program has been carefully designed to ensure its success. Money for the program will originate in a bipartisan Corporation for National Service

and assistance will be distributed on a competitive basis. No program will have an entitlement to funding. Moreover, future funding will have to be earned from Congress based on the merits of the program.

I also want to praise the process by which this bill was handled in the Committee on Education and Labor. I am happy to say that the committee was receptive to my concerns regarding provisions for quality management evaluations of national service programs, and I am satisfied that changes adopted by the committee has strengthened the program overall.

I am confident that the National Service Program will rekindle this Nation's commitment to community service and, at the same time, provide much-needed assistance for education and training. The program aims to build a foundation for service among America's youth, inspiring them to serve the Nation and instilling in them the great values upon which this country was built.

We cannot underestimate the amount of hope that is inherent in this bill. I believe it has the potential to provide successive generations of Americans with a richer quality of life by providing better access to educational benefits and exceptional experience that will allow them to better contribute to a better America.

□ 1600

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STRICKLAND].

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Chairman, I support the National Service Trust Act because I believe we have a great reservoir of Americans who want to give of their time and talent in service to our great country.

In recent years we have neglected to attend to many of the real needs of our communities. It has been popular to be self-centered, to be hostile toward those who are less fortunate, and to absolve ourselves of a patriotic responsibility to give ourselves in service to others.

Without question, our country needs citizen-servants at this time in our history.

The facts are clear:

We have an increasingly violent society—we are turning against each other.

Greater numbers of our people are incarcerated.

More and more of our children are living in poverty. Can the National Service Act change these awful facts? No. But galvanizing our citizens to care more for each other, providing opportunities for our young people to work for society's greater good, and encouraging an inclusive commitment to national brotherhood will be a step in the right direction.

John Gardner has said, "Some people strengthen the society just by being the kind of people they are."

Mr. Chairman, I believe the National Service Act will result in the development of such citizens. And I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 2010.

I am an ardent supporter of voluntarism. This bill is not the vehicle in which to promote service.

A volunteer is one who gives of his or her time and energies willingly and without necessarily receiving monetary compensation. This bill, if enacted, would make a mockery of what we call voluntarism.

Today, the Government already spends over \$1.2 billion on 24 existing Federal community service programs. We do not need another, more expensive program. We need to improve and better manage existing programs and not add to the existing Federal bureaucracy.

This legislation is expensive both in terms of actual costs as well as opportunity costs. In terms of real costs, this bill will charge American taxpayers \$7.4 billion over 4 years. It is absurd that in this time of economic crisis that we are even discussing beginning an entirely new program with this high a price tag. There are also opportunity costs to society including the time students lose from learning the skills they will use in their future careers and the loss of the services of qualified students to society.

Also, the bill will only serve 100,000 students. This represents just 2 percent of the estimated 4 million students who are currently eligible for student financial aid. This bill will spend approximately \$15,000 per student without targeting these dollars to students based on financial need.

This bill will be open to abuse. There is a requirement in the bill that grant applicants consult with, and in some cases, receive the concurrence of, labor unions. This provision gives unions a distinct advantage over other applicants and the power to influence the outcome of grants to nonunion applicants. This will create a blatant conflict of interest and lead to potential widespread abuse.

This bill will not "expand educational opportunity, reward individual responsibility, and build the American community together to tackle common problems," as proponents of the bill claim. National service would not, in fact, encourage voluntarism and genuine service, but distort its meaning. This program, unlike the military or Peace Corps, requires no special sacrifice or risk. Rather, it would confer upon its participants the same kinds of public honor, and greater Government benefits that these programs bring

about, without expecting the same levels of individual responsibility.

Just as individuals and corporations never have the time and money to perform every task that they wish, neither can Government officials, using taxpayers dollars, fix every problem of society. While voluntarism should be encouraged, it should not be a function of the Federal Government. This bill is simply another costly, bureaucratic Government spending program. For America's taxpayers, national service is an expensive venture with few, if any, net gains.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Ms. ESHOO].

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong and enthusiastic support of the National Service Trust Act.

I salute President Clinton, Chairman FORD and the members of the committee for their vision.

We have much to accomplish for our country. There are many discordant notes in our communities today on how best to meet our Nation's many needs.

H.R. 2010 unites Democrats, Republicans, and Independents, because it fuses together education, community service, and responsibility by unleashing the incredible energy and talent of our youth to renew our Nation.

This legislation will give thousands of bright young people a heightened sense of community and enlist them to serve our people and rebuild our communities.

Vice President GORE recently met with future national service leaders at a national service boot camp on Treasure Island in San Francisco. I was inspired by the idealism and the compassion of the volunteers. They have a commitment to service and a unity of purpose that harkens back to the idealism of John Kennedy's Peace Corps.

Many projects in my district were chosen as training sites in this program and have already benefited from the efforts of this prototype.

Imagine this effort on a national scale, 150,000 young people building homes for the homeless, teaching preschool youngsters, acting as mentors and mentors, caring for the infirmed and the elderly and assisting our local police departments.

Clearly the possibilities are endless, and quite simply this legislation makes sense for all of us. It speaks to the best of us and I am confident that this will be the great legacy of the 103d Congress and of our President for generations to come.

I urge my colleagues to support this magnificent piece of legislation.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON].

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman, I rise with grave concerns regarding this legislation. What concerns me, and I am

anxious to see the amendments that are going to be offered later this week and next week, is the prospect of another new Federal program that is going to tell us how to serve our country and create more volunteers.

Now, let me first of all give you my perspective. I was born and raised the youngest of nine children in an impoverished community in this country in Pennsylvania. I could not have gone to college except for student loans which financed my entire education, which I paid back 5 years after I taught school.

I got involved in politics because I was a volunteer in my community. Like my father and my brothers, I was active in the volunteer fire company.

I became the Boy Scout troop committee chairman and served on the Red Cross Board. As a matter of fact, I eventually became the president and chief of the local volunteer fire company, and then went on to become the countywide director of fire training for 78 other fire organizations on Saturdays and weekends, none of this with any prodding from the government, either Federal, State, or local.

I got involved with volunteer efforts here primarily to help those men and women who service our emergency needs all across the country, and 5 years ago formed what is now the largest caucus in Congress, the fire and emergency servicemen's caucus, which works with 30,000 fire and emergency service departments in every one of your districts.

I have traveled to 48 States of the 50 over the last 3 years. And do you know something? I have never heard one of those people ask for this program.

Now, 1.5 million men and women, we heard them mentioned in the flood. They are out there today in that flood in the Midwest. They were in the wildlands fires in Yellowstone, down in Hurricane Andrew in Florida, and every day doing a service, 1.5 million of them, 85 percent of them volunteers serving our country. Have they asked for this? Absolutely not.

What is even worse, were they even consulted? I asked one of my colleagues who is working this legislation if the National Fire and Emergency Services Council was consulted, and he said no.

So here we have people who have been serving this country longer than this country has been a nation, 280 years, and we did not even talk to them.

We are going to create a program that is going to do what they have been doing for 280 years before this was America, the great Nation, in every city and town in this country.

If we would have listened to these people in their 30,000 departments, we would have heard what they are saying. They are saying, "Don't pay us. Give us the resources we need. Help us buy the fire equipment, the ambu-

lances, the EMT units. We will do the training."

What has Congress done? Well, let me tell you, some of the same proponents of this bill are the same people who gave us SARA-title III and they are talking today about wanting a new spirit of public service.

□ 1610

What does SARA-title III do?

For those of my colleagues who cannot remember, the superfund reauthorization amendments provide a level of training and resource requirements for local towns that 90 percent of the communities in America cannot fund. That is our commitment to community service. What has happened? Those towns all across America have not been able to recruit volunteers because they cannot train them and they cannot buy the resources to allow them to serve their towns, and yet we are going to create another Federal bureaucracy that these people have not asked for.

My colleagues, I say that listening to the rhetoric on the floor today makes me really wonder what we are all about. Go out and listen to those people who are truly performing American public service, who are not asking for a college education, who are not asking for a \$5,000 contract and benefits, but who want to serve their town and want to do it because it is the right thing to do. That is what we should be focusing on, and this legislation does not meet the mark.

Let us be honest. This is a feel-good, politically correct vote, but it is not going to foster community service.

I would ask my colleagues to rethink this whole issue.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] for yielding this time to me, and I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2010, the National and Community Service Act. I commend President Clinton, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ], and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MCCURDY] for their leadership on this important issue. President Clinton's vision for the people of the United States includes access to an affordable higher education. H.R. 2010 helps make this vision a reality by offering our citizens the opportunity to serve their communities in return for educational grants.

Mr. Chairman, our colleagues have gone over the provisions of this legislation. I, instead, want to tell my colleagues that I had the distinct honor of welcoming Vice President AL GORE to San Francisco, to Treasure Island, on June 21, to launch the summer of service. The kickoff was truly a celebration. The students who began a week of training for the summer months ahead

were alive with hope and enthusiasm in anticipation of the experience before them. These young people will serve disadvantaged children across the country. They will tutor inner city children, work in health facilities for children, rehabilitate and immunize urban children, and they are excited about the challenges they will face.

I wish every one of my colleagues would have seen the enthusiasm and energy present on Treasure Island. I wish my colleagues could all have seen the diversity of the young people from all of the communities represented in our country. I wish my colleagues could have seen them speak with hope and enthusiasm about the opportunity that this legislation carries for their future and the future of our country.

Mr. Chairman, I told them that I would tell my colleagues how excited they were about it and how hard we would work to make this legislation and this vision a reality.

Again, I want to commend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] for bringing this legislation to the floor.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I only do this because I think it is important that everyone understand exactly what we are talking about here today in this legislation. I say to our good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that there is no one in this House who is a stronger advocate for volunteer firemen than he is, but I think it is important to understand the difference between paid voluntarism, as he was describing, and this bill that deals with national service. So, as we go on with the debate, my colleagues, let us understand this is not paid voluntarism. This is not student financial aid. This is national service.

Do my colleagues know what? Every volunteer fire department in America can put together, if they can create a competitive grant that meets a unique, local, national service that can be approved on a competitive peer review based on the amount of money we appropriate here. Then they can apply for that grant like everybody else. But the reason they were not consulted is because we are not trying to design a paid volunteer program across this country. We are trying to design a national service program where we meet unique and critical national and local needs.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Ms. SHEPHERD], a dynamic new Member of the Congress.

Ms. SHEPHERD. Mr. Chairman, the National Service Trust Act is a bill whose time has come. It will be a bridge that links education and service. Finally, young people who want to serve can complete their education and follow that opportunity by actively participating in service to their communities.

The National Service Program will help Utah's students gain organizational skills while it gives them a sense of their communities and an expanded understanding of the world around them. But that is not all. Communities win, too—by gaining a broad volunteer base, a well-trained and experienced work force, and citizens who are immediately connected to the community and a lifetime of involvement.

Mr. Chairman, community service is a State tradition in Utah, and the National Service Trust Act embraces and expands this spirit of service. It's not the answer for every student, but for many it will provide the foundation for a lifetime of service—service which will make each of our communities stronger. I am proud to cosponsor this bill and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER], a member of the committee.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I will be the first one in this body to stand up and espouse the virtues of a national commitment to community service. It is important for all Americans to do community service, including the young. The American people realize this; that's why 80 percent of the American people are engaged in service in one form or another.

In fact, we have all seen across the nation the goodness of America. Whether it's helping in stemming the floods along the Mississippi River or passing out fans to the elderly during the heat wave along the eastern seaboard, Americans have shown their willingness to lend a hand to help their neighbor. And this dedication to service is played out every day in every town across this Nation. Some acts are met with much fanfare and notoriety, while others are known only to the person lending the hand and the beneficiary of their generosity. These caring individuals are not paid for their service, and they certainly are not subsidized or cajoled by the Federal Government.

There is no question that all Americans should be a part of this community spirit. Young adults should be encouraged to do community service. And the Federal Government can have a role in this process. But, it should not be by paying the young to do the service. Money cheapens the process. Money makes a mockery of the service. And money is an insult to that 80 percent who do community service simply out of the goodness of their heart.

So, what can the Federal Government do? The Federal Government can lend encouragement, serve as a bully pulpit, convince colleges to get involved in the process by requiring community service in order to graduate. National service does not require a new Federal bureaucracy. It does not re-

quire Paying Americans to do the service. And it certainly does not require \$4.7 billion from the American taxpayer.

President Clinton should know this. After all, he is a big fan of Thomas Jefferson, who, along with his fellow Founding Fathers, believed in, fought for, and preached all about the need for service by Americans to their country. But I really doubt he expected the Federal Government to be involved in the process.

There have also been other great Americans who believed in the goodness of the individual, others who believed in the goodness of all Americans. This faith was proven time and again, especially during the 1980's. For example, charitable donations rose dramatically during this period. Measured in 1991 dollars, Americans donated 70 percent more to charities in 1990 than they did in 1977, giving \$128 billion to charities.

Throughout our Nation's history, the American people have always answered the call to aid their fellow neighbor in need. And they did it all without a national service trust corporation.

Mr. Chairman, as one of my colleagues on the Education and Labor Committee put it when we first started considering this bill, the National Service Trust Act is sexy. It looks good and it feels good. But that does not make it good legislation. While it may warm our hearts to think that we are casting a vote to allow students to engage in community service, pay for their college, and get self-actualization, what this bill really addresses is a perceived need. In the process, we're creating more government, spending more money, and deceiving not just the young adults of America, but all Americans as well. Finally, Mr. Chairman, at a time when the Federal Government is \$4 trillion in debt, we do not need to spend an additional \$4.7 billion, and we do not need to create a new Entitlement Program.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote on this bill.

□ 1620

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, as a reward for his extreme patience, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. COPPERSMITH].

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the National Service Trust Act, a bill of which I am proudly an original cosponsor.

I support this bill for several reasons. In the brief time I have, though, let me talk about only two. First, I support this bill because the trust is open to all, regardless of socioeconomic status or age.

This bill recognizes a crucial economic truth. Education is no longer a process that ends at age 16 or 18 or 21.

Instead, it must be now a continuing renewal and refreshing of skills our citizens need to compete in the world economy. Second, and even more importantly, this bill rejoins two concepts that have become separated, to the great detriment of our society. This bill links rights and responsibilities once again.

National service will provide a vital opportunity for our citizens to improve themselves, giving them the skills they will need to compete in the world economy; yet it will also require from them the equally vital obligation to repay the country and the community that provide that opportunity. Responsibility, opportunity, and community are the principles behind the National Service Trust Act. If our citizens will invest in their communities, our country will invest in them.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I thank the most courteous gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] for yielding time to me in recognition of my patience.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TORKILDSEN].

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the National and Community Service Act, of which I am glad to be an original cosponsor.

One key element of America's greatness has always been community or volunteer service. Whether responding in time of disaster or everyday need, Americans have come through for their fellow Americans, and for people throughout the world. President George Bush sought to recognize the commitment of some of those Americans with the 1,000 Points of Light program.

Today we have an opportunity to encourage young people to become involved in community service, both for the benefit of their communities as well as allowing them to defray some of the cost of a college education.

This program will pay a stipend of 85 percent of the minimum wage for participants, plus funding to defray college costs. Eighty-five percent of minimum wage is not a lot of money, and coincidentally, it is the same amount that some have advocated for a training wage for young people.

Critics say this program will only help a few individuals deal with the cost of a college education. They are correct. We have a deficit, and we do not have the money to make this program universally available. But is it not better that we help some students with the cost of college education, even if we cannot help every student? And while we are helping some, is it not a positive step that we are encouraging community service?

The success of this program cannot be measured solely by the community work done by those in the program, or by the number of students who will only be able to attend college because of this program. The real success of this program can only be measured by the volunteer work that participants do long after they have left the program.

I strongly believe Government does not have all the answers. Much of what is right with this country has little to do with Government at all. If we can encourage just a few young people to look to themselves to help their communities, and not look to the Government to solve every problem they face, then we will have indeed accomplished something significant.

I urge colleagues to support this effort to help a few students deal with the cost of a college education, and to encourage all of us to volunteer to help in our cities, towns, and neighborhoods.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER], a member of the committee and a co-sponsor of the bill.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, the United States has a long and rich history of service by this country and of the people to this country as well. De Tocqueville in his great treatise on "Democracy in America" talked about what distinguished America from other countries, and he mentioned service to one's country. Presidents have followed that advice all through the decades over 200 years, and we have come up with the Civilian Conservation Corps, we have come up with the GI bill, and we have come up with VISTA and the Peace Corps. And I might say by the way, Mr. Chairman, in terms of the GI bill providing educational assistance for bearing arms, what we are saying with this bill is that you will get educational assistance for lending a hand to others.

I salute President Clinton for the new spirit that he has engaged in as a new Democrat with this legislation to open up education to more and more Americans. And I want to make clear what this bill is not. It is not more bureaucracy because it plugs into existing systems like the University of Notre Dame in my community.

It is not voluntarism. It is promoting service, public service, career service, getting people into teaching and health care, and it is not, as it has been referred to by some Members on this distinguished floor, raking leaves. We are talking about helping the drug addicts in desperation, we are talking about helping the dying in health care, and we are talking about helping the drop-outs in our educational system.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this good legislation for America.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2010, the National Service Trust Act. The purpose of this legislation is to enhance opportunities for national and community service and provide educational awards to persons who participate in such service.

During his campaign, President Clinton talked about changing the direction in which our country has been going for a long time and moving toward a new direction. This legislation will help move our country in a new direction by renewing America's commitment to community service while at the same time help to make the cost of college education more affordable for our young people.

Service to country has a long history in the United States. In the 1930's President Roosevelt established the Civilian Conservation Corps which enabled millions of young people to restore the environment. In the 1960's, the Peace Corps and VISTA grew out of President Kennedy's challenge to Americans; "Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country."

By providing educational opportunities for an entire generation of young Americans, this proposal would go far to promote the spirit of community service and social responsibility that created the framework of more than 200 years of American success.

If enacted, this bill would do for America in the 1990's what the GI bill did in the 1950's. Only this time, instead of receiving educational assistance for bearing arms, young people could earn college money by lending a hand in the areas of unmet needs in education, public safety, and the environment.

Too often, the costliness of higher education prevents many Americans from attending college or receiving additional job training. However, under the National Service Trust Act, individuals over age 17 could receive up to \$5,000 a year by volunteering for programs like those at the University of Notre Dame's Center for Social Concerns. The center and its more than 1,500 participating students provide a variety of services in South Bend, IN, which include tutoring, working with the handicapped and senior citizens, and staffing a shelter for the homeless.

The strong dedication to these activities leaves a lasting effect on both our communities and the students who take part. In fact, ten percent of Notre Dame's graduating seniors build on their social consciousness after college by devoting their professional lives to organizations like Holy Cross Associates and Teach for America. They teach in inner-city schools and on Indian reservations; they help drug users overcome their addictions; they give aid to battered women, and assist in rehabilitating convicts so they may again become contributing members of our society.

These young Americans demonstrate that monetary concerns and financial gain are not the only factors that determine their career paths. Often, they hold a fundamental conviction that they should return something to a society that has been rewarding to them. We need to continue to promote young people's desire to give back to their country, and this legislation would allow millions of young Americans the opportunity to act on their beliefs.

And let us never underestimate the impact that charitable service has on our Nation's

communities. In the words of Father Edward Malloy, president of the University of Notre Dame:

The impact is not always easily measured but is often displayed in intangibles like community spirit and hope. The true epiphany for many students \* \* \* is that the community often gives as much to those who serve as it receives.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Education and Labor Committee, I know that this legislation will open up educational opportunities for millions of Americans while fostering community service and goodwill throughout the Nation. The National Service Trust Act will leave behind a valuable legacy as America moves into the 21st century, and I hope my colleagues will join me in support of this bill.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER].

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, actually, I am glad to have followed my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana who just spoke. We have, both of us, shared the northern part of Indiana, but I know that the people of Indiana are not that much different in South Bend than they are in Kokomo or Logansport or Peru or other parts of northern Indiana. I have visited 21 town meetings in 20 counties throughout north central Indiana, and the theme of what they talked about is a lot different from what I just heard from my colleague.

The people of Indiana have consistently been like other people throughout this country who continue to do more with less. They talk about national service, and I heard the gentleman's response about the voluntarism aspects and also about the GI bill.

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

Mr. BUYER. Yes, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROEMER. No, I did not say, voluntarism. What I said was service to the country, and that the two should be very distinct and separate. Voluntarism is one thing that we are noted for in this country, but service is what this bill is about.

Mr. BUYER. I will stand corrected, then.

Mr. ROEMER. All right.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I reclaim my time.

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

Mr. BUYER. Yes, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman is a veteran of the gulf war, and I used to be the ranking Republican on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. I just want to remind the Members of what a great President named Ronald Reagan used to say: "Here we go again." Another entitlement program. And make no mistake about it, I say to the Members, this is an entitlement program.

I was shocked when I was sitting in my office a few minutes ago reading

the report on the VA, HUD, and independent agencies appropriations bill, and I came across a part that says, "National Service Initiative."

□ 1630

It says 1993 appropriation, and the space is blank. No money. And it goes on and on and on and on.

My point is this: For years we have robbed the veterans hospitals and veterans programs in this country, and here we go again—\$7.4 billion in the next 5 years to fund this bill and we cannot even staff our veterans hospitals, 174 of them, and dozens and dozens of clinics in all of our districts.

Where are we taking money for this bill from? Not out of education and whatever else, but out of veterans program again. When is this going to stop?

Mr. Chairman, every Member in this building ought to vote down this bill. I hope every veteran in this country is listening and will write all Members to oppose this bill.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will advise those who are in the gallery that they cannot express any manifestations for or against any proceeding that is taking place on the floor.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, when the gentleman talked about the cuts in the VA, I have tremendous concern about this national service plan and its effect upon recruitment, not only of the National Guard, but of the reserves and the active force, the tremendous impact that this is going to have over the long period of time.

True, we can talk about the dollars here in the short run, but we are talking about \$7.4 billion to 1997 and the growth of a new entitlement bureaucracy beyond that. It will have a tremendous effect upon the military, and we ought to listen to veterans organizations out there, like the American Legion, who have spoken very strongly on this issue.

Right now, when the manpower pool is shrinking for recruitment and the quality has started to decline, we should not be turning our back on that pool. We need to be able to recruit that quality of individual into our force.

Have we stopped to ask about the detailed effects the program is going to have on the military, and will it affect the recruitment? The GI bill provides \$4,800 a year for up to 3 years, compared to national service of \$5,000 per year up to 2 years. It does not take a brain surgeon to understand that this 18-year-old out there can get some benefit or an entitlement without the risk of military service.

Mr. Chairman, we should be analyzing the present pilot program. We should allow it to run its course and then analyze it before we jump into a new bureaucracy.

Early when I opened this up I talked about the people of Indiana. When I

talked about the people of Indiana, I mentioned that because when the President came into this body and spoke during his State of the Union Address, he talked about shared sacrifice, and America was prepared to respond to this President. He talked about shared sacrifice. But part of the confusion he left with America is also with not only the greatest tax increase, but all this new spending, new spending for more entitlement programs.

Mr. Chairman, that is what America is saying no to. They have sent a message overwhelmingly to this body to cut spending first; streamline Government before you ever increase taxes. And what are we doing here again today? Creating new bureaucracy and more Federal spending.

Mr. Chairman, we need to listen more to the American people. Washington is not the tail that wags the rest of this country; the country is the dog that wags Washington. This town has got it mixed up.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA], a member of the committee.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am very proud of our President today and very proud as well to be a cosponsor of this legislation.

Last year President Clinton challenged all of us as Americans to serve our country. Well, today President Clinton, through this legislation, has provided us with the leadership, the inspiration, but, most importantly, the mechanism for us to serve.

In national service, what President Clinton is doing is investing in America. I believe that is what we should be focusing on, the fact we are investing in our people.

We are not just spending this money. This is an investment. He recognizes that this country's most valuable resource is its people. He also recognizes that the most precious of those people is its youth.

National service is open to all, young and old, rich and poor, rural and urban. National service is there for your brother, for your mother, for your daughter, or for your grandfather.

Who benefits from the services of these people? National service benefits children through child care, gang diversion, tutoring; it benefits the elderly through hospice care; it benefits our neighbors through the police Explorer programs that it will fund, through the gang diversion and neighborhood watch programs that it will help to create; and it will benefit our environment. But most of all, it will benefit all of us, because we will be providing a service to these youth or the elderly to work and provide a service and ultimately to be able to go on and get a college degree and help us as productive members of our society.

With the cost of college education exploding in some cases to more than \$100,000 to receive a 4-year degree, national service is a fantastic investment. It provides a 1-year \$5,000 stipend, or a 2-year \$10,000 stipend, plus an annual wage of \$7,400. That is 15 percent below the minimum wage, and it is only 85 percent of what the Federal Government would provide.

Mr. Chairman, this is an investment we must all take advantage of. I urge Members to support this measure.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LINDER].

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the National Service Program. At a time when Congress is fighting to reduce the Federal deficit, rein in Government spending and reduce Federal bureaucracy, I find it ironic that we are on the verge of implementing a massive new entitlement program which will cost American taxpayers more than \$7.4 billion over 4 years.

Mr. Chairman, we must ask ourselves, is it fiscally responsible to implement a new entitlement program? The Federal Government already has at least 23 Federal programs that support and provide for community leadership with a combined appropriation of \$1.3 billion and already administers student aid programs which provide assistance to 5 million students. If H.R. 2010 is implemented it will only provide assistance to 3 percent of those students who are currently eligible for student aid at a cost of \$22,667 per student annually. Rather than creating a new entitlement program which will assist only 100,000 students when fully implemented, we should look toward fully funding Federal student aid programs which are already in existence.

As a member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, I am also gravely concerned with the detrimental affects the National Service Program will have on this Nation's armed services' recruitment efforts. Currently, the GI bill offers \$4,800 per year for up to 3 years in education benefits to service members who commit to 3 years of service and contribute \$1,200 of their own money. Compare this to the national service plan which will provide a \$5,000 voucher each year for up to 2 years, health care and child care benefits in exchange for 2 years of community based service. It does not take a genius to figure out which program is a better deal for students.

Mr. Chairman, the national service plan, although well-intended, is bad legislation. It is expensive. It duplicates current Federal programs and has the potential of severely hampering the recruitment programs of the armed services. I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 2010.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, could Members be advised how much time remains on each side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] has 23 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] has 23 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON] has 9½ minutes remaining.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR].

□ 1640

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] for allowing me to speak briefly on this issue.

I rise in support of H.R. 2010, to implement President Clinton's National Service Trust Act.

It was 30 years ago this year that as a young graduate of college, I responded to my President's call of "Ask not what your country can do for you but what can you do for your country." I joined the American Peace Corps and served 2 years in South America.

That experience gave me an opportunity to learn another language and another culture. I lived as a minority in another land. I learned to focus on the unmet needs of that Third World country, the unmet needs in education, the unmet needs in health care delivery, the unmet needs in the lack of environmental remediation, and the unmet needs in public safety.

What I saw in South America 30 years ago I now see in my own country back home. We have unmet needs in all of those areas, and the President has suggested and Congress is considering enacting legislation that would allow people to join national public service.

This is not an expenditure program. This is a program to do without having to spend a lot of money, to involve people in what they do best, and that is giving of themselves to help others.

H.R. 2010 opens up that opportunity for service to all ages. I might remind those who are critical of this program that the Peace Corps also gave a monthly allowance and a stipend, when participants left the Peace Corps, just as this program does.

Those who critique this bill and critique the cost, I believe, are the ones who know the cost of everything and the value of nothing.

I urge support of this legislation. I think my colleagues will live to celebrate it.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. KREIDLER].

Mr. KREIDLER. Mr. Chairman, this week we will vote on the National Service Act. This legislation seeks to promote community service, volunteerism, and higher education—goals that we all support wholeheartedly.

But the reality of America today is that we must carefully choose among the goals we support and the resources we commit to them. That is why I

must vote against this bill. To put it simply, we cannot afford this program at this time. The first phase will cost nearly \$400 million in fiscal year 1994 to serve 25,000 students, yet there has been no proposal about how to pay for it. Does this mean these funds must come from other, equally worthy, and already proven programs? Programs that already encourage community service and student aid? In the current budget crisis, there simply is no money available for such an experiment, especially when there are already several successful programs promoting these goals.

If our goal is to encourage volunteerism, then let us increase funding for the programs we already have—the Peace Corps and VISTA, for instance. If we fully funded them, would we really need a new National Service Program? And if our goal is to encourage higher education, then let us increase grants and loans to help students go to college. It is estimated that each National Service participant could end up costing the Federal Government \$15,000 per year. Is that really the best, wisest, most cost-effective use of this money? That money for one student alone could provide several other students with Pell grants or guaranteed student loans.

I favor loan forgiveness where people go to work in underserved areas and fields. Perhaps we should expand some of these programs to target specific problems, instead of creating a new bureaucracy. I favor the idea of young people giving something back to their communities, but why only this group of people, why not all youth? Most important, I favor making higher education more accessible to more people, and I do not feel this program adequately addresses that goal.

I understand why this proposal is so important to the President. Who among us who came of age during President Kennedy's administration does not endorse the ideal of service to the community? But I have more questions than answers about what this bill is, and whom exactly it would serve. And I have more doubts than certainties about the wisdom of spending this much money on a project whose mission and methods are vague, duplicative, and costly. In the past few weeks I have cast a number of tough votes—against funding for the space station, the superconducting super collider, and other projects. These projects are worthwhile too, but not today, not with our deficit. This is not an easy vote for me either, but it is one I feel must be made.

The bottom line, Mr. Chairman, is that this program is expected to cost several billion dollars each year when fully implemented. Soon, conferees from both bodies will be looking for funding for childhood immunizations, for family preservation, and childhood

hunger. These are programs we know are urgently needed and cost-effective. This is no time to create another program whose goals are unclear, and whose funding is nonexistent.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GUTIERREZ].

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to join this important debate today—a debate that I believe centers on the idea of priorities.

And this bill tells me that we are beginning to put our national priorities back where they should be—on education, on community service, on building a better America for all of our people.

I congratulate our President for promoting this outstanding piece of legislation.

I encourage this body to adopt the spirit of volunteerism and responsibility—this new spirit of community—as a top priority in our Nation.

National service—the spirit of exchanging our labor to better our community while still helping ourselves—should become the new American spirit of the 1990's.

And it is not only a spirit of community that commends this legislation, it is a spirit of innovation, of problem-solving. It is a spirit that says we will find a way, in spite of budget and deficit difficulties, to put people to work to solve our problems.

Some voices today rise and suggest we find ways to limit this initiative—that perhaps we are serving too many people, or the wrong people, or that they are doing the wrong work.

I suggest that we can never allow enough Americans to serve their community. So instead of debating limits on this bill, let us all decide today to work together to find ways to expand it.

This bill embodies so many aspects of common sense that this body is usually lacking. It is fiscally responsible. It will be effective. It serves people who need help most.

So let us not criticize, let us praise our President for this effort. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" for a new community spirit, vote "yes" for national service.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA].

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to say that this bill is a perfect example of what is wrong with Congress. Here we are spending money we do not have on a program we do not need.

Let us ask ourselves several questions before we create another new multibillion-dollar Federal program. Does this duplicate existing programs? The answer is clearly "Yes". There are over 24 national service programs spending in excess of 1.2 billion Federal dollars each year.

Then what makes this program different? Well, this is a new concept—national service with perks, benefits,

guaranteed cash payments, health care, and educational benefits that exceed those available to veterans and even our poorest students. This proposal gives a whole new meaning to national public service.

This is a prime example of what is wrong with the philosophy of this Congress and this administration. They continue to believe big government programs work best. Pack the Federal rolls. Spend now, think later.

During the past weeks, I have talked to dozens of graduates from high schools and colleges. You know, I believe they are much smarter than most of the leaders of this Congress and this administration.

Not one of them said I can't wait for this new Government program to get started. Not one of them said, "I look forward to having a chance for a make work position in the public sector."

You know what they said? "I want a real job. I want to work or have an opportunity to enter the business or profession of my choice." They want an opportunity to succeed in the real world.

Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleagues I am afraid that with this proposal before us today—we are not helping to fulfill dreams—we are creating another nightmare.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time. When others have finished, I reserve the right to finish debate.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

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

I rise in opposition to this bill. If we went to the American people with the proposition that in order to solve our problems in this country what we should do is create 25,000 new Federal employees, my guess is that most of the American people at the present time would look at us and laugh. But that is exactly what this is.

I do not care what title we put on the bill, what we are doing here is we are creating 25,000 new Federal employees. These are a rather interesting group of new Federal employees we are creating. We take them outside of the civil service system.

What does that mean? That means that we are moving beyond the civil service system so that we can assign them perhaps politically, 25,000 new Federal employees that are now going to have political positions in communities across the country. And then beyond that, what we do in the bill is we say, "And, oh, by the way, we are not going to pay them the regular wages. What we are going to do is we are going to pay them a subminimum wage."

□ 1650

What we have now is 25,000 new Federal employees, assigned politically

across the country, all being paid subminimum wages. I am not so certain that the American people see that as being something which is going to contribute to the national good. In fact, I think most people see the big Federal Government as part of the problem, if not the problem.

The American people look at thousands upon thousands of Federal employees across the country who seemingly have positions that are supposed to be helping, and yet they do not see the communities getting better. What is the solution that we propose here? To add 25,000 more people to that number?

I would suggest that we would much better put our money to work by reducing the deficit, by reducing the debt, and by doing those things that get the economy moving to produce real jobs, rather than creating 25,000 new Federal employees.

One more thing. Where is the money going to come from for these 25,000 new Federal employees? It is going to come out of the hide of the veterans, out of the hide of our housing programs, and out of the hide of our science and high-technology programs, because that is the account into which they have shoved this money. This committee decided they did not want the account that is in the education field to govern this money. Instead, they put it over into the account that takes the money out of veterans, out of housing, and out of science and high-technology programs. We are going to have 25,000 new Federal employees that are going to be undermining major efforts in this country to do something about moving the economy forward. I do not think that is much of a bargain. As a matter of fact, I think that is a pretty bad deal. We ought to reject this bill. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to respond to my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Let me see if I can try to correct all of this. The gentleman says we have created 25,000 new Federal employees. What we have done is, we have created for the opportunity, through competitive grants, of up to no more than 25,000, and we have eliminated the entitlement, which everyone was concerned about beforehand.

Second, he says we have created something outside the Federal civil service. Yes, we did that. That was the second concession to the Republicans, because we did not want to create a new permanent Federal work force, so we created the recognition that this was a unique individual who, yes indeed, would be working for the Federal Government, but for 1 or 2 years at a maximum; would not be anything close to a permanent employee.

He says they will be politically appointed. On that one, he is just wrong,

because one of the other concessions that the President made to the Republicans was to guarantee that the boards that would review all these competitive grants would be balanced between political parties, so we have made sure that there will not be partisanship in any way involved in the decisions of who does and does not get these grants.

These are just some of the many reasons why a number of us Republicans, working in good faith through the administration, have found what we think is a fair political compromise.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2010, the National Service Trust Act of 1993. I oppose this bill not because I don't believe in voluntarism or the need to help our communities in despair.

To the contrary, while the goals of this legislation are well intentioned, it is the means to achieve those worthwhile goals that I find great fault with. In looking at page 87 of the report from the committee, I reviewed the goals of the act. Three quarters of the way down on the page, I read those goals: and I quote:

This act has two central goals: (1) to benefit communities by meeting their unmet environmental, educational, human and public safety needs; and (2) to enhance the lives of participants by enabling them to develop a service ethic, strengthening their bonds to their communities and country, improving their skills and, on many cases, providing educational awards.

Now I ask, just before this past recess, did the House not just pass the Labor, HHS, and Education appropriations bill which funds the aforementioned goals? And when we take up the Interior appropriations bill later on this week, are we not going to address some of these goals as well?

Where is all this money coming from? I hear a lot of hollering from my friends that this is the first President that is truly committed to cutting the national debt and reducing the deficit. Well, I ask again, where are we getting the \$7.4 billion over the next 4 years to pay for this act? Where?

In hearing my colleagues talk in favor of this bill, it almost sounds like we have to bribe our citizens to be patriotic and useful before they'll consider serving our country. If you are truly committed to helping our students who desire to attend college yet can't afford to go, then I say let us improve the dollars going to Pell grants and Guaranteed Student Loan Program recipients.

I really find it hard to believe that morale and patriotism has sunken to such a low, that our country requires a whole new massive Federal spending

program to entice our young to be productive members of our society.

I also find it highly objectionable to the provision that requires grant applicants to consult with, and in some cases, receive the blessing of labor unions. Are we telling our teenagers who want to go to college that "Here's the ticket to an education, go through this national volunteer program, but, whoaaa you had better check with the union because they might not approve of your grant application." So now we have a young citizen who has gotten all excited about going to college, volunteering for his country, but now he cannot do all this because the union does not endorse it. So instead of fostering all this good feeling we are trying to do here, we now have a dejected, unpatriotic teenager. I understand that the local unions do not want to displace local union workers. But frankly, this gives unions a distinct advantage over other applicants and power to influence the outcome of grants.

Mr. Chairman, I hold a letter from Roger Munson, national commander of the American Legion. In his letter, he points out the significant inequities and fundamental unfairness between the benefits paid under this bill and the Montgomery GI bill. I quote from his third paragraph:

The national service plan provides our young people a better option for receiving funding for education than does the current GI bill for those young people who deployed to the Persian Gulf to support Operation Desert Storm or to Somalia or may possibly be sent on air strikes to Bosnia.

I find it of some concern that today, July 13, 1993, has been designated as "Cost of Government Day." The combined cost of State, local, and Federal Government through taxes, spending, and Government regulations has soared through the roof. And here we are today, about to add another \$7.4 billion to that figure.

This bill is seriously flawed and needs to be reexamined before we ask the taxpayers of this country to foot this bill. I ask my colleagues, is now the time to start another Government program? Doesn't the deficit matter? The long-term stability of this Nation depends upon our habits, Government controlling its profligate spending habits. We have not reduced spending to pay for this program. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on passage of this bill.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS], who in my opinion is the Republican Member of the Congress who has been more dedicated, worked longer and harder on this legislation, than anyone else.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the President's National Serv-

ice Trust Act of 1993. There are good Government initiatives and there are bad Government initiatives. This happens to be an extraordinarily good initiative that is deserving of the bipartisan support it has received.

I want to thank both the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Education and Labor for yielding 30 minutes to the Republican Members who support this legislation, and thank the President and the White House staff, particularly Eli Segal, for reaching out to both sides of the aisle in helping to draft this landmark legislation.

The chairman, the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. FORD, the gentleman from Oklahoma, DAVE MCCURDY, the gentleman from California, MARTY MARTINEZ, all deserve great credit. So does the gentleman from Wisconsin, STEVE GUNDERSON, and the 18 other Republican cosponsors of this bill.

As a former Peace Corps volunteer, I get down on my knees, figuratively, to President Kennedy and the 87th Congress, for establishing the Peace Corps. The Peace Corps has made a tremendous difference in the lives of the volunteers who served, and it has made a tremendous difference in the lives of the individuals who received the benefits of their service.

I see the President's National Service Trust Act as having far greater impact than the Peace Corps ever had. It is a bill every Republican should be happy to support, because it is a bill that was drafted by Republicans and Democrats. It was a bill intended to deal with the concerns of Republicans and Democrats.

□ 1700

So I am not surprised that Republicans should want to support this bill. The educational grant was lowered because Republicans and veterans were concerned that the education benefit was too competitive with educational benefits under the GI bill. It is not now.

This bill is not an entitlement, and I am absolutely amazed that my colleagues who have been here so long would tell this Chamber that it is an entitlement. We are voting today on an authorization bill. There will be a specific appropriation bill that follows, and that bill will state exactly how many positions will be funded and how much money will be allocated for these positions. An entitlement? No way. It is an authorization bill with an appropriation to follow.

And the bill is decentralized. My God, this is something Republicans have asked for in every piece of legislation that comes before us. It is not a mammoth government program emanating out of Washington. This is a decentralized program. It is designed much the way the Corporation for Public Broadcasting is designed with significant

local and State control. Two-thirds of the funds will go to State organizations.

So I look at this bill and see the educational grant has been lowered to deal with legitimate concerns. The program is not an entitlement but an authorization with a subsequent appropriation bill. And further more the program is decentralized. Isn't this what Republicans want in a bill and Democrats as well?

Then I think of the kind of programs we are talking about, the Service-Learning Program where a national service participant, will work in our school systems helping to organize young people for true volunteer service. They will not get minimum wage, they will not get an educational grant. They will be volunteers, hundreds and thousands of them because of one individual National service participants who are there helping to organize them.

I think of the Conservation Corps and what can happen to make those programs more beneficial with this bill. I think of our Urban Youth Corps and how this will expand and improve its efforts. I think of the Literacy Corps Volunteers that many, including myself, envision being established under the act. Because the National Service Program is decentralized I have the ability to go to the State of Connecticut's commission and petition for the establishment of such a program. Imagine a Literacy Corps high school graduate in every first grade urban classroom teaching our young people how to read. I can compete for that program. I can help design it, and our commission can decide whether to fund it.

I think with all my heart and soul that this program is going to lift up our Nation in a way that many of us here may not fully understand.

National service participants' lives will change for the better. The lives of the hundreds of thousands of people they serve will change for the better as well.

There is something magical and inspirational about serving others. Provide today's young people with more opportunity to serve and they will invigorate our Nation and lift it up.

This initiative is not Republican, it is not Democrat, liberal or conservative. It is simply a sound concept based on fundamental American values.

I would like to just conclude with a letter that was sent to Chairman FORD by Elizabeth Dole, who is now the president of the American Red Cross. In past years she served as the Secretary of the Department of Transportation, and also as Secretary of the Department of Labor. In her letter Libby Dole says:

We particularly appreciate the proposed act's strong emphasis on: Renewing the ethic

of civil responsibility; engaging locally based and diverse organizations in a system of service delivery that is both decentralized and nationwide; facilitating the replication of existing successful service programs; and providing service opportunities for both stipended and nonstipended participants and for persons of all ages.

She continues by saying:

We understand that community service is neither a panacea for the Nation's problems nor a substitute for traditional volunteerism. However, your bill will enlarge the means by which individuals can make a difference in their community.

Then she concludes by saying "We look forward to the bill's passage into law." And so do I.

I say to the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, Mr. FORD, you have an excellent bill. I congratulate the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. GUNDERSON, and others who have worked so hard, and the White House for reaching out to Republicans for our input and support. I believe we have all come together for a noble cause that if implemented with as much care as it has been drafted will help change the course of America's future.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] and I ask the gentleman to yield.

Mr. SHAYS. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for reading Libby Dole's letter into the RECORD, which was dated only on July 9, so many Members have not had a chance to see it. In her new and important role we will see her almost every day as she works with the problems of the Mississippi River. I worked very closely with her when she was Ronald Reagan's Secretary of Labor, and I hold her in very high regard. We did not solicit the letter that the gentleman has read. She took it upon herself to send it, and for that I am grateful.

I would like to add to what the gentleman read into the RECORD. We have heard references here to how do people who were involved in Desert Storm feel about this. Well we have a statement that was submitted to my counterpart chairman on the other side of the Capitol from Gen. H. Norman Schwarzkopf, U.S. Army (Ret.): "Statement on National Service. I have often been asked if I am in favor of universal military service," says General Schwarzkopf. "My response has always been that I am not in favor of universal military service. I am in favor of universal service. I feel it is totally appropriate for each young American to earn the right to be called American. In this regard, I feel it is right and proper to ask every young person to serve their country in some fashion."

He goes on at some length and then finishes with this: "I strongly believe

that universal national service would provide a source of inexpensive, highly trained manpower to apply against many sectors of our economy that desperately need help, would give a sense of self-worth to many young men and women who are lost today because they do not feel they will ever have a chance to make a contribution, and finally would instill great patriotism in the youth of America who because they earn the right to be called Americans would be proud to be Americans," said General Schwarzkopf.

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

Mrs. UNSOELD. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleagues for the bipartisan support that has worked on this bill, and particularly Chairman FORD. I rise in strong support of the National Service Trust Act.

We are hearing a lot of very good reasons today for supporting the National Service Trust Act, but there is no better reason than Brooke Wallway.

In June 1992, Brooke's grades were so low that she barely graduated from Battle Ground, WA, High School. Her confidence level was just as low. Shy, lacking in self-esteem and without a plan for the future, she joined a Washington Service Corps project and ended up leading and supervising a team of at-risk youth.

Eventually Brooke helped create a "Helping Hands from Youth" effort to repair and take care of homes for the elderly. But more than that, Brooke ripped away a veneer of shyness and self-doubt and replaced it with self-confidence and bold plans for tomorrow. And along with gaining a sense of self, she made a difference in her community.

Today Brooke Wallway works full-time as a care provider for severely disabled children in Vancouver, WA. Service changed her life and enriched the lives of many others near her. And that is what this program is all about.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING].

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in opposition to H.R. 2010, the National Service Trust Act.

All of us in Congress understand the need to support voluntarism in America. The call to public service is one we have all heard clearly and I encourage young people to become involved in their communities and volunteer.

However, the National Service Act does not just encourage people to volunteer, it pays them, too. Mr. Chairman, I didn't think that voluntarism came with a price tag. I thought that voluntarism meant giving of yourself and your time, not working on the Federal payroll.

A recent Gallup poll revealed that over 94 million Americans perform volunteer work. No one is paying those 94 million Americans. No one is creating jobs for them. But, if you are one of the lucky applicants who gets grants

from the new National Service Trust, you can get the satisfaction of volunteering and the satisfaction of having the Government pad your wallet.

I also do not understand, Mr. Chairman, why we need a new National Service Program when we already have over 20 other federally funded programs that support community service and voluntarism. VISTA, ACTION, RSVP, and a slew of other programs support by the Federal Government already promote community action in America to the tune of \$1.2 billion per year.

CBO estimates that the National Service Trust Act will cost over \$2.8 billion over the next 5 years. At a time when we are tightening our budgetary belts and struggling to fund the programs that we already have, I do not understand how we can afford to more than double our spending on this type of program.

Mr. Chairman, supporters of the National Service Act also claim that this new program will foster community spirit and will encourage young people to give something back to their communities. Instead, the National Service Trust Act will be the biggest boon to political patronage since Tammany Hall.

The National Service Act will only help at most 100,000 of 10 million eligible applicants. We know that there is a lot of interest in this program and competition for grants will probably be fierce. So the big question will be who decides who gets a grant and who does not.

The answer is "politics." The participants in the new National Service Program will be handpicked by State political appointees. These selections won't be made according to a means tests or objective qualifications outlined in the bill—they will be made by State-run selections processes that will be tainted by politics and patronage.

In some cases, applicants for national service must even consult with the get the approval of labor unions.

Mr. Chairman, this does not sound like national service, it sounds like national patronage. It sounds like just another program for big city mayors and political bosses to use to hand out favors.

Charitable organizations that want to employ national services recipients will have to be approved by a politically appointed national review board. Who knows what politically correct standards charities will have to meet to qualify to participate. Given the moral incorrectness today of the Boy Scouts, troop leaders probably need not apply for National Service grants.

Proponents of the National Service Trust Act claim that it will promote community service, but it only promotes it if you know a political bigwig that can get you a grant or you meet the standards of the political correctness police.

Mr. Chairman, community service is good for America. But the National Community Service Act does not promote community service—it buys it and it plays politics with it. We need community service and we need voluntarism, but we don't need this bill.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this misguided proposal.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], the whip on the minority side.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from Pennsylvania for yielding the time. I rise, I guess, in a real quandary about this bill.

In many ways I like the bill very much. I like its spirit of trying to reach out for service. I like its effort to be decentralized and to have local involvement. I like the degree to which it emphasizes for younger people a sense of idealism. And I think you can make a very good case that the Clinton administration and the Democratic leadership in the House has worked to try to fashion a bipartisan bill, and many Republicans I think will end up voting for the bill.

□ 1710

And yet, as I walk through it, I cannot help but—at a lighter level than just this bill—almost seeing this entire procedure this week as the perfect classic example of why people are furious about Government and enraged at politicians and why every member of the industrial world who went to Tokyo last week went from a weak Government, in a position of weakness, in a sense of rage because it comes down to these questions: First of all, do we really think Government is too small? Is the only way to achieve these goals more Federal Government?

Second, given the same number of dollars, whether it is in Marietta, GA, or it is in Detroit, MI, or it is in Camp Hill, PA, are we better off to have a \$300 billion tax increase sitting in a conference committee now, to take the money away from local people and local institutions and true voluntarism to give it to the Federal bureaucracy to send it back home?

And if the fact Government-run has become a major pejorative—and one recent study, when asked, "Do you believe in Government-run health care," it went through the floor because the baby-boomers have figured out that Government-run is a synonym for waste, inefficiency, bureaucracy, red-tape.

So what we are being told is that in the age of Ross Perot and in the age of trying to balance the budget, in the age of trying to cut deficit spending, what we have is the perfect new idea which has to be enacted this year.

Now, I have a real problem with that. I have a problem because I think we ought to find a program, at least one program, of greater cost that we kill if we are going to pass this program. And I would be very open by the time we get to the motion to recommit, if we can find a more expensive program to kill, that we could tie into this program so that before we create this program we kill another program. Then maybe there is an argument that meets the Perot voters and meets the deficit-cutters and meets the balanced-budget folks and says, "Yes, this is a step toward a smaller Government."

But let me tell you what happens in this building: Programs start tiny, they start decentralized, and there is not going to be much bureaucracy and there is not going to be much paperwork and the politicians are not going to decide where the money goes. Then, year by year, they get bigger, and then one morning they are an entitlement. And then suddenly they are gigantic, and then they are 70 percent of the budget, and we are told, "Gee, that is uncontrollable."

After all, 10 years from now when there are several hundred thousand people who must have the money, when we have had a series of fights over quotas and who gets the money and how does it get there, when the Committee on Appropriations is selecting their favorite projects and writing it into the bill, it will be very hard 10 years from now to come back and remember the promise of this program.

So, I could be talked into voting for this under very certain circumstances, which I do not think we will get to. I do not rise and say automatically it is a terrible program. I cannot say there have not been serious efforts to try to meet some very real objectives. But I do have to come down to the final conclusion: You cannot, with a straight face, pass this program unless you include in the bill killing a more expensive program; you cannot, with a straight face, go back home and tell folks you are really trying to balance the Federal budget; you cannot really explain unless you believe the Federal Government inherently spends money smarter than the private citizens of this country, that Government-run is better than private-run voluntary, back-home, local. You cannot really say what we need is one more Federal bureaucracy with one more Federal program.

So, I have to say sadly that at this date, unless I see some amendments passed and a really good motion to recommit, at this date I would vote "no". But I do commend the effort, which I think is sincere, and I do look forward to seeing exactly how the amendments work out over the next several days.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. CLEMENT].

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the National Service Trust Act, H.R. 2010. It is what this country needs.

Mr. Chairman, for over 200 years, our great Nation has been known as the land of opportunity. Businessmen such as Andrew Carnegie and Cornelius Vanderbilt have made their fortunes here, and immigrants from all over the world have come here for a fresh start.

But hard work is not enough anymore. Our young people need education and training to assure their futures. Unfortunately, higher education has become increasingly expensive in

recent years. So expensive that many young people cannot afford to go to college at all. Doors are automatically closed to these young people, and they miss many opportunities.

The National and Community Service Act will provide our young people with the opportunity to obtain the education and training that they deserve. It will allow them to contribute to society and to become better citizens and better Americans. I urge my colleagues to support the National and Community Service Act because the future of our Nation rests with our young people.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the National Service Trust Act. I want to thank, in particular, the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], for the tremendous work, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON] for their cooperative efforts in getting this legislation onto this House floor. I think, if we look at the major changes that have taken place in the U.S. society over the course of the last couple of dozen years, the fact is that young people have been at the very forefront of the major political changes that have taken place.

Going back to the early 1960's—late 1950's and early 1960's—we heard a lot of credit being given to individuals for the changes that took place in civil rights legislation. But it was only when young people got on buses and traveled throughout the country and demanded that we change the way civil rights were provided to all America that, in fact, changes took place.

The same thing took place in the Vietnam war: A lot of controversy, a lot of heartaches took place in that war. But it was not until hundreds of thousands of young people came to this city and demonstrated and took a stand that we saw the United States begin to change the policies that led us to the eventual difficulties that took place at the end of the Vietnam war.

If we look at what happened with regard to the 18-year-old vote, it was when young people demanded the right to vote in America that changes again took place.

Most recently, in terms of the women's struggle for the equal rights amendment, it has been young people on the cutting edge.

What this bill does is enable those young people to be involved in so many ways throughout our society, in helping a homeless family get a meal from a soup kitchen, in helping a senior citizen weatherize an apartment, in helping clean up an urban park, in helping go out into rural America and assist with the very real needs of our farmers and so many of the poor that exist.

It gives a voice and the ability to young people to go out and be involved in the critical affairs of America.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the legislation, and I hope that this Congress does its part.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

I would preface my remarks by saying that one of our colleagues from this committee, whose family at this particular time could certainly use all of our thoughts and all of our prayers, and I am referring to the gentlemen from Michigan [Mr. HENRY], who is extremely critical at this point.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call your attention to a few things that were said that were said incorrectly. I think two of them may have been an allusion to an amendment that I will be offering when we get to the amending process.

One gentleman indicated that we want the legislation as it is because it gives an opportunity to have people work side by side, people coming in, is the way that he put it, working side by side, no matter what their economic status in life may be.

Nothing in my amendment will preclude that. In fact, it will probably encourage it.

At the present time, many people, young people who volunteer, are financially in a position to volunteer. Many people are not financially in a position to volunteer. My amendment will insure those who presently volunteer that they can continue to volunteer but now they will receive the minimum wage and they will receive the health benefits so that they will work side by side.

The second statement that was made that was totally erroneous indicated that—and again I am sure it was in reference to an amendment that I will offer—that somehow or other my amendment would cause someone to have to borrow money before they could get involved in this program. That is totally false. The bill conforms to the needs analysis in title IV of the Higher Education Act. My amendment does not cause anyone to borrow one penny before they exhaust every other opportunity of grant, including that which is provided in this legislation.

□ 1720

So I want to make sure that that is very, very clear, not one penny to be borrowed until after the needs analysis, they get the grants that would be available to them under title IV and the money that would be coming to them from this experience. Then they would borrow, not before.

Mr. Chairman, what I am saying today is basically what I heard many of my colleagues on either side of the aisle say during the campaign and immediately after the campaign. I heard one colleague say on two occasions when this program was mentioned that that program is stupid when we think about the needs that are unmet at the

present time. That is what I am arguing for.

I believe that all should participate, all should receive the benefits up to the benefits in relationship to higher education or postsecondary education.

Then I believe in fairness to the millions out there who need our financial assistance, who cannot afford to have us cut back on State grants, who cannot afford to have us cut back on work study, the needs analysis should protect them so that those who do not have that kind of financial need for education will not receive money that should go to those who are in need.

As I said earlier, I believe it is immoral to enact the bill the way it is presently written. I would hope as we go through the amendment process, that amendment and another amendment which I would offer which would extend the time for use to 10 years rather than 5 will be amendments that I believe can make the bill acceptable whether it is a good idea or whether it is a bad idea.

So again, when we come before you with amendments, I hope you will be listening and I hope that the rhetoric, some of which was incorrectly stated today, will not be repeated, will be corrected and that we can move ahead with the amendment process whenever that time comes.

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

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman and colleagues, for a quarter century after World War II, America was the world's economic superpower, largely because of a decision that is very similar to the decision that we are being asked to make now. America decided that because of the commitment that our young people made in entering and winning World War II, they had a right to own a piece of America. They had the right through the GI bill of rights to own a home and to have access to higher education. That is the ticket to the middle class, the ticket to success in America. It is still the ticket to success in America, but now 50 years later we find that of that 1.8 million 18-year-olds, 700,000 of them are today functionally illiterate. They do not have the verbal and the quantitative skills to have a piece of America, to participate in this economy or this society. That is what this program is all about, to give them an opportunity to get that higher education, to be fully participative, to break out of the limitations that their neighborhoods, that the income of their families, that their prior experience, their peers and all have imposed upon them, to break out and find out what they are capable of doing, what they want to do, and what we need to be doing for the rest of their lives. That is what this is all about, giving

them that opportunity, and because of the mountain of debt that we were left by the Reagan and Bush administrations, it does have to start tiny, but I do hope it grows, that it becomes an enormous commitment on the part of America to our young people. They deserve no less and there is nothing more important that we can do for them than to give them this opportunity.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Ms. SCHENK].

Ms. SCHENK. Mr. Chairman, I rise as an original cosponsor and strong supporter of H.R. 2010, the National Service Trust Act.

I applaud President Clinton for presenting this program to the American people, and I applaud the chairman and ranking member for bringing it to the floor of this House.

National service is clearly a win-win proposition. Communities win by receiving valuable services. Participants win by the experience and by receiving up to \$10,000 in educational assistance, and in the long term we all win by cultivating the kinds of citizens for which this country is so well known.

In our Nation today, there are children who cannot read, but there are also young people who have the patience and energy to teach the children.

In our country today, we have dirty city streets and littered public parks, but we have an abundance of young men and women who want to make our communities cleaner and safer.

In our country today, we have hospitals under tremendous financial stress to cut costs and maintain care, but we also have citizens who are blessed with good health and a generous spirit who want to improve our Nation's health care services.

The National Service Program would channel the energy, the patience, the strength, and generosity of Americans to good purpose.

As a founder of the Urban Corps of San Diego, I know firsthand the value of youth service programs. Our Urban Corps is considered a success by everyone, participants, business leaders, social service agencies, and educators.

Opponents of H.R. 2010 will argue against a new costly program, but we heard today that this bill would not establish a new Federal bureaucracy. This program would be operated by nongovernmental entities.

Also this program is subject to annual appropriations by Congress. In other words, every year the House will have the opportunity to reevaluate this program, to decide how successful it is.

The National Service Trust Act once again taps the richest vein of America's strength, our desire to work for the physical, emotional, and spiritual well-being of our fellow citizens.

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

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. TUCKER].

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

I would like to congratulate, first of all, the very diligent work of several Congressmen, Congressman FORD, Congressman OWENS, and Congressman MARTINEZ, for they have truly embodied what we call vision around here in the House of Representatives. They have had the vision and have had the foresight to take an initiative by this administration and to work assiduously with Members on both sides of the aisle to make sure that this bill has come very timely to the House floor.

On the eve of the All-Star Game, I am reminded of those things that are endemically and purely American, those things that smack of Mom's apple pie, Chevrolets.

Education is the hallmark of what has made America and Americans great. I myself would not be standing here on the House floor were it not for the wonderful opportunities I have had coming from Compton, CA, to be able to go to schools like Princeton, USC, and even Georgetown University where the President went, had it not been for the opportunity to access education.

This National Service Trust Program is going to give people in communities like Compton, CA, South-Central L.A., and communities all over this country where young men and women have not had the opportunity to avail themselves of a quality education, it is going to give them that opportunity.

It has bipartisan support. It has support from the President, because it is what America needs, and it needs it now.

To those naysayers who cannot come on board on this bill, Mr. Chairman, I say shame, for truly and surely they cannot find a bill that has more merit, that is more laudable than this. I cannot imagine anyone who would not support something as purely American and purely rich in investment in our people than this bill.

So I challenge both Republicans and Democrats alike today, Mr. Chairman, to come on board on this bill, to stop talking about what we can do for Americans, and to get in line and show the American people that we mean business about education.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time remaining on this side.

Mr. Chairman, when all else fails, we trot out the same old red herrings that we have seen dragged across this floor for years—create a huge new bureaucracy.

□ 1730

One gentleman, who graced us for all of 1½ minutes, walked to the well and

said, "Twenty-five thousand new Federal employees." That is only part of the hogwash that we heard from people who either have not taken the time to read or did not understand what they read, and \$7.2 billion is total fiction.

One thing that ought to be borne in mind is that the Corporation for National Service created by this bill virtually absorbs every one of the related programs we already have on the books that are in the jurisdiction of our committee. The ACTION programs, including VISTA, Retired Senior Volunteers, Foster Grandparents, Senior Companions, Student Community Service, special volunteer programs and VISTA illiteracy programs; those are all folded into this program. Conservation and Youth Corps, authorized as recently as 1990, is folded into this program, as well as school-based community service, authorized during the Bush administration in 1990, higher education programs in 1990, a program Mr. Bush talked about, the Points of Light Program. Those are all folded in, Mr. Chairman, as well as the Civilian Community Corps, authorized in 1990. Virtually every service program within our jurisdiction is folded into the Corporation.

Now what does that mean? We are not creating a new bureaucracy. We are bringing the existing bureaucracy into a reduced, more manageable form and having it run, not by one of the regular departments of the Federal Government, but by a newly created National Service Corporation.

In answer to the suggestion that there is 25,000 new Federal employees, Mr. Chairman, I would point out that this legislation provides for approximately 500 Federal employees, all but 75 of whom we already have in these other programs we are folding in. So, the administration will have a grand total of maybe 20 percent of the total Federal work force because the Federal Government is not going to operate these programs.

It is true that a department, like the Department of the Interior, could, like any city or State, apply to the Corporation for a program for environmental work or conservation, but they apply to the same people that they would apply to if they were a State, or a unit of local government, or a non-profit organization. They do not have any right to have any part of this program because they are a Federal agency, and I suspect that there will be a limited number of Federal agencies that will be able to take advantage of it.

The authorization for this program includes the authorizations for all these programs I just mentioned to my colleagues. Let us get it through our heads. This is not an entitlement. This late in the budget process we should not be confusing entitlement with authorization, and for the gentleman

from the Committee on Rules, I was a little surprised that he would make that kind of mistake because he, above all, knows the difference between an entitlement and an authorization. This is an authorization of \$389 million and such sums thereafter, and I say to my colleague, "If you can turn that into \$7.2 billion, you can only do it one way because the legislation makes it very clear that we do not advocate any appropriation in the second, third, and fourth years unless we can satisfy the Appropriations Committee that this program is working, and then only to the extent that we can establish that it is working we ask them to appropriate funds." It is true, as the gentleman said, that it would be funded out of HUD and VA appropriations, but let us not think about this as some clever legislative trick. What we are creating here is a new independent agency, as we did when we created the Post Office and when we created a lot of other—

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, would my friend yield?

Mr. FORD of Michigan. And it is funded like all other independent agencies. I do not decide that, and my committee does not decide that. That is decided by the rules of the House, and it is just the way the cookie crumbled when it crumbled and where the crumbs fell.

Mr. Chairman, having referred to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], I am going to yield to him. I hope that he was here when I quoted General Schwarzkopf about his support for this.

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

Mr. FORD of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, let me say to my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], that I appreciate the position that he is taking, and I thank both him and the ranking member, and my good friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON], for accepting the amendment in committee which deals with drug testing in his bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that the committee incorporated my drug prevention language into the bill and appreciate Mr. GUNDERSON offering the amendment. I also would like to thank Mr. GOODLING and Chairman FORD for their support.

My amendment suspends eligibility in national service for any individual convicted of using and selling drugs. We will not bestow Federal benefits to individuals who refuse to stop using and selling illegal drugs.

It is not unreasonable to ask the participants in this program, who will be serving others in exchange for Federal benefits, to stay away from drugs. You cannot adequately provide a service to others when you are involved with illegal drugs.

This drug language is supported by an overwhelming majority in both Houses and I hope that the committee will work to make it part of the final bill.

Under the terms of this bill, national service participants, convicted of possession or sale of a controlled substance would have their eligibility in any National Service Program suspended for a certain period of time.

The bill provides that first-time offenders who enroll in a drug rehabilitation program will be allowed to continue in the National Service Program. Repeat offenders would be required to complete drug rehabilitation before they could regain their eligibility. In other words, it steers people with a drug problem into a rehabilitation program.

This language is both firm and fair. It is fundamentally designed to encourage people with a drug problem to get help.

It also sends the message to our young people that you will not receive the Federal benefits if you cannot abide by our laws. Young Americans must be responsible for their own actions before they sign up to serve others.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming the balance of my time, I have one more duty before I finish.

I think it should not go unnoticed that this is the most bipartisan presentation that has been on the floor in this Congress. There are people who say that we have snarled ourselves up so badly, up here, that we cannot work together. Now, it is true that some people said things on the floor about what was in the bill, and they believe it because this bill is a little bit different than what the administration proposed, and it is to the administration's, in my opinion, credit that they worked with both Democrats and Republicans, conservatives and liberals, to modify their original proposal to meet what we thought were the realities of the budget that we would be facing in the next few years, and nobody deserves more credit for that than the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON] of the Committee on Education and Labor and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] who is not a member of the committee, but if I could draft him, I certainly would, and also the new Member, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA] who is a member of the committee and spoke earlier today in favor of the legislation. They have all had suggestions, they have all been accommodated, and this truly is not something that a bipartisan group of people came forward to embrace. It is something that a bipartisan group of people worked on together.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that many other important issues that we have coming through our committee in this Congress can be approached in the same fashion, and it should be noted that there were people on the committee, on both sides of the aisle, who started out with severe reservations, and to the best of our ability we have met those, and the others we will meet when the amendments are offered. We are not yet operating under a rule on

the amendment process for this bill, which should be noted, and I know the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] will give me some points for this. I went to his committee and asked for an open rule so that no Member would be denied an opportunity to present any amendment that is permitted under the general rules of the House to this bill, and we will have, I am sure, a full and complete discussion of everybody's concerns when we get to the amendment process.

Mr. Chairman, I apologize to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for having to cut him off.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to announce my strong support for H.R. 2010. This bill will allow young people who participate in community service jobs to receive financial assistance for education. It will also provide educational awards in return for participation in approved national service programs, and will fund the President's season of service.

H.R. 2010 will establish the Corporation for National Service, which may be full-time or part-time—including summer program—will make grants to states public, private nonprofit organizations, elementary and secondary schools and institutions of higher education. This bill will not establish new Federal bureaucracy. National service projects will be operated by nongovernmental entities, existing Federal, State, and local agencies, and colleges. Some programs would include individuals with graduate and professional degrees to provide health or legal aid to the poor or teaching in inner city schools. The bill will also establish an urban youth corp program under which youth between 16 and 25 years of age would participate in year round public works, public housing, or transportation programs in urban areas.

National service is not just for the poor, it's for everyone, regardless of their social and economic background. The National Service Program is a wonderful trade-off, education aid in return for service that is both important to the participant and of lasting value to the community. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for H.R. 2010.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I enthusiastically rise in support of the National Service Trust Act. I commend President Clinton and his staff in drafting legislation which will enable Government, at all levels, to effectively join with the private sector to revitalize communities throughout America. I would like to take this opportunity to outline the reasons that I strongly endorse the National Service Program.

First and foremost, national service provides public service opportunities for our youth while also giving them the chance to pursue post-secondary education. The National Service Trust Act offers an educational award of \$5,000 to any student 17 years or older, regardless of income, who performs 1 year of full-time or 2 years of part-time service in a public service program designated by a State or by the Federal Government.

Second, the public service projects that will be conducted through the National Service Program will address unmet needs in many

communities. Four priority areas have been outlined in this legislation: education, environment, human services, and public safety.

Education: Through public service efforts, tutors, teachers' aides, and other volunteers will be extremely helpful in trying to lower our dropout rate through reading and other literacy programs, helping parents become involved in their children's education at all levels, especially through early childhood education. Early childhood education programs throughout this Nation do not have the number of staff necessary to provide individualized attention which is so important to preschool age children as they develop their cognitive skills.

Environment: A current program that will be enhanced through the new National Service Trust Act is the Conservation Corps. The Conservation Corps has played a key role in cleaning our rivers and preserving and protecting our landscapes. As we have all witnessed the destruction caused by the floods throughout the Mississippi Valley, this Nation's Conservation Corps has been assisting many communities. I would particularly like to express my appreciation to the Wisconsin Conservation Corps, which has been especially helpful to several western Wisconsin communities that have been devastated by the flood. Their activities have included sandbagging, moving furniture, and debris cleanup.

Public safety: Our police departments and schools are in desperate need of committed individuals who will assist in organizing crime prevention education and anticrime activities.

Human services: I believe human services programs, especially the health care field, will be enhanced through national service. There are currently over 2,000 health professional shortage areas in the United States; over half are rural communities. Participants in the National Service Program could be extremely useful in providing medical assistance to those underserved areas, especially emergency medical services.

A third reason I support national service is that it combines democratic idealism with republican philosophy. My rationale for this statement is based on the following: First, working for an educational benefit and not obtaining a free grant, second, this program is not a financial aid program, third, this initiative encourages diverse participation for both the participants and the designated projects, fourth, local programs are required to provide a 25-percent match of program costs, fifth, flexibility is allowed regarding minimum wage, sixth, offers people instead of dollars as the solution for problems, seventh, opportunity for personal growth and responsibility, eighth, builds upon current projects funded by the National Community Service Commission which has awarded 58 grants to over 200 colleges and universities, ninth, funding will be based on success of program—the first year is funded in the legislation and subsequent years include such sums for funding language, and tenth, the \$5,000 education award does not compete with the GI bill.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to not only support this bill, but to go back to their districts and work with local communities in developing national service projects and see how those projects can have a positive impact on communities. Leslie

Lenkowski, the president of the Hudson Institute, said in a May 19, 1993, letter that:

National Service makes government a partner, but not a lonely actor. National Service can point the way toward the proper role of government—not to solve our problems or even to try, but to make a limited investment in the people who will make the real difference.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2010, the National Service Trust Act. This is a bill that will benefit the nation on two levels; first by providing our young people with help to pay for college or to pay off college loans, and also by providing much needed services to and for the people of this country.

H.R. 2010 authorizes \$389 million in fiscal year 1994 and such sums as may be necessary in fiscal years 1995 and 1996 for a national service program that would provide educational awards in return for participation in approved national service programs. This includes programs that assist those who are in most need of help, or help to rebuild our cities or protect and preserve the environment.

In the 1980's, we watched our young college graduates flock to Wall Street in search of wealth and instant prosperity. At the same time, our youth growing up in urban areas watched as prosperity came to others through seemingly little effort, while opportunity seemed to slip further away from their reach until it was nowhere in sight. As a result, our youth have turned to the illegal sale of drugs and violence as a way to pass the time. Our urban youth saw the sale of drugs as their only means of achieving prosperity. Our country has produced a generation that seems to have fallen victim to the trappings of instant self-gratification and did not think twice about helping their neighbors. We have raised a generation that believes that those who cannot help themselves should not be helped at all.

The National Service Trust Act is an attempt to return to the notion that we are all in this together, that we cannot succeed as a nation if there are people starving on our front steps while we sit back and discuss finances with our accountants. We must return to the belief in helping ourselves succeed by aiding others in their attempts to succeed.

There are many people who wish to offer their volunteer services to others, but simply cannot financially afford to take a job that will not help them pay for school or help to pay off their college loans. This is particularly true of students of color who wish to give something back to their communities, but their financial obligations unfortunately outweigh their richness in spirit. National service can aid these students by providing them with \$5,000 in educational awards for 1 year of service.

At a time when the slow economic recovery has the potential to pit Americans against each other in the scramble for job security, I cannot think of a more effective way to unify this Nation than through national service. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this timely and progressive legislation.

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the National Service Trust Act of 1993. This bill will give more lower and middle income students the opportunity to gain a postsecondary education. This legislation expands the

Federal commitment to postsecondary education and at the same time addresses many unmet needs in our communities.

We have always prided ourselves on having one of the finest and most competitive university systems in the world. A look at current university enrollments confirms that the student population is representative of many different countries. Unfortunately, financial burdens have denied many American students of these educational opportunities provided in their own back yard.

As college costs rise and the trend toward using loans to pay these costs have risen in recent years, pursuing a higher education has become less attainable for many young people, particularly those from lower and middle income families who rely on loans and scholarships to pay for college. Many students are forced to work their way through college and often lose focus on their studies. I have heard from many of my constituents about their desire to pursue a postsecondary education, but financial limitations obstruct their aspirations.

It is imperative that we make higher education accessible and affordable for all Americans. Education provides our work force with the skills to prosper in the marketplace. We must break down the financial barriers that inhibit our progress in education. The National Service Trust Act is an investment in our communities and is a significant step in making postsecondary education a reality to all students.

This legislation benefits both students and communities, alike. Our Nation has many crucial needs that can be met by public service. The national service plan is an incentive to serve communities in a variety of ways including teaching children in Head Start programs, initiating recycling programs, helping the elderly and disabled with daily chores, and assisting the police with public safety.

Mr. Chairman, this plan will encourage young Americans to serve fellow citizens and play a pivotal role in rebuilding our country. In return, this initiative will enable many students to pursue a postsecondary education they otherwise would be denied. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Chairman, the National Service Trust Act of 1993 provides Congress with an opportunity to empower Americans to assist their communities, gain important skills, and earn money for higher education. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this innovative legislation.

The National Service Trust Act would enable participants to earn as much as \$10,000 for the college, university, technical training school, or vocational school of their choice. By fanning out into our Nation's communities to perform desperately needed services, participants will earn every penny of this educational award. It is money that every participant will feel very proud of having earned.

Many financially strapped localities have countless unmet needs. National service volunteers could meet some of these needs, thereby enhancing the quality of life within our Nation's communities. By performing tasks such as tutoring the illiterate, working in public health clinics, setting up community crime watch task forces, cleaning public parks and streets, renovating housing projects, and rais-

ing drug awareness, participants would make an invaluable contribution to our country.

Civic responsibility comes when people believe that taking responsibility is important and has an impact. The National Service Trust Act will show that it does. The National Service Trust Act would bring Americans from all social strata, and unite them in working toward a common goal—to better society and enrich the lives of others. The national service experience would leave an indelible and favorable mark on each participant.

The National Service Trust Act would harness the energy of the countless dedicated Americans and socially conscious organizations across the country. I urge my colleagues to support the National Service Trust Act.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. DELAURO) having assumed the chair, Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, 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. 2010) to amend the National and Community Service Act of 1990 to establish a Corporation for National Service, enhance opportunities for national service, and provide national service educational awards to persons participating in such service, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous matter, on H.R. 2010, National Service Trust Act of 1993, which we have just debated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DELAURO). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? There was no objection.

#### NATIONAL VETERANS GOLDEN AGE GAMES WEEK

Ms. BYRNE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 190) designating July 17 through July 23, 1993, as "National Veterans Golden Age Games Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

□ 1750

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DELAURO). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Virginia?

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I would simply like to inform the House that the minority has

no objection to the legislation now being considered, and I am rising in support of the legislation.

Madam Speaker, every year the Department of Veterans Affairs hosts the National Veterans Golden Age Games, a national multievent sports and recreational competition for veterans, age 55 and older, who are currently receiving medical care from a veterans medical center.

Previous games have been held in Georgia, Colorado, Indiana, Texas, Florida, and Michigan. This year the games will be held at the Veterans Medical Center at Mountain Home, TN, which is located in the congressional district of my colleague, JIM QUILLEN.

To commemorate this week-long competition, Representative QUILLEN has introduced House Joint Resolution 190, designating the week of July 17-23, 1993, as National Veterans Golden Age Games Week. Sports and recreation are integral components in veterans rehabilitative medicine and help improve the health and quality of life for older veterans. Veteran athletes from across the country will compete in events such as swimming, bicycling, tennis, bowling, and several other activities. Special wheelchair competitions will also be held.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to be a cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 190, and I support passage of this resolution.

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 190

Whereas from July 17, 1993, through July 23, 1993, the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center at Mountain Home, Tennessee, will host the seventh annual Veterans Golden Age Games;

Whereas the games are a national multi-event sports and recreational competition for veterans, age 55 and over, who are currently receiving medical care from the Department of Veterans Affairs;

Whereas sports and recreation are integral components in the rehabilitative medicine programs offered at Veterans Administration hospitals, and help improve the health and quality of life for older veterans;

Whereas veteran athletes from across the United States will compete in events and competitions at the games;

Whereas the National Veterans Golden Age Games Program serves as a showcase for the prevention and therapeutic medical value that sports and recreation provide in the lives of all older Americans; and

Whereas the games provide further recognition of the valiant service given to the Nation by its veterans: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That July 17 through July 23, 1993, is designated as "National Veterans Golden Age Games Week", and the President is authorized and requested to

issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL FORMER PRISONER OF WAR RECOGNITION DAY

Ms. BYRNE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate Joint Resolution (S.J. Res. 54) designating April 9, 1993, and April 9, 1994, as "National Former Prisoner of War Recognition Day," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to commend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. APPELEGATE], who is the chief sponsor of this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of Senate Joint Resolution 54 designating April 9, 1994, as "National Former Prisoner of War Recognition Day." This resolution is identical to House Joint Resolution 6, which I am pleased to cosponsor in the House. I would like to commend my distinguished colleague from Ohio [Mr. APPELEGATE] for his tireless efforts to honor those who were held as prisoners of war and resolve the fate of American servicemen currently held as captives of war in hostile nations.

As we honor our former prisoners of war, let us bear in mind that there is a great deal of evidence that the governments of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia hold information which could resolve the status of many Americans who are still unaccounted for. Despite the difficulties involved, we are deeply committed to resolving the POW-MIA issue. This issue is a humanitarian matter of such great importance that it is difficult to understand why some governments continue to stonewall our Nation. For this reason, I continue to oppose the normalization of relations with Vietnam, and I oppose the granting of additional IMF loans to Vietnam as well.

By supporting Senate Joint Resolution 54, we will be taking an important step to honor Americans who have served in the Armed Forces, particularly those who were formally held as prisoners of war, as well as those who may still be held in captivity.

Let us observe April 9 as a day to commemorate the courage and determination of these brave Americans in upholding the principles of freedom and democracy.

Accordingly, Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], who is the ranking member of our Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Speaker, I certainly thank the ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, with whom I had the privilege of serving for so many years on that committee. The gentleman from New York has also served for many, many years, I think every year I have been here for 15 years, as a member of the Task Force on POW-MIA issues.

The gentleman has been the chairman of that task force, and I have served in that capacity myself. I want to commend him, and I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. APPELEGATE], who has also served in that capacity, for bringing this resolution before us.

It has always been American foreign policy never, never to forget our POW's and MIA's and to always pursue the final accounting for each and every one of them. As a matter of fact, we are still pursuing these matters even back to the Korean war. As the gentleman knows, just the other day the People's Republic of North Korea finally accounted for some additional remains of some soldiers from that period of time. We will never forget them, and again I just want to commend the gentleman for all he has done. I notice the bracelet he is wearing, and I commend him for his efforts.

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for his continuing efforts on behalf of our POW's and MIA's. Yes, I served with the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] when he chaired our task force on MIA's and POW's as part of our work in the Committee on Foreign Affairs. He is always there when we need help for our veterans, and I thank him for his service on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this joint resolution.

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 54

Whereas the United States has fought in many wars;

Whereas thousands of members of the Armed Forces of the United States who served in such wars were captured by the enemy and held as prisoners of war;

Whereas many such prisoners of war were subjected to brutal and inhumane treatment by their captors in violation of international

coders and customs for the treatment of prisoners of war and died, or were disabled, as a result of such treatment; and

Whereas the great sacrifices of such prisoners of war and their families deserve national recognition: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That April 9, 1993, and April 9, 1994, is designated as "National Former Prisoner of War Recognition Day" in honor of the members of the Armed Forces of the United States who have been held as prisoners of war, and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to commemorate such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. BYRNE

Ms. BYRNE. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. BYRNE: page 2, line 3, strike "April 9, 1993, and".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Virginia [Ms. BYRNE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

TITLE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. BYRNE

Ms. BYRNE. Madam Speaker, I offer an amendment to the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Title amendment offered by Ms. BYRNE: Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution designating April 9, 1994, as 'National Former Prisoner of War Recognition Day'".

The title amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BYRNE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the joint resolutions just considered and passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

#### CONCERNS OF A CONSTITUENT

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

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of rhetoric from my colleagues on the other side trying to defend the largest tax increase in the history of the world. It is time to listen to the constituents we represent.

I got a letter recently from Spike Yoh, the chief executive officer of Day & Zimmerman, one of the Nation's largest engineering firms.

I quote from his letter to me:

Orders were starting well this year, but they have now been put on hold while clients

have taken a wait-and-see attitude about the impact of the President's economic plan and the soon-to-be-announced health care program. Those of you in the Congress may not be aware of the breaking effect that these two huge unknowns are having on the willingness of business leaders to commit to investment right now. Capital projects in the private sector have all but stopped. Expansion, improvement and modernization projects seen as essential to keeping American business competitive in world-class markets have been shelved.

He goes on to say:

The simple truth is that jobs are not created through the transfer of capital from the private sector to the public sector.

He goes on to say:

Let us not follow the lead of New Jersey, which is now suffering.

He goes on to say:

History has repeatedly proven that economic growth is not fueled by higher taxes.

I say to my colleagues, let us listen to the people of America. Let us vote down the Clinton economic tax plan.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the letter to which I referred:

DAY & ZIMMERMANN, INC.,  
Radnor, PA, May 27, 1993.

Hon. CURTIS WELDON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WELDON: As you prepare to vote on President Clinton's tax package, I thought it worthwhile to give you a view from the marketplace to help inform your decision process on a yes or no vote for the package as presented.

By the way of background, Day & Zimmermann is a 93 year old company headquartered in southeastern Pennsylvania with a substantial proportion of its 12,000 worldwide employee population located here in the Delaware Valley.

During our long history of growth, we have weathered economic cycles well, except for the great depression, through aggressive management and diversification. This year, however, is presenting a different picture. It started well, with new business orders continuing to come in. But these orders have been put on hold while clients have taken a wait and see attitude about the impact of the President's economic plan and the soon-to-be-announced health care program.

Those of you in the congress may not be aware of the braking effect that these two huge unknowns are having on the willingness of business leaders to commit to investment right now. Capital projects in the private sector have all but stopped. Expansion, improvement and modernization projects seen as essential to keeping American business competitive in world-class markets have been shelved.

As a consequence, and in spite of our diversification, Day & Zimmermann is in the unfamiliar and uncomfortable position of having to let employees go, across a broad range of specialties.

If the tax program as presently stated is passed, it will cost more jobs in the Delaware Valley. The simple truth is that jobs are not created through the transfer of capital from the private sector to the public sector. We have proven that locally with the end of economic growth in Pennsylvania with the enactment of the billion dollar tax increase of '92, and in New Jersey with its now second highest unemployment rate in the country

and loss of 400,000 jobs after passing its largest tax increase in history.

As important an issue as the deficit is, I do not believe that it can be improved by crippling the private sector. History has repeatedly proven that economic growth is not fueled by higher taxes.

In the best interests of the people of the Delaware Valley—and of our country as a whole—I ask you to vote no on the Clinton tax bill.

Sincerely,

SPIKE.

#### VACATION OF SPECIAL ORDER AND INSTITUTING NEW SPECIAL ORDER

Ms. BYRNE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to change the 60-minute special order of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TOWNS] for July 13, 1993, and substituting therefor a 50-minute special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DELAURO). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

#### VACATION OF SPECIAL ORDER

Ms. BYRNE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the 60-minute special order on December 5, 1993, for the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

#### ECONOMY MUST GROW

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

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, I have had some things on my mind for some time, and each day it seems I am reminded of this and the theme is strengthened.

Today's Washington Post discusses Mr. James Hudson, the man who worked at the Lincoln Memorial for the National Park Service and who was paid \$29,000 a year. It turns out he worked for 8 years but was still considered a temporary worker, and therefore had no benefits of any kind. He was a good worker. He passed away due to a heart attack which he sustained during the heat spell, and leaves behind, I understand, a wife and seven children.

That was troubling to me, to think that we have an individual in this country in that sort of a situation.

I have also been carrying around a Sacramento Bee story which discusses, oddly enough, hunger in California. Their statistics indicate that 1 in 9 Californians does not have enough food every month, that the Golden State has fallen on hard times. We have the longest economic depression in California since the Great Depression of the 1930's.

This article contains a story about another couple which I would like to just briefly share. Theran and Karen Norman of the Silicon Valley once had a combined income of \$80,000. Now they drive to and from the San Jose homeless shelter in a 1929 Mercedes Benz they are desperate to sell. Their six grown and teenage children are living with others, and one day last month their world consisted of the car, \$3 in cash, and a half a tank of gas.

"We haven't told anyone in our family where we are at," Karen Norman said. "We are in shock." Last year the couple were both employed, but had little savings. Then Theran Norman's job went overseas, along with 1,500 others, when Atari Corp. sold to a Taiwanese company last year. Karen Norman, who made software for a computer programming company, was laid off in May.

Such stories are becoming more common throughout California where the recession continues to devastate businesses and lives, pushing welfare rolls and other measures of hunger to record levels.

I have received a couple of letters from my own constituents which at this point I think time does not permit me to read, but I shall read portions of them in the future. But basically they are in a similar vein.

Then I read in the July 12 issue of Fortune magazine, in fact, I am having a graph reproduced for future discussion before the House, but in the July 12 issue of Fortune, which I think is the current issue, they make this statement: "For workers, from Wall Street to Main Street, real compensation, including benefits and bonuses, but not options, fell 1.5 percent over the past two decades."

I have a graph of this, but I will just explain it because I do not believe people can see it. But this graph shows that, say, from 1950 through 1970, real compensation per worker, so that is adjusting for inflation, real compensation per worker increased from \$14,000 to \$24,000. From 1970 to where we are today, 1993, it has actually slightly decreased.

Now, what is the implication of that for our future as Americans? The implication is not good, to say the least.

A couple of years ago, August 12, 1991, Fortune magazine, they have an article on retirement, "How Safe Is Your Nest Egg," and related articles.

It makes the startling statement in there that today's baby boom generation, when they retire, will have one-half the real wealth that their parents had accumulated.

Madam Speaker, the reasons for this are clear: Our economy has been growing at a much lower rate. Even considering the relatively good years of the 1980's, the rate began to slow down in the middle 1970's, and we have never recovered from that.

The slow growth, I believe, is due to the interaction of the high deficit, the

high debt, and the annual deficit that produced it, and perhaps as important, if not more important, the amount of regulation. These two factors are sapping the economy of its vitality.

Today we heard in 1-minute is the Cost of Government Day, meaning today, by July 13, every dollar you earn from now to the end of the year is your own, and every dollar earned from January 1 until today is a dollar you owe the Government.

This is outrageous, Madam Speaker. We must do Americans a favor, whether they are liberals or conservatives, Republicans or Democrats or Independents. It is our job to make this economy grow, to cut the spending, to cut the taxes, to help the families stimulate the economy, and get us back on track, recognizing, as President Kennedy said, that a rising tide lifts all boats.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER] be allowed to precede me in the order of special orders.

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

There was no objection.

#### TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE EUGENE A. CHAPPIE

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

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, today my colleagues and I have asked for this special order to pay tribute to a former Congressman, Gene Chappie of northern California, who passed away this past year.

Gene Chappie, or Gino, as his friends called him, served in this body from 1980 to 1986, and was my predecessor representing California's Second Congressional District.

His three terms in the Congress capped a remarkable 40-year career in public service.

Gene served in the Pacific with the Army in World War II, and also in the Korean war. He won his first election in 1950, to fill an unexpired term on the board of supervisors of El Dorado County. He served on the board for 14 years, and as a result, he had a keen understanding of the problems facing local governments.

In 1964, Gene was elected to the State assembly, where he spent 16 years representing many of northern California's rural counties. His years in the legislature included the period when Ronald Reagan was Governor, and Gene forged a lasting friendship with the Governor that continued when Gene was elected to the Congress and

President Reagan was in the White House.

In 1980, Gene ran for Congress, and after a vigorous campaign in a sprawling 12-county district, he defeated the dean of the California delegation, who was also chairman of the Public Works Committee.

As he had done in the legislature, Gene fought tirelessly for rural communities whose economies depended on agriculture and timber.

Gene retired from the House in 1987 because he said he "didn't want to be like some of the old codgers who leave Congress only when they're taken out on a stretcher." However, in 1989 he was brought out of retirement by Gov. George Deukmejian, who appointed him to a vacancy on the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors. It was fitting that his career came full circle back to local government in his home county.

Gene was known as an able legislator who could get things done. However, Gene was never one to take himself or anyone else too seriously.

One of my greatest regrets is that I never had the opportunity to enjoy the camaraderie of serving with Gene. He had a keen sense of humor, and he loved practical jokes. He set a tough standard for me to measure up to.

I succeeded him in the State assembly, and when he left the Congress, I again followed in his footsteps in the House. He was a tireless campaigner, and he managed to visit every corner of his district frequently. That was quite an achievement, since his district was larger than 10 States of the Union. Even though he served in elected office for more than 40 years, he remained a man of the people. When I was a freshman here in the House it never ceased to amaze me how everyone knew and loved Gene Chappie.

That included the Capitol Police, the maintenance people, and the elevator operators, and other service people who Gene befriended. He kept them laughing with jokes and stories, and he remains one of their favorite Members even to this day.

I might point out that this was characteristic of Gene, and it tells us what kind of man he was, because none of these people lived in his district or could vote for him. These were people he appreciated, because they were the people who do so much of the work around here. They loved him, and I know they miss him a great deal.

Gene was a great supporter of mine in all of my campaigns, and I learned a great deal from him. He gave me valuable advice on dealing with people and with particular communities in the districts we represented. He helped me learn things that you wouldn't really have discovered until you had served for a few years.

Gene's experience greatly benefited the people of northern California not only when he was serving them himself, but as well through those who

came after him, who had his advice and support. Gene was always someone who was there to help and that will always be remembered with our sincere gratitude.

There were many times I enjoyed listening to the colorful stories that only Gene Chappie could tell. They were truly unique.

Whether it was in a small group or before a large crowd, he could really say it like it was. He could joke about it, see the humor in it, and have fun with it in a way that we could only describe today, quite frankly, as politically incorrect. But, in being politically incorrect, he brought people together to laugh at themselves and at the ridiculous situations we can create.

□ 1800

Madam Speaker, I yield to a colleague of his who was elected at the same time that Gene Chappie was, in 1980, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

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

I would like to congratulate the gentleman for taking out the time on this special order. As I was walking over here thinking about what I was going to say about Gene Chappie, I was just having an exchange with my friend, the gentleman from Rockland, CA [Mr. DOOLITTLE], who is now walking out of the Chamber because he is probably nervous about what I might say about Gene Chappie, I was struck by the fact that there is so many things that I could say which cannot be said here on the floor of the Congress.

The gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER] very nicely referred to the fact that Gene Chappie kept everyone laughing with his jokes, but he was so much of a diplomat in his statement that he did not say that many of those jokes are, quite frankly, very off-color. And I will say that he had Members on both sides of the aisle laughing regularly.

He had, yes, the elevator operators, Robbie, the officer who stands right outside the corner of Independence and New Jersey, people all over this Capitol in stitches.

The point that comes home to me on this issue, Madam Speaker, is the fact that Gene Chappie was a caring person who enjoyed seeing people happy, and that is why he would go to a great deal of effort to ensure that that story, which he could only tell in his inimitable way, came through loudly and clearly.

I will say that he was a very caring person. I found that out on many occasions.

I had the privilege of being elected with him in 1980. We came in, and the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER] reminded me that we, Gene Chappie and I, were among the 33 Re-

publican Members who unseated entrenched Democrat Members of the House of Representatives. Gene Chappie unseated the chairman of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, Mr. Johnson. And he campaigned by riding in his Jeep, starting in Cool, CA, his home, all over that large district to which the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER] referred. And he had all kinds of great stories that he used to tell about those campaign experiences.

But he had a grassroots organization that really was built from the ground up. He did it, obviously, in his other campaigns for county supervisor and as a member of the State legislature.

I was reminded, when we recently planted a tree here, our friend, the gentleman from Redlands, CA, Mr. LEWIS, talked about the fact that Gene Chappie had been chairman of the rules committee in the assembly when the Republicans were in the majority in 1970. And that, of course, made him one of the most influential people in the entire State of California. So he had that leadership position. He very much wanted to see this House of Representatives go into Republican hands. He and I talked many times about the fact that we were going to see a majority, and I remember one of the last things that he said to me, when he made his decision to retire in 1985, was that he said, "DAVID, you are going to have a chance to see a Republican majority in that House."

And I will say that, as I see my friend, the gentleman from Glens Falls, NY [Mr. SOLOMON], and the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE], and the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER] and others who desperately want to see that happen, I want Gino to know that we are still struggling with hope that we will soon have a Republican majority in the House. But quite frankly, we all know it has not happened yet.

So I stay here because I enjoy this work, and there are other reasons. One of those is I often think about how Gene Chappie said to me, as he decided to retire from this institution in 1986, that we are going to see a Republican majority.

One of the little instances that comes to mind, he would go around this Capitol doing all kinds of wild and slightly irreverent things. One day I was going to his office, which was in the penthouse of the Longworth Building, and he never chose to move from that office, as I recall. He moved into that office in his first term and stayed there throughout his entire tenure here.

But on his birthday, several members of his staff got a little pig and put it in his office. And he came in for his birthday, and this pig was running all over his office. And that created a bit of havoc as members of the media and constituents came in to visit him. But

he also took his work here very seriously. Even though he was one of the most lighthearted people you could possibly have serving in this institution, he was very committed to the outdoors.

He represented that massive district, which I guess is shared by the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] and the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER], and I do not know who else has parts of that original district that Chappie represented now. But Gene was clearly a man of the people and the Earth, and he was regularly enjoying it.

I deeply regret the fact that I never seized the opportunity to visit Nancy and Gino, when they were regularly extending invitations for me to come up to northern California and visit them. It is one of the regrets I will always carry with me that I did not get a chance to go up and visit.

I saw pictures, and I heard great stories about it. I want to say that I love the gentleman from California [WALLY HERGER], but there was a real void created when Gene Chappie left this place.

□ 1810

I have missed him ever since, and was very saddened a year ago when I heard of his passing. I am glad that we are able to rejoice in the great life that he had here and in California. I was glad that we were able to plant that tree out here on The Mall a few weeks ago.

I was bugging WALLY HERGER on a regular basis over the past year, saying, "Why can't we take time to talk about this great life of Gene Chappie," and I am happy that we are finally able to be here tonight doing that.

I wish well to all the members of his family, and I want him to know, I want all of the members of his family, to know that I greatly, greatly miss their father and husband, who was an inspiration and a source of much fulfillment and entertainment for many of us here.

I thank my friend for yielding to me.

Mr. HERGER. I thank the gentleman very much for his comments, and sharing some of his experience with our good friend, Gene Chappie.

I would like to recognize another gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE], an individual who was elected to the California State Senate at the same time that Mr. Chappie was elected to Congress. As a matter of fact, all three of us were running in portions of Congressman Chappie's district. I had the assembly seat that he left.

I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE].

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I am certainly pleased to be here to participate in this special order.

I first saw Gene Chappie when I worked at the legislature as a staff member. As Mr. HERGER alluded to, we did not serve in elective office in the

legislature at the same time, because I was elected in 1980, just as he was moving on to Congress.

Gene Chappie, like B.T. Collins, whom we talked about on the floor here a while ago, was another one of those individuals who would be properly characterized as a living legend. He was a legend right there in the California Legislature. Everybody knew Gene Chappie and knew about Gene Chappie and knew his traits and so forth, as some of the stories that we have heard others tell.

The story I remember, and I cannot even remember what was said, but my first encounter with Gene Chappie was a wisecrack made in a crowded elevator as he was going down. The doors closed, and I do not remember exactly what the words were, but it was funny. He was a funny man. He really could have served, I think, in the entertainment business and earned a good living at it. He was very natural, very down-to-earth. People responded to him. He was a warm human being.

My first memory of Gene Chappie as an elected official was when he was in Congress and I was in the State senate. We both represented the County of Siskiyou, in the far north of California. Every year there is a parade, and this year, which I guess would have been, I do not know, 1985, something like that, or 1986, maybe, we were both up there for the parade. It was a very short parade, just two blocks long, because Etna is not a very big town, but it is the only time I have ever ridden an elephant. I remember standing there with Gene Chappie, both of us, and Gene Chappie, I thought to myself, "My word, here is a man that has held elective office for," in fact the gentleman may have read it in the record, I do not know how long, but probably at least 20 years or longer, in different capacities.

Mr. HERGER. A total of 40.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. A total of 40 years, I think the gentleman; a very extensive career.

I thought, "Here he is, at his station in life, he is still out there on the hustings." He climbed up on that elephant. In fact, he went before I did, as I recall. Riding an elephant is no big deal, I suppose, but it is an unusual experience. When you are on an elephant, your feet are about 8 feet off the ground. It is quite a high animal.

One of the things you think about when you are on top of it is that you kind of hope that you do not fall off. They had a little seat for you there. Gene, I remember, before the ride and afterwards, we were sort of waiting in a place while the next event was to occur. He was wisecracking about the things one has to, you know, put up with in public office. He did it cheerfully, and it is just a memory that will always stick with me in my mind. It was sort of a special memory I have of Gene Chappie, for someone who has now passed on.

The last time Gene and I actually interacted in a public place was at the debate in Placerville in 1990. He had been appointed by Governor Deukmejian to fill out the balance of the term on the board of supervisors, and I guess the board of supervisors is where he started, there in El Dorado County. This was, of course, 1990 was a very difficult time in California. That was the harbinger of 1992. We had just had the budget summit agreement, and at that time, I did not necessarily attribute it to that, but in retrospect, I think people were not in a very happy mood in that election, in our part of the State particularly. The recession had taken effect and people were very much not at rest with incumbent elected officials.

I remember the packed room, and once again, I thought to myself, "Here is a man, a truly distinguished public servant, who has had a long career and done many things for the benefit of his constituency, and no slack was cut Gene Chappie. He had an opponent that ran against him, never held public office, and Gene was having to defend votes he cast in Congress. This was, of course, a race for county supervisor.

The man had a lot of character. He was a tough man. He was up there, fielded all the questions, and stayed the course through the election. I always admired Gene Chappie. What you saw was what you got. He spoke plainly, and people respected that, particularly the people that worked around any of the places where he might have been: The legislature, the House of Representatives, in the county of El Dorado, the people that one could go by and not notice if one were inclined to do that, but Gene Chappie always noticed them, always took an effort to inquire about them, to let them know that he cared about them. I think people sensed a very special rapport with him.

When I think of Gene Chappie, I think of the Jeep. The two go hand-in-hand. That was one of his trademarks, so to speak. I remember him telling stories about the problems he had with the Jeep here in Washington, DC, in terms of it being stolen, or perhaps vandalized, but that was something he always had was a Jeep.

I understand that it was not just for show. He would go and run this in the races that they would have with off-road vehicles, one in particular every year that he would participate in, at least one that I know of.

Gene would shock people. Sometimes they would go into his office and they would find something nailed to the wall. They were not sure what it was. It was a dried cow pie. He was just a character. He liked to shock people, in that sort of a sense.

He was a good, loyal American, a good Republican. He was a man who had, I think, quite a profound under-

standing both of government and of politics, and insight into people's needs. He truly was beloved of the people, and we could see that, certainly, at his funeral service.

Everywhere he went, even today, those who know Gene Chappie would mention his name and a smile comes to their face as they remember him.

It was my pleasure to know Gene. We were not close friends, just because of the way our careers were situated. We did not have that much opportunity to interact, but I always paid attention to him, because I always felt I was dealing with someone who was just a little bit larger than life. I think that is how he would be remembered.

It is certainly my pleasure today to join in the special order to commemorate his life, his career.

□ 1820

Mr. HERGER. I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] for sharing some great experiences of our former colleague and good friend, Gene Chappie.

At this time I yield to the gentleman from New York who served with Congressman Chappie for 6 years, Mr. SOLOMON.

Mr. SOLOMON. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I hesitate to speak at this time because there are so many Californians here who genuinely loved and respected Gene Chappie. But I just want you to know that it is not just a California affair. Just as Governor Deukmajian, former Governor of California, had such respect for Gene Chappie, and, incidentally, Governor Deukmajian was from upstate New York from near my home, a very fine gentleman indeed, but those of us on both sides of the aisle had such great respect for Gene. I did for a number of reasons.

But I used to look up at his name up there under the "C's" and you would see a red light over next to SOLOMON's name, and a red light over next to Chappie's name, and I would say to my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER], I noticed you are following right in the same vein with lots of red lights. And it reminded me of Gene Chappie's philosophy somewhat, because I used to sit right back there in that Cloakroom with him, and he would have a cigar, or the stub of a cigar in his hand, but you never saw it lit. But he always had that cigar in his hand, and I would think of his philosophy because of all of those red lights. And I would remember what was Abraham Lincoln's philosophy, and Abe Lincoln used to say we should only provide those services to the people that the people cannot provide for themselves. In other words, small government. He came from, I guess, a philosophy of people like myself that served in local governments, went on to the State government, and finally came to

the Congress. But they knew what mandates were on private industry, they knew what mandates were on school districts, what they were on local governments, and that is why you saw so many red lights up there.

But without taking up too much of the time, because I know you have other speakers, I just want to say that Gene Chappie did have a great sense of humor and, yes, the policemen and the elevator operators loved him. But so did we.

Some of us tend to, I think, take ourselves too seriously at times, and I can recall being very serious, and storming off the floor, and going back into the Cloakroom. And there would be Gene, sitting there, and he would tap you on the shoulder, and he would tell you a little funny story, and it kind of lightened things up. And he was one of the reasons why some of us have not gotten ulcers around here, I guess, in all of these years.

But Gene was only here for 6 years. It seems like a lot longer than that. He was just a great man, a great human being, and a great American, and I appreciate the gentleman taking the time for this special order to honor this type of an individual.

Mr. HERGER. I thank the gentleman from New York for sharing that with us. As he alluded to, Gene Chappie did vote no a lot, and I think it was for the reasons you mentioned.

I can remember Gene sharing with me the story of his parents who came over from Italy, and his growing up on a small farm up in cool California in the El Dorado County up in the foothills above Sacramento, and his working. I remember him indicating how proud he was as an immigrant whose parents had emigrated here that he was able to be elected to office, again, first as a member of the board of supervisors, then to the State legislature. And it was always his dream, I believe, to have the opportunity someday perhaps as the son of an Italian immigrant to be able to serve in the Congress of the United States. And certainly he was able to achieve that and did so very well in that capacity.

I would now like to yield to another gentleman from California who served with Congressman Chappie, Mr. LEHMAN.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague, WALLY HERGER, and appreciate very much his doing this this evening. I was in my office, frankly, doing some work with the television on, tuned to the House floor and saw that this was happening, and I just felt compelled to come down here, unprepared as I am, just for a few brief moments to speak about my friend, Gene Chappie.

I met Gene Chappie when I went to the California legislature in 1976, and I can say without fear of contradiction

that he was one of the best friends I had there in the legislature. I am a Democrat. He was a Republican. But those things did not matter that much. We sat together on committees as Democrats and Republicans together, and I served on the Agriculture Committee together with him, and we served on the Water Committee together, and we generally shared the same interests.

I will never forget the man, Gene Chappie. There was a lot of talk there tonight about Gene Chappie being a Republican, but I remember him primarily as a man, and a real man in the strongest sense of the word, who believed above all in honesty and in keeping your word. And in fact, one of my fondest memories of a lesson in the assembly was one time—and I know my colleague, Congressman LEWIS who is here was there in those days and shares many of these memories with me as well—but I will never forget there was a very important vote on the Republican side of the aisle on leadership. And a freshman Republican, I guess, had voted against the way he had professed he would vote on that matter. And a few days later on the floor of the assembly there was a crucial vote in which this Republican member had a bill up, and Geno, as we used to call him, was up in his office listening to his squawk box, he heard the vote was up and it was tied on the House floor. He walked down to the floor late that night, and they lifted the call, and he cast his vote against the Republican. And I will never forget the Republican coming over to Geno and he said, "Well, why did you do that?" And Gene said, "My friend," and his cigar was in his mouth, "one thing you got to learn around here is how to keep your word." And he taught lessons like that to people on both sides of the aisle at all times.

Again, some of my fondest memories of Gene were in the social settings that we got together with him in Sacramento. Often on these late night sessions, as we invariably had, we would find ourselves finding our way to Gene's office late at night where we would all sit around, Republicans and Democrats together, talking about what was going on on the floor, and sharing stories, and maybe easing some of the pain and also the tensions that we had in those days. And Gene was a great one at helping people to relieve tension. Again, I do not think he cared so much about where you stood, but that you stood for something, and that you came from someplace solid inside of you when you made those decisions, because he certainly did.

Also I remember every year he used to sponsor a bus trip that we would take up to the Auburn Dam site, and he would get all of the Members who wanted to go to ride up there in that bus with him to take a look at that big

hole in the ground that was sitting there. And we would circumnavigate the dam site, and then hear Gene's perspective on things, and then we would go to a nice restaurant up in Gene's district for the rest of the evening.

He was dearly loved by everybody in the legislature, and I know is as greatly missed out there as he is back here. He brought the same type of character to this House, the same type of commitment to the people that he represented, and the same type of friendship with anyone who would look him in the eye. And I am just proud to have spent some time with him, and to have known him, and to have considered him a dear friend of mine, a person who I will miss very much, and a person who I can honestly say taught me some things just watching the way that he operated, the way he represented his people, the way he stood up for his beliefs, and the great sense of humor that he used in going about the very serious business of life that always made it much easier for everyone.

He was a man who loved the Earth, who loved the outdoors, who was, as was mentioned earlier, someone who really loved to go around in Jeeps and other vehicles in the mountains, and had a real sensitivity towards the area that he represented, and a real relationship on a human level with all of the people he represented, Democrats and Republicans. He was a true man of that district, and a true Californian in the great historical sense of great men in our State.

I loved him very much, and like the rest of the people speaking tonight, I am going to miss you, Gino.

Mr. HERGER. I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. LEHMAN] for sharing those memories of our good friend, Gene Chappie. There is a point that comes across with each of our colleagues who are sharing time this evening, and that is the friend that Gene Chappie was to everyone. I mentioned earlier about the friend he was not just to people in his district, but to the elevator operators and to the police, to those people who worked around us here. But he was a friend to everyone.

I remember very vaguely when I was running the first time again, Gene Chappie, who had served 16 years in the State Assembly, was running against a 22-year incumbent in 1986. Nineteen eighty-six was not a particularly good year for a Republican running against a Democrat, but yet Gene Chappie was doing so. And with an incredibly tough race that he had, an incredibly tough challenge, Gene Chappie was still there to work with me when I was running for my first elective office, to help me know the lay of the land, to help me know the different elected officials in the different counties, the different individuals that it would be important he felt for me to meet, and the different little pointers that I should know.

□ 1830

And again Gene did not have to do this. He could very well have spent all the money working on a very tough campaign of his own, but again, another example of Gene Chappie's being a friend to everyone.

And, Madam Speaker, I yield to another longtime friend of Gene Chappie's, who served with him many years in the State legislature, served with him here for 6 years and shared a very close relationship with him, and also someone who had been working together with us on this Gene Chappie memory time.

Madam Speaker, that is the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER] for taking this special order and giving us an opportunity to express our feelings for our good friend.

I suppose I have never experienced a time in my life when it was more difficult for me to talk about a friend than it has been to talk about Gene Chappie since the moment of his death, at the memorial service we had here several months ago, and this evening as well.

I was thinking as I sat here looking at our Speaker, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. ESHOO], who I do not believe had the opportunity to serve specifically with Gene, and I am not really certain how well she knew him, but I can tell you this, the more you knew him, the more you loved him.

He in turn would, without any question, go beyond providing lessons for all of us, would have in a very real way shown his own affection and his friendship to you and yours.

Gene Chappie: I remember at the memorial service that we had here, where I was reminded of that etching on one of our great buildings in the State capitol in which it is said, "Bring me men to match my mountains."

On that occasion, I mentioned that of all the people I had ever known, surely Gene Chappie was one for whom that statement was meant.

Beyond that, there is an old commentary about "the most unusual character I have ever met." That comment, if it fits anybody, it fits my friend Gino Chappie, a very, very unique individual. They call him "the gentleman from Cool," Cool, CA, a community that got its name because Gene plucked that name out of the air, enjoying the cool atmosphere of his district and at the same time, making fun of the society that talked a lot about cool in those days.

Gene had a most unusual sense and understanding of people, the people of California, especially the people of the gold country that he represented for so long. He cared about every human being who took the time to get to

know him or where he had the chance to get to know about that individual and his or her individual problems.

Mr. HERGER. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON].

Mr. DIXON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I think that is an appropriate time at this time: Gino was a person that I got to know very well, basically because he got to know me very well. I had the privilege, like many of the members of the delegation, of serving with him in the assembly and then in the House of Representatives.

He was a very partisan person, but he also always understood the issue, most importantly, and he also understood the other side of the issue and always respected other people's views.

I also had the pleasure of traveling with Gino on several occasions, and one of the things that other Members have talked about was his great sense of humor. He had good insight and good chemistry while watching people.

I can recall on a codel that the California delegation took to Japan, he delighted in walking into a restaurant with my wife, while Nancy and I would wait outside for a minute, because he wanted to see the Japanese reaction to this white man walking in with what appeared to be his black wife.

I also recall once, that I loaned Gino a camera that had film in it from a codel that I chaired while in Grenada. He was kind enough to not only develop that film for me, but he put captions about all the Members of Congress who were on that codel, and what he thought they were doing at the time.

I do not think that we can really sum up the life of Gino Chappie, because he is somebody that will live on in legend, in the State legislature, for his many novel approaches to legislative issues; yes, his practical jokes from time to time; and here in the Congress he was a fighter for his district and a fighter for his cause, but he was always willing to listen and understand the other side.

I recall one day when I was at home on a Saturday afternoon that he had only been married a short time to Nancy, and I was walking down the street and I saw Gino and Nancy together. Gino was taking a sensitivity seminar that happened to be housed in the recreation room of the apartment building where I lived. After that he came up and shared some wine with us. In fact, he expressed that Nancy opened his eyes to many things that he had not appreciated before. I think that was the essence of Chappie, that he was willing to listen and always had his antenna positioned to be receptive, not only to other people's thoughts and to respect them, but he was receptive to new ideas.

So, his life, I think, is one that we will remember for the sense of humor,

the sense of being receptive to others, and we shall always remember that he was truly a gentleman.

I thank the gentleman for yielding. Mr. LEWIS of California. I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

Gene Chappie, known by his friends across the State of California and the country, not so much as a Republican or Democrat, but a human being who really did care about our business, which is public affairs.

I cannot help but recall when I first got to know Gino. He came into real power in the State legislature just at the end of the Jess Unruh era, when, for a very, very, short period of time, Republicans actually controlled the State assembly.

My speaker, Robert T. Monagan, Bob Monagan had to look very carefully and think carefully about who would be his right hand.

The chairman of the committee on rules in the State legislature is certainly the third most significant position—the Governor, the speaker, and then the rules committee chairman—in the assembly, the third most powerful, important position in our Government in the State.

A lot of people do not realize that. He turned, to fill that spot, to the gentleman from Cool, and not lightly, because he had dealt with Gene Chappie through many a battle over a number of years. He needed an intelligent, talented, experienced, and just as important, even-handed individual. Gene Chappie fit the mold of the perfect rules committee chairman.

You have got to be tough with members of elected office when you are responsible for handing out all the assets or the prerequisites of our office, the number of staff, where you park your car, any number of things. But when you are adding or subtracting from one individual member, Democrat or Republican's office, staffs, the amount of paper he has, that can be a real battleground. He needs somebody who can deal with people on a straightforward basis and have them know that he is going to be fair.

Gene was phenomenal in that respect. He could be tough as the world, but no small part of that responsibility was dealing with not just the personalities of elected officialdom, but the people who make up the legislature, the staff, professional staff, and the like.

Gene was loved by virtually all of them, on the Democrat as well as the Republican side of the aisle. He made a difference because he cared about their personal lives as well as their professional work.

Gene believed very much in Government. First, he believed we should not have any more of it than we absolutely have to have. He knew by his basic nature that people did things best for themselves, left on their own. And if

they absolutely could not accomplish that which was needed by themselves, individually, or as a family, then one should turn to Government. But the closer the better.

□ 1840

While in the State legislature he reflected that view of supportive local government. He served in those committees, was constantly a voice that you heard that said, "My goodness, let us not take more power into the State, and indeed, not be willing to pay the price for those responsibilities. People need their governments at home."

He carried that view here to Washington as well.

I must say that during the years that he and I served together, I remember beyond the friendship most of the lessons that I learned.

Gene was a person who was really willing to listen and really did care. He made State government fun to be a part of when we served in the legislature together.

I remember the time, for example, it was the age of the miniskirt in California. It had to be in the early seventies. Gene was the Rules Committee chairman and with that responsibility, and noticing suddenly this change of dress, one day he made nationwide news by announcing to his engineers that if it did not change, if the skirts did not get longer, he was going to make the engineers raise the drinking fountains in the capital building. Gene knew how to make his point in his own special way.

In those very early days, the very powerful chairman of the Assembly Rules Committee could make or break your life in terms of your committee work, in terms of your very existence as it relates to comfort. Gene did not play partisan favors in terms of those responsibilities.

Each of us was a professional who had a job to do in terms of representing our districts, and he made sure that he kept that in mind—separate from party—all the time.

Gene Chappie, among other things, was strong as a bull. You could tell that immediately when you shook hands with this guy. He was kind of thin as a wire, and yet no question, tough as nails. Gene took great care of himself and cared about other people doing the same.

You knew that he had to go home every weekend, kind of like pictures of Ronald Reagan, but this had to be real. He chopped wood and pounded nails or something, or you could not stay in that condition.

He was a person who loved the Sierran country. He went out of his way to try to see that other people understood and appreciated it.

Among other things, one of his most well-remembered activities involved the Jeepers Jamboree, in which he got people who had Jeeps from all over the

State to come to his country, and they would have this fantastic time together over several days in convoy with Jeeps going over, I mean absolutely impassable country roads, over river and dale. They would gather together in the evening by combination of song, weather, and friendship, and now and then I suppose an ice cream soda together.

Gene Chappie loved his country, and he wanted to make sure people understood just how important his part of the country was.

You know, one could not have had in public affairs a more loyal friend, for loyalty was everything to Gene.

He was, as I said, always ready to help, ever ready to inject humor as well.

From time to time, you find yourself in this business getting a little bit bigger than yourself. I sometimes say that I had a great week, maybe a bill passes or otherwise, and I go home to beautiful downtown Redlands and I walk across the pool and I get wet every time.

Gene loved to kind of bring you up when you got into that condition.

I remember this rather sizable, and I might share at least at this moment, that rather pompous member of the State assembly, who happened to be a woman. She did not sit very far away from Gene, and that particular evening, we were discussing the budget or something intense like that. Gene kind of snuck off to the side of the Chamber, and there was a small powderroom for ladies only. Gene Chappie snuck in there and he took a piece of cellophane and tightened it over the marble portions of the commode that was there.

My goodness, when that lady came out of that powderroom, you could hear the bellow all the way to the top of the Sierras. It was really something, and it brought the House down for those who understood the circumstances.

To all the people, that particular member of the assembly would never forget anyone, but Gene Chappie was a person that you could not help but forgive, because he was making a special point in his own special kind of way.

I must say that maybe the first time I heard Gene make that point, "Be careful about how big you are today," was in a small group of new members. I happened to be a new member at the time. He happened to be my seatmate during my freshman year. I remember his saying that it is very important that those of us who have the privilege to serve in public affairs recognize that the office in which we are now serving in an awful lot more important than we are individually.

"Remember, Jerry, that the office is an awful lot more important than you are."

His philosophy of smaller government, not bigger government, less

taxes, not more taxes, was Gene Chappie; but to suggest that he did not see a role for government in caring for those who truly were in need would be to miss the point of this man, because he knew by way of mankind, for he came from that background that suggested that there are people in our society who do struggle and those who are struggling to make it for themselves often need the assistance of their government. When that was the case in Gene's mind's eye, philosophically he had no problem with going to the wall, doing whatever was necessary to see that those who were less fortunate than he or we were tended to in a very special form.

I might mention also that Gene Chappie was the person for me who coined the phrase, "In politics and in public affairs, your word is everything. If you don't have that, then you have nothing."

Gene came to the Congress after a number of years of the highest level of leadership in our State government. He always has wanted to serve in the House. He came here with a great deal of enthusiasm, but I cannot tell you that he was always enthusiastic about our work here. While the subjects are interesting and fascinating, it can be such a huge bureaucracy, so difficult to penetrate, so much more difficult to get to know people in a personal way. Gene was not quite comfortable with that, but he went about his work here seriously representing his district and making a great contribution to California.

Above and beyond that, I saw his personal assistance to Member after Member, friend after friend. There has not been in all my time in public affairs any better Member of a legislative body, any finer friend than Gene Chappie.

I will never, ever forget his saying to me time and time again, "Son"—he always started by saying "Son"—"Son, you got to remember this. Son, you got to do it that way," or "Son, would you mind helping with that problem that one of our friends has."

Gene Chappie was a great American, a great Californian, a great friend. He will be missed by all of us, especially he will be missed by Nancy, by Paula, and by all of his children.

Madam Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER] for yielding to me.

Mr. HERGER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Redlands, CA, Mr. LEWIS, for sharing some very outstanding experiences that he has had with our good friend.

Madam Speaker, I yield to another gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN], an individual who served with Gino Chappie in the State legislature as well and then in 1982 was elected to the Congress and served with Gene for another 4 years.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I thank the gentleman for calling this special order.

Some time has passed since Gene's passing, but nonetheless it is always timely to pay tribute to this great American who served with me here in Congress, who the gentleman from California succeeded to in the U.S. Congress and with whom, as he mentioned, I had an opportunity to serve with for 8 years in the State legislature in an occupation where it is not infrequent that people who get elected all of a sudden become very full of themselves and take on a certain sanctimonious air, a certain self-righteousness.

Gene Chappie, in addition to being a very talented Representative, was one of the most down-to-earth, human, real kind of person ever to serve in this Chamber or in Sacramento.

□ 1850

I got to know him particularly well after he married Nancy, who I had known for years in Los Angeles, and, whether it was the passion of his advocacy or the tremendous sense of humor that he had, Gene always made a great impression on someone who I had tremendous respect and admiration for and perhaps even more affection for.

I remember once on the floor of the legislature I had a very controversial bill up trying to reform the bail bond industry. I had done something Gene had asked me for a while before that time. I was having a very difficult time with this legislation. It was opposed passionately by the whole bail bond industry. Knowing Gene, my guess is he knew every bail bondsman in the Sierra Nevadas at the time and undoubtedly had his own pressures, but I spent all day trying to get my 41 votes that one needed to pass the bill in the State assembly and had the bill on call all during the day trying to cajole and twist arms. And on this bill that I guess was not one of Gene's favorite three of the year, he ended up giving me a 41st vote. A group of his colleagues on the Republican side rushed up to him, "How could you vote for that? How could you do this?"

Gene said, "There are times when you just remember your relationships with your colleagues and what they might have done for you, and this was the time for me," and that was a quality of Gene Chappie's that anyone who served with him knows, the bond of relationships and friendships that can grow in a collegial body. With Gene it was felt very strongly. It crossed partisan lines. It crossed ideological lines.

So, I again want to close by wishing my very best to Nancy and Gene's family, and my admiration for my friend from California for taking the time for this special order for us to pay tribute to Gene Chappie.

Mr. HERGER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much, the

gentleman from southern California [Mr. BERMAN] who, again, served with Gene for many years.

Again, I think about my experiences with Gene Chappie. I guess one of the great regrets that I have in my political office is that I never actually had an opportunity to serve in the same legislative body with Gino. Again, when he ran for Congress, I was elected to his assembly seat, and then when he finally retired in 1986, I was elected to his congressional seat. But I did have an opportunity to travel around with Gene on a number of different occasions since my legislative seat and his congressional seat, there was an overlap, and it was always a—they say it was a kick to travel with him and to be with him. That is really a great understatement. Just to be with Gene Chappie was an experience unlike any experiences I can recall with anyone else.

Gene was really very unique. He was an individual who was known, as one speaker mentioned earlier, literally a legend in his own time. His way of communicating also was not like any other political person that I have known. Perhaps today we would say that he was not politically correct in the way he would address things, but he had a way of making people laugh. He had a way of making people, again as has been mentioned by a number of different speakers, at a time when so often we take ourselves too seriously, and it is not that we do not have very serious challenges before us, but yet Gene Chappie had a way of getting to the crux of the problem, of doing it in a very humorous way, again like you had to experience Gene to know, but he is a special person.

I remember also the last month of his life. I had the opportunity to go up and visit with him and Nancy up at their beautiful mountain home up above Cool, CA. It was an experience common and similar to so many meetings with Gene Chappie. Gene Chappie had a nickname for many people and I remember coming into his room and him saying, "Well, there's the Herg," as he would refer to me, and I remember that great visit we had. We reminisced some, and that great fight that was in Gene always was there.

Gene was, among other things, a very good dancer, and he had an occasion on several different times to dance with my wife, Pam, and one of the things he said was how he was looking forward to dancing again and dancing with Pam. Again, that fight was there. Gene Chappie was someone who never gave up. He was someone, again, who was a legend and will always be a legend, and even though Gene has been away from this body for some 6½ years now, his memory will be here for those of us who serve here, for his many friends, many of whom have spoken earlier this evening. It will be here forever, not only for Members, but, again, the po-

lice, Capitol Police, who work here, the elevators, all who knew Gene in a very special way.

And we had also a great opportunity here just a couple of months ago of planting a tree, a tree in memory of Gino, and we had his wife, Nancy, who was here at that time and several members of his family, and this tree is probably in one of the most ideal locations I have ever seen with a full look at the Capitol, a view of the Capitol from where it is placed out on the west side of the Capitol. It is probably about a block and a half away, and so good old Gino, not only will he be looking down from where he is in heaven, guiding us, as he did so often, to me, to myself and to others, but his tree will be here for many, many years to come as well.

So, I would like to let Gene know that he may not be with us in person, but Gino will always be with us in our heart.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, on May 31 of last year, the House of Representatives lost a dear friend and former colleague, but we all retain the friendship he left behind. I am, of course, referring to Gene Chappie, who so ably represented the constituents of California's Second District for 6 years.

During his three terms in the House in the early 1980's, Gene demonstrated the skill and competence that earned him the respect and admiration of his colleagues during 16 years in the State legislature. His understanding of politics and procedure made him a valuable part of the House during Reagan's Presidency. Whether he was addressing the concerns of farmers and ranchers in his district or dealing with critical drug issues on the Select Committee on Narcotics, Gene's wit and wisdom made him a pleasure to work with.

I join with my colleagues in offering my deepest sympathy to his family and am proud to offer my tribute to Gene Chappie's dedicated service.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Gene Chappie, a former Congressman from California who served for three terms before retiring in 1987. Gene was known for his distinct personality that characterized his honesty and uniqueness. His commonman, smalltown character lent itself to his approachable manner. Mr. Chappie passed away a year ago at the age of 72.

Chappie's political career began as an El Dorado County Supervisor four decades ago. He was a State assemblyman from 1965 to 1981 and gained a seat in Congress in 1980. While serving the House of Representatives, he served on the Agriculture, Small Business, and Select Narcotics Abuse and Control Committees.

Gene Chappie was a man of strong beliefs. When other politicians were in disagreement with him, he did not hesitate to engage in debate. When he disagreed with you, he told you so in a jovial manner. A manner, which itself generated the respect which fellow politicians had for Gene Chappie.

He was in touch with the needs and concerns of the people of northern California. His farming and ranching background strengthened his ability to communicate effectively

with his constituents while serving in Congress. After leaving Congress, he retired to the community of Cool, and cared for the family's farm, in a State where he served for so long.

We will all miss Gene Chappie. We will always appreciate his tremendous contributions to our community and to the entire East Bay. To his ex-wife Nancy, the rest of his family, and all the members of the extended Chappie family, I express my deepest condolences, and once again note the great enjoyment I had in knowing Gene Chappie.

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, we pay tribute today to a man known for his straight talk and down-to-earth manner, our late former colleague, Gene Chappie of California. Gene and I served together here in the House from 1981 through 1987. All of my colleagues and I recall him with fond affection and hold precious memories left with us as a result of his service as a Member from the second District of California.

Despite being known as a practical joker, Gene had a knack for getting the job done with a certain flair, flamboyance, and great humor. Yet, he had his serious moments too. He had little patience for speeches and posturing. He represented hard working and self-reliant constituents in northern California and reflected this in his work on the floor and in committees on issues affecting timber, ranch land, and rural matters. In Congress, Gene served with talent on the Agriculture, Small Business, and Narcotic and Abuse and Control Committees.

Politics was always in his blood but he retired after only three terms. He never slowed down, even in retirement, and stayed active in issues affecting his fellow human beings.

The Honorable Gene Chappie—a people person—is very much missed by his colleagues, friends, and family, and we come together today, as a body, to pay tribute to our dear friend, Gene.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I am honored today to recognize the service of Gene Chappie to our Nation and the House of Representatives.

Gene entered Congress with me in 1981, and represented the Second Congressional District of California for 6 years before deciding to retire in 1987. His tenure in Congress capped an outstanding 40-year career of public service, during which Gene served as a county supervisor and a member of the California State Assembly.

Gene, who was a farmer and rancher by trade, earned the respect and admiration of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle with his hard work, straightforwardness, and honesty. He was truly a Jeffersonian "citizen-legislator," who recognized the needs of his constituents in northern California and served them, as well as our Nation, ably and skillfully. He also was a dedicated husband and father, and I am pleased Gene's wife and children were able to be here with us today to celebrate the memory of Gene.

Like so many of my colleagues, I miss Gene's wisdom and strength in the House of Representatives, and it is an honor for me to join today to posthumously thank Gene and acknowledge his family for their many contributions and sacrifices for the House and our Nation.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, this special order honors our good friend and former colleague Gene Chappie, who passed away at the end of May of this year. An honorable and able legislator, Gene spent a good part of his life dedicated to public service and the citizens of northern California.

Gene and I both came to Capitol Hill in 1980—freshmen Congressmen bent on carrying our conservative message to Washington. A former county supervisor and State legislator, Gene often worked long hours to secure a better life for the people he served. As a loyal follower of then-Governor, Ronald Reagan, Gene gained a reputation as "the common man"—a straight shooter who would tell it like it is.

In Congress, Gene rapidly gained the respect of other Members for his strong beliefs and easy-going leadership style. Always quick with a joke or one-liner, Gene added a realistic humor to a place that is often overburdened with difficulties. I admire a man who has the unique ability to not only enjoy his work but to help others enjoy theirs as well.

California and the U.S. Congress have become better places due to the lifelong public service of Gene Chappie. I was told it was only 3 months from the time he discovered he was ill until his untimely passing, but this did not surprise me since Gene was not one to sit around and wait for things to happen.

Like preparing for his beloved Jeepers Jambooree, I am certain Gene donned his red bandanna and drove off into the Sierra Mountain sunset.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, in the often grey and unintelligible institution of Congress, Gene Chappie's black and white personality stood out like a lone oasis in a barren desert. His straightforward manner and his offbeat, inimitable humor were as refreshing as a cool drink to the weary traveler. One could not speak with Gene Chappie and fail to go away feeling buoyed and invigorated.

Gene proved that an affable, straight-talking politician and colleague could also be an effective legislator. Few representatives served the needs of their constituents more faithfully and more successfully than Congressman Chappie. For 6 years in Congress, and 16 years before that in the California State Assembly, Gene was known as a legislator who could get the job done. All of us who served with Gene as members from the California congressional delegation know that in Gene Chappie, California had an able and honest representative whose loss, even after retirement from public service, will be dearly felt.

But I will keep this short and simple, the way I think Gene would have liked it, and just close by saying that Gene Chappie was truly a good man, a good legislator and a good American, and all who knew him were the better for it.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate one of our own, former Congressman Gene Chappie. Although Gene served in the House of Representatives for only 6 years, it was the culmination of years of service to the people of northern California—14 years as a county supervisor and then 16 years as a State legislator. His career was truly that of a citizen legislator. He was a rancher, a winemaker, a farmer, and a veteran

of two wars—a truly admirable career. But simply recalling Gene for these things would miss the essence of the man and why we commemorate him today.

Gene was truly a man of the people. He loved representing the people in his district, becoming personally involved in their problems. He was a tireless worker on behalf of the farmers and loggers who formed the backbone of his district's economy. He worked with a style that made you like him and listen to him even when he was arguing the other side of an issue. Through it all, he managed to keep and use his sense of humor in a way that always made working with him enjoyable.

Gene's reputation as a humorist is well-founded, and his ability to find something amusing in everything he did kept his spirits—and many others'—elevated during even the most difficult legislative actions. He was a tremendous practical joker and he loved telling stories just to see if he could make others laugh. There was more to his jokes than simple humor. He also believed Congress takes itself far too seriously, and that laughing about the system helped provide perspective in what is truly the people's house.

In the end, Gene may not be remembered as a great orator or a conspicuous public figure, but he should be remembered as a tireless public servant and the kind of representative we should always aspire to be: A man who represented his constituents with energy and a style that helped make the legislative process a bit more human.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to include in my remarks the following statement by our former colleague, Chip Pashayan.

GENE CHAPPIE, AS I KNEW HIM  
(By Charles Pashayan, Jr.)

I cannot remember exactly when I first heard the gravelly voice followed by the high-pitched laugh, or saw the sinewy frame crowned by the bird-like face; but it was here, in Washington, not Sacramento.

Gene's reputation had preceded him: different, blunt, rough, unpredictable, at least half wild, at best half tame.

On the occasion of our introduction, Geno treated me to a characteristically aggressive salvo: was it an insult or was it brazen humor? I hurled something equally aggressively back. There was a pause, and then he laughed, and so did I.

Geno had laughed first. I had made the Great Tormentor laugh at my barb first.

We had countless laughs thereafter, and indeed Geno's laughter was a window to his essence. He loved action, he loved pasta and practical jokes. Next to Nancy and his family, he loved the general human relationship the most. At Phil Burton's funeral, Geno, who had fought Burton so hard on almost every land-use issue, unashamedly wept aloud.

Some say his irreverent humor was the mirror of a man wholly irreverent, but nothing could be further from the truth. He revered America, and often told of his parents and his recent immigrant antecedents; he revered the great outdoors, wished the same for all Americans, and upheld the people's right to share the beauty of their public lands, in their vehicles if they chose; he revered honest politics, and always kept his word; he revered the truth, and exposed hypocracies and falsehoods with his sharp and perceptive wit. If he held any true irreverence, it was to self-important persons unwilling to laugh at themselves.

Others say that in Washington, Geno was a square peg in a round hole. If so, it must be because he felt firsthand what so many Americans felt instinctively; the pomp and circumstance of Washington was detracting from the serious business of governance. He would have none of it; rather, let Government do less, but do it well and unpretentiously. Maybe these cynical times would indeed be less cynical if there were more such square pegs as Geno. He gave more than he took, and Capitol Hill has known no truer gentleman.

It is one of the saddest moments of the human condition when someone as vigorous, as lively, as at peace with himself as Geno was, departs too soon for our mortal understanding. Maybe God wanted a little balance in Heaven, and needed someone to tweak Geno's beloved "posey pluckers" and "tree huggers," as only Geno could do in his own way.

In 1992 in Fresno, I went to buy a Jeep Grand Wagoneer, Geno's long-favorite vehicle. "It's the last one in California," the salesman told me.

As if animated by a mysterious force, my response was instantaneous.

"No it's not," I said, "the last Grand Wagoneer in California is in Georgetown, and its name is Gene Chappie." The salesman was bewildered, but I knew my words.

I later called Gene and told him the story of how he had been elevated from what he was to an it, but also that it somehow really seemed to symbolize his grand love of life.

He laughed, and laughed heartily, throwing some deserved epithet back at me.

Gene Chappie laughed last.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, my friend, Gene Chappie, was a unique individual. He symbolized what a real American is. He was the son of immigrant parents, who distinguished himself as a leader, starting at the local level—from county commissioner to U.S. Representative from the Second District in his home State of California—where I came to know him so well in the class of 1981. Gene was one of the older new Members in 1981 who had one of the youngest out looks concerning the legislative process and the realities of Government. Gene was a good friend who's company was always welcome and enjoyable. He was entertaining and informative. Many of us were disappointed at his decision to leave at such an early point in his legislative career but it was understandable because of his love of his home State of California. I was saddened by the news of his illness and death. He will always be remembered for his many talents to include being trilingual and his great sense of humor. He is and will be for a long time, sorely missed.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor our late colleague, Gene Chappie, whose affiliation with this body from 1980 to 1987 left an indelible mark on all those who knew him. Gene's candid and forthright manner was an inspiration to many in Washington, DC, and his dedication was respected by all.

I always felt a special affinity to Gene because we shared the same vision of serving California and our country through public service. As a young politician involved in public service on the local level, I remember following Gene's unswerving efforts for his constituency in the California State Assembly.

Throughout his career, Gene served tirelessly and faithfully for the people of his dis-

trict. He began his political career as an El Dorado County supervisor. After more than a decade in this role, he was elected to the State assembly where he served from 1965 to 1980 before coming to Washington to represent Californians at the Federal level. During Gene's tenure on Capitol Hill, his straightforward manner enabled him to bring the concerns of his constituency from the largely rural northern Californian territory to the forefront. Certainly, his efforts to restore the California Trinity River and its surroundings to its original state will be remembered for generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in saluting Gene Chappie for his long career of dedicated service to the people of California and this country. He always will be remembered for outstanding leadership in public service.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to my late friend and former colleague, the Honorable Gene Chappie. Though Gene Chappie and I were from opposite ends of the State of California, from opposite parties, and often of opposite views, I came to regard Gene with deep affection and great respect.

When I arrived in Sacramento in 1969 as a freshman Democratic assemblyman, Republicans had a majority in the assembly. The second most powerful assemblyman was Rules Committee Chairman Gene Chappie. I will always remember the lengths to which he went to welcome me and assure me that he and the Rules Committee had no intention of slighting even the most junior members of the opposition party. He kept his word.

Gene Chappie was a gentleman in the most profound meaning of that word. The tensions, the competitiveness of the parties and of individual members never affected Gene. He had a personal code of decency and integrity that transcended the passions and issues of the moment. I believe I speak for all of us who knew and served with Gene in stating that he was a man of unsurpassed honor, decency, and integrity. He will be long remembered by those privileged to know him.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HERGER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous material, on the subject of my special order tonight.

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

There was no objection.

#### TELEPHONE PIONEERS OF AMERICA ANSWER THE CALL FROM FLOOD DISASTER VICTIMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TALENT] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. TALENT. Madam Speaker, I represent the Second Congressional District in Missouri. One of the counties in my district, St. Charles County, is partly under water as we speak here today. A number of States and counties in the United States are in that position, and it is a tragedy and a devasta-

tion for those counties up in it. Thousands of people are out of their homes, many homes having to be evacuated. We had power shortages the other day. It is a 500-year flood in the history of the Mississippi River, one of the worst disasters that people in that situation have ever encountered, and that is the tragedy that we are facing.

There is, however, a silver lining, if my colleagues will, to this cloud, and that is how the community, the community of individuals in my district and in the St. Louis area, have pulled together, and I want in the next few days and weeks, as we continue to fight this flood and this tragedy, to highlight some of the people who are making it a little less bad, who are shining a little light into the lives of their neighbors who are adversely affected. Tonight I would like to discuss the work of the George F. Durant chapter 11 of the Telephone Pioneers of America headed up by Nicholette Papneck. There are about 10,000 people in this chapter, Madam Speaker, and what they do is make themselves available in disasters to answer telephones and to do all kinds of work related to disaster relief. With regard to this flood, Madam Speaker, they have answered the call, the call for action, within 4 hours after it went out. Since July 8, Madam Speaker, 6 to 8 volunteers have been manning the phones at the St. Charles emergency management agencies. Volunteers have been managing ham radios, volunteers have been sandbagging, and over 100 volunteers from this chapter alone have been involved in providing some relief to their neighbors during this difficult time.

□ 1900

Just the psychological effect of knowing that people care is important in a time like this. I would like to salute them and the thousands of volunteers who are working in my district alone to make this disaster a little less disastrous for the people involved. I know we will pull together in the weeks and months to come and get past this terrible time.

Madam Speaker, my friend, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON], has some remarks he would like to make on the subject of health care, and I would like to yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri for yielding. I did want to talk a little bit about health care, but I also wanted to say as a Representative and resident of the low country of Georgia-South Carolina, we had the disaster several years ago of Hurricane Hugo, and I too was extremely impressed with the caliber and dedication of the volunteers as they brought ice to the area, chain saws, and backhoes. They worked Saturdays and Sundays. It is moving to see that sort of thing in the face of

such a grim disaster as that. I want you to know that the folks in our part of the country are praying for you, and we hope that your area recovers as quickly as possible.

Mr. TALENT. I thank the gentleman for those kind remarks.

Mr. KINGSTON. On the subject of health care, we hear so many things about it. Just to throw out some of the rhetoric we are hearing now, and I say it is rhetorical, but it is not, but it is just rhetorical, let me clarify that. But America spends \$8 billion a year on health care. We spend \$1.7 million per minute on health care.

We hear that there are 35 million Americans who are uninsured. We hear that \$1 out of every \$7 spent by the Federal Government is spent on health care, and that the cost to the Federal Government is \$314 billion a year alone.

We also hear that the current economic recovery package, the budget that we will be getting from the House-Senate conference committee this month, does not have money for taxes allocated to health care dollars. So when the Health Care Task Force comes out with its idea for change, we will possibly be faced with another tax increase.

These are some of the issues that we are concerned about as Representatives, and certainly as citizens of the United States.

I have a number of ideas which I think will help the health care crisis and develop a solution. So what I wanted to do is talk tonight about some of these ideas and some of the things that I believe have been done in other States and are being done successfully.

I cannot hit that point too hard, because as we go about health care reform in national health care revision, it is important for us to realize that we have 50 States, and that is 50 laboratories for health care reform.

Right now one of the big dangers of coming out with a broad, comprehensive national health care program is that we will automatically eliminate the initiative, the flexibility in the State government level, so that they can address these problems. Right now, as the gentleman knows, the President has just returned from, or maybe still is in, Hawaii. He praised their system. He said it is a great model. It is a model he would like to see other States use.

I agree with the President. But I also know that what might be good in a small State such as Hawaii may not do the trick in California or New York. It may be great in South Carolina, but Georgia is about twice as big as South Carolina. It might not fit us.

But let us try it. The Hawaiian system could be good for 20 or 30 States, but I do not know that it is going to be universally true.

That is what I am trying to say. The Federal Government could throw out

all State initiatives, and I would hate to see that. Let us let those on a State level govern as they can do best, closer to the people, closer to the problem, not here in Washington in a remote ivory tower where we are saying this is what ought to happen when we change this law, because so often what we think is going to happen does not necessarily happen.

One of the ideas that I think we should allow is the States to eliminate some of the State-mandated benefits on health care. What typically happens is State legislatures can say well, we want to require insurance companies to offer certain benefits.

Well, it might be that those benefits are not needed by the customer and that those benefits are going to drive up the cost of health care to the customer.

States need to have flexibility on decisionmaking, but we need to encourage them on the Federal level to realize what this can do to the buyer.

Mr. TALENT. The gentleman has just raised a very good point, and it is something a lot of people back in my district raised with me. Many of the people who are currently unsponsored, not covered by any insurance, are in that position because they are working for employers who do not provide health insurers. One of the reasons they do not provide health insurers is that it costs too much. If we could get the cost of health insurance down, even with no frills basic coverage, then the problem of the working poor, if you will, or people working for employers who do not provide health insurance, would be substantially alleviated by itself.

There is an insurer in my district who is able to market a plan they call the Basic Blue. It is the Blue Cross in my district. They are able to offer it to employers and cover families of four for \$100 a month or less.

If you get the cost of insurance down to that level or below, then you have millions of people who have access without new taxes or new bureaucracies. So I think the point the gentleman makes is an excellent one.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman will yield further, what we are saying is to somebody who does not have a car, that a Ford is fine, they do not need a Cadillac, and I might say a beat up Ford. They are both good automobiles. But the fact is the basic policy is better than no policy, and that is what an awful lot of people have now.

One of the other problems is for mom and pop employers, unincorporated businesses, which employ most of the people in America, that is where most of the jobs are, in the small shops, not in the huge Fortune 500 companies. But they do not get the full deductibility of health care premiums that a large corporation does. Large corporations can deduct on their taxes 100 percent of

their health care costs. Small businesses are limited to 25 percent. Yet 70 percent of people in America who have insurance get it through their employer.

Let us make it more affordable to employers. If we do that, it will be more accessible to the public. That will also help the people that you are talking about getting on an insurance roll, if you will, so they will have some coverage.

There are a couple of other steps that we could take, and none of these really require massive new programs. Some of them take basic changes in law. Some of them are regulatory changes.

For example, if we can require that physician fees be disclosed, this is one of the problems. I always say to folks, you drive down a street in your neighborhood, or not even in your neighborhood, but in your hometown, that you do not live on, and you know how much the houses are. You see a car, you know how much the car is. You know how much a suit is worth. But if you break your arm, you do not know if that is \$75 or \$750. You do not have any idea.

If we can increase consumer education in health care the way that it is with cars or houses or stereo systems or hamburgers, the American public is one of the shrewdest buyers in the whole world. We could bring down the cost of health care just by that one device, making it more competitive and educating our people more on it.

Mr. TALENT. Taking that a little further, I appreciate the gentleman's comment about the American consumer being a shrewd consumer. I agree with that comment.

One of the problems it seems to me we have, and I like your comment on this, is that we do not give people enough of an incentive to be an informed consumer with regard to health care, because basically we have a situation where people have no responsibility for the cost of the services that they are getting.

It seems to me if we went to some kind of a health care IRA system, where, for example, we encouraged insurers to provide high deductible policies, say a \$3,000 instead of a \$300 deductible, to save money on the premiums, and pass through the money to the employers to be placed in a health care IRA to be used to pay their deductible, then people would in effect be paying their own money. It would be the employer's money, they would not be out a penny, but they would be writing a check out of their health care IRA to pay for this first \$3,000 worth of coverage which they got from their employer. If they did not spend it all, they could keep it. They would be spending their own money in that sense and would have an incentive to find out what the fees are, as you put it, and to make sure they were an informed consumer and did not get

health care they did not really feel they needed.

Mr. KINGSTON. The gentleman is absolutely right, because there is nothing like the American consumer when it comes to saving money, being motivated by getting the return on the savings that they realize.

Mr. TALENT. One example with regard to that, I talked to a physician who said a fellow will come in and say he has a strained knee.

□ 1910

And the physician says, "Well, I am 98 percent certain that it is just a muscular problem but maybe you ought to get a CAT scan." If the CAT scan is \$600 and the insurance company is paying for it, you have no incentive not to get it. But if you feel financially responsible, because if you do not spend that money, you can keep it at the end of the year, you say, I will go home and put some lotion on my knee and see if it is better or not in a week.

So we are driving health care spending up artificially. And the physician has a real incentive to prescribe the CAT scan, because if not, he might get hit with a medical malpractice suit. So we are encouraging the physicians to prescribe the CAT scan and encouraging people to take it.

Mr. KINGSTON. I agree with you. One of the analogies I have heard is that if an insurance company was doing your grocery shopping every night, you would eat steak because you would not care. You would never have to eat tuna fish, like I was raised doing.

But one of the things that I think is important in this step is there is House Resolution 150, and I cosponsored it and believe that it will move us toward this system. And it will be workable in that regard.

I met yesterday, actually, with a nurse practitioner from one of our area universities. She sort of tied into this and put it into an interesting perspective. A nurse practitioner is an advanced trained R.N., and they have a high degree of skill and the ability to do many of the things that an M.D. can do.

What she was saying is, if they had direct reimbursements, then what would happen is people, if they had stitches, could go to a nurse practitioner rather than a doctor and get the stitches sewn up. And it would have a cost advantage. But also in rural areas—and I know you have a number of rural areas in your district—it could provide, there is a niche out there. There is a need.

I know in one of the counties I have, for example, women have to drive to another county to have babies. Midwifery would help tremendously to alleviate some of that problem.

Now all this is sort of getting into a turf area, and there is dispute in the

medical community about it. I think that the idea is that we have a problem. We have an obligation to explore all sorts of alternatives and to see what will do the trick.

Another thing that has sort of happened in recent years, long-term care and home health care, home health care generally has the price tag about 30 percent of institutionalized care. You can have a nurse go to a house and administer medicine, give shots, and so forth, a physical therapist. But the patient is still in his house, not a hospital bed, no late-night interruptions, no costly medical bills. You are at home with the ones you love. That makes so much sense, not just from a medical standpoint, but from a human standpoint.

Mr. TALENT. I have had some experience with home health care like diversionary programs. I was in the legislature in Missouri. The concept is a good one.

You do have to be careful that you are not in a situation where you create expectations; political authorities create expectations that we are going to divert a certain number of people from nursing homes. And you end up pushing people out of the homes who really are not appropriate for home health care.

Most of the people in nursing homes today are there because they need to be there. But certainly, home health care, where it is appropriate, is both less expensive and usually the preferred course of action for the individual involved.

Mr. KINGSTON. It is a start.

Again, it is something that we need to consider. It is part of the puzzle. And where it fits in, I am not certain.

Another thing that we have, and I always give the analogy that when I started in 1973 at Michigan State University, we voted to not allow calculators because pocket calculators were \$159 in 1973. And yet by the time I graduated from college, everyone had a pocket calculator that was \$10, and it was a better calculator. And they were universal at that time, in 4 short years.

The same thing has happened with cellular telephones and personal computers, and so forth. But what happens when your hospital wants to go from a CAT scan to an MRI; suddenly the cost of that same high technology that has saved America millions of dollars in the business world increases the cost in the medical world. And a lot of this is because of excessive Government regulations and redtape. So we need to reduce that bureaucratic burden on our health care providers and our hospitals so that we can get that technology in there to help the patient and lower the cost of medicine.

Another thing along that line is reforming the antitrust laws. Hospitals now, on a regional basis, cannot exchange certain information because they would be considered price fixing

and telling too much. I believe that we ought to let hospitals have a dialogue back and forth because if it can save a life and save a dollar in 1993, we want that dialog to take place.

Just jumping around a little bit—I certainly appreciate the use of the gentleman's time tonight—one of the things that we Americans need to do, and we are doing it more and more each year, but is proactive health care. We need to go out and have the prostate tests and the mammograms and pap smears and annual physicals. We need to eat right, and we need to take care of ourselves. Part of the health care problem right now is that medicine is generally reactive and not proactive. We fix the stitch. We mend the broken arm. We take care of somebody who is overeating, but we do not do it up front.

We need to practice proactive medicine and really drill into people that, hey, you can do these things up front.

We talk about immunizations. One of the counties in my area came up with an interesting way to get these children in for their immunization, because, as you know, 86 percent of the children in America have access to free immunizations right now. The problem has been that their parents will not bring them in.

So what Glynn County, GA, did is they put the parents on an automatic dialing machine. If you have been at home at night, between the hours of 6 and 8 p.m., you get all sorts of solicitations and phone calls that drive you crazy. There is nothing quite as obnoxious as an automatic dialing machine.

But if you get that call every night, saying your child still has not been immunized, you are going to respond to it. It is expensive. It was done on a local level. It did not take a Federal grant or big law or Federal Government intervention. It was a local initiative. They did it in Glynn County, GA. It has been very successful. As a result, many, many more children have been immunized.

There are some of the ideas I have. This is a long road. This is a road that I hope will be opened to Members of both parties, that this will not be done in a partisan fashion.

I was very disappointed that the Health Care Task Force that Mrs. Clinton is managing did not have any Republicans named to it. I understand it is a new administration and they make mistakes. I hope that the administration realizes that people who do practice medicine or who are in the insurance business or who are in the legal business have a right to be at the table. People who are in the real world, the business world, have a right to get together and negotiate on these things. It should not matter what your wealth is or what your political party or what area of the country you come from. Everyone should be in on this debate.

Probably the best news about health care is that the folks back home are not sitting around waiting for Washington. They are moving ahead with it.

There are a number of examples of corporations coming up with innovative approaches, new ideas. States are doing things. So we are moving along.

Washington is a little bit sluggish right now, but the rest of the world seems to be moving ahead.

I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I certainly appreciate all that he is doing for health care reform and look forward to working with him on these and other ideas in the months and years ahead.

Mr. TALENT. Madam Speaker, without necessarily associating myself with the particulars of every idea the gentleman suggested, I think he is definitely in the ballpark.

I especially like his comments regarding we cannot wait for Washington to do this whole thing. People who believe that Washington should dominate the health care system must believe that the system has screwed up the welfare system and the criminal justice system and cannot come within \$350 billion of balancing its own budget, we now should put in charge of allocating health care decisionmaking.

□ 1920

I was very willing to yield time to the gentleman to discuss his particular ideas.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BOEHLERT (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today and tomorrow until 2 p.m., on account of a death in the family.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

The following Members (at the request of Mr. SOLOMON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. WELDON, for 60 minutes, on July 27.

Mr. DOOLITTLE, for 5 minutes, on July 13.

Mr. SOLOMON, for 60 minutes each day, on August 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, September 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 27, 28, 29, and 30, October 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, and 29, November 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 29, and 30, and December 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 27, 28, 29, 30, and 31.

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. BYRNE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, for 5 minutes each day, on July 13, 14, 15, 16, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30 and August 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6.

Mr. TOWNS, for 5 minutes each day, on July 20 and 22.

Mr. FLAKE, for 5 minutes each day, on July 13 and 14.

Mr. HOYER, for 60 minutes, on July 15.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SOLOMON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. COMBEST.

Mr. FIELDS of Texas.

Mr. LEWIS of California in two instances.

Mr. ROTH.

Mr. HASTERT.

Mr. GINGRICH.

Mr. SKEEN.

Mr. GILMAN in three instances.

Mr. BEREUTER.

Mr. GUNDERSON.

Mr. SOLOMON in two instances.

Mr. COX.

Mr. SCHIFF.

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. BYRNE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GORDON.

Mr. TORRES.

Mr. DICKS.

Ms. MALONEY.

Mr. DEUTSCH.

Mr. MILLER of California.

Mr. SWETT.

Mr. FAZIO.

Mr. ACKERMAN.

Mr. GLICKMAN.

Mr. RICHARDSON.

Mr. MATSUI.

Mr. COLEMAN.

Mr. STARK in 4 instances.

Mr. LANTOS.

Mr. MANN.

Mr. FORD of Michigan.

Mrs. SCHROEDER.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

Mr. BLACKWELL in 2 instances.

Mr. COPPERSMITH.

Mr. ANDREWS of Texas.

#### SENATE BILLS AND A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 412. An act to amend title 49, United States Code, regarding the collection of certain payments for shipments via motor common carriers of property and nonhousehold goods freight forwarders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

S. 464. An act to redesignate the Pulaski Post Office located at 111 West College

Street in Pulaski, Tennessee, as the "Ross Bass Post Office"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1205. An act to amend the Fluid Milk Promotion Act of 1990 to define fluid milk processors to exclude de minimis processors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. Con. Res. 28. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the Taif Agreement and urging Syrian withdrawal from Lebanon, and for other purposes; to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROSE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following title:

On July 2, 1993:

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 14, 1993, at 10 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1542. A letter from the Chairman, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the annual report for the calendar year 1992, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 2252(a)(3); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1543. A letter from the Acting General Sales Manager, Foreign Agricultural Service, transmitting his determination that the minimum quantity of agricultural commodities prescribed to be distributed under title III of Public Law 480 during fiscal year 1993 has been amended, pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 1721(b); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1544. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the annual animal welfare enforcement report for fiscal year 1992, pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 2155; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1545. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend Public Law 100-518 and the United States Gain Standards Act to extend through September 30, 1998, the authority of

the Federal Grain Inspection Service to collect fees to cover administrative and supervisory costs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1546. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a request for fiscal year 1993 emergency appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1107 (H. Doc. No. 103-108); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1547. A letter from the Comptroller General, the General Accounting Office, transmitting status of the President's fifth special impoundment message for fiscal year 1993, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685 (H. Doc. No. 103-113); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1548. A letter from the Director, the Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the cumulative report on rescissions and deferrals of budget authority as of July 1, 1993, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685(e) (H. Doc. No. 103-114); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1549. A letter from the Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting certification of major defense acquisition programs reflected in the selected acquisition report [SAR] for the quarter ending December 31, 1992, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2433(e)(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1550. A letter from the Director, Congressional Budget Office, transmitting a study entitled "The Federal Home Loan Banks in the Housing Finance System"; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1551. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting Final Regulations—Federal Direct Student Loan Program, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1552. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the audit of the Student Loan Marketing Association, with any necessary comments for the year ended December 31, 1992, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1087-2(k); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1553. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting an interim report on "Demonstration Projects to Study the Effect of Allowing States to Extend Medicaid to Pregnant Women and Children Not Otherwise Qualified to Receive Medicaid Benefits," pursuant to Public Law 101-239, section 6407(g)(2) (103 Stat. 2267); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1554. A letter from the Administrator, EPA, transmitting a report entitled "Anthropogenic Methane Emissions in the United States: Estimates for 1990," pursuant to Public Law 101-549, section 603(a) (104 Stat. 2670); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1555. 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 Intelsat (Transmittal No. DTC-25-93), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1556. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting his justification for waiving legislative prohibitions on approval of United States-origin exports to the People's Republic of China, pursuant to Public Law 101-246, section 902(b)(2) (104 Stat. 85); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1557. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting develop-

ments since the last report concerning the national emergency with respect to Haiti, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703 (H. Doc. No. 103-109); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1558. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report on developments since his last report of December 30, 1992, concerning the national emergency with respect to Libya, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c) (H. Doc. No. 103-110); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1559. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the report of political contributions by Roland Karl Kuchel, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Zambia; Alan H. Flanigan, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of El Salvador; Robert Gordon Houdek, of Illinois, to be Ambassador to Eritrea; and John T. Sprott, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Swaziland, and members of their families, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1560. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on employment of U.S. citizens by certain international organizations, pursuant to Public Law 102-138, section 181 (105 Stat. 682); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1561. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1562. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report on progress of U.S. efforts towards peace and stability in the vital Balkan region (H. Doc. No. 103-111); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1563. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting OMB estimate of the amount of change in outlays or receipts, as the case may be, in each fiscal year through fiscal year 1998 resulting from passage of H.R. 2343 and S. 80, pursuant to Public Law 101-508, section 13101(a) (104 Stat. 1388-582); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1564. A letter from the Farm Credit Banks of Texas, transmitting the annual pension plan report for the plan year ending December 31, 1992, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9503(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1565. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting OMB's estimate of the amount of discretionary new budget authority and outlays for the current year (if any) and the budget year provided by H.R. 2118, pursuant to Public Law 101-508, section 13101(a) (104 Stat. 1388-578); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1566. A letter from the Interim CEO, Resolution Trust Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's management report, pursuant to Public Law 101-576, section 306(a) (104 Stat. 2854); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1567. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report on proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1568. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General (Legislative Affairs), transmitting

the annual evaluation report on drugs and crime for 1992; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1569. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General (Legislative Affairs), transmitting the Department's report on important programs, initiatives, and other activities conducted during fiscal year 1992, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 3712(b); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1570. A letter from the Chairman, National Advisory Council on the Public Service, transmitting the Council's first year report on the public service for June 1993, pursuant to Public Law 101-363, section 8 (104 Stat. 427); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1571. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a copy of the President's determination that the "Agreement on Trade Relations Between the Government and the United States and the Government of Romania" will promote the purposes of the Trade Act of 1974 and is in the national interests, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2437(a) (H. Doc. No. 103-112); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

1572. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting a report on the audits of the financial statements of the Resolution Trust Corporation for the years ended December 31, 1992 and 1991, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 1441a note; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under the clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. STUDDS: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 927. A bill to designate the Pittsburgh Aviary in Pittsburgh, PA as the National Aviary in Pittsburgh (Rept. 103-169). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. STUDDS: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 1916. A bill to establish a marine biotechnology program within the National Sea Grant College Program; with an amendment (Rept. 103-170). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2530. A bill to amend the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 to authorize appropriations for programs, functions, and activities of the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, for fiscal year 1994, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 103-171). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROWN of California: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 1727. A bill to establish a program of grants to States for arson research, prevention, and control, and for other purposes, with an amendment (Rept. 103-172). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROWN of California: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 1757. A bill to provide for a coordinated Federal program to accelerate development and dissemination of applications of high performance computing and high-speed networking, and for other purposes; with an amendment

(Rept. 103-173). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STARK: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 1631. A bill to amend title 11, District of Columbia Code, to increase the maximum amount in controversy permitted for cases under the jurisdiction of the Small Claims and Conciliation Branch of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia (Rept. 103-174). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STARK: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 1632. A bill to amend title 11, District of Columbia Code, to remove gender-specific references, with an amendment (Rept. 103-175). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. STARK: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 1633. A bill to create a Supreme Court for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 103-176). 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. BUNNING (for himself, Mr. STUMP, and Mr. MONTGOMERY):

H.R. 2617. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit rollovers into individual retirement accounts of separation pay from the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLAY (by request):

H.R. 2618. A bill to provide for a pay adjustment for the Chairman, members, and general counsel of the Federal Labor Relations Authority; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EMERSON:

H.R. 2619. A bill to establish Federal grant programs to identify and address the foreign language needs within the United States for the purposes of enhancing economic competitiveness, ensuring national security, and promoting the national interest; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Education and Labor.

By Mr. MATSUI (for himself and Mr. HERGER):

H.R. 2620. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain lands in California through an exchange pursuant to the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY:

H.R. 2621. A bill to provide that certain civil defense employees and employees of the Federal Emergency Management Agency may be eligible for certain public safety officers death benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 2622. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to make certain drug offenses under State law predicate offenses under the armed career criminal statute; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SLATTERY:

H.R. 2623. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to facilitate utilization of volunteer resources on behalf of the Amateur Radio Service; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota:

H.R. 2624. A bill to provide for comprehensive health care and health care cost containment; jointly, to the Committees on En-

ergy and Commerce, Ways and Means, Education and Labor, the Judiciary, Armed Services, and Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BONIOR (for himself, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. UPTON, Mr. DIXON, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. FILNER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. RICHARDSON, and Mr. TORKILDSEN):

H.R. 2626. A bill to establish a system of National Historic Ball Parks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GEPHARDT (for himself and Mr. MICHEL) (both by request):

H.J. Res. 228. Joint resolution to approve the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment with respect to the products of Romania; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DELAY (for himself, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. HEFLEY, Ms. DUNN, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. LINDER, Mr. KIM, Mr. HERGER, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. HORN, Mr. GOODLATTE, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. HOKE, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, and Mr. GOODLING):

H.J. Res. 229. Joint resolution establishing July 13, 1993, as "Cost of Government Day"; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GILMAN:

H. Con. Res. 119. Concurrent resolution to urge the Secretary of State to provide to the Congress an emergency plan to vastly improve the visa issuance process of the Department of State to prevent terrorists from entering the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAMSTAD:

H. Con. Res. 120. Concurrent resolution stating the disapproval of the Congress regarding the President's unilateral deployment of United States troops as peacekeepers to the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

217. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to the pharmaceutical industry in the field of corporate philanthropy; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

218. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Florida, relative to Cuba and Haiti; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

219. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to construction or upgrading of airport access roads and facilities; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

220. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to the construction of a veterans hospital in Lakewood Township, Ocean County, NJ; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

221. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to Social Security benefits for "Notch Year Babies"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of Maine:

H.R. 2625. A bill for the relief of Olga D. Zhondetskaya; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 2627. A bill for the relief of Ovidio Javier Morla Paredes, Maria Estrada de Morla, Javier Alfredo Morla Estrada, and Carlos Andres Morla Estrada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2628. A bill for the relief of Marlene Anita Hudson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ:

H.R. 2629. A bill relating to the petition filed with respect to certain customs entries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHEAT:

H.R. 2630. A bill for the relief of Richard Wayne Tribble and Tammy Tribble; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 58: Mr. RAVENEL.  
H.R. 65: Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. MCCREY, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H.R. 84: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BROWN of California, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. MEEK, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OWENS, Mr. STOKES, Mr. WHEAT, and Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 106: Mr. WYNN.  
H.R. 115: Mr. DELLUMS.  
H.R. 118: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 146: Mr. DELAY.  
H.R. 290: Mr. WYNN.  
H.R. 300: Mr. HINCHEY and Mr. KIM.  
H.R. 302: Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey.  
H.R. 303: Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. MCCREY, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H.R. 306: Mr. LIVINGSTON.  
H.R. 349: Ms. THURMAN.  
H.R. 406: Ms. THURMAN.  
H.R. 419: Mr. McDERMOTT.  
H.R. 431: Ms. SCHENK.  
H.R. 493: Mr. BALLENGER.  
H.R. 507: Mr. VALENTINE.

H.R. 509: Mr. SPENCE and Mr. PACKARD.  
H.R. 557: Mr. KLEIN.  
H.R. 563: Mr. GALLEGLY and Mr. PACKARD.  
H.R. 567: Mr. INHOFE.  
H.R. 643: Mr. KLEIN.  
H.R. 667: Mr. KIM.

H.R. 702: Mr. HYDE, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. FROST, Ms. DUNN, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. WISE, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, and Mr. KIM.

H.R. 743: Mr. SHAYS.  
H.R. 763: Mr. PACKARD.  
H.R. 818: Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Ms. FURSE.  
H.R. 824: Mr. DUNCAN.  
H.R. 840: Mr. WYNN.  
H.R. 885: Mr. SCHAEFER.  
H.R. 911: Mr. OLVER, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. LANTOS.  
H.R. 929: Mr. MANZULLO.

- H.R. 963: Mr. BROWN of California.  
H.R. 998: Mr. COX.  
H.R. 1012: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. ROWLAND, and Mr. SARPALIU.  
H.R. 1015: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.  
H.R. 1036: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. DICKS, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, and Mr. MARTINEZ.  
H.R. 1078: Mr. MILLER of Florida.  
H.R. 1079: Mr. MILLER of Florida.  
H.R. 1080: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.  
H.R. 1081: Mr. MILLER of Florida.  
H.R. 1082: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. ENGEL.  
H.R. 1094: Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.  
H.R. 1098: Mr. PORTMAN.  
H.R. 1154: Ms. SNOWE.  
H.R. 1155: Mr. GEJDENSON.  
H.R. 1164: Mr. EDWARDS of California, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey.  
H.R. 1171: Mr. VISLOSKEY.  
H.R. 1172: Mr. PASTOR and Mr. ENGEL.  
H.R. 1181: Mr. CRAPO, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. WYDEN.  
H.R. 1191: Mr. HASTERT.  
H.R. 1222: Mr. HYDE.  
H.R. 1251: Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas and Mr. UPTON.  
H.R. 1257: Mr. MFUME.  
H.R. 1270: Mr. WYNN.  
H.R. 1277: Mr. GILMAN.  
H.R. 1280: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. MFUME, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. WYNN, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. BILBRAY, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.  
H.R. 1283: Mr. LEVY, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. HASTERT, and Mr. GONZALEZ.  
H.R. 1292: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. WYNN.  
H.R. 1312: Mr. SPENCE.  
H.R. 1325: Mr. INSLÉE.  
H.R. 1354: Mr. WYNN.  
H.R. 1360: Mr. BROWN of California and Mr. KREIDLER.  
H.R. 1362: Mr. LIPINSKI.  
H.R. 1385: Mr. ZIMMER, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. SKEEN.  
H.R. 1386: Mrs. LLOYD and Mr. SKEEN.  
H.R. 1397: Mr. VENTO and Mr. SWETT.  
H.R. 1399: Mr. MANZULLO.  
H.R. 1404: Miss COLLINS of Michigan, and Mr. BEREUTER.  
H.R. 1419: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. OWENS, Mr. WYNN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mrs. LLOYD.  
H.R. 1423: Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. ROSE, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. CASTLE, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BUYER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. HOKE, and Mr. PASTOR.  
H.R. 1437: Mr. WYNN.  
H.R. 1493: Mr. GLICKMAN.  
H.R. 1504: Mr. LAZIO, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. CLINGER, and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.  
H.R. 1517: Mr. DINGELL and Mr. JEFFERSON.  
H.R. 1534: Mr. FOGLIETTA.  
H.R. 1542: Mr. SANDERS.  
H.R. 1552: Mr. CUNNINGHAM and Mr. KIM.  
H.R. 1555: Mr. MACHTLEY.  
H.R. 1560: Mr. MARKEY.  
H.R. 1565: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.  
H.R. 1586: Mrs. MINK, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Miss COLLINS of Michigan.  
H.R. 1605: Mr. STARK, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. SHAYS.  
H.R. 1607: Mr. OLVER.  
H.R. 1620: Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. MOORHEAD.  
H.R. 1645: Mr. WYNN and Ms. WOOLSEY.  
H.R. 1667: Mr. KOPETSKI and Mr. MFUME.  
H.R. 1670: Mr. BALLENGER and Mr. HANSEN.  
H.R. 1683: Mr. DELLUMS, Mrs. MINK, and Mr. HINCHEY.  
H.R. 1697: Mr. HOYER, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PORTER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. STARK, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. LEVY, Ms. FURSE, Mr. DEAL, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. INHOPE, Mr. BOUCHER, Mrs. MEEK, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. WELDON, Ms. DUNN, and Mr. BISHOP.  
H.R. 1709: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. FARR.  
H.R. 1718: Miss COLLINS of Michigan and Mr. WYNN.  
H.R. 1719: Mr. MURPHY, Ms. BYRNE, and Mr. WYNN.  
H.R. 1727: Mr. KLEIN.  
H.R. 1738: Mr. SMITH of Oregon.  
H.R. 1755: Mr. GREENWOOD.  
H.R. 1788: Mr. INHOPE.  
H.R. 1796: Mr. FISH, Mr. LEVY, Mr. KING, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BATEMAN, and Mr. BARLOW.  
H.R. 1823: Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.  
H.R. 1824: Mr. WYNN.  
H.R. 1886: Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PARKER, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. WALSH, Mr. FISH, Mrs. UNSOELD, and Mr. HASTINGS.  
H.R. 1888: Mr. PARKER, Mr. FROST, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. JEFFERSON.  
H.R. 1900: Mr. BECERRA, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. DE LUOGO, and Mr. SERRANO.  
H.R. 1910: Mr. BARLOW, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. PETERSON of FLORIDA, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. CAMP, and Mr. BOEHNER.  
H.R. 1916: Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mrs. MINK, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM.  
H.R. 1923: Mr. CLAY, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. STOKES.  
H.R. 1925: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Mr. OWENS.  
H.R. 1930: Ms. NORTON.  
H.R. 1938: Mr. HOAGLAND and Mr. COYNE.  
H.R. 1945: Mr. JACOBS, Mr. BARLOW, Mr. MINGE, Ms. THURMAN, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.  
H.R. 1961: Ms. NORTON.  
H.R. 2050: Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina.  
H.R. 2076: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. VISLOSKEY, Ms. MALONEY, Mr. KLEIN, and Mr. MARTINEZ.  
H.R. 2093: Mr. PARKER, Mr. WISE, and Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.  
H.R. 2095: Mr. COSTELLO.  
H.R. 2130: Mr. WILSON, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. WYNN, Mr. BALLENGER, Ms. FURSE, and Mr. WILSON.  
H.R. 2140: Mrs. UNSOELD and Mr. HALL of Ohio.  
H.R. 2146: Mr. GREENWOOD.  
H.R. 2151: Mr. HINCHEY and Mr. EVANS.  
H.R. 2152: Mr. HINCHEY and Ms. MALONEY.  
H.R. 2216: Mr. SHAYS.  
H.R. 2241: Mr. KOPETSKI.  
H.R. 2245: Mr. SMITH of Texas and Mr. ALLARD.  
H.R. 2322: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.  
H.R. 2331: Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Ms. MALONEY.  
H.R. 2346: Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. SOLOMON, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, and Ms. NORTON.  
H.R. 2392: Mr. LEVY and Mr. MCHUGH.  
H.R. 2414: Ms. UNSOELD, Mr. BREWSTER, and Ms. NORTON.  
H.R. 2415: Mr. COX, Mr. WALSH, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. EVERETT, and Mr. SOLOMON.  
H.R. 2420: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CLAY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. WATT, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. BONIOR.  
H.R. 2421: Mr. FISH.  
H.R. 2434: Mr. SAXTON and Mr. QUINN.  
H.R. 2451: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.  
H.R. 2481: Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. HALL of Ohio, and Mr. ACKERMAN.  
H.R. 2484: Mrs. MEEK, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. UNSOELD.  
H.R. 2515: Mr. MCMILLAN.  
H.R. 2547: Ms. FOWLER, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. TORKILDSEN, and Mr. LAUGHLIN.  
H.R. 2583: Mr. FARR.  
H.R. 2598: Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. BOEHLERT.  
H.R. 2602: Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. MORAN.  
H.J. Res. 44: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.  
H.J. Res. 86: Mrs. MINK, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. SKEEN, and Mr. SPENCE.  
H.J. Res. 88: Mr. LIPINSKI.  
H.J. Res. 106: Mr. MCCLOSKEY and Ms. PELOSI.  
H.J. Res. 122: Mr. ANDREWS of Maine.  
H.J. Res. 129: Mr. HASTERT.  
H.J. Res. 137: Mr. VISLOSKEY, Mr. ROWLAND, Ms. NORTON, Mr. WYNN, and Mrs. MORELLA.  
H.J. Res. 139: Mr. STARK.  
H.J. Res. 145: Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. PAXON.  
H.J. Res. 148: Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. QUINN, Ms. LOWEY, Mr. HOBSON, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. TALENT, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. SARPALIU, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. DANNER, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. DELLUMS.  
H.J. Res. 165: Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. LAROCO, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. MCCREERY, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. MANTON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. BROWDER, and Mr. TANNER.  
H.J. Res. 173: Mr. ARMEY and Mr. MONTGOMERY.  
H.J. Res. 175: Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. VENTO, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. WAXMAN.  
H.J. Res. 194: Mr. GORDON, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. FISH, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LEACH, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. STOKES, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Ms. MALONEY, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. TAUZIN, and Mr. WYNN.  
H.J. Res. 204: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SHAW, Mr. INHOPE, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. BREWSTER, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. ROSE, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. EVANS, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. HALL of Ohio, and Mr. PALLONE.  
H.J. Res. 212: Mr. TEJEDA, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin.  
H.J. Res. 214: Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. SWETT, Mr. ROBERTS,

Mr. CASTLE, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. GALLO, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. WILSON, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. HAYES, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. WISE, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. KLEIN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. COBLE, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. CRANE, Mr. UPTON, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. STUMP, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. TANNER, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. McDADE, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SARPALIUS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BARLOW, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. QUINN, Mr. LAFALCE, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. SHAW, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. SYNAR, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. BERUTER, and Mr. RAVENEL.

H. J. Res. 226: Mr. HUGHES, Ms. ROYBAL-ALDARD, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. RICHARDSON, and Mr. CHAPMAN.

H. Con. Res. 42: Mr. WYNN.

H. Con. Res. 66: Ms. MALONEY.

H. Con. Res. 80: Mr. VISCLOSKY.

H. Con. Res. 91: Ms. DANNER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin.

H. Con. Res. 95: Mr. FILNER, Mr. PASTOR, and Mr. BERUTER.

H. Con. Res. 98: Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. FARR, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. FINGERHUT, Mr. MARTINEZ, Ms. HARMAN, and Ms. FURSE.

H. Con. Res. 100: Mr. GREENWOOD, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. PORTER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MACTHLEY, Mr. WISE, Mr. GALLO, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. CASTLE, and Mrs. UNSOELD.

H. Con. Res. 107: Mr. BORSKI, Mr. STUPAK, Ms. BYRNE, Ms. MALONEY, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. WATT, Mr. GELDENSON, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. WILSON, and Ms. VELAZQUEZ.

H. Con. Res. 108: Mr. WYNN.

H. Con. Res. 113: Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. KOPETSKI.

H. Res. 13: Mr. CASTLE and Mr. SPRATT.

H. Res. 134: Mr. HOBSON, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. BAKER of California, and Mr. ALDARD.

H. Res. 175: Mr. ZELIFF and Mr. RIDGE.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

52. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the city of Henderson, NV, relative to a new mission for the Nevada test site; and other matters relating thereto; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

## AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2010

By Mr. FORD of Michigan:

—Page 30, beginning on line 3, strike "paragraph (1)" and insert "subparagraph (A)".

—Page 11, line 18, insert the following after "cash": "(including not more than 85 percent of the cost of providing a health care policy described in section 140(d)(2))".

—Beginning on page 65, strike line 19 and all that follows through line 6 on page 66, and insert the following:

"(2) OPTION.—A State or other recipient of assistance under section 121 may elect to provide from its own funds a health care policy for participants that does not meet all of the standards established by the Corporation if the fair market value of such policy is equal to or greater than the fair market value of a plan that meets the minimum standards established by the Corporation.

—Page 62, line 4, insert "who participates on a full-time basis" after "participant".

—Page 63, strike line 6 through 11, and insert the following:

"(5) WAIVER OR REDUCTION OF LIVING ALLOWANCE.—The Corporation may waive or reduce the requirement of paragraph (1) with respect to such national service program if such program demonstrates that—

"(A) such requirement is inconsistent with the objectives of the program; and

"(B) the amount of the living allowance that will be provided to each full-time participant is sufficient to meet the necessary costs of living (including food, housing, and transportation) in the area in which the program is located.

"(6) EXEMPTION.—The requirement of paragraph (1) shall not apply to any program which was in existence on the date of enactment of the National Service Trust Act of 1933.

—Page 63, line 12, strike "(6)" and insert "(7)".

—Page 70, strike lines 18 through 23, and insert the following:

"(4) WAIVER OR REDUCTION OF LIVING ALLOWANCE.—The Corporation may waive or reduce the requirement of paragraph (1) with respect to such national service program if such program demonstrates that—

"(A) such requirement is inconsistent with the objectives of the program; and

"(B) the amount of the living allowance that will be provided to each full-time participant is sufficient to meet the necessary costs of living (including food, housing, and transportation) in the area in which the program is located.

"(5) EXEMPTION.—The requirement of paragraph (1) shall not apply to any program which was in existence on the date of enactment of the National Service Trust Act of 1933.

—Page 70, line 24, strike "(5)" and insert "(6)".

—Page 164, strike lines 5 through 7.

—Page 172, strike lines 14 through 16.

—Page 185, line 2, insert the following before the period at the end: ", and shall constitute assistance to an education program or activity for purposes of title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (20 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.)"

—Page 199, after line 5, insert the following:

"(6) LIMITATION ON MEMBER PARTICIPATION.—

"(A) GENERAL LIMITATION.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), a voting member of the State Commission (or of an alternative administrative entity) shall not participate in the administration of the grant program (including any discussion or decision regarding the provision of assistance or approved national service positions, or the continuation, suspension, or termination of such assistance or such positions, to any program or entity) described in subsection (e)(9) in any period during which there is pending before the Commission (or such entity) a grant application submitted by a program or entity of which such member is, or in the 1-year period before the submission of such application was, an officer, director, trustee, full-time volunteer, or employee.

"(B) EXCEPTION.—If, as a result of the operation of subparagraph (A), the number of

voting members of the Commission (or of such entity) is insufficient to establish a quorum for the purpose of administering such program, then voting members excluded from participation by subparagraph (A) may participate in the administration of such program, notwithstanding the limitation in subparagraph (A), to the extent permitted by regulations issued under section 192A(h)(10) by the Corporation.

"(C) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Subparagraph (A) shall be construed to limit the authority of any voting member of the Commission (or of such entity) to participate in—

"(i) discussions of, and hearing and forums on—

"(I) the general duties, policies, and operations of the Commission (or of such entity); or

"(II) the general administration of such program; or

"(ii) similar general matters relating to the Commission (or such entity).

—Page 211, line 24, strike "and" at the end.

—Page 212, line 2, strike the period at the end and insert "; and".

—Page 212, after line 2, insert the following:

"(10) for purposes of subsection (i)(2) and section 178(d)(6)(B), issue regulations to waive the disqualification of members of the Board and members of the State Commission (or of an alternative administrative entity) selectively in a random, nondiscretionary manner and only to the extent necessary to establish the quorum involved, including rules that forbid each member of the Board and each voting member of a State Commission (or of such entity) to participate in any discussion or decision regarding the provision of assistance or approved national service positions, or the continuation, suspension, or termination of such assistance or such positions, to any program or entity of which such member of the Board or such member of the State Commission (or of such entity) is, or in the 1-year period before the submission of such application was, an officer, director, trustee, full-time volunteer, or employee.

"(1) LIMITATION ON PARTICIPATION.—

"(i) GENERAL LIMITATION.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a member of the Board shall not participate in the administration of the grant program (including any discussion or decision regarding the provision of assistance or approved national service positions, or the continuation, suspension, or termination of such assistance or such positions, to any program or entity) described in section 121 in any period during which there is pending before the Corporation a grant application submitted by a program or entity of which such member of the Board is, or in the 1-year period before the submission of such application was, an officer, director, trustee, partner, full-time volunteer, or employee.

"(2) EXCEPTION.—If, as a result of the operation of paragraph (1), the number of members of the Board is insufficient to establish a quorum for the purpose of administering such program, then members excluded from participation by paragraph (1) may participate in the administration of such program, notwithstanding the limitation in paragraph (1), to the extent permitted by regulations issued under subsection (h)(10) by the Corporation.

"(3) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Paragraph (1) shall not be construed to limit the authority of a member of the Board to participate in—

"(A) discussions of, and hearings and forums on—

"(i) the general duties, policies, and operations of the Commission (or of such entity); or

"(ii) the general administration of such program; or

"(B) similar general matters relating to the Corporation.

By Mr. GOODLING:

—Page 83, line 8, insert before the semicolon the following: "or an unsubsidized loan pursuant to section 428H (20 U.S.C. 1078-9)"

—Page 86, beginning on line 17, strike out paragraph (6) and insert the following:

"(6) MAXIMUM AWARD NOT TO EXCEED FINANCIAL NEED.—The portion of an eligible individual's total available national service educational award that may be disbursed under this subsection for any period of enrollment shall not exceed \$5,000, and shall not, when combined with any other student financial assistance available to the individual (excluding any loan to such individual or such individual's parents), exceed the student's financial need as determined under part F of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Page 90, after line 19, insert the following new paragraph (and redesignate the succeeding paragraphs accordingly):

(4) ELIGIBILITY FOR PERKINS LOANS.—Section 464(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087dd(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(3) The amount of the loan to any student for any academic year shall not exceed the difference between—

"(A) the student's estimated cost of attendance (as determined under section 472); and

"(B) such student's estimated financial assistance (as determined under section 428(a)(2)(C)(i))."

—Page 77, line 6, strike "FIVE-YEAR" and insert "TEN-YEAR".

—Page 77, lines 9 and 19, strike "5-year" and insert "10-year".

By Mr. HEFLEY:

—Page 218, after line 6, insert the following new subsection:

"(f) FULL FUNDING OF COSTS TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS OF REQUIREMENTS UNDER NATIONAL SERVICE LAWS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a national service law may not impose any re-

quirement that a unit of State or local government conduct an activity (including the requirement that a State maintain a State Commission pursuant to section 178 or a requirement that such a government meet national standards in providing a service) unless and until all amounts necessary to pay the direct costs incurred by the unit in conducting the activity are provided to the unit by the Government of the United States.

By Mr. MINETA:

—Page 167, after line 19, insert the following new paragraph:

(5) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development or the Secretary of Transportation.

—Page 167, beginning line 22, strike "appropriate executive departments of the Federal Government" and insert "Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Department of Transportation".

—Page 168, line 1, strike "Secretaries of such departments" and insert "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the Secretary of Transportation".

—Page 168, line 16, add after the period the following new sentence: "As part of the Urban Youth Corps established in the Department of Transportation, the Secretary of Transportation may make grants to States (and through States to local governments) for the purpose of establishing, operating, or supporting qualified urban youth corps that will perform appropriate service projects relating to transportation resources or facilities."

By Mr. WALKER:

—Page 68, line 4, strike the close quotation marks and the final period.

Page 68, after line 4, insert the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

**"SEC. 142. AGREEMENT TO PERFORM MILITARY SERVICE IN EVENT OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY.**

"(a) AGREEMENT REQUIRED.—Subject to subsection (b), each participant in a national

service program carried out using assistance provided under section 121 who is selected to serve in an approved national service position shall be required to enter into an agreement with the Secretary of Defense to be available, throughout the term of service of the participant in the position, for temporary enlistment in the Armed Forces at the call of the Secretary in the event of a national emergency declared by the President.

"(b) QUALIFICATIONS.—Only participants who are at least 18 years of age at the time of their temporary enlistment pursuant to this section and who are otherwise qualified for enlistment under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense may be enlisted under the Authority provided by this section.

"(c) TERM OF ENLISTMENT.—A temporary enlistment under this section may not exceed the duration of the national emergency for which the call is made plus six months."

By Mr. WATT:

—Page 212, after line 2, add the following subsection:

"(i) COORDINATION WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES.—As part of the agenda of meetings of the Board under subsection (a), the Board shall review projects and programs conducted or funded by the Corporation under the national service laws to improve the coordination between such projects and programs and the activities of other Federal agencies that deal with the individuals and communities participating in or benefiting from such projects and programs. The ex officio members of the Board specified in section 192(a)(3) shall jointly plan, implement, and fund activities in connection with projects and programs conducted under the national service laws to ensure that Federal efforts attempt to address the total needs of participants, their communities, and the persons and communities they serve.