

SENATE—Tuesday, July 13, 1993

(Legislative day of Wednesday, June 30, 1993)

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the acting President pro tempore [Mr. WOFFORD].

PRAYER

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

Let us pray:

Gracious Father in Heaven, we thank Thee for the recess, for work accomplished, for family and home, and for safe return.

"God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble. Therefore will not we fear, though the earth be removed, and though the mountains be carried into the midst of the sea; Though the waters thereof roar and be troubled, though the mountains shake with the swelling thereof."—Psalm 46:1-3.

Eternal God, Father of us all, our hearts are heavy as we ponder the tragedy and suffering of those in the flooded areas of the Midwest. We lift our hearts in earnest intercession for every community, every family, every individual so sadly affected by this devastation. We pray for those who have lost loved ones. We pray for those who have lost precious possessions. We thank Thee for the many who have responded to help, not only locally, but from all over the country. We thank Thee for the visit of President Clinton and Vice President GORE. We thank Thee for the promise of ready response from the Federal Government.

Gracious God, for all of us who have been untouched by this tragedy, help us to be grateful for such a blessing. Help us never to take for granted the common benefits of life which are so plentiful, so constant, so unfailing.

We pray in the name of Love incarnate. Amen.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 11 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for not to exceed 5 minutes each. The first hour shall be under the control of the Senator from West Virginia.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, prior to the Independence Day recess, I stated my intention to proceed, upon our return today, to S. 185, the Hatch Act reform bill, and obtained a unanimous-consent agreement, printed in today's calendar of business as Order No. 95.

That order states that between 11 a.m. and 12:30 p.m. today, and then again between 2:15 p.m. and 4 p.m., there would be debate on the motion to proceed to that bill; and that at 4 p.m., the Senate vote on a motion to invoke cloture—that is, to terminate debate and filibuster—on the motion to proceed to that bill.

Over the recess period, my staff was notified by Senator DOLE's staff that the cloture vote on the motion to proceed would not be necessary and could be vitiated and we could proceed to the bill today, provided that there be no recorded votes today. I have indicated that such a procedure is agreeable to me, provided in turn that at least one and, hopefully, more than one amendment be offered today, with votes scheduled for the first thing tomorrow morning.

And so, Mr. President, our respective staffs of the majority and minority having worked the matter out, I will now propound two unanimous-consent agreements to revise the schedule under which the pending bill will be considered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 185

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I first ask unanimous consent that at 2:15 p.m. today, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 95, S. 185, the Hatch Act reform bill; and that once the managers have concluded their opening statements, Senator ROTH be recognized to offer an amendment; and further, that the cloture vote scheduled for 4 p.m. today on the motion to proceed to S. 185 be vitiated.

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

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the period

for morning business today be extended until 12:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each; and that the previous order for morning business for Senator BYRD remain in effect; and that the recess period for the regular party conferences today remain as previously ordered.

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

SCHEDULE

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, as a result of these agreements, the Senate will today at 2:15 p.m. begin consideration of S. 185, the Hatch Act reform bill. During today, Senator ROTH will offer an amendment. A vote on that amendment will be scheduled for the first thing tomorrow morning. There may well be other amendments offered today and other votes scheduled for tomorrow morning.

Senators should be apprised of the fact that this will be a very busy legislative period. As is my practice, I have written a letter to each Senator prior to the Independence Day recess setting forth the schedule for this legislative period.

I repeat now that votes may occur at any time the Senate is in session, unless otherwise announced on the floor. We have to begin work on the several appropriations bills. The House has completed nine of them, and I suspect we will be acting on several of them during this legislative period. We will also have, of course, the conference report on the reconciliation bill, and I hope and expect a number of other measures will be the subject of our action during this period.

So Senators can and should expect, unless otherwise announced, legislative session each weekday during this period with votes possible, unless otherwise previously stated or announced in the future.

CONGRATULATIONS TO PRESIDENT CLINTON FOR A SUCCESSFUL G-7 SUMMIT

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I congratulate President Clinton for a successful and productive G-7 summit in Tokyo last week. It is a good foundation to promote U.S. economic interests and strengthen the world economy.

In the post-cold-war world, economic security and expanding international

markets are important factors for both the developed world and developing nations alike. The economies of the world's nations are interdependent, and the future of the U.S. economy is closely linked to the future of the world economy. We have a central role in the international economy. We therefore have the responsibility to chart the path of world growth as we approach the 21st century.

Today both the United States and other economies are struggling through a post-cold-war restructuring. In the fourth quarter of 1992, the annual rate of real economic growth declined 2 percent in France, by 3.3 percent in Germany, by 0.3 percent in Japan and by 2.3 percent in Italy. Unemployment in developed nations remains high: 11 percent in Canada, 10.8 percent in France and 9.4 percent in Italy.

Economic growth in the United States is slow. In the first quarter of this year, U.S. gross domestic product grew at an annual rate of 0.9 percent. Unemployment remains at 7 percent.

The United States must provide leadership to promote world economic growth, and President Clinton has demonstrated his commitment to address the problems that confront the world economy. The International Monetary Fund has repeatedly recommended that the United States lower its Federal budget deficit to restore U.S. national savings to adequate levels. President Clinton has proposed a responsible plan to lower the Federal deficit by \$500 billion over the next 5 years. The majority in Congress is committed to passing the President's plan.

At the G-7 summit, President Clinton's leadership in the effort to lower the U.S. Federal budget deficit gave him the authority to promote world growth and fight for U.S. businesses and workers in foreign markets. His achievements at the G-7 summit include a market access package in the Uruguay round negotiations, an aid package for Russia and a framework agreement to address the trade imbalance between the United States and Japan.

In Tokyo, the President achieved a breakthrough on the market access package, which is a preliminary step to the successful completion of the Uruguay round. Among other things, this market access package will eliminate the tariff and nontariff measures on pharmaceuticals, construction equipment, medical equipment, steel, beer, furniture, farm equipment, and distilled spirits. This breakthrough on the market access package will provide the momentum to lower other tariff and nontariff barriers and to strengthen the set of international trading rules under the General Agreement for Tariffs and Trade.

Completion of the Uruguay round will provide a boost to the world econ-

omy. As the world's largest exporter, the United States will benefit from increased access to foreign markets in manufactured goods, agricultural products, and services. One economic forecasting firm estimated that 10 years after the implementation of a Uruguay round agreement, there would be a net gain of 1.4 million jobs in the United States. I therefore compliment President Clinton on his persistent efforts to negotiate a successful conclusion of the Uruguay round by December 15 of this year.

President's Clinton's leadership also paved the way for an agreement by G-7 members to provide a \$3 billion aid package for Russia. This program of loans and grants will help Russia move to a market economy by speeding up efforts to transfer inefficient state-owned enterprises to private sector control. These funds will make available operations for new enterprises, as well as credits for exports, and will assist Russia in making a successful transition to a free enterprise system.

A successful Russian free market economy will not only enhance freedom and strengthen democracy, it also will increase prospects for solid investments by American businesses.

In the coming weeks, the Congress will be working with the administration on an extensive review of the existing legislation affecting relations between the United States and Russia. We will seek to improve progress in strengthening democracy and promoting economic cooperation between the two nations.

Another important step taken at the summit was the new framework for the economic relationship between the United States and Japan. The trading relationship between these two countries is out of balance. In 1992, Japan had a bilateral trade surplus of \$49 billion. In the first 4 months of 1993, that trade surplus has increased 22 percent on an annual basis. The President recognizes the need to address this recurring trade imbalance with a comprehensive policy to open Japan's markets to United States goods and services.

Under the United States-Japan framework for a new economic partnership, Japan is committed to the goals of increasing the access of foreign goods and services to its markets, decreasing its current account surplus and significantly increasing global imports, including those from the United States. But most importantly, the administration has negotiated a framework which will use objective criteria to evaluate the progress in opening Japan's markets. I am hopeful that the President's new framework agreement with Japan is an important first step in addressing the trade imbalance between the United States and Japan.

At times in the past, the G-7 summit has been criticized as a forum that fails

to accomplish any goals to promote world economic growth. This year was different, and I congratulate President Clinton for his concrete achievements to expand international markets and to help U.S. businesses and workers compete in foreign markets.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi.

THE WORLD FOOD PROGRAMME

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, last year the World Food Programme very skillfully coordinated a relief effort to deal with a very serious drought in Southern Africa. The World Food Programme has a record of many successes.

It began as a small, 3-year experimental program with less than \$100 million in resources, and in 30 years has grown into the largest source of grant assistance to developing countries. While currently providing an average of more than \$1.5 billion in assistance annually, the World Food Programme has invested approximately \$13 billion involving more than 40 million tons of food to combat hunger and promote economic and social development throughout the developing world.

The World Food Programme's activities are not limited to food and economic assistance. They also include serving as the largest provider of grant assistance for environmental activities in developing countries. Since 1963, the programme has given more than \$5 billion in assistance to help developing countries provide the necessary food and fiber to sustain their people while protecting their natural resources.

A highlight of its innovative and imaginative leadership came in April 1992, when Southern Africa was threatened by the worst drought that region had seen in over 100 years. The United Nations designated the World Food Programme as the coordinator for the distribution of almost 11.6 million tons of commodities needed by the region.

Much of the success of the Southern Africa relief effort can be credited to the World Food Programme's executive director, Catherine Bertini. Her capable leadership was indispensable in making this monumental relief effort a success. History should note that the Southern Africa drought emergency operation was a triumph which prevented millions of people from suffering severe hardships, and thousands from starving.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the World Food Programme's report on the Southern Africa drought emergency operation be included in the RECORD.

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

**A DISASTER AVERTED: SOUTHERN AFRICA
FIGHTS THE DROUGHT OF THE CENTURY**

While the world's attention was riveted on the emaciated Somali children, at the same time, on the same continent, the largest preventive operation ever was unfolding successfully in the drought-hit southern Africa—a relief effort based on regional cooperation that effectively avoided disaster for 18 million people at serious risk.

Together, the 10 Southern African Development Community¹ countries and South Africa experienced the worst drought in this century. There was a larger crop failure than the Horn of Africa in the mid-1980s. Roughly five times more food had to be brought into the region than was shipped to the Horn during the famine of 1984-85. The southern region, usually a food exporter, had to import 11.6 million tons of food with an estimated food and transport cost of \$4 billion (US). This volume, a six-fold increase above normal imports, was to be added to existing transport flows.

Much of this huge amount of food had to be brought into landlocked countries (Zambia, Zimbabwe, Malawi, Lesotho, Swaziland, Botswana) through long overland routes and a network of ports, roads and railways geared for exports, not imports. It involved complex and daunting logistics, and also put a great strain on the regional transport system.

Only unprecedented regional coordination could cope with such a challenge. Six transport corridors and 12 ports (Dar es Salaam, Nacala, Beira, Maputo, Durban, East London, Port Elizabeth, Cape Town, Walvis Bay, Namibe, Lobito and Luanda) were used to bring in the food commodities. Berthing priorities, port congestion, warehousing, discharge of ships and loading onto trains, border crossings, customs, tolls and levies, transshipment, maintenance and many other problems had to be solved to move food (both aid and commercial) smoothly.

The region, however, had some comparative advantages: with the exception of war-ravaged Angola and Mozambique, it has a fairly good infrastructure of rail, roads and communications; a strong commercial sector; and, most importantly, the commitment of governments and donors that people would not go hungry—that the drought would not turn into a famine.

The drought occurred at a time when countries in the region were facing economic recession, structural adjustment and soaring unemployment. In addition, civil wars in Angola and Mozambique spilled over into neighboring countries, as refugees fleeing drought and violence poured in, especially to Malawi, host to almost a million Mozambicans.

NEEDS AND PLEDGES

The alarm was sounded early by the Global Information Early Warning System of the UN Food and Agricultural Organization and the U.S.-funded Famine Early Warning System. At the end of January 1992, the early warnings were substantiated with reports of food shortages, dwindling water supplies and deaths of cattle due to lack of grazing. In March, a joint Food and Agriculture Organization/World Food Programme mission, with the support of other UN agencies, assessed the needs in the 10 SADC countries and pub-

lished a special alert. Between April and May, Governments, donors, the UN family and private voluntary organizations reviewed the situation and drew up relief plans.

The potential consequences of the disaster led the UN Office for Humanitarian Affairs (DHA) to launch the joint UN/SADC appeal in New York in the presence of the Secretary General and organize a pledging meeting in early June in Geneva. The appeal requested \$845 million (US) in emergency aid, including 1.6 million tons of targeted food aid (for vulnerable groups and the poorest segments of the population with very limited purchasing power) and 2.5 million tons of programme food aid (for market sector to enable people who had money to purchase food) for the SADC countries only.

Donors responded generously and quickly, especially the US, which began preparations as early as December 1991. Pledges fulfilled almost all the appeal, and by April 1993, almost 11.6 million tons of drought-related commodities (food and fertilizer) had arrived.

The United Nations then designated the World Food Programme to act as its coordinator for this massive logistics operation. Working jointly with SADC, WFP coordinated the flow of all food, including commercial imports, throughout the region by establishing a Logistical Advisory Centre (LAC) in Harare with a Support Unit in Johannesburg (within the South African Railway and Port Authorities network). Port and railway operations were coordinated through some 20 logistics experts posted to key points on the network and funded through WFP by several donors.

REGIONAL COORDINATION

The LAC, generously funded by the US, amongst others, was a unique cooperative effort that coordinated relief logistics throughout the region. It provided a working link between donors, SADC governments, shipping agents, contractors and transport operators to deliver food (aid and commercial) swiftly.

The LAC compiled and shared regional information on drought relief procurement, importation, distribution and shortfalls, and the flows of food. In addition, the LAC obtained funds from donors, including a \$5 million (US) grant from the US and funds from the Netherlands, Canada, Sweden, UK, Luxembourg and the African Development Bank, used to help eliminate bottlenecks in SADC countries. The LAC made it possible to buy, lease or borrow equipment; install communication and signaling systems; repair rail wagons and tracks; buy stacking machines, weighing scales, tarpaulins, radios and faxes; and, to repair and maintain roads and bridges. The improvements made on the regional transport system will remain in place once the drought is over.

The weekly shipping bulletin issued by the LAC contained up-to-date, detailed information on all drought-related shipments (commodities, volume, destination port, arrival and discharge dates, etc.) Obtaining, checking and collating this vast amount of information (more than 1,000 consignments with 25,000 information elements) was a major undertaking that involved daily contact with ports, railways, shippers and donors. Handling up-to-date information about shipments, bottlenecks and needs, the LAC could ask donors and shippers to divert or speed shipments according to need.

All UN Agencies, Governments and non-governmental organizations participated in the relief effort. Country-by-country infor-

mation on the drought was issued by Agencies and consolidated by DHA in Geneva in monthly reports.

The relief effort demanded careful planning and unprecedented regional coordination. The experience gained and links forged will continue to play a constructive role in the region after the drought is over. As an example of regional cooperation, in December 1992, when warned by LAC of an impending shortage of food for the commercial sector in Malawi, SADC countries agreed to give priority to Malawi-bound shipments and to loan Malawi grain from built-up stocks in other countries.

AT COUNTRY LEVEL

Although each country chose its own approach to drought relief, generally Governments, UN agencies and NGOs pooled efforts, resources and expertise to deliver aid to the needy while avoiding duplication and overlapping. Decentralized and effective provincial, district and ward councils played a key role.

Non-Governmental Organizations (such as Save the Children, Oxfam, Lutheran World Federation, World Vision, Caritas, Care, Red Cross, Africare, Concern/US, Food for the Hungry International, Catholic Relief Services and other missions and churches) were often responsible for the final distribution of food to people. UNICEF devoted resources to providing potable water to thirsty villages. Food-for-work schemes proved very successful, especially in Zambia. Supplementary feeding schemes at schools and health clinics helped keep children and mothers in good health, notably in Zimbabwe and Botswana. Vulnerable household feeding was the strategy in Lesotho.

Among the problems encountered were difficulties in registering beneficiaries in some countries, which made for weak targeting. In addition, inadequate reporting and monitoring at the provincial level also hampered the relief effort in Namibia and Botswana, while war-ravaged Angola and Mozambique were a logistics nightmare. Swaziland and Lesotho also had a late start in drought relief, but finally succeeded in moving the food where it was needed.

By March 1993, widespread rains had blessed Malawi, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Tanzania and (although delayed) Mozambique and Botswana, where the crops were in good health. However, in the case of Mozambique, the areas planted were smaller because farmers faced shortages of animal drought power, tractors, seeds, fertilizer and tools—critically so in the case of Mozambique. The region will need a few years to fully recover, but few lives were lost and a disaster was averted because people, Governments and donors cooperated in helping those in need.

The Southern Africa Drought Emergency operation will go down in the annals of history as a great success—especially for the millions of people who could have become victims of the drought. The United Nations, the World Food Programme, the international community, the U.S. government and all the governments of the region deserve congratulations for a job well done and a disaster averted.

**APPOINTMENT BY THE PRESIDENT
PRO TEMPORE**

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, pursuant to Public Law 99-498 reappoints Lynn M. Burns,

¹SADC: Southern Africa Development Community—its members are Angola, Botswana, Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, Swaziland, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

of Rhode Island, to the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance effective September 30, 1993.

The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, am I to be recognized for 1 hour?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chair.

LINE-ITEM VETO—IX

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this is the ninth in my series of weekly 1-hour speeches on the line-item veto.

In my speech of the week preceding the July 4 holiday, I noted the remarkable economic and social changes that had occurred in Rome and throughout Italy during the period of Rome's phenomenal territorial expansion in the third and second centuries B.C.

I noted that there had been an emergence of two political factions: the Optimates, who represented the senatorial oligarchy and other aristocrats; and the Populares, or the people's party, who represented the proletariat and those elements that were discontented with the existing social order and who demanded certain reforms.

I also observed the growing rivalry between the Senate and the equestrian order. The roots of the equestrian order went back to the days of early Rome, to the equites who composed the cavalry of the Roman armies.

We also noted the rapid growth in the latifundia, the large plantation-type farms that spread throughout Italy and that resulted from the diminishing number of small family farms, from which had come the stalwart citizen soldiery during the centuries of the regal period and the early and middle Republics.

We noted also the growing slave economy, the serious problem of unemployment in the cities, the spread of the latifundia and the diminishing number of small family farms.

Tiberius Gracchus, who was a tribune in 133 B.C., had been traveling through Etruria when he noticed the dearth of inhabitants. He noted that the soil was tilled and the flocks were tended by slaves. And he wondered how the great Roman Republic could continue to be independent and continue in its leadership if the vanishing peasantry were supplanted by slaves from foreign countries. In those days, in order to be a soldier one was required to have property.

This concerned Tiberius and he felt, in view of the vanishing peasantry from the land, that the armies of Rome would suffer.

I am reminded that Tiberius' concerns were echoed by Oliver Goldsmith in "The Deserted Village," who picked up the theme that had so disturbed Tiberius Gracchus.

Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates, and men decay;
Princes and lords may flourish, or may fade;
A breath can make them, as a breath has
made;

But a bold peasantry, their country's pride,
When once destroyed, can never be supplied.

So, we see in this, another parallel between the history of the Romans and the history of our own country, as we have experienced the shift away from the small family farms to the large corporate farms, and the movement away from what was once a predominantly rural population in this country to huge sprawling urban communities with their problems of poverty, disease, unemployment, crime, declining family values, and declining religious values.

It was to these problems, therefore, that Tiberius Gracchus, in 133 B.C., sought to address legislation which was violently opposed by the Senate oligarchy. It cost him his life at the hands of a mob made up of slaves and clients of Senators and other aristocrats.

I have mentioned the word "client" heretofore during this series of speeches, and I should digress momentarily to explain the meaning of the term when used in this context.

In early Rome, it was customary for poorer citizens to attach themselves to a rich or influential citizen in return for his financial assistance or legal assistance, and he thus became their patron. They—the poorer citizens who had attached themselves to the more influential citizen—became his clients. And in return for his financial assistance and other types of aid, they gave to him their political support, and their help in his private life. And it was a matter of great prestige for the patron to appear in public surrounded by a large delegation of these respectful clients. They not only owed him their political support and private help, but they also owed him their respect, and they showed this by greeting him in the morning and by accompanying him about the city.

Also, in those early times when enemy peoples were conquered or when an enemy city was captured, the conquered peoples were sold as slaves. It was the right of any owner of a slave to manumit that slave whenever and however he pleased, and when the owner manumitted a slave, the freedman then became his client and the former owner became the patron.

The law recognized this relationship. It had legal sanction. The patron and his client were not allowed to give testimony against one another.

In 124 B.C., Gaius Gracchus, the younger brother of Tiberius, was elected tribune—following the death of his brother by a decade. In 123 B.C., Gaius was reelected tribune, contrary to the established practice which precluded one's election to the same office unless 10 years had passed.

Gaius carried forward the agrarian policies of his dead brother, and his

aims went even further. Several of his laws were clearly designed to strengthen the equestrians and weaken the Senate as, for example, his law changing the composition of juries so as to exclude Senators from sitting on juries and to allow the replacement of Senators as jurors by equestrians. That he fully recognized the significance and the implications of this law was shown by his remark to someone that even if he should die, he would leave it—meaning the law—as a sword thrust into the side of the Senate.

Gaius also sought to reestablish an Italian peasantry on the land—as his brother had tried to do before him—as a means of bringing new strength to the Roman armies, while at the same time ridding the cities of the hands.

Gaius was not successful in his effort to be elected tribune for a third time. When he was no longer tribune, the consul, Lucius Opimius, summoned Gaius to appear before the Senate to answer questions concerning the actions that he, Gaius, had taken during his two terms as tribune. Paterculus, the historian, who lived between the years 19 B.C. and 30 A.D., writes that Gaius was determined not to be arrested, not to appear before the Roman Senate, and that, in his flight, at the point of time in which he was about to be apprehended by the emissaries of Opimius, he offered his neck to the sword of his friendly slave, Euporus. The body of Gaius, like the body of Tiberius before him, was unceremoniously cast into the Tiber, that he would not enjoy the quiet repose of the grave. Many of his followers were executed.

The Senate had suffered a great loss to its prestige and its authority, and even though the Gracchan threat had been eliminated, the Senate owed its victory to violence. This afforded a precedent which might be turned against the Senate itself. Moreover, the alliance of the Equestrians and the urban proletariat had proved to be stronger than the Senate, and this, too, was a lesson that was not lost on future leaders ambitious for power.

While at Rome the interest had been centered upon the struggle between the Gracchans and the Senate, Roman armies had been busy fighting wars in the defense of Roman territory, as a result of which, in 121 B.C., the Romans became masters of southern Gaul, from the Alps to the Pyrenees. In 112 B.C., Rome became involved in a serious conflict in North Africa. Her involvement revealed to the world the corruption of the ruling class in Rome, and it rekindled the smoldering fires of internal political strife. The occasion was the death, in 118 B.C., of Micipsa, successor to Masinissa, King of Numidia and loyal ally of Rome. Micipsa had bequeathed his kingdom to his two sons, Adherbal and Hiempsal, and to a nephew, Jugurtha, whom he had adopted

several years before. Jugurtha was able and energetic, but also ambitious and unscrupulous. While preparations were being made for the division of the kingdom among the three heirs, Jugurtha had Hiempsal assassinated and expelled Adherbal, who fled to Rome and appealed for aid.

It is difficult to understand the motivations of the Roman Senate in the imbroglio that followed. Rome had no obligation to interfere in the internal affairs of the Numidians, but so successful and influential were Jugurtha's agents that a commission, sent to Numidia in 116 B.C. to partition the country between the rivals, gave to Jugurtha the western and richer half of the kingdom, leaving the eastern and poorer part to Adherbal.

Jugurtha, however, had no intention of ruling only half of the country. His aim was to be the ruler of all of Numidia. He provoked Adherbal to war, and he blockaded Adherbal in his capital city of Cirta, which was aided in its defense by the local Italian business community. Adherbal again appealed to Rome, and the Roman Senate sent out a commission to investigate. But they succumbed to Jugurtha's diplomacy, and the decision was made to force the city to surrender. Adherbal and the city's defenders were executed, many of whom were Italians. This created a storm in Rome, and war was declared.

The Roman consul, Lucius Calpurnius Bestia, invaded Numidia, but Jugurtha resorted to bribes and secured easy terms for peace that aroused such suspicions among the Equestrians in Rome that the opponents of the Senate forced an investigation. Jugurtha was summoned to appear before the Senate to answer questions as to his relations with Roman officials in Numidia.

Arriving in Rome, Jugurtha immediately bought the intervention of two Roman tribunes, who voted against the taking of any testimony from him. Confident that he could purchase immunity for any action, he secured the assassination, in Rome itself, of a rival claimant to the Numidian throne. His friends in the Senate dared protect him no longer, and he was ordered to leave Italy.

The war was reopened, and a battle was fought in which the Roman army was defeated and forced to pass under the yoke, a matter of great humiliation, and released only after its commander had conceded to an alliance between Jugurtha and Rome. Treachery and bribery had played a part in this shameful episode. The terms were rejected by the Roman Senate, and a new consul, Quintus Caecilius Metellus, surnamed Numidicus, took command. One of his staff officers was a man named Gaius Marius. Gaius Marius was an ambitious and able officer, and he implored Metellus that he, Marius, be

allowed to go to Rome and stand for the office of consul. Metellus' reaction was one that insulted Marius, and from that time on, he had a bitter feeling toward Metellus and intrigued against him. Finally, Metellus agreed to let Marius go to Rome to stand for consul.

In 107 B.C. Metellus was elected consul and the Populares secured the passage of a law by the Tribal Assembly transferring the command in Numidia from Metellus to Marius. Take note. The Senate yielded in this encroachment by the Populares on its traditional rights. Marius pursued the battle in North Africa with energy, enthusiasm, and effectiveness. His quaestor, or quartermaster, was Lucius Cornelius Sulla, who was destined, in due time, to become a bitter rival.

Marius pressed the war with great vigor and won hard-fought victories over Jugurtha and his father-in-law Bocchus, king of Mauretania. Sulla, in due time, was successful in capturing Jugurtha, at great risk to his own life. He captured Jugurtha through the treachery of Bocchus, whose betrayal of his son-in-law brought an end to the war. Jugurtha was taken to Rome where he was executed after gracing the triumph of Marius in 105 B.C.

The repercussions of the Jugurthian war were significant. The prestige of the Roman Senate, having already suffered from the Gracchan assaults, was weakened still further by the apparent corruptibility and venality of Senators in dealing with Jugurtha, and by the Populares and the equestrians, who had intervened in foreign policy in the transfer of the command in Numidia from Metellus to Marius. Once again, the equestrians and the city proletariat had shown that they were stronger than the Senate and that they could control public policy. The Jugurthian war had also produced a military leader in the person of Marius, behind whom these elements could unite.

Marius was again elected consul in 104 B.C., the Roman people disregarding the required legal interval of 10 years, and he was given the command against the northern barbarians in Gaul. He set to work immediately in reorganizing and strengthening the Roman army.

Not only did he bring about improvements—may I say to my good friend, the senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], who serves on the Defense Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations and is interested in military affairs—not only did Marius bring about improvements in legionary tactics, equipment, weapons, and organization, but he also accepted as recruits citizens whose lack of property had previously disqualified them from service in the legions. He accepted men who had no property at all. This was a great and far-reaching change. Marius thus transformed military service from an obligation to the Roman state into

a career which could employ thousands of landless and unemployed Romans.

Marius' innovation thus made possible the creation of large standing armies for the first time—the creation of large standing armies in Roman provinces such as Spain, Asia, and Africa. Loyalty to the Roman State came to be supplanted by loyalty to a successful general, who could rely on his soldiers to support him against civil authority and on the support of his veterans to back him in subsequent political campaigns.

Marius was reelected consul for the years 103 and 102 and 101 (since the threat from the northern barbarians continued). In his fifth term as consul, in 101 B.C., Marius was victorious over the Cimbri and the Teutones, and Rome was thereby saved from a repetition of the Gallic invasion of the fourth century B.C.

A coalition among three men—Lucius Appuleius Saturninus and Gaius Servilius Glaucia and Marius—resulted in a sixth term as consul for Marius, in the year 100 B.C., the year in which Julius Caesar, a nephew of Marius by marriage, was born.

It also resulted in Saturninus' reelection to the office of Tribune for a second term, and a praetorship for Glaucia. Glaucia and Saturninus became candidates for the following year 99 B.C., but Glaucia had a rival candidate murdered, which provoked violent disorders. The Senate adopted a decree calling on Marius to restore order. Marius forced the surrender of Glaucia and Saturninus and placed them in a building for safe keeping, but their enemies tore off the roof of the building and stoned them to death, as a result of which, Marius suffered a political eclipse and went into seclusion for several years.

The Senate was once more triumphant and the Populares were discredited. The Optimates celebrated their triumph by seeking to place a check on demagogic legislation through the passage of a law declaring the inclusion of unrelated or extraneous topics in any single legislative enactment illegal, and requiring that the customary interval of 3 market days between the formal publication of an impending measure and the actual voting on it to be strictly observed.

So here—I see my friend from Mississippi smiling; I see a smile on my friend's face from Alaska. They know what I am about to say—here was a type of Byrd Rule 2,092 years ago, dealing with unrelated and extraneous matter.

Perhaps a better awareness of these rules of parliamentary procedure in ancient Rome will help the Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives to better appreciate and understand the importance and significance of our own rules.

In 91 B.C., the Roman Tribune, Livius Drusus, promised non-Roman Italians

that he would bring forth legislation to give them Roman citizenship. The Senate and the Equestrians were very much opposed to this, and Drusus, learning of a plot against his life, removed himself to the atrium of his House, where he transacted the public's business. It was poorly lighted, and one evening, when he was sending a crowd away, he suddenly exclaimed that he was wounded, and fell down while uttering the words. A shoemaker's knife was found thrust into his back.

When the Italians heard of the murder of Drusus, they considered it no longer tolerable for those who were laboring for their political advancement to suffer such outrages and, as they saw no other means of acquiring citizenship, they decided to revolt against the Romans altogether and to make war against them.

They, therefore, sent envoys secretly to one another, formed a league, and exchanged hostages as a pledge of good faith. They also sent ambassadors to Rome to complain that, although they had helped Rome to fight its wars of conquest, the Romans had not been willing to admit the Italians to citizenship. The Roman Senate sternly rejected their pleas.

Appianus, or Appian, states in his history of the civil wars that when the revolt broke out, all the neighboring peoples declared war at the same time. Thus, in the year 90 B.C., the Social War began. It is sometimes referred to as the Marsic War, sometimes as the Italic War, and sometimes as the War against the Allies.

The non-Roman Italians had forces amounting to about 100,000 foot soldiers and horsemen, besides the soldiers that remained as guards in each town.

The Romans sent an equal force against them, composed of the Roman legions and the Italian peoples who were still in alliance with them. The Romans were led by the two consuls, Sextus Julius Caesar and Publius Rutilius Lupus. Serving with them as lieutenant generals were such renowned men as Gaius Marius, Lucius Cornelius Sulla, Gaius Perpenna, Publius Licinius Crassus, Gnaeus Pompeius Strabo, the father of Pompey and under whom both Pompey and Cicero served during the Social War.

The non-Roman armies had several very able generals, as well, to lead their united forces. The consul Rutilius Lupus lost his life in the war, as did tens of thousands of others on both sides. The body of Rutilius, along with the bodies of many others, was brought to Rome for burial. Their corpses made a piteous spectacle. The Roman Senate decreed that from that time, those who were killed in the war should be buried where they fell, lest the spectacle deter others from entering the army.

Another consul, Cato Porcius, subsequently was killed. The Romans de-

ecided to bring an end to this terrible war, which was costing them so heavily in treasure and in blood. So they conceded the issue at stake. All Italy was now united, and all of the peoples south of the Po River received Roman citizenship. By promising Roman citizenship to all those who had not yet revolted or who would lay down their arms, the Roman Senate belatedly acknowledged the folly of its policy opposing Drusus.

The revolt had brought Marius out of exile. The Senate had already appointed Lucius Cornelius Sulla to the command in Asia Minor against the able and ambitious King of Pontus, Mithradates VI, Eupator. However, with the aid of a demagogic tribune, Publius Sulpicius Rufus, the command in Asia Minor was transferred by law to Marius, whereupon Sulla marched his army back to Rome. Marius and Rufus hastily collected troops to fight a pitched battle of Romans against Romans in and around the city itself.

Appian writes, "Now for the first time, an army of her own citizens invaded Rome as a hostile country. From this time, all civil dissensions were decided only by the arbitrament of arms."

Sulla was victorious. Marius barely escaped with his life to Mauretania. Sulpicius was killed and his head severed from his body and nailed to the rostra in the Forum. We are told that Sulpicius had been betrayed by a slave, and that Sulla rewarded the slave for his services by freeing him, and then having him executed for his treachery.

Sulla hastily tried to reorganize the Roman Government by strengthening the Roman Senate and reviving the army assembly, the comitia centuriata, and by using it to replace the Tribal Assembly, the comitia tributa.

Leaving two consuls, Lucius Cornelius Cinna and Gnaeus Octavius, sworn to support the new constitution, Sulla hurried off to fight Mithradates in Asia Minor. He had not been gone long before Cinna impeached Sulla and proposed the recall of Marius. The Senate deposed Cinna. He was driven from the city by the other consul, Gnaeus Octavius.

Cinna fled to raise an army, to return and besiege Rome. Marius also returned and the two of them overcame all resistance, again capturing Rome with a Roman Army. With a cruelty beyond belief, they hunted down their opponents. Octavius and leading Senators and Equites were brutally slain.

Appian writes, "They killed remorselessly. All the heads of Senators were exposed in front of the rostrum. All the friends of Sulla were put to death. His home was razed to the ground, his property confiscated, and himself voted a public enemy. A search was made for his wife and children, but they escaped."

Marius died early in 86 B.C., soon after beginning his 7th term as consul. Cinna was left to lord it over Rome, where he was supreme as consul for that year and for the succeeding 2 years.

Meanwhile, in Asia Minor, Sulla was victorious. He had slain thousands and collected a vast treasury. He now prepared to return with a well-equipped, seasoned army to exact the terrible revenge which he had been planning in cold blood. Cinna was under no illusions as to the fate that awaited him. He started with an army to sail to Macedonia to intercept Sulla. But Cinna was assassinated by his own soldiers in a mutiny at Brundisium, and the fleet did not sail. The followers of Marius and Cinna, nevertheless, would not yield in Italy without a struggle.

Sulla landed in Italy in 83 B.C., and, at the Colline Gate, destroyed an opposing army, massacring to the man the Samnites who had joined it. With a ruthless barbarity, he pursued all those whom he considered to be his enemies, putting up proscription lists of their names and declaring rewards for those who murdered them or who informed against them.

Paterculus, the historian, says that Sulla "was the first to set the precedent for proscription." Plutarch says, "Husbands were dispatched in the bosoms of their wives and sons in those of their mothers." The innocent rich were included in the proscription lists in order that their property might be confiscated. All of Italy was in terror of Sulla's name. After a while, the proscriptions ceased and Sulla went about the business of reorganizing the government.

Sulla was named dictator in 82 B.C. He brought about the appointment of an interrex who, under a special law, then appointed Sulla as dictator for an indeterminate term. This meant that Sulla had all the powers of consuls and tribunes and censors, the combined powers of all the magistrates. Whereas the old practice had allowed the appointment of a dictator for a limited term of no more than 6 months, this new law made possible an open-ended appointment. Sulla, by virtue of this unlimited term and the scope of his powers, became the most powerful person in Roman history up to that time. He had unprecedented autocratic authority.

Mr. President, Sulla was now the complete and absolute master of Italy. He reshaped the Roman Government to suit his own conservative ideas. He made the Roman Senate the most powerful body in the state, weakened the powers of the tribunes, subjected all magistrates to strict accountability, and deprived the equestrians of the privilege, that had been granted to them by Gaius Gracchus, of sitting as judges in their own cause.

Sulla also sought to improve the caliber of men sent to govern the republic's growing empire. He tightened up the whole machinery of government, and settled thousands of his veterans on land throughout Italy that had been confiscated from the vast numbers who had perished or been proscribed in the frightful slaughter he had let loose.

When Sulla voluntarily retired in the year 79 B.C., he depended upon his aristocratic friends not to allow any infraction of the revised form of senatorial government that he had created. He died the following year, 78 B.C., probably from colon cancer.

Mr. President, as we look back now, we see momentous changes that have taken place. Elderly Romans who were boys in the days prior to Tiberius Gracchus had seen their world overturned. Young Romans like Pompey and Cicero, who were 28, and Julius Caesar, who was 21, when Sulla retired, had lived through unspeakable horrors that were utterly alien to the traditional, idealized notions that they had held about their country.

The Roman Republic was still a Republic, but it was far different from the Republic that had already been in existence 350 years when it attracted the admiration of the historian Polybius in the middle of the second century B.C.

The army was no longer made up of the tough rural farmers, many of whom came from the most mountainous areas of the peninsula. Marius, in creating a professional army, had created a new base of power for ambitious men to exploit and use as an instrument of despotic authority.

And what of the Roman Senate? In the old heroic days, the Senate was the most powerful body in the State. It held supreme power because of the respect given to its wise, courageous, and incorruptible leadership. But the power that Sulla conferred upon the Senate—he had increased the number of Senators to 600 during his dictatorship—the power that Sulla conferred on Roman Senators made them neither wise nor courageous. As to the incorruptibility of the Senate—which Cincinnatus in 280 B.C., had compared to an "assemblage of kings,"—its sad decline was pregnant in the prescient words uttered by Jugurtha 170 years later at the time he was ordered to leave Italy.

After passing through the gates of Rome, it is said that he looked back at the city several times in silence. Suddenly he exclaimed, "Yonder is a city put up for sale, and its days are numbered if it finds a buyer."

Mr. President, the Republic's days were numbered.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MATHEWS). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks appear as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are in morning business.

THE NEED FOR A COMMITMENT TO THE NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL STRATEGY

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, on Thursday, July 1, President Clinton's Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, Lee Brown, was sworn into office. I was there in the Rose Garden. At that Rose Garden ceremony, President Clinton pledged his commitment to fight the many-headed monster of drug abuse, and then he stated that he planned to increase drug demand reduction programs by 10 percent.

The very next day, the Washington Post reported that the Clinton administration had, in fact, agreed to a \$231 million cut in drug treatment and education funds by the House of Representatives. Administration officials from the Office of Management and Budget were reported to have privately suggested many of the cuts.

The sum of \$131 million was cut from the drug free schools program and another \$100 million was cut from treatment programs, much of which would have gone to urban areas. As Herb Kleber, executive vice president of the Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse, was recently quoted as saying, "This is a shameful retreat from the fight against drugs."

I would not be so quick to take the floor to make note of this retreat if it were simply an isolated incident. But it is not. This is just another example, on an ever-growing list, of where the administration talks tough about drugs but fails to come through with action.

For example, on February 1, 1993, the Clinton administration was required by law to submit to Congress its first national drug control strategy. Nearly 6 months later, it still has not done so. Some delay is understandable for a new administration, but this has gone on too long. The President announced his plans to make the drug czar's office Cabinet level, and then proceeded to cut the staff size from 146 to 25. Additionally, budget allocations for prosecutors have been reduced, prison construction is being cut, we now see drug treatment and drug education being cut, there is talk about not prosecuting certain drug offenses, and it appears interdiction efforts will be cut back.

It is no secret around here that I favor cutting the budget. But to cut

the budget in this area calls into question the administration's commitment to address the drug problem effectively. It is also shortsighted to cut the budget for the drug war if only because paying to fight the subsidiary problems of drug abuse—health care, crime, lower productivity—is also so expensive. This is not to mention the tragic human costs of drug abuse to children and families.

Despite my concerns, I take comfort in knowing that Lee Brown is on the job. He has publicly criticized these most recent cuts. He has been quoted as saying that his staff of 25 people "is not sufficient to carry out the mandate of the drug czar's office." That was in the Washington Post on July 8. I believe that Lee Brown has already demonstrated that he is willing to take on this challenge and that he has the courage to tell it like it is.

Still, he cannot do it alone. Our drug czar needs a capable staff equipped with a workable battle plan for action against illicit narcotics. And he needs the support of his boss, the President of the United States.

Americans and the Congress have recognized the drug problem and have worked with the past administration and the drug czar's office to implement a national strategy against drug abuse. Much has been accomplished. More resources have been devoted to the war against drugs; there are more drug education programs; we have expanded drug treatment capabilities; and casual drug use has declined. Still, we have a long way to go—specially in fighting the problems of hard-core addiction, rural drug abuse, and drug-related violence.

The question is, does President Clinton really want to lead the Nation in this fight? Recently, columnist A.M. Rosenthal harshly criticized President Clinton's leadership and questioned his willingness to meet this challenge. In a recent article Mr. Rosenthal writes, "Before it is too late, Americans should realize that the concept of the war against drugs is in danger of being dismantled and the result will be creeping legalization. If that is what they want, fine—they can get it by just keeping silent." That was in the New York Times on May 18. Frankly, I think Mr. Rosenthal is right on target here. Congress cannot remain silent.

I hope President Clinton and the rest of the administration will begin to demonstrate a stronger commitment to sustaining a vigorous national effort against drugs and drug abuse. Lee Brown recently was quoted as saying that drugs may be no longer be "at the top of the agenda" as a political issue. That was in the Washington Post on July 8. I think this administration ought to make it a top issue for the good of the country.

I stand ready to work hand in glove with President Clinton and Lee Brown

in continuing the fight against drugs. When a strategy is presented to Congress, I look forward to reviewing it, discussing it with the drug czar and the Attorney General, and, where appropriate, suggesting changes. Through a sustained effort on the part of the Clinton administration, I believe we can continue to make progress in the fight against drug abuse and drug-related violence throughout all of America. So I hope the administration gets going soon.

I am very concerned because I see this scourge undermining much of what is good in America. I see this scourge undermining much of what is good among our young people. I see a lot of young people who really do not have to suffer this way, who really do not have to be tempted this way, who really do not have to put up with this type of treatment if we just do what is right now.

I believe this administration can. I have faith in Lee Brown as a good leader. I intend to back him, and I intend to help him, and I intend to help this President. But I hope they get on the ball and start doing something about it and get this policy and this program going.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Rosenthal and the July 8, 1993, article from the Washington Post be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, May 18, 1993]

DISMANTLING THE WAR

(By A. M. Rosenthal)

Before it is too late, Americans should realize that the concept of the war against drugs is in danger of being dismantled and the result will be creeping legalization.

If that is what they want, fine—they can get it by just keeping silent.

But if they are among the huge majority of Americans who believe legalization would build drug addiction into American life forever, then they should make themselves heard now. There is still time, while decisions are being made in government.

Until recently everybody interested in fighting drug addiction instead of surrendering to it by legalization accepted one concept: The struggle could not be won by one weapon but only through an irreducible variety, each strong. They were six:

Reduction of foreign drug crops. Interdiction of drug smuggling. Enforcement of laws against making, selling or using drugs. Education against drugs. Treatment of addicts. Presidential leadership.

Now four of the six are in question: reduction, interdiction, enforcement, leadership.

For about 20 years, ever since the drug war became an obvious top priority, there has been argument about how to divide the money. Mostly it was about how much law enforcement and interdiction should get compared with treatment.

I believe that funds for the whole arsenal should be expanded rather than weakened part of it. If not, give more money to treatment, without killing the rest of the package.

But now elected and appointed officials are making it clear that they have no real interest in some of the essential instruments of the struggle.

A few Federal judges are saying they will no longer handle drug cases involving mandatory sentences. They should resign, rather than just defy legislative law—or be asked to leave by Congress.

They help spread the myth that the drug laws have failed. The truth is we do not know because the "mandatory" sentences have not been carried out nationwide.

Prof. John J. DiIulio Jr., of Princeton and the Brookings Institution, a particularly lucid expert, says that most drug criminals spend only 10 months in prison, less than a third of their average sentence; that most of them are not in jail for possession but for organized selling and distributing; that in state prisons they are mostly men who served time for other crimes, and that on the street the possibility of long jail time is a prime deterrent. I save my sorrow for Americans and foreigners hunted down by drug gangsters, or just shot in casual sport.

Interdiction is now routinely called a failure by trendies because it did not seal off America. That was not the goal—just to make life harder for the drug trade, instead of saying come right in and ruin us.

But some in the Clinton Administration, including Attorney General Janet Reno, make it known that they do not have much interest in pursuing interdiction. How would you like to be an American agent risking his life to fight drug smuggling and production? Or a Latin president who trusted America to carry out life-and-death promises from one administration to another?

Drug arrests diminish in some cities because the assumption grows that law enforcement does not work in the street. Says who? Ask Americans who live in neighborhoods where children cannot step out of the house for fear of drug crossfire. Do they want even less protection than is now their miserable lot?

What's more, reducing drug arrests immediately reduces the hope in treatment. Drug criminals are often hard-core addicts who will not subject themselves to tough therapy until they are behind bars.

I do not suggest a conspiracy in Washington—just trendiness, mushy thinking, lack of commitment. Perhaps that is a matter of middle- or upper-class background, where it is easier to quit drug use, so it all seems not so terribly terrible. The legalizers will take advantage of all that, creep by creep.

They will achieve de facto legalization unless Americans speak up, most of all President Clinton. By acting as if the drug struggle is interesting, but not very, he dismantles his own leadership role. From the campaign, most voters did not expect that.

Four out of six endangered—but all salvageable. Pay attention or pay the price; free choice.

[From the Washington Post, July 8, 1993]

DIRECTOR OF DRUG POLICY PROTESTS WHITE HOUSE ACCEPTANCE OF CUTS

[By Michael Isikoff]

National Drug Policy Director Lee P. Brown, conceding he was "out of the loop" on a key budget action affecting his office, yesterday vowed to fight to restore \$231 million in House-passed cuts in anti-drug programs that Clinton administration officials had accepted.

Brown, who was nominated in April and took office June 21, said he was unaware of the drug treatment and drug abuse preven-

tion reductions until he read about them in The Washington Post last Friday. After learning that Office of Management and Budget officials had acquiesced informally in the cuts last month during negotiations with the House Appropriations Committee, Brown said he met with OMB Director Leon E. Panetta this week to protest the action and make sure he is consulted about any such moves in the future.

"Certainly, it's not what we wanted to see happen," Brown said when asked about the cuts during a briefing yesterday. "Things have gone on that would not have gone on if a drug director had been in place. . . . We have got to get back in the loop."

The House cut \$131 million from an Education Department "drug free" school program and another \$100 million from treatment programs. The cuts, and the disclosure of OMB's acquiescence in them, embarrassed the White House last week and prompted some antidrug advocates to question the administration's commitment to continuing the drug war. President Clinton had pledged during last year's campaign to dramatically expand federal support for treatment programs—a goal that some treatment advocates say will be severely set back if the Senate upholds the House action.

The move also raised new questions about the role Brown, who won respect of police and others as New York City's police commissioner, will play in the Clinton administration. Although Clinton formally made him a member of his Cabinet, a White House directive in February slashed the staff of the drug policy office by four-fifths, mandating it be reduced to 25 positions by October.

Brown said yesterday he was "not happy with the cutbacks in staff" and has protested them to White House deputy chief of staff Roy Neel. Brown said 25 people "is not sufficient to carry out the mandate of this office."

But it was unclear yesterday whether Brown will have any luck. The staff cut was part of a broader White House directive aimed at meeting another presidential campaign pledge: to cut the White House staff by 25 percent. The White House did not respond to a request for comment yesterday.

"The fact of the matter is the president dug [Brown] a very deep hole" by cutting the staff, said John P. Walters, a former deputy and acting director in the drug office during the Bush administration. "It was already a difficult job. They've come close to making it impossible."

Nonetheless, Brown said that because he will be sitting at the Cabinet table he will have clout that the office never had under President George Bush. He also said that while drugs may no longer be "at the top of the agenda" as a political issue, "I want everybody to understand that we still have a very serious drug problem in America. . . . My duty is to raise the consciousness of the American people."

Brown said his initial goal will be to prepare a general administration drug strategy for presentation to Congress in September. That will be followed by a more detailed blueprint next February. Asked how these might differ from previous policy statements by two Republican administrations, Brown said they will place more emphasis on treatment and prevention programs rather than law enforcement. "I want drugs to be considered as more of a public health problem than as a criminal justice problem," he said.

But Brown offered few specifics and did not suggest any programs that he would curtail. Despite doubts expressed recently by Attorney General Janet Reno about interdiction

efforts. Brown said it would be wrong to "open up the borders" to drug traffickers.

Brown also ruled out even any discussion of legalizing drugs. "I would equate the legalization of drugs to the moral equivalent of genocide," he said.

REGISTRATION OF MASS MAILINGS

The filing date for 1993 second quarter mass mailings is July 26, 1993. If your office did no mass mailings during this period, please submit a form that states "none."

Mass mailing registrations, or negative reports, should be submitted to the Senate Office of Public Records, 232 Hart Building, Washington, DC 20510-7116.

The Public Records Office will be open from 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. on the filing date to accept these filings. For further information, please contact the Public Records Office on (202) 224-0322.

SEX SELLS; IT ALSO MASTERS

Mr. HELMS. Madam President, Dr. L. Nelson Bell was one of those remarkable human beings who comes along only occasionally. I knew him as Dr. Billy Graham's father-in-law. He was a professional baseball player, briefly, before he entered medical school. Then, sometime in the late 1930's, if memory serves me well, he and his family went to China where he served as a medical missionary.

His daughter, Ruth Graham Bell, bless her heart, has never lost her affection for the Chinese people. On countless occasions we have worked with her on problems involving the Chinese.

When Dr. Bell returned to western North Carolina, he founded the Presbyterian Journal, a very readable and informative publication that appealed to Christians of all denominations. This Baptist became a subscriber long ago and I always enjoyed the publication.

At Dr. Bell's death, the Presbyterian Journal was acquired by God's World Publications in Asheville, NC. It was then that the publication, the World, emerged—a very professional, very impressive review of the news of the world, particularly news relating to morality, religions, ethics, and human behavior.

A gentleman named Joel Belz is editor of this news magazine. In each issue he publishes an editorial page. He is a fine craftsman and obviously a profound thinker.

In the July 3 edition of the World, editor Belz examined the subject of sex, and how it is so abused by so many. The heading of his editorial warns: "Sex Sells; It Also Masters." The subheading cautions: "And the Mastery Leads Us to Ignore Some Plain Facts."

Editor Belz does not sermonize his readers. He is not holier than thou. In this instance, as is always the case with his editorials, he implores his readers not to ignore plain facts.

Madam President, I want to share this particular editorial with Senators, and with others who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the aforementioned editorial be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

SEX SELLS; IT ALSO MASTERS—AND THE MASTERY LEADS US TO IGNORE SOME PLAIN FACTS

Pavlov was wrong—at least when it comes to the matter of sex.

The famous Russian physiologist believed that all acquired habits (and even some higher mental activity) are based on chains of conditioned reflex. He thought his experiments showed that when any subject—a human being, a dog, or a rat—made an association between a couple of happenings over a long enough period of time, that subject's behavior would be affected accordingly. The association I remember from my early not-so-detailed studies of Pavlov is of a cocker spaniel regularly beginning to salivate every time he bit and pulled a string that rang a bell.

But Pavlov's theories, however well they might work out when they have to do with other kinds of conditioned response, don't seem to work so well with sex. For the evidence is overwhelming that people keep on choosing destructive behavior even when they have learned repeatedly how chintzy the rewards of that behavior are.

No example is more dramatic than AIDS. By the thousands, men around the world do particular things that have indisputably devastating results. No one doubts the connection between the behavior and the death sentences they produce. Does the behavior change because of that knowledge? Hardly at all.

But just as one kind of sex brings unwanted death, another kind of sex brings unwanted life. Teenagers aren't really ignorant of the relationship between sexual activity and pregnancy; they've had the connection demonstrated for them a lot more times than any cocker spaniel ever pulled the string on a bell. Yet they choose to ignore the obvious lessons.

The list of unlearned lessons goes on: The close tie between promiscuity and disease has little effect on the popularity of casual sex.

The demonstrated connection between marital infidelity and family collapse doesn't keep people from jumping into bed with each other's spouses.

In other words, we simply don't learn our lessons as well as Pavlov says we should have learned them. Experience isn't nearly as good a teacher as it should be. Still, when the evidence provided by experience is so overwhelming, we really ought to ask: Why are we such slow learners?

I'd suggest a combination of two reasons: First, God has built sex into us as human beings as perhaps the most volatile of all his gifts. No one can doubt that Madison Avenue knows what it's doing when it uses sex to move products. It works. And it works primarily because God made sex to be a very compelling force in our lives.

The problem is that sex is just as compelling when we use it wrongly as it is when we use it the way God wanted us to. And an astonishing proportion of society's problems these days are traceable directly to such compulsions.

By compulsion, I mean precisely the kind of behavior we engage in even when all the evidence suggests we shouldn't. There are compulsive eaters, compulsive drinkers (coffee as well as alcohol), compulsive gamblers, compulsive baseball fans, and compulsive shoppers. (OK, so maybe baseball doesn't belong in the list—but it's worth pondering.) But each of those, relatively speaking, exacts its toll from a relatively small segment of society. Sexual compulsion, at one time or another, has sent its bill to almost every one of us.

But second, there is something about sexual compulsion which, whether by God's design or our perversion of his design, is much more off-limits for other people's involvement than is the case with other compulsions. If a compulsion for alcohol begins to consume someone, for example, even our secularized society doesn't hesitate to step in and help deal with the problem. If someone on your street swells to 300 pounds from overeating, it may be a slightly touchy subject, but your face probably won't turn red if the subject turns to Weight Watchers. If it's too difficult for personal discussion, at least the media aren't afraid to discuss the rights and wrongs of overindulgence in all these various aspects of modern life.

Yet somehow, when it comes to sexual behavior, society finds it impermissible to bring into popular discussion the wisdom of experience. Mind you, I'm talking here not about going on Oprah Winfrey with an appeal from the Bible, but merely to say something like, "Hey, when you pull this string, I've discovered that a bell rings!" Such practical discoveries are out of bounds and politically incorrect.

Given the enormity of the consequences, that is a remarkable thing. To know for a fact that the huge social issues of AIDS, abortion, and venereal disease all have easily demonstrable ties to how we act sexually, but not to be able to talk publicly about the consequences of those sexual acts, is incredible. To know that a change in behavior by a defined group within society would clear up AIDS and release billions of dollars in research and health care for other needs, but not to be permitted even to discuss that, is preposterous. To know that tens of billions of welfare dollars could be trimmed from the federal deficit if people took seriously God's ideas about sex and marriage, but never to be able to bring up those ideas in public discourse, is unfathomable.

It's what the apostle Paul had in mind when he talked about the tendency of sinful people to "turn the truth of God into a lie." It's bad enough when individuals do that. When a whole society makes it a way of life, it gets terrifying.

IRRESPONSIBLE CONGRESS? HERE IS TODAY'S BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Madam President, as anyone even remotely familiar with the U.S. Constitution knows, no President can spend a dime of Federal tax money that has not first been approved by Congress, both the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate.

So when you hear a politician or an editor or a commentator declare that

"Reagan ran up the Federal debt" or that "Bush ran it up," bear in mind that it was, and is, the constitutional duty of Congress to control Federal spending. Congress has failed miserably for about 50 years.

The fiscal irresponsibility of Congress has created a Federal debt which stood at \$4,336,575,146,686.68 as of the close of business on Friday, July 9. Averaged out, every man, woman, and child in America owes a share of this massive debt, and that per capita share is \$16,883.10.

DEATH OF DAVEY ALLISON

Mr. HEFLIN. Madam President, the people of Alabama and racing fans all over the country were deeply saddened early this morning to learn of the untimely death of stock car driver Davey Allison. The 32-year-old member of stock car racing's First Family passed away in Birmingham after a helicopter he was piloting crashed in the infield at the Talladega Superspeedway. Davey often referred to the speedway at Talladega as "his home track," the site of his greatest success as a driver. The tragic accident occurred yesterday when Davey and driver Red Farmer flew to the speedway to watch test driving.

Unfortunately, this tragedy is not the first for this legendary Alabama family from Hueytown, a quiet city located just southwest of Birmingham. One of NASCAR's all-time greats, patriarch Bobby Allison saw his career come to an end in 1988 when he was involved in a devastating crash at Pocono International Speedway. Bobby was recently voted into the International Motorsports Hall of Fame.

Next, it struck Davey's brother Clifford, his career cut short at age 27 by a fatal crash 1 year ago at the Michigan International Speedway. Davey himself had survived a racing crash last year at the same track where his famous father was injured. During this accident, his car flipped an astounding 12 times. Like all the Allison's, though, who are known in Alabama and racing circles for their perseverance and determination, Davey quickly rebounded and qualified his car for the race that following weekend at Talladega. He raced the first five laps with a cast on his arm.

Davey Allison was clearly on his way to the top in the world of stock car racing, a pastime that borders on religion in Alabama and other parts of the country. He was ranked fifth in the NASCAR standings for this year and finished third in the Winston Cup standings in 1991 and 1992. His first win came at the Winston 500 race in Talladega in 1987, and over the course of his brief career, he enjoyed 19 victories. He was named rookie of the year in 1987, the first rookie in the history of the sport to sit on the front row

at the Daytona 500 with a lap over 209 miles per hour.

I think it says something about the kind of person that Davey was that he never asked "why me?" in conjunction with the tragedies he and his family have endured over the last 5 years. Only recently, he commented to a friend that his trials were no different than the people under water in Des Moines, IA, or anyone else who loses a brother. Davey's attitude was characteristic of the Allison family. It seemed the greatest tribute Davey could pay to these loved ones was to charge on, harder and faster than ever before. That strength and perseverance will remain his greatest legacy.

Madam President, I wish Red Farmer, who was in the helicopter with Davey and who is still hospitalized, a speedy and full recovery. I also extend to the entire Allison family, including Davey's wife Liz, their children Krista Marie and Robert Grey, and his parents Bobby and Judy, my deepest condolences in the wake of this tremendous loss.

TRIBUTE TO IRWIN LERNER ON HIS RETIREMENT

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Madam President, I stand before you today to pay tribute to Mr. Irwin Lerner on his retirement as president and chief executive officer of Hoffmann-La Roche, Inc. Throughout his 12-year tenure as president and chief executive officer of Hoffmann-La Roche, Mr. Lerner's outstanding efforts and widely hailed accomplishments in the pharmaceutical industry have stood as a model for all to follow.

Irwin Lerner, a New Jersey native, received his BA from Rutgers State University and his MBA from Rutgers Graduate School of Business Administration. He has been graciously giving back to the State of New Jersey ever since. Mr. Lerner has spent 31 years, of his 40-year career in the pharmaceutical industry, working with Hoffmann-La Roche. Headquartered in Nutley, NJ, Hoffmann-La Roche is the United States affiliate of the multinational group of companies headed by Roche Holding Ltd. of Basel, Switzerland, and is known as one of the world's leading research-intensive health care companies.

Hoffmann La Roche's corporate slogan "Working Today for a Healthier Tomorrow," has been demonstrated through Mr. Lerner's continuous efforts to improve the quality of life for Roche's employees, the professionals who prescribe and use its products and services, and the people who benefit from them. Mr. Lerner is best known for his leadership and innovation in the field of prescription pharmaceuticals. During the time he headed the company, Roche launched several breakthrough medications, including the

first effective treatment for severe, treatment-resistant acne and the first recombinant human interferon product ever to enter clinical trials.

Mr. Lerner has successfully taken the lead in the battle against AIDS. He has shown outstanding dedication and commitment to AIDS research, as well as provided social services and public education forums on AIDS. Under his stewardship, Roche has launched a new therapy for AIDS, HIVID, which is used in combination with AZT. Roche made pharmaceutical industry history with HIVID for the most rapid nationwide distribution of a medication following Food and Drug Administration approval. Mr. Lerner's wholehearted devotion to securing financial and human resources to help organizations provide AIDS education to the public and HIV-infected people exemplifies his caring nature.

In the pharmaceutical industry, Mr. Lerner is widely known and respected not only for his success as a corporate executive, but for his leadership in addressing industry issues. He is a member of the board of directors of the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association [PMA] and has long served as chairman of the PMA Board Committee on Food and Drug Administration [FDA] issues. Mr. Lerner was the driving force behind the 1992 passage of a landmark bill empowering the FDA to charge pharmaceutical companies user fees as part of an effort to speed the approval of new drugs. Upon hearing of his retirement, FDA Commissioner Dr. David Kessler described Irv Lerner as "the key actor and true visionary in helping to forge a strong and collaborative relationship between the pharmaceutical industry and the Food and Drug Administration." Mr. Lerner has successfully extended Roche's commitment to corporate social responsibility as demonstrated through his broad support of the voluntary health and non-profit human service communities and numerous initiatives in patient information, math and science education, environmental protection, and drug abuse prevention.

Irwin Lerner has dedicated his life to improving the quality of life for others. I salute and applaud Irwin Lerner, whose commitment, vision, and energy have benefited so many.

FLOODING IN THE MIDWEST

Mr. BOND. Madam President, I thank the Chair and my colleagues for their thoughtfulness in allowing me to proceed, because I want to address, very briefly, a subject of great concern. Many colleagues in this body have asked about it, and I wanted to give a very brief report on the extent of the floods and devastation that have been visited upon my State, as well as neighboring States in the Midwest.

Any of us who have watched the national news have seen pictures of flooding along the Mississippi, and it truly is devastating. Yesterday, we were there and we were visited by Vice President AL GORE, who came out to see the flood waters, and who has promised to work on a bipartisan basis to get the flood relief that is needed.

But as he said and as I have seen in traveling around the State for the last 7 days, this is not just a problem along our Mississippi River. This is a problem on the Missouri River as it comes down from Iowa and goes across our State. It is a problem on tributaries feeding into these rivers.

We have also been visited by flash floods with heavy rain storms that have killed people in southwest Missouri. They have killed people in the Kansas City area. We have had more deaths from the flooding in Missouri than have any other State.

This is a regional disaster of monumental proportions. I have told some of my colleagues that the devastation that is being wreaked upon our State and the rest of the Midwest is much like the devastation that afflicted south Florida last year in Hurricane Andrew.

I have had the privilege of serving my State as Governor for 8 years. In my first year in office in 1973, I saw what at that time were record floods, and I thought that the magnitude of the flooding was very significant. Unfortunately, I must tell you that the flooding that I have seen now is worse than the flooding that occurred at that time.

By Sunday in St. Louis, the flood level is expected to crest over 45 feet, 2 feet higher than ever before. It is possible by Sunday that our capital city of Jefferson City will be marooned. The historic first settlement west of the Mississippi in Sainte Genevieve is undergoing a violent fright. It has been threatened by flood waters for 2 months. With the help of the National Guard and local people they are fighting the flooding.

I have been in the Cape Girardeau area. I went down to see them fight to maintain the levees there. Large levees protecting all of southeast Missouri and elsewhere are in danger because of the continuing rains.

Just to give you an idea of the magnitude, 7 Federal levees will be breached, 120 non-Federal levees will be breached.

The President has declared 49 counties and the city of St. Louis a disaster area. The barge traffic on the rivers has been stopped and will be stopped for a month at the cost of \$1 million a day.

I rode across a railroad bridge on the Mississippi River on Friday, the last remaining rail link between east and west in our State with the flood waters lapping at the base of the railroad bed,

and, as I said, we are looking at possibly continued flooding.

I have seen heroism. I have seen dedication. I have seen volunteers who do not care about the heat, young people and old who are handling sandbags taking care of the people who are suffering. A young mother in Lemay said that her five children had been farmed out to families because her house was halfway under water. There have been instance after instance of people with resignation but with patience and good humor who are undergoing tremendous trials and tribulation. There are long-term health damages, health dangers. Sewage treatment plants all along the river have been knocked out. The cost of restoring them is great.

Obviously, the immediate term health effects are very severe for everybody downstream.

We are going to need assistance. We are going to be coming to this body, working with our colleagues in the House, to get the kind of full-scale relief that we need. Men and women who are in official positions working day and night are strained to the limit. The Federal resources are cooperating. FEMA is cooperating with the corps. But it is a situation that unfortunately is not showing any signs of improving and by this weekend, unfortunately, we may see even more problems.

There is the disaster for farmers. A half million acres are already under water. The damage will undoubtedly be in the billions of dollars.

I advise my colleagues of this because it is something that is going to require prompt assistance. We are looking forward to receiving a message from the President.

To all those people who have expressed interest in helping, let me say that we are deeply grateful. The Salvation Army and the Red Cross are providing assistance. All that assistance in the private sector is most appreciated. The people who have been flooded out express their gratitude to all those who show concern.

I express my thanks to my colleagues for giving me this moment, and I advise them that I must be calling on them for assistance in the future.

SITUATION IN SOMALIA

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, the situation in Somalia has changed since the introduction of United Nations Forces. As my colleagues will recall, President Bush sent United States Marines into Somalia last winter on a humanitarian mission. Senate Joint Resolution 45, which passed the Senate in February of this year, constituted authorization for using U.S. forces to establish an environment secure enough to conduct humanitarian relief operations. The general understanding at that time was that the United States was committing itself for a short-dura-

tion operation. We were not intending to pacify all of Somalia but to secure limited areas in which critically needed aid, primarily food, could be distributed to end mass starvation. The authority embodied in the Senate-passed resolution was very limited, therefore, and the Senate most certainly did not have political solutions in mind.

Now, Madam President, we have turned our operations over to the United Nations, but the United Nations seems to have in mind a much expanded mission which appears to me to be an open-ended mission with open-ended duration. According to the U.N. resolution adopted on December 3, 1992, the U.N. effort is aimed at "facilitating the process of a political settlement. * * * aimed at national reconciliation * * *" This policing process has now squared off U.N. Forces against local warlords. Missions of food relief have now taken a back seat to participation in conflict with local warlords. This was never the Senate's intent. On the heels of the December 3, 1992, U.N. resolution, then White House spokesman Marlin Fitzwater emphasized that "we want to make it clear that this U.N. force would be designed to get humanitarian supplies in, not to establish a new government or resolve the decades-long conflict there or to set up a protectorate or anything like that."

The situation of yesterday highlights the peril of expanding the original humanitarian mission. Three journalists were killed, one by stoning, another by being beaten, another shot, a fourth missing and presumed dead, and two others narrowly escaped with their lives with machete and bullet wounds from a frenzied crowd. This is the first violence imposed on journalists, and follows escalating violence between warlord forces and U.N. Forces. The United States has a contingent among the U.N. Forces, and has recently reinforced that contingent. Where are we going with this policy?

Madam President, these were not American journalists. I read from the Washington Post story of today this excerpt: "Today's mob violence was the first directed specifically at foreign journalists in 2 years of strife." One was a German photographer with the Associated Press, confirmed dead, another was a Kenyan, a third was a British-born resident of Kenya, both photographers for the Reuters News Agency.

Now, Madam President, if these were Americans, there would be a lot of speeches on this floor. They were not American journalists. If they were American journalists, what would the American press corps be saying? The American press corps would have a lot to say about it. These are going to be Americans one of these days. And America is not going to like it.

The United States has a contingent among the U.N. Forces and has recently reinforced that contingent.

The Senate is not being asked if this is OK. Does the Senate support these actions which progressively may lead us deeper and deeper into a difficult situation? So, where are we going with this policy? The Senate has not bought into a police action against Somali warlords. I have not cast any vote to do that.

On June 17, 1993, I made a statement opposing the introduction of additional U.S. Forces in the U.N. operation. Nobody paid any attention to my statement. The press never noticed it. But the day is coming, Madam President, when the press is going to notice it and other Senators are going to notice it.

The violence imposed on international journalists came on the heels of an attack mission conducted by U.S. aircraft, including six Cobra helicopter gunships.

I thought we were going into Somalia to make it possible to stop the starvation of men, women, and children. We anticipated there would be some problems. We knew about the warlords because it was they who were depriving the men, women, and children, the starving peoples, from getting food. But we were not told that it was going to be an open-ended operation, which it appears that it is becoming, or that we were going in there to settle political problems and make peace between rival warlords.

I spoke this morning about the Romans who had no obligation to go into Numidia and interfere there in the internal affairs of Numidians. I did not know earlier that we would be doing the same thing—interfering in political affairs, bringing about a political resolution, restoring peace between and among warlords. Is that what we are doing?

According to the Pentagon today, the United States has 3,925 personnel in Somalia as part of the 18,905-man-strong U.N. Force, 1,160 serving in the Quick Reaction Force and another 2,640 logistics personnel. Another 4,400 marines and sailors are serving as a Marine expeditionary unit offshore in the theater of operations.

Apparently, the United States is playing a more and more significant combat role in a U.N. operation of unknown duration in support of a mission which the U.S. Congress has not endorsed. To my knowledge, it has not. To date, the taxpayers of the United States have spent or committed close to \$1.5 billion for the Somalia operation, and it is going to cost more.

The time has come to remove United States Forces from Somalia whether or not they are part of the U.N. operation. I know some people may not like what I am saying, but I do not see anywhere in our U.S. Constitution that this Senate is bound to go along with a U.N. operation that appears to be getting us deeper and deeper into a war in which we have no business. Getting food to

starving people is one thing. But this is something else.

We were appalled as we sat evening after evening and watched the evening news and saw the starving people of Somalia, and our hearts went out. Nobody objected to trying to get food to those starving people. We no longer see on the evening news children starving to death.

Why are we staying there? When is the U.S. Congress going to demand that the Senate and the House be asked for support in what appears to be more and more an open-ended operation? Is there any indication as to when our people are coming out? The humanitarian relief mission is over. The mission for us, it seems, is accomplished. It is time to go. We have to say, "enough is enough."

The United States has been in Somalia for over 6 months. The duration of our stay was expected to be a short time at the beginning. Now, 7 months down the pike, we are introducing new combat forces and conducting gunship attacks on warlords' camps. We are going to lose some men; we are going to lose some men.

And the United Nations is talking about national reconciliation. What does that mean? Has the Senate bought into that?

Further U.S. action and participation in the newly expanded mission should either be specifically endorsed by the Congress, or we should pack up and go home. My vote is for the latter.

I yield the floor.

THIS VIOLENCE MUST END

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, it is with tremendous grief and anger that I rise today to speak out about the wave of gun violence that has crashed over this Nation and over my home State of California.

Just 1 week ago today, a massacre erupted at a San Francisco law firm. Shots rang out. People ran for their lives. Eight people lost their lives. And when all the smoke had cleared, my son had lost one of his close friends. John Scully's young life had been cut short, his wife of 10 months severely wounded. John Scully had thrown himself in front of her and took the bullet she would have taken.

On that tragic day, something came between John Scully and his ability to fulfill the promises of a young man bursting with love and with life. Something came between him and his ability to be a husband to the woman he had just married in September, to the woman, Michelle, for whom he gave his life. And, something came between him and his ability to continue to be a son and a brother—and someday possibly even a father and a grandfather.

And what ended John Scully's very young 28-year-old life? It was not a disease. It was not an accident. It was a

semiautomatic assault weapon set loose in the hands of a deranged gunman.

Gun violence touches too many of our lives, Madam President. I know that you know that. Its victims are our sons and our daughters, our neighbors and our friends. The sadness runs deep. It is sapping our strength to rebound.

Madam President, this was not California's first gun massacre. How many of us can forget the gunman who opened fire on a Stockton schoolyard in 1989? Five children were killed. Thirty were wounded. And the weapon: It was a semiautomatic assault weapon called an AK-47. The gunman? He had a history of criminal arrests and convictions.

We need to ask ourselves: How can we allow deranged criminals to purchase military-style assault weapons? In 1990, almost 3,000 children and teenagers were murdered with guns. We are losing our children. We are not protecting the innocent and the most vulnerable parts of our population. Between 1984 and 1990, firearm murders of children under 19 increased by 125 percent. We must ask ourselves this question: How many more children must die, how many more lives destroyed before we act here in the U.S. Senate?

Madam President, workplace violence is growing. It represents almost 20 percent of all workplace deaths in California; and nationwide it is about 12 percent of all workplace deaths.

Time and time again, we hear the gun lobby defending its assault weapons, defending the Uzis. These guns do not kill, they say. Only people kill. Well, all the well-paid lobbyists in the world, and all the influence-peddlers in the world will not change the fact that guns help people kill people. They make it easy to kill people.

These weapons allow the criminals to kill from a distance; allow them to kill large numbers of people; and allow them to kill sometimes without knowing or even seeing their victims. It is quick, it is easy, it is impersonal. It is all the things that death—in a civilized society—should never ever be.

The NRA tries to tell us that gun control does not work, but we need to look at the statistics that the NRA does not want us to see. Let us look at the number of people killed by handguns in nations that have gun control laws. In 1990, there were 22 people killed by handguns in Great Britain; 13 in Sweden; 91 in Switzerland; 87 in Japan; 10 in Australia; 68 in Canada. And in that very same year, 1990, handguns killed 10,567 Americans.

The gun lobby bullies, it distorts, and it mocks. You have seen those latest TV ads. They mock elected officials who have the courage to stand up to them. The gun lobby refuses to accept the fact that most people favor commonsense approaches to decreasing the gun carnage in America. The gun lobby

is dangerously out of touch, out of touch with all Americans, and even with the very people they claim to represent—the gunowners. Recent surveys have shown that 60 percent of gunowners favor a ban on assault weapons.

Today I ask the gunowners to help us, help us stop this carnage. What are we waiting for? Without bans on assault weapons how many more religious zealots like David Koresh are going to be allowed to create their own military stockpiles? Without background checks and waiting periods, how many more criminals are going to leave our gunshops armed to the teeth? Without commonsense laws targeting copycat versions of already banned assault weapons, how many more gun manufacturers are going to be able to produce the weapon of their choice through this deadly loophole.

We need to pass commonsense gun control laws to curb the sale of assault weapons and take weapons out of the hands of criminals.

I want to thank my good friend the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. METZENBAUM] for his leadership on this issue. I am proud to be an original cosponsor of his bill, the Semiautomatic Assault Weapons Violence Protection Act of 1993. I want to make a point here to you, Madam President, and to others who may be listening: every single Democratic woman in the U.S. Senate is a cosponsor of that bill. We understand that we must be courageous, we understand that we must save the children. We have common sense, and I think we are right.

This bill will give the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms the tools that it needs to ban certain classes of semiautomatic assault weapons.

I also want to commend Senator JOSEPH BIDEN, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee for shepherding the Brady bill through the Senate.

Now, we need to be clear about the Metzenbaum bill. Assault weapons that serve legitimate sporting purposes would still be legal. Assault weapons used for military and law enforcement purposes would still be legal. But it would ban guns like the one used in San Francisco, guns designed to do one thing—kill a lot of people in a short period of time.

Even though an exact replica of it is already banned under California law, the gun used in San Francisco is still perfectly legal.

That is why the Metzenbaum bill is so important. It gives the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms the power to ban copycat weapons and close this deadly loophole once and for all.

Madam President, in the memory of John Scully, and the other innocents who have fallen victim to this slaughter, I ask my colleagues to act quickly to pass real gun control legislation.

The pain inflicted on the family and friends of the victims must be acknowledged not only by comforting words, but also by critical deeds. Let us act with courage and conviction to get these weapons off our streets and out of our communities.

I do not want to see any of my colleagues have to go to funerals in their States to share the tears of family and friends for these outrageous deaths.

We must not rest until we create an America where children do not go to school armed; an America where gunfire does not spray across our communities; and an America where we are appropriately horrified by this violence and committed to eradicating it. We must not rest until we pass the Brady bill, pass the Assault Weapon Act, and stop the violence once and for all.

To John Scully and the others who died at 101 California Street in San Francisco—we must do this in your name.

Thank you, Madam President

Mr. BAUCUS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

THE GATT AND THE GROUP OF SEVEN MEETING

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, I rise to discuss last week's Group of Seven summit meeting, and the agreements on GATT market access issues and the United States-Japan negotiating framework we reached there.

PRESENT STATE OF THE GATT

First, the GATT. It is fitting that last week's tariff-cutting agreement was announced in Tokyo, because it was there in 1979 that the Tokyo round was completed.

The Tokyo round brought down GATT member tariffs by an average of 34 percent. It did a lot for world growth in the past decade. But to remain relevant in this decade and the next century, the GATT must cover to other issues.

The cornerstone of the GATT is still tariff status—specifically, the principle of most-favored-nation status, which says countries must not offer one GATT member better tariff treatment than others. Today, that is no longer enough. Tariffs were the whole picture when the GATT was created in 1947. But they are only a few brush-strokes in 1993.

Today's trade issues include the fact that United States banks cannot open their doors in Mexico; the French bureaucrats who require 40 percent of all TV programming be French-made; and the Japanese Government's refusal to buy United States-made supercomputers. We did not even have calculators in 1947, much less supercomputers.

NEED FOR GATT TO COVER NEW ISSUES

Today, the GATT covers only trade in goods. Within that category, it

largely excludes agriculture and textiles. Overall, therefore, it covers only about two-thirds of all trade. If we include investment and currency exchange, then present GATT rules cover only about 7 percent of world commerce.

Thus, our initial goals in the Uruguay round went beyond reducing tariffs. We hoped to extend GATT coverage to services and agricultural trade, eliminate agricultural export subsidies, and guarantee protection for copyrights, patents, and trademarks.

These were ambitious aims. And many were pessimistic about the chances for progress toward them in Tokyo. I can only imagine what Leon Panetta must have thought. But last week's summit surprised them all and pushed the Uruguay round forward.

PROGRESS AT TOKYO G-7

That is an unusual result for the G-7. Recent G-7 meetings talked about moving the GATT negotiations forward. This one did move them forward, and President Clinton should be commended for that. It is clear that he knows GATT stands for the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—not the "General Agreement on Talk and Talk," or, as I believe the French translation has it, "General Agreement for Tantrums and Tirades."

Last week's agreement gives the GATT momentum that is crucial if it is to succeed by December 15.

We won commitments from our trading partners to cut tariffs to zero in construction equipment, farm equipment, steel, and furniture. It is good news. But by itself, it is not enough.

We had hoped to cut our tariffs to zero in exchange for identical pledges from our trading partners—zero-for-zero deals—in 18 separate areas. We ended up with eight of eighteen. That is a good start, but we need to keep going until we reach the finish line.

We need assurances that tariffs will be cut to zero on semiconductor chips, computer parts, wood products, non-ferrous metals, and other areas.

Once this is accomplished, we must then get onto the other 103 GATT members to agree—because, after all, the Tokyo agreement was only an agreement among 7 of 108 or 111 countries in the world—and then move on to agriculture, services and intellectual property to finish the job by December 15.

That will be tough. But President Clinton showed in Tokyo that he understands how important a good deal can be for America, as well as how damaging a bad deal could be.

WHAT IS A GOOD AGREEMENT?

What would a good agreement achieve? It would substantially cut tariffs on manufactured goods and remove barriers that keep U.S. service providers like securities firms, insurance companies, and architects out of foreign markets.

A good agreement would protect U.S. intellectual property works like pharmaceuticals, videos, sound recordings, and computer software from piracy.

A good agreement would remove trade distorting farm subsidies that cost us market share in Russia, the Middle East, and Latin America.

It would remove quotas, and outright import bans that keep our competitive grains, rice, apples and wood products out of countries like Japan and South Korea. The United States must not cut our farm tariffs or export subsidies unless our trading partners do the same.

JAPAN NEGOTIATING FRAMEWORK

There is, of course, something a good GATT agreement would not do. It would not weaken our trade remedy laws.

Section 301, the GSP Program, Special 301, our antidumping and countervailing duty laws must stay intact and at full strength. And this year, we must make those laws stronger by adopting Super 301 as well, because even the best Uruguay round agreement imaginable will not solve all our trade problems. We must extend Super 301 this year.

The President took so much care on the negotiating framework with Japan, because the GATT will have little effect on our most serious trade problems with that country. They are not issues of high tariffs or formal quotas.

Rather, they are questions of industrial collusion and failure to enforce antitrust laws; unspoken and unwritten rules; discriminatory distribution networks; and government procurement decisions systematically biased against foreign products.

The United States is not alone in suffering from these problems. The European Community, the newly industrialized countries of East Asia, the ASEAN states and China all run large and persistent deficits with Japan.

Thus, if the negotiating framework we established in Tokyo succeeds, it will have benefits for the whole world trading community as well as for American businesses and Japanese consumers.

This framework sets two major goals. First, it aims for a significant, measurable reduction in Japan's current account surplus. And second, it aims for similar measurable progress in such areas as Government procurement of competitive foreign products, regulations that block foreign service providers, and implementation of existing arrangements.

This, in my opinion, may be the last chance for progress through bilateral negotiations. Japan has already begun to argue that the agreement does not call for measurable progress. The Japanese press does so far as to compare the agreement to a tamamushi—a kind of beetle that changes color depending on how you look at it.

That is a bad sign. It is bad for Japan as well as for the United States, be-

cause if this negotiating framework brings no progress, the result will be to discredit all bilateral negotiations with Japan. That would make President Clinton's vision of a Pacific Community much harder to realize, and would mean a very difficult era in United States-Japanese relations.

Nonetheless, that is still in the future. President Clinton comes home from Asia with two very important achievements. I congratulate him, and I look forward to further progress in the months to come.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to speak in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are in morning business.

Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRESIDENT CLINTON'S PACIFIC NORTHWEST FOREST PLAN

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, those of us who were born in the shadow of the Cascade and Olympic Mountains grew up amidst some of our Nation's most incredible natural resources. We grew up in awe of their splendor, but also amidst increasingly divisive arguments over how to manage them.

Throughout the 1980's, families in our timber towns were told they could harvest growing amounts of timber. The harvests jumped from an average of 2.9 billion board feet during the previous decade to 5 billion board feet in the 1980's. Official Government projections indicated these levels could be maintained. Businesses went into debt to expand. No one would publicly acknowledge that it could not last forever.

Then in 1989, reality hit. It turned out that Federal land management agencies were acting outside the laws. The court stepped in and declared that Federal timber could not be cut unless the agencies began complying with the laws. Harvesting of Federal timber took a dramatic turn. Mills began to close, loggers lost their jobs. The heyday was over, but no one had bothered to let our communities know.

For the last 5 years, my friends and neighbors have watched battle lines form over the fate of the Pacific Northwest forests and the families who depend on them. For 5 years, Congress has argued over board feet. Tempers have flared over how much timber could be harvested or protected. To date, people have rightly feared that intransigence on all sides would lead to the worst: Continued loss of jobs; continued loss of beautiful old growth forests; and continued court-imposed gridlock. Everyone faced uncertainty.

The reality in timber towns today is one where hundreds of families are

struggling to find family wage jobs to put food on the table. Mills have streamlined operations, downsized, or closed. Community colleges are jammed with workers trying to learn new skills for jobs that might not be there. Families wait in line at food banks.

These families are justifiably bitter. No one prepared them for what they now face. Politicians rushed to town to say, "Elect me and I will return life to what it use to be." But as we now know, no one can turn back the clock.

President Clinton has done something no one has seen in the executive branch during the course of this long fight. He has brought leadership to the issue that may finally bring this battle to a close. He has proposed to end the uncertainty and move on. Although many people are unhappy with the President Northwest forest plan, it is clear that a solution is finally at hand. It is a solution that calls on all sides to give something today in return for certainty about tomorrow. This plan insures that there will be a future for the timber industry in our State, and that there will be ancient forests for our grandchildren to see.

I refuse to send empty promises to the families in my State. Clearly, there will be more jobs lost in my State as we move to harvest levels that are legally justifiable and scientifically valid. The job-loss figures used in the press vary widely. But I think we owe our people some truth for a change.

Washington State's chief economist, who follows the industry closely, estimates that of the 53,000 people presently employed in the wood products industry in the State, 3,390 to 3,500 may lose their jobs under the President's plan.

I have no figures on how many would lose their jobs if current court battles continue to prevent any Federal harvest. I do know that if we move ahead with the President's plan, it is possible that some 1.8 billion board feet on the westside alone could be ready for harvest by the end of this year. This is from timber sales that have been sold but not harvested, or sales that have been prepared but not sold. I take the opportunity now to urge the Clinton administration to do everything it can to get this supply moving as soon as possible. Added to an eastside harvest of approximately 400 million, this amount is substantially larger than the harvest levels commonly mentioned.

Now that the President has made his plan public, it is time for Congress to step up to the mark. We now bear the responsibility to pass the economic component of the President's forest package. The people in our timber towns have been bystanders for years, dependent on decision made in the other Washington about how much Federal timber will be harvested. Yet,

no one wants to ask for help in our timber towns. They are proud and independent people. They work hard for a living. They want no handouts. What they want is a chance at the future. The chance to learn new skills, the chance to have their homes be valuable once again. The chance to feed their families and give them hope once again.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee that will review this package, I pledge to the people of my State that enactment of this package is my top priority. And I hope all Members from the Pacific Northwest will set an example by making this important package their highest priority as well.

The key to the President's Northwest economic adjustment initiative is job creation. His proposed Federal assistance package contains \$287 million for fiscal year 1994, and a total of \$1.3 billion over 5 years. All of these resources have been identified within existing spending caps. A combination of landscape investments and grants, loans and loan guarantees from programs such as the Job Training Partnership Act, Small Business Administration, Rural Development Administration, and other programs will create a total of 12,000-14,000 new job opportunities next year, and as many as 33,000 new jobs over the course of the 5-year plan.

The core of this program is devoted to workers, their families, and the communities they live in. The fundamental principle of this plan is stewardship. By taking care of our natural resources, we will be taking care of the towns and people who depend on them. Under this plan, we will rebuild watersheds. We will control soil erosion. We will restore and enhance our forests to ensure biodiversity, high water quality, and a healthy environment over the long term. We will provide seed money and other incentives for small business that can extract greater value from the timber we do harvest. We will provide incentives for non-Federal land managers to implement habitat conservation plans. And we will empower local communities and grassroots groups to manage tracts of Federal land on a new, innovative basis.

All of these things are geared toward creating a new forest resources economy in the West. If implemented, they will remove the uncertainty of the past and give people a strong sense that the future holds new opportunities. This is a new direction not only for the Pacific Northwest, but for the country as a whole. If we implement this program successfully, we can simultaneously create long-term stability within the national forest products economy and set a new model for conflict resolution for natural resource disputes.

Throughout our Nation we see towns and cities and neighborhoods struggling to move into the economy of the 21st century. Nowhere is that struggle

more clear than in the timber towns of the Pacific Northwest. Jobs have been lost in the struggle to design the forests for the future. But by passing the President's economic package, we can show the Nation how investing in people can bring communities back and restore hope for the future.

I believe we can have a balanced solution to the timber crisis in the Pacific Northwest in which we have a strong timber industry and healthy forests for the long term. I urge my colleagues to join together with me to pass the President's Northwest economic adjustment initiative. If we pass this initiative this year, I know that 5 years from now, the workers and families in our timber towns will remain proud, productive citizens of our country.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

DISASTER ASSISTANCE GREATLY NEEDED

Mr. PRESSLER. Madam President, I wish to report to the Senate on the disaster that is devastating my home State of South Dakota. During the last recess I conducted my second tour to parts of South Dakota that are experiencing the most disastrous planting season ever. Not only are persistent rains affecting agriculture and businesses in South Dakota, but the States of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, and Illinois also are being deluged by excessive rainfall. Damage in South Dakota alone could reach more than \$1 billion. Federal assistance is needed now.

Madam President, it is alarming that little has been reported in the national media on the damage in South Dakota. Flooding has claimed the lives of three South Dakotans. Estimated public property damage is \$10 million. Over 2 million acres of farmland have been flooded, causing an estimated crop loss of more than \$500 million. Approximately 1,000 homes have been damaged and some completely destroyed. Seventeen South Dakota counties have been declared State disaster areas and 33 counties are listed as State agricultural emergency areas.

Dr. Ralph Brown, professor of economics at the University of South Dakota, recently described the current situation in South Dakota:

While the state experienced disasters with droughts in 1976, 1988 and 1989, flooding has greater negative economic effects. Flooding preempts some of the usual farm expendi-

tures, like seed, gas, oil where as in a drought those supplies are sold. In terms of total personal income, farm income is 10 to 15 percent of South Dakota's economy. That may not seem like much, but it is the largest of any state in the union. When you look at farm spending for goods it is 40 percent of South Dakota's personal income, where nationally, agriculture spending is only one to two percent.

South Dakota is the most rural State in the Nation. When disaster strikes South Dakota agriculture, it sends a shockwave that affects all industries in South Dakota. Matters are made even worse when disaster strikes more than one growing season. Farm equipment dealers suffer. Seed dealers suffer. All local businesses suffer.

Madam President, this year's disastrous planting season follows last year's extremely wet harvest, when farmers experienced lower yields and poor quality crops. Tremendous amounts of income were lost last year. In fact, many farmers were unable to harvest and much of last year's crops still sits in flooded fields.

Many South Dakota farmers today have never experienced a planting season this disastrous. Time is running out for many of these farmers. Action is urgently needed to permit farmers in these counties to plant a crop and earn an income this year. These farmers are suffering. Legislation is needed to ease their suffering.

What is at stake for these farmers? The word that best answers that question is survival.

What is the situation in South Dakota?

Thirty-three counties are affected. Governor Miller has declared all of these counties as agricultural disaster areas.

In some South Dakota counties, as many as 25 to 35 percent of farmers will not be able to plant this year's corn crop; 12,580 farmers have not been able to plant this year's crops or have flooded acres; 2,351,900 acres are affected—1,116,200 corn acres and 1,235,700 soybean acres. Economic losses could exceed \$1 billion.

What can be done? The following actions are needed to help farmers recover the tremendous loss of income due to prevented planting or failed crops.

The Department of Agriculture should forgo all planting deadlines for this year.

The Department of Agriculture should allow farmers to plant any crop they can or let the land lay fallow to recover. This should be done without any loss of Farm Program benefits.

Farmers should be able to receive Federal crop insurance benefits even though they were unable to plant their crops.

Finally, Congress should act quickly to provide comprehensive Federal disaster assistance.

What has been done? I have written Secretary Espy since April to keep him

informed of the situation in South Dakota. I ask unanimous consent that this correspondence be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BREAUX). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, on May 28, 1993, I asked USDA Secretary Espy to extend the final date for certifying planted acres. I am pleased that he responded by extending the final date from July 1 to July 31. Without this extension, if a farmer could not have certified his planted acreage by July 1, he would have been forced to return advanced deficiency payments. Most of these payments were spent in preparation for planting this year's corn crop. Forcing the repayment of these benefits could place in economic jeopardy farmers who couldn't plant this year's crop. The extension will protect those farmers who are able to plant this year's corn crop.

I also asked Secretary Espy to extend the final date to enter into crop insurance. Unless action is taken now, many farmers stand to lose protection under the Federal crop insurance program and income from planned plantings. The Department of Agriculture still has this under consideration.

I have introduced two bills that would permit farmers to plant other crops on their program crop acreage without the loss of benefits. Though it is too late for most crops to be planted, I hope these legislative changes can be made.

Further, I have written the President to ask him to tour South Dakota to see the devastation firsthand. I hope the President will do this. I also have asked President Clinton to encourage bipartisan congressional action that in providing essential Federal disaster assistance to the Midwestern States devastated by the continuous rainfall and flooding. The President and Congress must work together.

Mr. President, the devastation in eastern parts of South Dakota extends beyond an agricultural disaster. It affects all aspects of South Dakota's economic base, including small businesses, tourism, transportation and other infrastructure factors. In short, the livelihood of hundreds of farming and business communities in South Dakota is in jeopardy.

An economist for the Federal Reserve bank in Minneapolis recently reported that the farm driven economy of South Dakota likely will suffer the most from flooding in the Upper Midwest. It probably will take more than a year for farm income and spending to recover. The bank estimates that in southeast South Dakota, southwest Minnesota, and northwest Iowa, farmers stand to lose \$1 billion in crops they could not plant due to wet conditions and another \$1 billion in damage to crops that

were planted. I ask unanimous consent that articles from several South Dakota newspapers regarding the economic impact of this crisis be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, many Midwestern States are in dire straits. Congress and the administration must act immediately. Federal disaster assistance is needed desperately to alleviate suffering and ensure the survival of farmers and small businesses in South Dakota and other Midwestern States. I urge my colleagues to join in developing a bipartisan disaster relief initiative.

In conclusion, Mr. President, let me say that it has been estimated that South Dakota will suffer, on a percentage basis, more than any other State. I have been disturbed that the national media has paid more attention to some of the more populous areas that will have suffered less. I have also been concerned that the President, in his earlier visit to Davenport, IA, has given the indication that some discretionary funds will be released to those more populous areas before South Dakota.

I have also been concerned that we have been told that all of the disaster assistance relief for South Dakota must come from newly appropriated funds. That is my understanding. I want fair treatment for my State. We do not get as much media attention because we are not at the center of a city or a national media center. But we have problems just as great.

In fact, according to an economist for the Federal Reserve bank in Minneapolis, the State of South Dakota will suffer more than any other State. I want that known, and I want our State to be included. I have invited the President to visit South Dakota. He is on his way back from Hawaii. I hope he will perhaps stop. Our people need assistance. They feel they are being neglected to some extent. We must fight very hard.

Mr. President, I look forward to working on a bipartisan basis with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle on this problem. When there is a hurricane in Florida, or an earthquake in California, there is a great deal of national attention, as there should be. However, we do not get as much attention for a tornado in South Dakota or a flood in South Dakota, but the individuals affected are taxpayers and citizens and are affected just the same. Therefore, the time has come that we need some help, and I will be working with my colleagues.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

U.S. SENATE.

Minneapolis, MN, July 2, 1993.

Hon. MIKE ESPY,
Secretary, Department of Agriculture, Washington DC.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We are writing to request you to immediately announce an Economic Emergency for the affected disaster areas in the states of Minnesota, Iowa, South Dakota, Wisconsin, Missouri, and Nebraska. As you witnessed during your trip to these flood-stricken states on June 30, the devastation and economic loss is significant.

There are further actions which you can take administratively to help our beleaguered farmers. Specifically, we request:

1. Repayment of unearned advance deficiency payments be waived. During these times, it is impossible for producers to repay advance deficiency payments. The 36 cents per bushel that most corn producers received in April has been spent paying last year's bills or helping to pay for this year's inputs.

2. Extend the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation's final planting date for corn and soybeans and permit farmers to purchase prevented planting coverage retroactively.

3. Permit local Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service offices maximum flexibility in administering federal programs—particularly the acreage set-aside programs.

4. Initiate the Emergency Feed Program for livestock producers.

5. Extend the payment schedule for Farmers Home Administration loans to seven years.

6. Drop the 1993 crop year when determining future crop insurance yield averages and other base production averages.

Thank you for your immediate consideration of our concerns. We look forward to working with you to provide relief to our farmers.

Sincerely,

DAVE DURENBERGER.
PAT DANNER.
CHUCK GRASSLEY.
KIT BOND.
JIM RAMSTAD.
BILL BARRETT.
LARRY PRESSLER.

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, July 1, 1993.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Over the past several months, a number of Midwestern states have endured damaging rainfall and flooding conditions. In fact, some South Dakota farmers have not been able to harvest 1992 crops due to continual precipitation. U.S. Secretary of Agriculture Mike Espy recently toured parts of South Dakota, Minnesota and Iowa to view first hand the devastation facing hundreds of Midwestern farmers.

Mr. President, the livelihood of hundreds of farming and business communities along the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers is in jeopardy. Federal disaster assistance is needed desperately to alleviate suffering and ensure the survival of South Dakota farmers and small businesses.

I understand you have requested Secretary Espy to draft legislation to address the current agricultural crisis. I strongly urge you to have Secretary Espy meet with both Republican and Democratic leaders of Congress

to formulate a bipartisan strategy to expedite passage of this disaster relief legislation. In the meantime, I believe a Presidential disaster declaration clearly is warranted. I urge you to make a disaster declaration for South Dakota, as well as other Midwestern states suffering from excessive rainfall and life-threatening flooding.

I plan to visit several South Dakota communities soon to survey the destruction and learn more about economic losses from farmers and small business owners. Further, I will be inspecting damage to the state's infrastructure. Should your schedule permit, I invite you to join me in touring rural South Dakota to assess damages and determine how the federal government can best provide assistance.

I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

LARRY PRESSLER,
U.S. Senator.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, June 22, 1993.

Hon. MIKE ESPY,
Secretary, Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We are writing to share with you our concerns surrounding the current weather and planting conditions in our states of Iowa, Minnesota and South Dakota. Many of us have written or called you previously, but this letter should serve to bring home the fact that the situation is not improving, and the outlook is becoming bleaker for many of our producers to get any kind of crop on many of their acres.

The crop report released on June 21, indicated that 17% of the nation's soybean crop remains unplanted. However, in southwest Minnesota, only 60% of the bean crop has been planted and in South Dakota, the figure is only 65% complete. Weather forecasts are not optimistic, and it's well-accepted that soybeans planted after the first of July can lose up to 40% of their yield potential. The condition of the crops that have been planted is not good either. Monday's report showed that of the corn and beans that have been planted in our states, over half of each crop is in the fair or worse category.

We would like to thank the ASCS for agreeing to meet with our offices. The items that were discussed with our staffs and Randy Weber of the ASCS that we would like to raise with you include:

(1) Repayment of unearned advance deficiency payments—You know as well as we do how difficult it is to ask producers to come up with cash to repay advance deficiency payments. The 36 cents per bushel that most corn producers received in April has been spent paying last year's bills or helping to pay for this year's inputs. At the least, we would like to ask that the Department do what it can to offset these payments from future payments due a producer rather than forcing them to come up with cash immediately.

(2) Expand the list of crops producers can plant under 0-92 provisions—The current list of crops that a producer can plant on acreage enrolled in the 0-92 program is limited to minor oilseeds such as sunflower, safflower, canola, rapeseed, mustard and flaxseed. The only other crops eligible at this point are sesame and crambe. We would like to ask that ASCS utilize the emergency rule under the Administrative Procedures Act to publish interim final regulations that would allow producers more options such as millet or buckwheat and industrial use crops not currently eligible. This action would have to

do be done as soon as is possible to be of benefit to producers.

(3) Waive the minimum size and width requirements for ACR and CU acres—It is our understanding that current regulations require that acres enrolled in set-aside or conserving use such as 0-92 must be at least 5 acres in size and average at least one chain or 66 feet in width. The only exceptions allowed are for permanent fields, and every farm can claim one area that does not meet the requirements. This year producers are going to have a quilt-like pattern in their fields, with the higher ground planted, but many low spots unable to be touched. If this requirement could be waived for this year for producers who opt into 0-92 because of prevented planting, it would allow producers the flexibility to deal with the inability to plant in wet areas.

(4) Economic emergency disaster payments as found in the 1990 farm bill—While we realize it may be a little early to tell just how bad the situation will eventually turn out to be, the weather reports are not improving. The ground is so saturated now that it would take a number of days of sunshine and wind to dry out the ground enough for producers to complete any more planting. Because of this bleak outlook, we would ask that you begin to contemplate the need for disaster payments under the economic emergency provisions found in the 1990 farm bill that would come from CCC funds. The severity and range of this problem could spell disaster for a number of producers and the credit institutions that serve them. The same is true of the main street businesses that also rely on the agricultural economy in our states.

Thank you for your consideration of our concerns. We look forward to working with you to provide some relief to our producers as quickly as possible to enable them to make use of every opportunity to get a crop in the ground. Please let us know if we can be of any assistance or should you have questions.

Sincerely,

Tim Johnson, Fred Grandy, Larry Pressler, Dave Durenberger, Jim Nussle, Jim Leach, Jim Lightfoot, David Minge, Tom Daschle, Tim Penny, Tom Harkin, Charles Grassley, Paul Wellstone.

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, June 4, 1993.

Hon. MIKE ESPY,
Secretary, Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have just returned from South Dakota and need to bring to your attention the current crop disaster conditions in southeastern South Dakota. I have never seen fields in that region so wet so late in the year. Current conditions are the worst in recent memory. Many farmers are facing tremendous loss of income simply due to the fact they are not able to plant their crops. I ask that you be as flexible as possible in administering programs for the 1993 crop to account for prevented or delayed plantings.

Lincoln County already has been declared a disaster by South Dakota's Governor and many more such designations are likely. There are some counties where only ten percent of the corn crop has been planted. As you know, by this time of the year practically all corn should have been planted in South Dakota. I urge your immediate attention to these requests as you receive them.

The current final planting deadlines have caused great concern in South Dakota. At

stake are deficiency payments, federal crop insurance, disaster benefits, and crop bases. I request that you extend for three weeks the final date to certify planted acres and the final planting dates for coverage under the federal crop insurance program. This action would not impact producers who have been able to plant their 1993 crops, but would provide much needed relief for producers who have not been able to plant their 1993 crops through no fault of their own.

I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

LARRY PRESSLER,
U.S. Senator.

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, May 28, 1993.

Hon. MIKE ESPY,
Secretary, Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I urge your immediate approval of disaster assistance for all potato producers in South Dakota who experienced economic losses resulting from natural disasters.

I commend you for your recent announcement of disaster payments for round white potato producers based on low quality of the 1992 crop. While your announcement is of assistance to white potato producers, potato farms in South Dakota produce both round red and round white potatoes. The quality losses in South Dakota have impacted both crops enough to make marketing and grading difficult, if not impossible. South Dakota red potato producers deserve assistance as well.

I have heard from numerous producers in South Dakota who believe they are being discriminated against. Those producers do not understand how disaster assistance would be made available for round white potato losses but not for round red potatoes, when both crops experienced substantial loss of quality due to adverse weather conditions. They believe assistance should be available for both types of potatoes. I share their concern and agree with them.

Many producers in South Dakota have experienced lost and lower-quality harvests due to natural disasters in 1991 and 1992. Some producers may not be able to continue farming without assistance. It is critical that the U.S. Department of Agriculture do all it can to assist those producers.

I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

LARRY PRESSLER,
U.S. Senator.

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, April 15, 1993.

Hon. MIKE ESPY,
Secretary of Agriculture, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I urge your immediate approval of disaster assistance for all producers who experienced economic losses due to the low quality of their 1991 and 1992 harvests resulting from natural disasters.

I commend you for your recent announcement of disaster payments for corn producers based on low quality of the 1992 crop. While your announcement is of assistance to corn producers, many producers of other crops, such as milo, have experienced the same hardships and depressed conditions. They deserve assistance as well.

While existing law provides the discretion to offer disaster assistance due to low crop quality, the law was never intended to be crop specific. Once a determination is made to offer assistance to compensate eligible

producers for low quality, that assistance should be offered for all crops where producers experienced similar losses.

I have heard from numerous producers in South Dakota who believe they are being discriminated against. Those producers, who also experienced economic loss due to the poor quality of their 1991 and 1992 harvests, believe they should be entitled to the same assistance as corn producers. I agree with them.

Many producers in South Dakota have experienced lost and lower-quality harvests due to natural disasters in 1991 and 1992. Some producers may not be able to continue farming without assistance. It is critical that the U.S. Department of Agriculture do all it can to assist those producers.

I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

LARRY PRESSLER,
U.S. Senator.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the Sioux Falls Angus Leader, July 9, 1993]

SIoux FALLS TO SUFFER MOST IN UPPER MIDWEST, FEDERAL RESERVE SAYS

(By Todd Nelson)

The farm-driven economies of Sioux Falls and South Dakota likely will suffer the most from flooding in the Upper Midwest, an economist with the Federal Reserve Bank in Minneapolis said Thursday.

If conditions don't improve in the next few weeks, farm income and spending in South Dakota might not recover for a year or more, agricultural economist Ed Lotterman said.

"Sioux Falls is probably the major urban area that's going to be most affected because you do get a lot of customers from Luverne, Rock Valley, Worthington, Beresford areas that are affected by the flood," Lotterman said.

"It's not that retailing in Sioux Falls is just going to hit a brick wall, but I think that people out in the malls are going to notice it. It may be just a few percent, but it's not going to be a boom year."

This area is more vulnerable because it's more dependent on agriculture than other states in the Ninth Federal Reserve District, Lotterman said. The district includes South Dakota, Minnesota, Montana, North Dakota, northwest Wisconsin and the Upper Peninsula of Michigan.

In southwest Minnesota, northwest Iowa and southeast South Dakota, farmers stand to lose \$1 billion in crops they could not plant because of wet conditions and another \$1 billion in damage to crops already planted, Lotterman said.

"It doesn't have the physical damage that a Davenport, Iowa, has, but in terms of lost business, Sioux Falls is going to be one of the worst hit areas," he said.

Lotterman predicted that smalltown businesses such as auto or appliance dealers would be the first to feel the effects of the farm slowdown, although city retailers would not be far behind.

Some business owners and managers in southeast South Dakota have mixed expectations about the future.

"I can't afford to look at it that way," Canton auto dealer Denny Gaspar said of the negative forecast. "I have not even considered it yet. Business is still good. I'm trying to find the silver lining in the clouds."

For some farmers, that spark of hope might come in higher grain prices for crops they have stored, Gaspar said.

Van Johnson of the South Dakota Auto Dealers Association said dealers from Rapid City to Sioux Economy Falls have reported stronger sales the last six months after sharing in a national slump that started 12 to 18 months ago.

"People are coming back in to the market," Johnson said.

Less optimistic is Randy Bak, part owner of Pedersen Machine in Beresford.

"We're just once removed from the farmers' income so we're in the same boat," Bak said. "I would say we're probably looking at 30 percent of our trade territory that was not planted to soybeans and corn. We are definitely looking at a backlash that may last, who knows, a couple of years."

Bak said he has been holding off on ordering combine parts and has reduced his inventory by 20 percent in anticipation of slower sales.

At The Empire mall, business has been good, marketing director Nancy Litwin said. Today, the mall will put out boxes to collect donations for the Red Cross to help flood victims in eastern South Dakota.

"Obviously, our thoughts are with these people," Litwin said. "We realize that farming is a big part of the economy. I guess I hate to predict the future until it's here to see exactly what comes about."

Bak said the future became clearer this week for many farmers when the rains continued.

"The jury was out up until this week," he said. "A lot of these acres could have been planted up until about now. The rain just never quit."

[From the Sioux Falls Argus Leader, July 8, 1993]

FARM LOSSES SHOULD BE IMMENSE, OFFICIALS SAY

(By David Kranz and Steve Young)

Flooded farmland could cost South Dakota farmers \$450 million and take as much as \$1 billion out of the state's economy, officials said Wednesday.

Ralph Brown, professor of economics at the University of South Dakota, said farmers' losses would be doubled or worse if the disaster extended past one growing season.

"What is important to the economy as a whole is the expenses they would have incurred in putting those crops in, with energy, gas, oil," Brown said of farmers prevented from planting by the flooding. "Then, consider that if this ends up being a poor year, you end up seeing that expenses for things like durable equipment purchases, like tractors, will be down."

Those figures do not include the economic losses that the state's municipalities will suffer.

Mike O'Connor, director of the state Agriculture Stabilization and Conservation Service in Huron, projected the farm production losses based on the number of acres of corn and soybeans that will not be planted or are in trouble because of weather conditions, their potential yield and the prices the crops would have brought.

O'Connor said the chances are slim that South Dakota farmers will be able to recover any more than half of their losses from government disaster declarations.

The ASCS projection is based on reports from 33 counties that are dealing with flooding problems. O'Connor said about 12,580 producers are affected, with a third of the state's 3 million acres of corn and half of the 2 million acres of soybeans at risk or unable to be planted.

O'Connor said his projections were estimates now, because the deadline for final certification is July 31.

Only corn and soybeans were used in the calculations because many farmers, waiting to get dry weather, avoided planting small grain crops such as wheat and oats and put most of their land into corn and soybeans, O'Connor said.

Agriculture contributes \$13.2 billion to South Dakota's economy, the State Agriculture Department said.

Brown said he was basing his projections on the effects past disasters have had on the state's farm economy.

"From a farmer's standpoint, it is loss in net income. From the Flood economic standpoint, it is the loss of expenditures not made by farmers. Farmers may not make money, but they spend a lot."

While the state experienced disasters with droughts in 1976, 1988 and 1989, flooding has greater negative economic effects Brown said.

"Flooding preempts some of the usual farm expenditures, like seed, gas, oil, where as in a drought those supplies are sold."

In terms of total personal income, farm income is 10 to 15 percent of South Dakota's economy.

"That may not seem like much, but it is the largest of any state in the union. When you look at farm spending for goods, it is 40 percent of our total personal income, where nationally, agriculture spending is only one to two percent," Brown said. "So that brings home the impact of the farm economy on the state."

One of the factors not considered in the basic rural income equation is the damage to roads and bridges in the rural areas, Shirlee Leighton, chairman of the Lake County Commission, said.

"In Lake County alone, the loss is \$25 million in agriculture-related business," Leighton said. "Commissioners are now in the process of documenting the road repairs. Right now, I think 85 to 90 percent of the roads are impassable."

Meanwhile, eastern South Dakota was still on alert for flood warnings and forecasts for rain that could make conditions worse.

Meteorologist Chris Jansen said the Big Sioux River won't be changing much in the next few days unless the prediction of scattered thunderstorms through the weekend brings substantial rainfall to the north of Sioux Falls.

The Big Sioux's flood levels Wednesday were about the same as the day before:

At Highway 38A, it was 15½ feet; the flood stage there is 12 feet.

At North Cliff Avenue, it was 23½ feet; flood stage there is 16 feet.

At Hawarden, Iowa, the river fluctuated between 21 and 23 feet; flood stage is about 15 feet.

Beyond submerged crops, water-filled basements and several dikes and levies that had eroded somewhat in Turner County, little other damage was reported Wednesday.

Byron Nogelmeier, civil defense director for Turner County, said waters from the Vermillion River had subsided quite a bit in Davis, and Highway 18 was open there now.

The Vermillion River was down quite a bit at Parker, too, though it is expected to crest at 17 feet today at Wakonda and at 24 feet near the city of Vermillion on Friday. Flood warnings remained in effect Wednesday for the Big Sioux, Vermillion and lower James Rivers.

Brad Stiefvater, McCook County Emergency Services director, said residents of Montrose were still drinking bottled water because of concerns about contamination of the city's water supply. He also said that 10

to 15 families were still unable to return to their homes.

State Game, Fish and Parks officials reopened Lake Vermillion to boaters Wednesday after it was shut down for five days because of flooding. However, Campbell, Madison, Herman and Brandt lakes and two state parks remained closed.

For now, community officials say they will be assessing the damage even further and watching the skies for the next downpour.

"I've been saying all spring that we can't take much more of these 3- and 4-inch rainfalls," Bob Borchers, Hawarden's superintendent of public works, said. "But we're holding on. The river's up and has stayed that way. The good thing is, it hasn't gotten as high as it was earlier."

[From the Sioux City Journal, July 10, 1993]

SOUTH DAKOTA OFFICIALS REPORT INCREASE IN FLOOD DAMAGE

PIERRE.—The preliminary estimate of flood damage to public property in eastern South Dakota has risen to \$4.3 million, state officials reported Friday.

And Mike O'Connor, director of South Dakota's Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, said officials now estimate crop losses in the state exceed \$500 million.

O'Connor said the South Dakota Emergency and Disaster Board, which he heads, has asked for a federal agricultural disaster declaration for the 33 counties recommended by Gov. Walter D. Miller.

The state also is seeking a federal disaster declaration to provide help in repairing public property in 17 counties.

Officials of the state Division of Emergency Management reported that survey teams have had trouble identifying and assessing damage because so much of the area in eastern South Dakota is still under water.

The preliminary estimates of damages to public property don't include Lake County, which suffered extensive flood damage beginning last weekend.

The estimates include damages to roads, bridges, water control facilities and recreational areas. Also included are the costs of debris removal and emergency protective measures.

O'Connor said ASCS officials estimate that more than 1.1 million acres of corn and 1.2 million acres of soybeans have been flooded or never planted because of heavy rains. That equates to a loss of nearly \$193 million for corn and \$256 million for soybeans, he said.

Total crop losses will exceed \$500 million when damage to wheat, sunflowers, oats, barley, hay and other crops is calculated, O'Connor said.

Meanwhile, state Adjutant General Harold Sykora said the state's flood command center in Sioux Falls will be open today and Sunday from 10 a.m. to 2 p.m. to provide technical assistance to South Dakota flood victims. The center operates between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m. on weekdays.

Sykora said the command center has been fielding 50 to 60 calls a day on its toll-free telephone line, which is (800) 407-5143.

Miller on Friday also announced that a state program will provide at least \$3 million in no-interest loans to help low- and moderate-income flood victims repair their homes in eastern South Dakota.

The loan program is funded by the South Dakota Housing Development Authority and five commercial banks.

Qualified families can get loans at zero percent interest to repair their homes. The

loan program carries no equity minimum, origination fee, points, or fees for survey, appraisal, title search or filing, Miller said.

"The interest rate on loans at zero percent will be a substantial help to qualified families whose homes need the kind of repairs I've seen in my travels across the state," Miller said in a written statement.

State officials and the banks involved in the loan program will provide more information on the program after final details are worked out, officials said.

To qualify for a home-repair loan, a family must be below income limits that vary from county to county. Those income limits range from \$30,000 in some counties to \$37,335 in Minnehaha County.

The home-repair loans are available only to families in the 17 counties that Miller has designated as disaster areas because of damage to public property.

Those counties are Bon Homme, Brookings, Clay, Davison, Hanson, Hutchinson, Kingsbury, Lake, Lincoln, McCook, Miner, Minnehaha, Moody, Sanborn, Turner, Union and Yankton.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

TROOPS IN SOMALIA

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, some months ago, I stood on this floor and objected to the manner in which our troops went into Somalia. I said at that time that the U.N. forces, European forces, and Japanese-financed assistance should be leading the way. I felt that the United States should be very careful about involving itself in the situation in Somalia, because it would lead to an entanglement. That prediction has come true. We should be careful when going into countries with military force—I say that as a Vietnam veteran. If we do it through the use of U.N. forces on a cooperative basis, using a multinational force, it is all right. But it is going to be a long time before the United States can disengage in Somalia.

I said that same thing the first day we went in, when it was very popular to be going in, and very unpopular to be saying otherwise. But that is exactly what happened. My prophecy has come true, that we would become entangled in a civil war, and it would be very difficult to disengage. I believe we should disengage as quickly as possible. It is going to get worse. If troops stay there, they should be U.N. multi-country forces, and our troops should not take the lead. We are going to be accused of killing people, and we are going to have claims against the United States. We are going to be blamed for everything. We are blamed for everything anyway. We should not be

going on these adventures, sending our troops into countries without multinational backing.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DURENBERGER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

EMERGENCY DISASTER ASSISTANCE AND CROP INSURANCE REFORM

Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, as America watched the horror caused by floods in the Midwest on TV, my colleague from South Dakota and I, and many others, were personally meeting with the victims in our home States, particularly those in the State of Minnesota, sharing their pain the best we could. It is truly an incredible sight, probably not yet to reach the State of the Presiding Officer right now, which all of our water eventually does. But it is incredible to note that it is now a consensus that the floods of 1993 are the single most widespread disaster to hit my State of Minnesota in 100 years.

As I have viewed newspaper pictures of Des Moines, IA, and places in Missouri, I was struck by the observation that in Iowa and Missouri, waters are wide. In Minnesota, they run very deep, and the damage runs very deep in the heart and the soul of the family farmer and of small communities.

I have never seen such pain, such hopelessness, and I have been through 4 years running of a drought in that part of a State. In the last 3 years, I have been through floods and tornadoes combined, and I have never experienced the pain and hopelessness that you can see in family farmers today.

Farmers in my part of the country, in Minnesota, have been prevented from planting their crops. If you do not make it by the Fourth of July, you do not make it. They have been prevented from planting corn and soybeans in particular. This is a tragedy for the farmers, but the tragedy is not confined to the farmers. Without a steady farm income, the farmers will go out of business. In the Second Congressional District of Minnesota alone, one of our largest, it is estimated that 25 percent of the small businesses will be bankrupt by September.

If Congress does not act now, the potential exists for a massive financial collapse in rural Minnesota—a region which relies on farm income as its economic base, and the heart of the economic base for the rest of the country.

The Senate must act on an emergency disaster bill before August 1, and I will work with the leadership, the administration, the chairman and ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, and anybody else, to move the process along.

Mr. President, these beleaguered citizens have been stricken by the most

violent force of nature in a century. America needs its farmers and its rural communities just as much as any other segment of our society, and it is our responsibility to protect them.

The people of Minnesota, as everyone knows, are particularly strong and they are also very proud. When I visited the disaster victims, they told me that Federal aid was needed but not at the expense of their grandchildren.

So let me be blunt about this. In the past, I have voted against emergency appropriations bills for the victims of disasters in south Florida, Chicago, and Los Angeles. The reason for my opposition was that those congressional actions lacked fiscal restraint and willingness to make sacrifices in other parts of the budget. In other words, it was like free money being sent off to these, at least in a couple cases, community-made disasters, not the result of mother nature. There was no willingness to make any sacrifice anywhere else in the budget. I think this kind of restraint is absolutely essential at a time when we have a \$4 trillion national debt.

So I must say it is not the American people that are the problem. When our Nation has been confronted with domestic and international emergencies and disasters, the very best in our people's spirit always come through. Many times in the 217-year history of our Republic, we have asked our citizens to make personal and financial sacrifices for the good of our Nation. And they always have.

In the face of terrible devastation in the Nation's bountiful agricultural sector, a part of our Nation we cannot do without, can we not ask for some sacrifice on the part of our people and Members of Congress? I fear it is the Congress that is the problem, and that is why I make this little talk today.

Can we not ask that the money needed to help rebuild these Midwestern cities, rural areas, and farms be taken from another program in the Federal Government's \$1.5 trillion budget? As a servant of the public interest, this Government must help rebuild the economies and incomes of the flooded areas, but we have to do it with fiscal restraint and real sacrifices.

And let no one doubt the severity of the problem—the clear and convincing need for Federal help. Kent Thiesse of Blue Earth County, MN, told me that farmers in his area have lost 30 percent of their corn crop, 40 percent of their soybeans, and will lose almost 60 percent of their alfalfa this year.

Remember, again, we are one of those States. We only get one chance a year, and many of these people lost their jobs in 1991, and lost their chance in 1992, and are now losing it in 1993. These people exemplify personal sacrifice, but they always exemplified community responsibility and that is the reason we need to help them.

In this context, I would like to address a broader issue than just Federal disaster aid, and that is, really, why Federal disaster aid? Last March, I introduced a bill called the Federal Crop Insurance Fairness Act. If that bill were in place today, it would make the prospects brighter for recovery from these losses. I will continue to fight for this bill because it will give farmers real coverage for their crops.

That bill would:

Base coverage on actual production history rather than county averages.

Extend late planting coverage an additional 5 days, to 25 days.

Increase prevented planting coverage by 15 percent, guaranteeing farmers fully 50 percent of the coverage of their crop if natural disasters prohibit them from planting, which is basically our problem in Minnesota. If you cannot get into the field and plant a crop, you cannot be covered by crop insurance, even though it is the kind of disaster that you ought to have insurance to cover.

The problem with the system today is that farmers in Minnesota and across this Nation pay out, but there is nothing there when it is time to collect. Yesterday, Richard Peterson, a corn farmer in Jackson County, MN, showed me his crop insurance statistics for the past 6 years. Between 1986 and 1992, Richard paid \$21,000 in crop insurance premiums. He was unable to plant because of drought and rain during 3 of those years and his total received from crop insurance, even though he was not able to get into the field 3 of these years, the total he got back was \$2,100 or 10 percent of the premiums that he paid in.

Mr. President, it is this kind of payout that discourages farmers from participating in the crop insurance program, and costs the Government more in disaster assistance—which is my point. I mean we are wasting money by not having an insurance program in effect.

So I intend to offer my legislation, the Federal Crop Insurance Fairness Act, as an amendment to an appropriate vehicle that comes through this body this month and before the August recess.

Both the Federal aid to flood victims and the reform of crop insurance need to be revitalized by the same spirit: A willingness to make fundamental, intelligent choices about what our Federal Government should do and how we are going to pay for it. I look forward to working with colleagues from the flooded areas and other parts of this country to solve this problem in a way that will provide a model for future discussions of emergency spending.

NETWORK AGREEMENT ON TV VIOLENCE

Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, it has been nearly 40 years since Con-

gress held its first hearing on television violence—and 20 years after the U.S. Surgeon General issued a report warning of the impact that television violence has on our people. It took that length of time for the four major television networks to finally acknowledge that TV does affect viewers, especially children.

That recognition—in and of itself, was truly historic.

I am especially pleased that the networks have voluntarily adopted an approach which I outlined a couple months ago, involving violence warning labels, as the first tangible step toward combating the epidemic of TV violence.

THANKS TO MARK OLSON

Mr. President, at this point, I would like to acknowledge the key contribution of Mark Olson, the young Minnesota State legislator who originally brought this particular issue to my attention. Mark introduced a bipartisan resolution in the Minnesota House of Representatives calling on Congress to pass my legislation called the Children's Television Violence Protection Act. Now the networks, in effect, have made that act unnecessary because they have done it voluntarily.

WARNING LABELS ARE NOT ENOUGH

As provided in that bill, the networks have now agreed to place warning cables on certain programs to help alert parents and safeguard children from televised violence. They have also agreed to notify local newspapers and programming guides about violent TV shows.

But as I have said—repeatedly—warning labels alone are not enough to stem the rising tide of TV violence. They are just a warning and reminder of our responsibility. Warning labels will work only when parents are home to supervise their children's TV viewing. True progress would mean a voluntary reduction in violence by the cable and broadcast industries, and by the Hollywood production community as well.

So while I am encouraged by this recent development, I am hopeful that we will see even bolder action by the networks, Hollywood, and the cable industry at the upcoming conference on TV violence next month. With studies now showing that a typical child watches 8,000 murders and 100,000 acts of violence before finishing elementary school, I think we all agree that this problem is just too serious to bandage over.

Let us be clear. The networks' action 2 weeks ago was not enough. There are serious flaws in this type of voluntary system.

First, there is no uniformity. Under this voluntary agreement, each network's standards and practices department will be determining which programs should carry warning labels and which shows should not. Parents will

not have a clear, reliable, uniform standard as to what shows are considered violent.

Second, neither the cable industry nor independent television stations are covered by the agreement. If you have cable TV in your home, you know what I am talking about. You may have 50 or 60 channels coming into your living room. But the agreement reached by the networks covers programs on only four of those channels. That means there will be no warning on about 95 percent of the stations.

Mr. President, because the proliferation of violence is due in large part to cable TV, it is critical that this warning label system be extended to cover cable and independent stations, as well.

I should mention that Ted Turner has acknowledged televised violence's effect on our children, and has been one clear voice in the industry admitting that something needs to be done. But in the cable industry, his is a lonely voice of sensitivity and responsibility.

THE CHILDREN'S TELEVISION VIOLENCE PROTECTION ACT

Mr. President, my intent in introducing the Children's Television Violence Protection Act was to push the broadcast industry, the cable industry, and Hollywood to do more than just place warning labels on violent programming. It was to convince them that legislative action would be taken if they did not actually reduce the amount of violence on TV, and make efforts to portray violence in a less gratuitous manner.

The intent of my bill was to say to the TV industry: We won't let you continue to bombard our children with senseless violence.

So if the networks' voluntary agreement to use warning labels was intended to stave off congressional action, I am here to tell you that it has not pacified this Senator.

I will continue to push for passage of the Children's Television Violence Protection Act, and to support the continued efforts of others in this body—including Senators SIMON, CONRAD, and DORGAN—to reduce TV violence.

JOIN ME IN COSPONSORING THE CTVPA

Finally, Mr. President, I want to say to my colleagues that they should not be ashamed or afraid to stand up to TV violence. Nor should they be deterred by television industry executives who wrap themselves in the cloak of the first amendment while they continue to assault our children day-in and day-out with gratuitous violent images.

I never have maintained that TV violence is the only cause of violence in our society. But over 40 years of evidence now shows, as the networks themselves have acknowledged, that TV violence does affect our children. It has contributed, and continues to contribute, in a very tangible way to the real violence in America today.

The Children's TV Violence Protection Act is fully consistent with the

first amendment. And if its warning label system is good enough for some of the television industry, it should be good enough for all. So I want to urge my colleagues to join me and Senators CONRAD, THURMOND, and DOMENICI in cosponsoring the bill, and standing up to TV violence.

I see on the floor my colleague from Illinois. If there is anybody in this body who has committed some part of his service to eliminating violence in our society, and particularly in the media, it is our colleague from Illinois. So I am pleased to yield the floor.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I simply want to commend my colleague from Minnesota for his attention to this problem. There is a growing awareness that we have a problem in our society. I saw one editorial in the Washington Times that said it is not clear that violence on television adds to violence in our society.

That is clear. The research is overwhelming, there is no question about that. Maybe the editorial writer has not read the evidence, but it is very, very clear and we are groping toward some answers. I think the steps that have been taken by the networks are a good first step, but we have to look at where we are going.

I simply want to commend my colleague from Minnesota for his attention to this.

Mr. President, if no one seeks the floor—

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield the floor?

Mr. SIMON. I yield to the Presiding Officer, of course.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will observe that morning business is now closed.

RECESS UNTIL 2:15 P.M.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now stand in recess until the hour of 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, at 12:29 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:15 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. KERREY].

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, in his capacity as a Senator from the State of Nebraska, suggests the absence of a quorum.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed as in morning business.

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

1993 ELLIS ISLAND MEDAL OF HONOR RECIPIENTS

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, as the former honorary chairman of Ethnic American Day, I have the distinct privilege of entering into the RECORD the names of the individuals who have been awarded the National Ethnic Coalition of Organizations [NECO] 1993 Ellis Island Medal of Honor.

NECO's distinguished board chairman is Mr. William Denis Fugazy. NECO, founded in 1984, is the only organization in the United States of America that celebrates the ethnic diversity of the American population. NECO serves as a watchdog for ethnic, racial, and religious injustice—and has been the Nation's one constant voice and vigorous advocate for ethnic unity and pride in America. One of its programs is the Ellis Island Medals of Honor.

Each year, since 1986, NECO has recognized America's ethnic diversity by honoring the achievements and contributions of ethnic Americans in all professions, including government, entertainment, business and industry, sports, health care, and communications. NECO's Ellis Island Medals of Honor embody the true spirit of what makes the United States unique among the world's nations.

Many of the country's ethnic groups have no direct connection to Ellis Island, but that is irrelevant to NECO because the experience of all immigrant groups that have landed on our soil has been the same—they have been the target of ethnic, racial, and religious hatred, discrimination, stereotyping, and prejudice.

The Ellis Island Medal of Honor strives to eliminate this hatred. Whether they have entered past Lady Liberty in New York Harbor—or through John F. Kennedy International Airport—or whether they are native Americans, African-Americans, Asian-Americans, or other groups who have not entered this country through Ellis Island—NECO's Ellis Island Medal of Honor embraces all ethnic Americans who call this great country home. The National Ethnic Coalition of Organizations 1993 Ellis Island Medal of Honor recipients are:

1993 ELLIS ISLAND MEDAL OF HONOR RECIPIENTS

Ms. Roz Abrams
Mr. Joey Adams
Mr. Ernest Allen
Mr. William J. Alley
Mr. Arthur Ashe (posthumous)
Mr. Andrew A. Athens
Mr. Arthur August
Mr. Louis E. Azzato
Bishop Paul A. Baltakis, O.F.M.

Mr. Dado Banatao
 Mr. Ben Barnes
 Mr. Richard Bernstein
 Mr. Max Bleck
 Ms. Tova Borgnine
 Mr. Vincent A. Calarco
 Mr. Jerome A. Chazen
 Mr. Alfred A. Checchi
 Mr. Edward J. Cleary
 Mr. Marshall S. Cogan
 Mr. Lester Crown
 Michael DeBakey, M.D.
 The Honorable Robert J. Del Tufo
 The Honorable Edward P. Djerejian
 Rt. Rev. Tibor Domotor
 Mr. Michael Douglas
 Mr. Robert J. Eaton
 Mr. William T. Esrey
 Ms. Gloria Estefan
 Ms. Sandra Feldman
 Ms. Geraldine A. Ferraro
 Mr. William J. Flynn
 Mr. James M. Fox
 Mr. Abraham H. Foxman
 Mr. Marshall M. Fredericks
 Mr. James R. Galbraith
 Ms. Rose Gerace-Mancusi
 Mr. Thomas S. Gulotta
 Mr. Sonny Hall
 Mr. Arthur J. Halleran, Jr.
 Mr. Charles Harper
 Dr. Nils Hasselmo
 Mr. John Hatsopoulos
 Mr. Daniel Hesse
 Mr. Thomas R. Hilberth
 Mr. Allan Houser
 Mr. Kevoork Hovnanian
 The Honorable Dr. Irene H. Impellizzeri
 Dr. Ray R. Irani
 Mr. Theodore H. Ted Jacobsen
 Dr. J. Christopher Jafee, D.Eng.
 Mr. Morton L. Janklow
 The Honorable Sterling Johnson, Jr.
 Ms. Kathy Keeton
 Mr. Gaynor N. Kelley
 Commissioner Raymond W. Kelly
 Mr. Patrick J. Keogh
 The Honorable Jay Kim
 Mr. George Klein
 Mr. William I. Koch
 Ms. Kay Smith Koplovitz
 Mr. Stanley Kreitman
 Mr. Joseph Krentzel
 Mr. Brij Lal
 The Honorable Thomas D. Lambros
 Mr. Peter Lawson-Johnston
 Mr. Fred Lebow
 Mr. Jeff Lederer
 Ms. Judith Leiber
 Mr. Jay Leno
 Mr. O.G. Linde
 Ms. Susan Lucci
 The Honorable William H. Luers
 Mr. George M. Marcus
 Mr. Victor Markowicz
 John P. McEnroe, Esq.
 Mrs. Linda E. McMahon
 Mr. Bernard H. Mendik
 The Honorable Norman Y. Mineta
 Mr. Louis Mofsie
 Mr. N. Scott Momaday
 The Honorable John P. Murtha
 The Hon. Thomas A. Nassif
 Dr. Antonia C. Novello
 Ms. Sadye Sinn Olivieri
 Mr. Edward James Olmos
 Mr. Paul F. Orefice
 Mr. William Porter Payne
 Rev. Andrew Pier, OSB
 Mr. Michael Preisler
 Mr. Jerry Reinsdorf
 Ms. Mary Ann Restivo
 Mr. Pat Riley
 The Honorable Carlos Rivera

The Honorable William P. Rogers
 Mr. Vincent S. Romano
 Mr. Edgar Romney
 Mr. Phillip B. Rooney
 Mr. Frederic D. Rosen
 Leon E. Rosenberg, M.D.
 Mr. Eric O. Salonen
 Mr. Allan "Bud" H. Selig
 Dr. Beurt R. SerVaas
 Mr. Herbert J. Siegel
 Mr. Nick Smyrnis
 Rabbi Ronald B. Sobel
 Mr. Sheldon H. Solow
 The Honorable John E. Sprizzo
 Mr. Howard Stringer
 Mr. Thomas J. Sullivan
 Mr. Percy Ellis Sutton
 Mr. Daniel M. Tabas
 Mr. A. Alfred Taubman
 Mr. Anthony P. Terracciano
 The Honorable Peter Tom
 Mr. Angelo K. Tsakopoulos
 The Honorable Nydia M. Velazquez
 Mr. Karl M. von der Heyden
 Mr. LeRoy T. Walker
 Mr. Kung Lee Wang
 Mr. Walter H. Weiner
 Mr. Gary C. Wendt
 Ms. Marion Wiesel
 Mr. Walter B. Wriston
 Mr. Peter Yeung

FAST TRACK MUST BE EXTENDED

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I wish to address my primary concerns regarding the recent extension of fast-track trade negotiating authority. This extension was necessary if the current negotiations for a new General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade are to be concluded.

South Dakota is the most rural and agricultural State in the Nation. A bright economic future for South Dakota's farmers, ranchers, and small business men and women depends on:

Increasing exports of U.S. agricultural and small business products;

Eliminating nontariff trade barriers and significantly reducing the use of unfair export subsidies; and

A level playing field in the world trade arena.

Future trade agreements must help U.S. agriculture and small business become more competitive in the international marketplace. That is my No. 1 concern.

I have long made it clear that in order for U.S. agriculture to survive, farmers and ranchers must be represented at the trade negotiating table. I cannot support trade agreements that sell U.S. agriculture down the river.

Mr. President, the United States constitutes only 5 percent of the world's population, yet holds a comparative advantage in producing food and fiber. The United States is the world's breadbasket. One out of every 3 acres farmed in the United States is for export. The U.S. food and fiber system contributes nearly 20 percent of our gross domestic product. The key challenge to our trade negotiators is to assure that a new GATT agreement expands markets for U.S. farmers. We must seize this moment.

History has taught us that economic growth is attained through freer trade. Closed markets and protectionist trade action stunts economic growth. What does economic growth mean? It means new jobs. It means better paying jobs. It means higher productivity, higher standards of living. We are more intertwined in the global marketplace than ever before. One out of every six U.S. manufacturing jobs is dependent on exports. That is up from one out of every eight just a few years ago.

So we have 1 out of every 3 acres of land within this country that we export the food from, and one out of every six jobs in this country depends on the products we export. That will accelerate. We will become more and more dependent on international markets.

A BRIEF HISTORY

America's development is deeply connected to trade. From the Boston Tea Party where American citizens protested tea imports to the Tariff Act of 1789, to the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930, Americans have tried the heavy hand of protectionism. These protectionist acts resulted in reciprocal action on the part of other nations.

Many believed that the Smoot-Hawley Act was the catalyst for America's Great Depression as well as the worldwide economic downturn. To reverse this situation the United States enacted the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934. This law authorized the President to lower duties in trade agreements with foreign countries and embraced the principle that tariff adjustment be made selective and on reciprocal basis. It also gave the President the authority to negotiate tariffs with congressional approval. This act served as the basis for today's trade agreements.

Yet in another effort to promote freer and less restrictive trade the GATT—the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—was created in 1948. GATT was designed to serve as the world's governing body for international trade. Its primary objective is to achieve the substantial reduction of tariffs and other barriers to world trade. It is still in existence today.

It has been my hope that the GATT treaty will go forward, but I am worried it will not because of Europe's unwillingness to cut its agricultural subsidies and its subsidies to Airbus. We are decreasing our agriculture subsidies on a 5-year basis. We have two farm bills that have done so.

The GATT has grown in membership from its original 23 member countries to 108 today. Today's member countries represent 90 percent of world trade. Eight negotiating rounds have been held under the GATT—the first created GATT, and the current Uruguay round is the eighth. GATT members afford each other most-favored-nation status. A basic principle of GATT is that member countries consult with one another

to resolve trade disputes. If differences cannot be settled a complaint can be made to the GATT under its dispute settlement clause. Often a GATT panel of experts investigates the complaint and makes recommendations.

The GATT does permit regional trading arrangements, such as United States-Canadian Free-Trade Agreement and the United States-Israel Free-Trade Agreement. As long as these arrangements do not raise trade barriers against GATT members outside the regional arrangements, such free trade agreements are acceptable. Thus the GATT provides an exception to its most-favored-nation clause when the result is freer trade.

As the world enters the 21st century, a new agreement would significantly shape the future economic growth of the world's developing and lesser developed countries. This is significant for the United States since 40 percent of U.S. trade is with the world's developing and lesser developed countries.

WHAT IS AT STAKE

The United States is the world's central marketplace with \$929.2 billion in trade in 1992. The United States exported \$415.5 billion in 1992, a 21-percent increase since 1989. More than \$40 billion in U.S. exports was in agricultural products. Exports of capital goods, such as aircraft, high-technology equipment, and oil exploration equipment are up nearly 30 percent.

Up until now, GATT has dealt primarily with lowering tariffs and quotas. Nontariff trade barriers such as Government research and development, safety standards, licensing, domestic price supports, construction permits, protection of intellectual property rights are all on the table. Is this agenda too ambitious? Only time will tell. Many believe that these nontariff barriers replaced the high tariffs of the 1940's. Will GATT, in time, be able to successfully address these areas as it did with tariff barriers throughout the last 40 years?

Will the world continue to embrace the principles of freer trade and less isolationism? Will these principles be discarded and replaced by Government-controlled managed trade? Will the world retreat into a period of predatory trade practices? I hope that world's answer is a resounding "no."

Mr. President, as we moved to the 1990's, I had hoped that we would have the eighth round, the Uruguay round of the GATT treaties adopted and we would have freer trade in the 1990's. I hope that eventually we have a free-trade agreement in North and South America. I am a believer in free trade as long as we have fair trade. But now I am pessimistic because the world seems to be balkanizing into little trade groups. Europe wants to be protectionistic. It uses some tariffs but it also uses nontariff trade barriers. Indeed, our telecommunications people

are told there are no tariffs but they go over there and discover standards and licensing procedures, and other nontariff trade barriers. There is really not free trade there, at least for our people.

The rest of the world believes free trade is being able to have access to the government markets and then put some nontariff barriers on. The nontariff barriers are frequently more vicious and harder.

So I am saddened that as we move through the 1990's we are not having free trade. We seem to be moving more toward regional or balkanized trade in this world, and that will hurt poor people the most. It will lessen the development of jobs, and it will hurt world prosperity.

The administration estimates that over the next decade a successful Uruguay round agreement would increase world output by more than \$5 trillion—more than \$1 trillion to the United States alone. This translates to an additional \$17,000 for the average American family of four. Rules to protect the intellectual property of U.S. business men and women would protect nearly \$60 billion of lost revenue due to theft and counterfeiting of U.S. ideas.

It is clear that a new GATT agreement would fuel economic growth and create jobs worldwide.

Mr. President, I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, was leader time reserved?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Leader time is reserved.

GOP READY TO HELP CONFRONT RECORD MIDWEST FLOODING

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, as the flood of 1993 continues to swallow up more and more land, and encroach on more and more midwestern communities, our thoughts and prayers are with the many thousands of Americans who are waist-deep in this disaster. But, these people need more than our warm wishes, and they will get more from the Federal Government.

We have not yet seen the President's request for emergency assistance, and the scope of this tragedy may not yet be known until the flood waters recede.

As the Republican leader, I am prepared to move quickly, and to cooperate with President Clinton and the administration as we seek to ease the suffering and the hardship of a disaster that has driven people from their homes, crippled businesses, destroyed crops, shut down water supplies, and been linked to at least 19 deaths.

The severe weather that has caused this record flooding has also wreaked havoc in Kansas. Severe storms have pounded Kansas, including tornadoes, heavy rains, large hail, and some extremely high winds. This severe weather has devastated crops, prevented plantings, hampered the wheat harvest, and destroyed homes and businesses.

So I guess, Mr. President, the message I think from all of us in this Chamber is that as soon as it is possible—it is not possible yet because we do not know the extent of the damage—for the President to send us his request, we will, I am certain, act quickly, act together, and act in the total spirit of bipartisanship.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

HATCH ACT REFORM AMENDMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will report S. 185.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 185) to amend title V, United States Code, to restore to Federal civilian employees their right to participate voluntarily, as private citizens, in the political processes of the Nation, to protect such employees from improper political solicitations, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Governmental Affairs, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

That this Act may be cited as the "Hatch Act Reform Amendments of 1993".

SEC. 2. POLITICAL ACTIVITIES.

(a) Subchapter III of chapter 73 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"SUBCHAPTER III—POLITICAL ACTIVITIES "§ 7321. Political participation

"It is the policy of the Congress that employees should be encouraged to exercise fully, freely, and without fear of penalty or reprisal, and to the extent not expressly prohibited by law, their right to participate or to refrain from participating in the political processes of the Nation.

"§ 7322. Definitions

"For the purpose of this subchapter—
"(1) 'employee' means any individual, other than the President and the Vice President, employed or holding office in—

"(A) an Executive agency other than the General Accounting Office; or

"(B) a position within the competitive service which is not in an Executive agency; but does not include a member of the uniformed services;

"(2) 'partisan political office' means any office for which any candidate is nominated or elected as representing a party any of whose candidates for Presidential elector received votes in the last preceding election at which Presidential electors were selected, but shall exclude any office or position within a political party or affiliated organization; and

"(3) 'political contribution'—

"(A) means any gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money or anything of value, made for any political purpose;

"(B) includes any contract, promise, or agreement, express or implied, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution for any political purpose;

"(C) includes any payment by any person, other than a candidate or a political party or affiliated organization, of compensation for the personal services of another person which are rendered to any candidate or political party or affiliated organization without charge for any political purpose; and

"(D) includes the provision of personal services for any political purpose.

"§7323. Political activity authorized; prohibitions

"(a) Subject to the provisions of subsection (b), an employee may take an active part in political management or in political campaigns, except an employee may not—

"(1) use his official authority or influence for the purpose of interfering with or affecting the result of an election;

"(2) knowingly solicit, accept, or receive a political contribution from any person, unless such person is—

"(A) a member of the same Federal labor organization as defined under section 7103(4) of this title or a Federal employee organization which as of the date of enactment of the Hatch Act Reform Amendments of 1993 had a multicandidate political committee (as defined under section 315(a)(4) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a(a)(4)));

"(B) not a subordinate employee; and

"(C) the solicitation is for a contribution to the multicandidate political committee (as defined under section 315(a)(4) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a(a)(4))) of such Federal labor organization as defined under section 7103(4) of this title or a Federal employee organization which as of the date of the enactment of the Hatch Act Reform Amendments of 1993 had a multicandidate political committee (as defined under section 315(a)(4) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a(a)(4))); or

"(3) run for the nomination or as a candidate for election to a partisan political office; or

"(4) knowingly solicit or discourage the participation in any political activity of any person who—

"(A) has an application for any compensation, grant, contract, ruling, license, permit, or certificate pending before the employing office of such employee; or

"(B) is the subject of or a participant in an ongoing audit, investigation, or enforcement action being carried out by the employing office of such employee.

"(b)(1) An employee of the Federal Election Commission (except one appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate), may not request or receive from, or give to, an employee, a Member of Congress, or an officer of a uniformed service a political contribution.

"(2) No employee of the Federal Election Commission (except one appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate), may take an active part in political management or political campaigns.

"(3) For purposes of this subsection, the term 'active part in political management or in a political campaign' means those acts of political management or political campaigning which were prohibited for employees of the competitive service before July 19, 1940, by determinations of the Civil Service Commission under the rules prescribed by the President.

"§7324. Political activities on duty; prohibitions

"(a) An employee may not engage in political activity—

"(1) while the employee is on duty;

"(2) in any room or building occupied in the discharge of official duties by an individual employed or holding office in the Government of the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof;

"(3) while wearing a uniform or official insignia identifying the office or position of the employee; or

"(4) using any vehicle owned or leased by the Government of the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof.

"(b)(1) An employee described in paragraph (2) of this subsection may engage in political activity otherwise prohibited by subsection (a) if the costs associated with that political activity are not paid for by money derived from the Treasury of the United States.

"(2) Paragraph (1) applies to an employee—

"(A) the duties and responsibilities of whose position continue outside normal duty hours and while away from the normal duty post; and

"(B) who is—

"(i) an employee paid from an appropriation for the Executive Office of the President; or

"(ii) an employee appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, whose position is located within the United States, who determines policies to be pursued by the United States in relations with foreign powers or in the nationwide administration of Federal laws.

"§7325. Political activity permitted; employees residing in certain municipalities

"The Office of Personnel Management may prescribe regulations permitting employees, without regard to the prohibitions in paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 7323 of this title, to take an active part in political management and political campaigns involving the municipality or other political subdivision in which they reside, to the extent the Office considers it to be in their domestic interest, when—

"(1) the municipality or political subdivision is in Maryland or Virginia and in the immediate vicinity of the District of Columbia, or is a municipality in which the majority of voters are employed by the Government of the United States; and

"(2) the Office determines that because of special or unusual circumstances which exist in the municipality or political subdivision it is in the domestic interest of the employees and individuals to permit that political participation.

"§7326. Penalties

"Any employee who has been determined by the Merit Systems Protection Board to have violated on two occasions any provision of section 7323 or 7324 of this title, shall upon such second determination by the Merit System Protection Board be removed from such employee's position, in which event that employee may not thereafter hold any position (other than an elected position) as an employee (as defined in section 7322(1) of this title). Such removal shall not be effective until all available appeals are final."

(b)(1) Section 3302(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out "7203, 7321, and 7322" and inserting in lieu thereof "and 7203".

(2) The table of sections for subchapter III of chapter 73 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"SUBCHAPTER III—POLITICAL ACTIVITIES

"7321. Political participation.

"7322. Definitions.

"7323. Political activity authorized; prohibitions.

"7324. Political activities on duty; prohibition.

"7325. Political activity permitted; employees residing in certain municipalities.

"7326. Penalties."

SEC. 3. AMENDMENT TO CHAPTER 12 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE.

Section 1216(c) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) If the Special Counsel receives an allegation concerning any matter under paragraph (1), (3), (4), or (5) of subsection (a), the Special Counsel may investigate and seek corrective action under section 1214 and disciplinary action under section 1215 in the same way as if a prohibited personnel practice were involved."

SEC. 4. AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE.

(a) Section 602 of title 18, United States Code, relating to solicitation of political contributions, is amended—

(1) by inserting "(a)" before "It";

(2) in paragraph (4) by striking out all that follows "Treasury of the United States" and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and "to knowingly solicit any contribution within the meaning of section 301(8) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 from any other such officer, employee, or person. Any person who violates this section shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 3 years, or both."; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) The prohibition in subsection (a) shall not apply to any activity of an employee (as defined in section 7322(1) of title 5) or any individual employed in or under the United States Postal Service or the Postal Rate Commission, unless that activity is prohibited by section 7323 or 7324 of such title."

(b) Section 603 of title 18, United States Code, relating to making political contributions, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) The prohibition in subsection (a) shall not apply to any activity of an employee (as defined in section 7322(1) of title 5) or any individual employed in or under the United States Postal Service or the Postal Rate Commission, unless that activity is prohibited by section 7323 or 7324 of such title."

(c)(1) Chapter 29 of title 18, United States Code, relating to elections and political activities is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§610. Coercion of political activity

"It shall be unlawful for any person to intimidate, threaten, command, or coerce, or attempt to intimidate, threaten, command, or coerce, any employee of the Federal Government as defined in section 7322(1) of title 5, United States Code, to engage in, or not to engage in, any political activity, including, but not limited to, voting or refusing to vote for any candidate or measure in any election, making or refusing to make any political contribution, or working or refusing to work on behalf of any candidate. Any person who violates this section shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than three years, or both."

(2) The table of sections for chapter 29 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"610. Coercion of political activity."

SEC. 5. AMENDMENTS TO THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965.

Section 6 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 1973d) is amended by striking out "the provisions of section 9 of the Act of August 2, 1939, as amended (5 U.S.C. 116i), prohibiting partisan political activity" and by inserting in lieu thereof "the provisions of subchapter III of chapter 73 of title 5, United States Code, relating to political activities".

SEC. 6. AMENDMENTS RELATING TO APPLICATION OF CHAPTER 15 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE.

(a) Section 1501(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting "the District of Columbia," after "State".

(b) Section 675(e) of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9904(e)) is repealed.

SEC. 7. APPLICABILITY TO POSTAL EMPLOYEES.

The amendments made by this Act (except for the amendments made by section 8), and any regulations thereunder, shall apply with respect to employees of the United States Postal Service and the Postal Rate Commission, pursuant to sections 410(b) and 3604(e) of title 39, United States Code.

SEC. 8. POLITICAL RECOMMENDATIONS.

(a) Section 3303 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§3303. Political recommendations

"(a) For the purposes of this section—

"(1) 'agency' means—

"(A) an Executive agency; and

"(B) an agency in the legislative branch with positions in the competitive service;

"(2) 'applicant' means an individual who has applied for appointment to be an employee;

"(3) 'employee' means an employee of an agency who is—

"(A) in the competitive service;

"(B) a career appointee in the Senior Executive Service or an employee under a similar appointment in a similar executive service; or

"(C) in the excepted service other than—

"(i) an employee who is appointed by the President; or

"(ii) an employee whose position has been determined to be of a confidential, policy-determining, policy-making, or policy-advocating character; and

"(4) 'personnel action' means any action described under clauses (i) through (x) of section 2302(a)(2)(A).

"(b) Except as provided under subsection (f), each personnel action with respect to an employee or applicant shall be taken without regard to any recommendation or statement, oral or written, with respect to any employee or applicant who requests or is under consideration for such personnel action, made by—

"(1) any Member of Congress or congressional employee;

"(2) any elected official of the government of any State (including the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico), county, city, or other subdivision thereof;

"(3) any official of a political party; or

"(4) any other individual or organization.

"(c) Except as provided under subsection (f), a person or organization referred to under subsection (b) (1) through (4) is prohibited from making or transmitting to any officer or employee of an agency, any recommendation or statement, oral or written, with respect to any employee or applicant who requests or is under consideration for any personnel action in such agency. Except as provided under subsection (f), the agency, or any officer or employee of the agency—

"(1) shall not solicit, request, consider, or accept any such recommendation or statement; and

"(2) shall return any such written recommendation or statement, appropriately marked as in violation of this section, to the person or organization transmitting the same.

"(d) Except as provided under subsection (f), an employee or applicant who requests or is under consideration for a personnel action in an agency is prohibited from requesting or soliciting from a person or organization referred to under subsection (b) (1) through (4) a recommendation or statement.

"(e) Under regulations prescribed by the Office of Personnel Management, the head of each

agency shall ensure that employees and applicants are given notice of the provisions of this section.

"(f) An agency, or any authorized officer or employee of an agency, may solicit, accept, and consider, and any other individual or organization may furnish or transmit to the agency or such authorized officer or employee, any statement with respect to an employee or applicant who requests or is under consideration for a personnel action, if—

"(1) the statement is furnished pursuant to a request or requirement of the agency and consists solely of an evaluation of the work performance, ability, aptitude, and general qualifications of the employee or applicant;

"(2) the statement relates solely to the character and residence of the employee or applicant;

"(3) the statement is furnished pursuant to a request made by an authorized representative of the Government of the United States solely in order to determine whether the employee or applicant meets suitability or security standards;

"(4) the statement is furnished by a former employer of the employee or applicant pursuant to a request of an agency, and consists solely of an evaluation of the work performance, ability, aptitude, and general qualifications of such employee or applicant during employment with such former employer; or

"(5) the statement is furnished pursuant to a provision of law or regulation authorizing consideration of such statement with respect to a specific position or category of positions.

"(g) An agency shall take any action it determines necessary and proper under subchapter I or II of chapter 75 to enforce the provisions of this section.

"(h) The provisions of this section shall not affect the right of any employee to petition Congress as authorized by section 7211."

(b) The table of sections for chapter 33 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by amending the item relating to section 3303 to read as follows:

"3303. Political recommendations."

(c) Section 2302(b)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) solicit or consider any recommendation or statement, oral or written, with respect to any individual who requests or is under consideration for any personnel action except as provided under section 3303(f)";

SEC. 9. GARNISHMENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' PAY.

(a) Subchapter II of chapter 55 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§5520a. Garnishment of pay

"(a) For purposes of this section—

"(1) 'agency' means each agency of the Federal Government, including—

"(A) an executive agency, except for the General Accounting Office;

"(B) the United States Postal Service and the Postal Rate Commission;

"(C) any agency of the judicial branch of the Government; and

"(D) any agency of the legislative branch of the Government, including the General Accounting Office, each office of a Member of Congress, a committee of the Congress, or other office of the Congress;

"(2) 'employee' means an employee of an agency or member of the uniformed services as defined under section 2101(3);

"(3) 'legal process' means any writ, order, summons, or other similar process in the nature of garnishment, that—

"(A) is issued by a court of competent jurisdiction within any State, territory, or possession of the United States, or an authorized official

pursuant to an order of such a court or pursuant to State or local law; and

"(B) orders the employing agency of such employee to withhold an amount from the pay of such employee, and make a payment of such withholding to another person, for a specifically described satisfaction of a legal debt of the employee, or recovery of attorney's fees, interest, or court costs; and

"(4) 'pay' means—

"(A) basic pay, premium pay paid under subchapter V, any payment received under subchapter VI, VII, or VIII, severance and back pay paid under subchapter IX, sick pay, incentive pay, and any other compensation paid or payable for personal services, whether such compensation is denominated as wages, salary, commission, bonus pay or otherwise; and

"(B) does not include awards for making suggestions.

"(b) Subject to the provisions of this section and the provisions of section 303 of the Consumer Credit Protection Act (15 U.S.C. 1673) pay from an agency to an employee is subject to legal process in the same manner and to the same extent as if the agency were a private person.

"(c)(1) Service of legal process to which an agency is subject under this section may be accomplished by certified or registered mail, return receipt requested, or by personal service, upon—

"(A) the appropriate agent designated for receipt of such service of process pursuant to the regulations issued under this section; or

"(B) the head of such agency, if no agent has been so designated.

"(2) Such legal process shall be accompanied by sufficient information to permit prompt identification of the employee and the payments involved.

"(d) Whenever any person, who is designated by law or regulation to accept service of process to which an agency is subject under this section, is effectively served with any such process or with interrogatories, such person shall respond thereto within thirty days (or within such longer period as may be prescribed by applicable State law) after the date effective service thereof is made, and shall, as soon as possible but not later than fifteen days after the date effective service is made, send written notice that such process has been so served (together with a copy thereof) to the affected employee at his or her duty station or last-known home address.

"(e) No employee whose duties include responding to interrogatories pursuant to requirements imposed by this section shall be subject to any disciplinary action or civil or criminal liability or penalty for, or on account of, any disclosure of information made by such employee in connection with the carrying out of any of such employee's duties which pertain directly or indirectly to the answering of any such interrogatory.

"(f) Agencies affected by legal process under this section shall not be required to vary their normal pay and disbursement cycles in order to comply with any such legal process.

"(g) Neither the United States, an agency, nor any disbursing officer shall be liable with respect to any payment made from payments due or payable to an employee pursuant to legal process regular on its face, provided such payment is made in accordance with this section and the regulations issued to carry out this section. In determining the amount of any payment due from, or payable by, an agency to an employee, there shall be excluded those amounts which would be excluded under section 462(g) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 662(g)).

"(h)(1) Subject to the provisions of paragraph (2), if an agency is served under this section with more than one legal process with respect to the same payments due or payable to an employee, then such payments shall be available,

subject to section 303 of the Consumer Credit Protection Act (15 U.S.C. 1673), to satisfy such processes in priority based on the time of service, with any such process being satisfied out of such amounts as remain after satisfaction of all such processes which have been previously served.

"(2) A legal process to which an agency is subject under sections 459, 461, and 462 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 659, 661, and 662) for the enforcement of the employee's legal obligation to provide child support or make alimony payments, shall have priority over any legal process to which an agency is subject under this section.

"(i) The provisions of this section shall not modify or supersede the provisions of sections 459, 461, and 462 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 659, 661, and 662) concerning legal process brought for the enforcement of an individual's legal obligations to provide child support or make alimony payments.

"(j)(1) Regulations implementing the provisions of this section shall be promulgated—

"(A) by the President or his designee for each executive agency, except—

"(i) with regard to members of the armed forces as defined under section 2101, the President or, at his discretion, the Secretary of Defense shall promulgate such regulations; and

"(ii) with regard to employees of the United States Postal Service, the President or, at his discretion, the Postmaster General shall promulgate such regulations;

"(B) jointly by the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, or their designee, for the legislative branch of the Government; and

"(C) by the Chief Justice of the United States or his designee for the judicial branch of the Government.

"(2) Such regulations shall provide that an agency's administrative costs in executing a garnishment action may be added to the garnishment, and that the agency may retain costs recovered as offsetting collections."

(b)(1) The table of chapters for chapter 55 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 5520 the following:

"5520a. Garnishment of pay."

(2) Section 410(b) of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating the second paragraph (9) (relating to the Inspector General Act of 1978) as paragraph (10); and

(B) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(11) section 5520a of title 5."

SEC. 10. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) The amendments made by this Act shall take effect 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, except that the authority to prescribe regulations granted under section 7325 of title 5, United States Code (as added by section 2 of this Act), shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) Any repeal or amendment made by this Act of any provision of law shall not release or extinguish any penalty, forfeiture, or liability incurred under that provision, and that provision shall be treated as remaining in force for the purpose of sustaining any proper proceeding or action for the enforcement of that penalty, forfeiture, or liability.

(c) No provision of this Act shall affect any proceedings with respect to which the charges were filed on or before the effective date of the amendments made by this Act. Orders shall be issued in such proceedings and appeals shall be taken therefrom as if this Act had not been enacted.

Mr. GLENN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, a couple of decades ago, there was a popular TV cop named Joe Friday. He always began his investigations by asking: Just give me the facts ma'am, just give me the facts.

We are called upon to investigate the proposed reform of the Hatch Act and the facts are what we want, not some of the rhetoric, not some of the false claims about what the Senate bill or House bill does, which are completely different. We need the facts about what is in this legislation.

This bill to reform—and it is a reform, it is not a repeal in spite of what some of the newspapers have said—it is not a repeal, it is truly just a reform, a fine tuning of the Hatch Act to bring it up to date. And some have said that we would undermine the law. One of the quotes was that we would let "the ghosts of corrupt government come creeping back under the disguise of 'worker rights'."

Mr. President, nothing could be further from the truth. Let me put things very simply, just the facts.

The Hatch Act Reform Amendments of 1993 would do three things, basically:

On the job, it would make the Hatch Act tougher than it now is. It would tighten up on Hatch Act. It would not make it weaker but would tighten up on it. I would make it tougher than it now is, retaining and strengthening current prohibitions against on-the-job political activity by Government employees and would beef up penalties for violators.

So just one very straightforward thing on the job, and that is no political activity of any kind on the job. That tightens up the Hatch Act. That does not loosen it up. That is not making exceptions. That is making it tougher.

No. 2, off the job, but still with major restrictions, it would allow America's 3 million civil servants to reclaim their constitutional rights by participating in our Nation's political process voluntarily—underlining voluntarily—and on their own time as private citizens.

No. 3, it would eliminate and/or clarify current rules that are confusing, that are often nonsensical and quite often contradictory.

I will go into these in a little more detail.

First, why do we want to mess around with the Hatch Act anyway? Why do we want to change it at all? I would submit that because in 1993, conditions are very much different for Federal employees than they were way back in 1939 when the Hatch Act was originally passed. Because many Hatch Act rules, as currently written, are arbitrary, they are capricious, inexplicable, and they are indefensible. And because Federal employees should not be treated like second-class citizens and

be forced to forfeit their constitutional rights when they opt for careers in public service.

Let me put them in public service, which I think is an honorable profession—which it certainly is. Then all of a sudden we say yes, but we cannot trust you to do all of these other things.

The Hatch Act was passed in 1939—and that was before the development of a professional civil service and at a time when Federal jobs were awarded, not on the basis of merit competition, but, quite often, in fact, most of them, as patronage plums for political contributions. To protect civil servants in such a climate, it was deemed necessary to bar them from taking part in most political activity.

Here we are some 54 years later, and we have a very dramatically different situation. We have a well-established, a professional, a classified merit-based civil service which ensures that promotions in the vast majority of Federal jobs go to those with the best qualifications, not the best political connections.

It would establish an office of special counsel; it would establish a merit systems protection board to which appeals could be made if an employee feels he or she has been dealt with unfairly.

And we have many other laws on the books that further protect Federal employees from political coercion and manipulation. I should note that these employees protected are not the 2,000 or so top-level Government officials that are appointees of each new President and who serve at that President's pleasure.

Unfortunately, we also have a number of Hatch Act rules and regulations on the books that make no sense and that deprive Federal employees of many basic rights that all other Americans just take for granted.

The dire portent of some of the editorials, however, is based on the fact that if the Senate joins the House to reform the 1939 Hatch Act that prohibits partisan political activity by Federal employees, our bill will somehow be transferred over into the House bill which was something completely different. That is a big if and it has not occurred.

The House and Senate bills are completely separate with completely different provisions. Directly to the point, it was not the House bill that was passed by the Governmental Affairs Committee. The Senate bill does bring some clarification, understanding, and fairness to what has been a muddled, a confusing, and a maladministered Hatch Act. Through the years, there have been some 1,500 identified rulings, regulations, and interpretations that grew up around the Hatch Act—many conflicting and overlapping and unclear. Some of those have been corrected. But some have not. Let me give

you a few examples of some that have not.

If you are a civil service employee, as like every other U.S. citizen, under current law, you are permitted to contribute up to \$1,000 to a Federal candidate.

That is, for the President in a Presidential election or, in campaign for a Member of Congress or for the U.S. Senate, you can contribute up to \$1,000. Let us say that person contributes \$1,000 to the person of their choice, and, yet, the next-door neighbor, a civil servant, has a couple of kids in college and cannot afford that \$1,000; they need to put it into tuition at the university—and I admire that—but this person is just as interested politically in what is going on in the world and what his Congressman or Senator is going to be doing and thinking, and he wants to support that person. Yet, he does not have the money to do it. You would think that person could go down to the headquarters and say: I want to make an in-kind contribution of my time. I want to help stuff envelopes or drive a car around and help you in campaign activities. That is against the law. That person could be cited and could even lose his civil service position for coming down and giving an in-kind contribution just because that person does not have \$1,000 to contribute to a candidate of his choice. Is that right? I do not think so.

Let me give another example of where the law is foolish and where we need some overhaul of the Hatch Act. Some persons want to indicate their support for a certain candidate. They are civil service employees. It is quite legal for them now to go down and get 100 signs and bring them home and put them in the front yard. They can have them all around the corner on which they live, or lawn signs, or in the windows; they can have them everywhere. They can put 20 signs on the automobile and drive around pointing to the signs. That is fine and good. That is permitted under the law right now. A person is also permitted to go to a political rally, not to participate as such, but just to go to it. But if he walks in the door and they have one of those signs and somebody hands that person a sign to stand in the back of the hall and hold—the same sign he had all over his or her car, the same sign all over their lawn—that is illegal. You can be cited for that. A person could lose his or her civil service position. Is that right? I do not think so. I think that needs to be corrected.

Another example: Federal employees may, by law, publicly express their opinions about political candidates. But the law also says they cannot make a speech on behalf of that candidate. How do you define that? What is the difference between stating your views about a political candidate and making a speech on behalf of that can-

didate? Is it because somebody stuck a microphone up in front of your face? Does that then become a speech? Do you have to have a crowd? What is the size of the crowd? Is it two people? Is a crowd 5, 50, or 500 people? What if the microphone is hooked into a TV camera and you are going out to 10 million people all over the country? I guess that is not a speech. Is it legal? Is TV or radio OK? If you are talking to a print reporter that puts your remarks out to 400,000 or 500,000 people in the newspaper, is that OK?

Well, obviously, I do not have the answers to these questions. I think they pose ridiculous questions, and we try to straighten some of those things out.

Let me give you another example: A Federal employee can wear a candidate's campaign button, any size, on the job, but is prohibited from campaigning for or against that candidate. Let us say the boss walks in some morning and he has a Clinton-Gore badge on here about 6 inches across, and we have a Bush-Quayle sign on somebody else, on another boss, and we do not think that is going to influence those people working for that person? They are permitted to do that. If the boss is wearing a large campaign button to work, it seems that is a not so subtle coercion of subordinates. That is permitted under current law. The bill we are talking about here today would stop that. There would be nothing political on the job, not even a lapel button of any size, 1 inch, 6 inch, whatever you might have.

I do not think I need to go on, because, from these examples, it is obvious that current rules are inconsistent, confusing, and desperately in need of overhaul. My bill would rationalize the rules while retaining all of the basic prohibitions of the original Hatch Act that are just as valid today as they were in 1939. I support the Hatch Act. I just want to make it workable.

Under this bill, Federal employees would still be barred from running for partisan political office. The House bill permits such candidacy, so let us not confuse the two bills. This bill would still bar civil servants from running for partisan political office.

Federal employees would still be barred from soliciting political contributions under this bill. The only contributions that could be solicited would be by a member of a union for the PAC of that union, and the only solicitation would be to other members of that particular union and from nobody that was a subordinate, no one that was a subordinate.

That is another big difference with the House bill. The House bill permits solicitations of the public and/or other people, except subordinates.

Another provisions of this bill, coercion of subordinates, would not only still be banned, but it would be subject to greatly increased penalties. The pen-

alties under this bill, as a matter of fact, for violations would be up to a \$5,000 fine and 3 years in prison. The House bill has far lower penalties.

In short, this bill, not the House bill, makes a long-needed, clear distinction between political activity on the job and political activity off the job, away from work and on an employee's own time. The former would be absolutely and unequivocally prohibited, even including wearing campaign buttons on the job, which current law permits; no political activity on the job, zero, including even what is permitted under today's Hatch Act.

So this legislation makes the Hatch Act more restrictive and tougher than ever, tougher than it now is, on the job. I cannot see why anybody who is interested in good government would oppose that. Voluntary political activity off the job and after hours still, with sensible controls and restrictions, would be recognized for just what it is, a basic constitutional right and a crucial ingredient of a free democratic society of whatever political party.

The year 1939 was a long time ago. Time and circumstances change, and so should the Hatch Act—sensibly. With the above clarifying explanations, I just hope my colleagues will all support the kind of obviously needed Hatch Act changes that I have proposed. If not, let somebody suggest a better way. Maybe I will join them. I just do not want to see this kind of Hatch Act confusion continue. As Sergeant Friday used to say, "Just the facts, ma'am," and he closed each broadcast by saying, "Well, that's about the size of it."

Well, that is about the size of it. Mr. President, the last time the Hatch Act reform visited the floor during the 101st Congress, it passed the Senate by a vote of 67-30. President Bush vetoed this measure, and the Senate, though, failed to override that veto by two votes. We had two people switch when it came back for a veto override.

(Mr. CAMPBELL assumed the chair.)

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, S. 185 is not quite identical, but it is close to it except for the addition of two provisions. S. 185 now contains a new section which would prohibit political recommendations in hiring and promotion decisions for career Civil Service employees.

It is based on language already included in title 39 for postal employees and was recommended by the Clinton administration.

The bill also contains the text of S. 253, the Garnishment Equalization Act. This legislation would allow our Nation's civil servants to participate voluntarily as private citizens in the Nation's political process. It would eliminate many of the complicated, restrictive, and confusing rules which inhibit the political activities and conduct of Federal employees. This legislation

puts an end to not only the chilling effect on the legitimate political activity off the job the Hatch Act rules and regulations have produced, but it also strengthens prohibition of political activity on the jobs, examples of which I just gave a moment ago.

In other words, Mr. President, S. 185 would restore constitutional political rights to nearly 3 million people—rights which most of us take for granted. The right of American citizens in good standing to participate in the politics of the Nation is a fundamental principle of our Democratic society.

There are those who say, well, OK, we are just denying this for a few people for a greater purpose. I will say where there is no purpose, where there is no demonstrated need for these kinds of restrictions, then to deny just a few is not American to me any more than it was right to deny just for a comparatively few people their rights under civil rights back some years ago. This is a fundamental principle in our Democratic society.

The purpose of this legislation is to reform and not repeal a 54-year-old law. When we discussed Hatch Act reform, my worthy opponents in times past on the floor here have often cited Thomas Jefferson who warned the politicization of Federal bureaucracy was a threat to the Constitution. I respond to my colleagues that S. 185 will not lead to the politicization of Federal employees because the bill does not destroy the Hatch Act. It strengthens it. It makes the law more workable.

I would remind my colleagues to another Jefferson quote:

I am certainly not an advocate for frequent and untried changes in laws and Constitutions * * * but * * * laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind. As that becomes more developed, more enlightened, as new discoveries are made, new truths discovered, and manners and opinions change with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also and keep pace with the times.

Simply put, times have changed and so must the Hatch Act.

When the Hatch Act was passed in 1939 the development of a professional civil service was being undermined by patronage appointments. More than 60 new Federal agencies had been created by the end of 1934 but only 5 had been placed under the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission. This meant that the majority of these agencies were being staffed on the basis of pure political patronage rather than merit competition. This rapid growth of patronage jobs—more than 300,000 of them as a matter of fact—caused congressional concern that some civil servants might be working for partisan rather than national interests.

The issues raised in the 1939 congressional debate offer a good perspective on the motivation for the original act. I quote from the floor debate of Mr.

McLean of New Jersey on July 20, 1939. He said:

It was established many years ago that the merit system should control in the appointment of persons to public office, and that the political idea that "to the victor belongs the spoils" should no longer be the measure by which appointment is made. If that principle had been adhered to there would be no reason, and hence no demand, for this legislation. But the new deal, under the pretense of emergency, saw fit to disregard the merit system and to provide in all legislation adopted that in making appointments to public office the provisions of Civil Service laws should not apply. But for that there would be no occasion for the enactment of this legislation.

That is the end of quote out of the debate of Mr. McLean of New Jersey on July 20, 1939.

In other words, in passing the Hatch Act, Congress was attempting to protect the civil servants from undue political influence by prohibiting Federal workers from engaging in partisan political activities altogether. Fifty-four years later we have a dramatically different situation—we have an established, professional civil service, hired on competitive merit basis. We also have many different laws on the books to protect Federal employees from coercion. We have the Office of Special Counsel, we have the Merit System Protection Board, to which employees can turn if they feel they have been dealt with unfairly.

In 1966, Congress created the Commission on Political Activity of Government Personnel. This was a bipartisan Commission and it was charged with the task of extensively studying the question of Hatch Act reform. After countless public hearings, informal conferences, and interviews, the Commission issued a report that recommended the Hatch Act be clarified. This was in 1966. It concluded that the current Hatch Act law was confusing, it was ambiguous, restrictive, and negative in character, and according to the Commission report:

The best protection that the Government can provide for its personnel is to prohibit those activities that tend to corrode a career system based on merit. This requires strong sanctions against coercion. It also requires some limits on the role of the Government employee in politics. It was the unanimous view of the commission members, however, that these limits should be clearly and specifically expressed, and that beyond those limits political participation should be permitted as fully as for all other citizens.

In developing this legislation the Governmental Affairs Committee exercised extreme caution in retaining this balance that the Commission spoke about.

First of all, there is nothing in S. 185 that would change Federal civil service laws requiring that Federal employees be hired and promoted based upon their qualifications. In fact, section 8 of S. 185 would specifically prohibit political recommendation in hiring and pro-

motion decisions for career civil service employees.

I repeat that: Would specifically prohibit political recommendations, including congressional recommendations, in hiring and promotion decisions for career civil service employees.

Second, S. 185 contains the strong sanctions against coercion recommended by the Commission. This bill would retain all current law prohibitions and penalties against the use of one's official position to influence other employees. In fact, under this bill criminal penalties for those convicted of such abuse would be increased. In fact, they go up to \$5,000 and 3 years in jail, as well as dismissal from the job.

Third, S. 185 still contains limits on the kind of political activity that Federal employees can engage in. Under this bill, Federal employees still could not run for partisan elective office—partisan elective office. Under this bill, Federal employees still could not solicit political contributions from the general public or subordinate employees. You can do that under the House bill, but not under this bill. And under this bill—unlike current law—all on-the-job political activity would be banned. Nothing on the job. Cannot even wear a campaign button on the job.

That tightens things up. That is not repeal of the Hatch Act. That tightens it up.

Finally, the legislation would set the clear and specific limits on political activity that the Commission mentioned. By making a clear distinction between activity on the job and activity off the job, away from work, on an employee's own time, all political activity on the job would be banned. That would even include, as I have said, the wearing of a campaign button. In addition, it would prohibit Federal workers from engaging in any political activity while wearing uniforms or insignia that identify them as a Federal or postal employee. So it tightens up on the job.

Under the reform proposal, "Hatched" employees would enjoy more freedoms after working hours, off the job, by being allowed to work voluntarily as private citizens for candidates and causes of their choice. For example, I mentioned a while ago the political rally, where a person could have a sign on the lawn. They could have 50 signs on the lawn. They could have their automobiles plastered with signs, bumper stickers all over it, placards on the side, taped to the side of it. But yet, if they walk into a political rally and someone places one of those signs in their hands, they would be charged with a violation because they are at a political rally. I think that is a little bit ridiculous.

If they walk into a rally like that, if this bill becomes law, they would be allowed to carry posters at a political rally, they would be allowed to go to a headquarters and stuff envelopes if they wanted to, participate in voter registration drives, and distribute campaign material while off the job.

These are basic rights other Americans take for granted. I would submit, as long as their neighbors can give a \$1,000 contribution to the Federal candidate of their choice, everybody should be able, if they want to participate in the political process, also to give their in-kind contribution, go down and give some of their sweat labor, go down and take part in the whole process, if they want to, voluntarily.

If they are coerced, 3 years in jail and a \$5,000 fine and firing for any of their supervisors that may have coerced them into doing this sort of thing. So we would prohibit that absolutely. It is just basic rights that other Americans take for granted.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to give Federal workers the right to participate more fully in the political processes. It is a right that has been denied to them for some 54 years.

Reforming the Hatch Act—and it is reform, not repeal—requires us to practice what we preach: That democracy benefits from the free participation of law-abiding citizens.

I believe this bill does strike a fair and workable balance between the rights of Federal employees to participate in the political process and the protection of the public and Federal employees from political coercion. Coercion will be penalized with increased penalties that are provided in this bill.

Mr. President, before turning the floor over to my distinguished colleague from Delaware on the other side of the aisle, let me run through just a couple of things here so there will not be any confusion, because I think in some of the editorials I have seen there has been a lot of confusion about the two different bills. The House bill is quite different than the Senate bill.

In the Senate bill, employees would still be prohibited from running for partisan elective office. Now they could run for nonpartisan offices—nonpartisan offices back in my home State of Ohio, like the judiciary from top to bottom is nonpartisan—school boards, township trustees, some mayors, some councils, some municipal clerks, some clerks of the court.

Under the House bill, elective office employees would be able to run for partisan local office and only nonpartisan statewide offices. So we have a major difference there.

We get into a very major difference, though, on solicitation, on requests for money for political campaigns.

Under the Senate bill, S. 185, employees would be prohibited from soliciting

a political contribution from the general public or from any subordinate employee. And political contribution is defined as anything of value. An employee could solicit a contribution for a labor organization's multicandidate political action committee if the donor were a member of the same labor organization and was not a subordinate employee.

In other words, any request for funding that comes from a designated person within that union could only go to other union members. It could not go to anyone who was not a union member and the request could not be made of anyone who was a subordinate of the person making that request.

Now over on the House bill, solicitation of employees would be allowed to solicit contributions from the general public and nonsubordinate Government employees.

So that is a very major difference between the two bills. I think there has been a lot of confusion about the differences.

In the Senate bill, also, we include additional language in title V, as I mentioned a moment ago, to prohibit the use of political recommendations in hiring and promotion decisions for career civil service employees.

Now, quite frankly, this was requested by the Office of Personnel Management, because they thought this should be tightened up a little, so that political recommendations could not creep through the system and be used in determining whether a person would be promoted or not from one civil service position to another. And I agree with that. We thought that this was probably already adequately covered in law but, just to make sure that there is no confusion about it, we put it in here. OPM requested that we do that. The House, on hiring like that, has no similar provision.

Garnishment. We provide that Federal employees' wages can be garnished to pay for bad debts that have been decided by the courts. That is one that needed some tightening up for a long time. The House bill has no similar provision.

Under penalties, we provide, under the State bill, that an employee found guilty of any two Hatch Act violations should be removed from his or her job. These are for cases decided by the Merit System Protection Board. Any level violation, two times and out.

I believe when we had this on the floor before, if I am correct, that that was submitted by Senator DOLE. And I think we accepted that. We included that in this bill because that tightens it up and I think it is good.

We also increase in this bill the coercion penalty. And I believe that was submitted last time around when we had the Hatch Act on the floor by Senator ROBB. Senator ROBB wanted to tighten that up by making tougher

penalties—I believe 3 years in prison and a \$5,000 fine. Senator ROBB submitted that and we adopted that and we accepted that.

So coercion gets a stiffer penalty under this bill—3 years in prison and a \$5,000 fine and dismissal for violations.

So you can see there is a great deal of difference between the Senate bill and the House bill.

We think this is a much needed correction for the Hatch Act. On the job it tightens things up. It makes it tougher on the job. Absolutely no political activity will be acceptable on the job. Off the job, it lets people have a little bit more freedom, but still under very carefully controlled circumstances.

And if they are being coerced into off-the-job activity—as they could be now; this does not change that—but if they are being coerced into off-the-job activity, then the penalties are stiffer—3 years in jail, \$5,000 fine, dismissal. That is pretty tough, I would say.

So there are very major differences between the Senate bill and the House bill.

Mr. President, for all those reasons, I, obviously, feel strongly that the Hatch Act should be passed. I urge my colleagues to give it their support.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

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

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

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, as the Nation celebrates the 250th anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson, the first Democratic President, it is appropriate to consider his views on the relationship between Government and Government employees. Jefferson, one of the very first people to comment on the issue of employee political activity, deemed it not inconsistent with the Constitution that Federal employees should not engage in electioneering.

Despite Jefferson's directive, and the passage of the Civil Service Act of 1883, problems with political activity continued to arise. In spite of all the efforts of various Presidents through our history, the Nation never licked the problem of the spoils system until a Democratic Congress under the leadership of a Democratic President enacted the Hatch Act in 1939. Since then, the Hatch Act has protected the Federal employee, fostered a more efficient work force, and enhanced the confidence of the American people in the nonpartisan administration of Government.

S. 185 not only wipes out 54 years of a civil service protected by the Hatch Act, but is a complete break from our Nation's entire history, extending from Thomas Jefferson, to John Tyler, to

Rutherford B. Hayes, to Theodore Roosevelt, to Franklin Delano Roosevelt, to Gerald Ford, and George Bush.

President Bush's veto of similar legislation in 1990 was a continuation of a long line of Presidential actions to protect Federal employees from coercion and maintain the nonpartisan administration of Federal programs. In his veto message, President Bush stated:

Originally enacted in 1939 as a bulwark against political coercion, the Hatch Act has successfully insulated the Federal service from the undue political influence that would destroy its essential political neutrality. It has been manifestly successful over the years in shielding civil servants, and the programs they administer, from political exploitation and abuse.

Unfortunately, there are those who are determined to take us in the opposite direction. In my view, President Clinton is the first President in this century who would sign such legislation.

More than 50 years ago, a Democratic Congress under the stewardship of a Democratic President voted to remove partisan politics from the federal work force and protect Federal employees from coercive pressures to be involved in partisan activity. That so many Presidents, Democrat and Republican, promoted a civil service removed from what Thomas Jefferson condemned as electioneering should alert this body that S. 185 is a sharp break from fundamental principles that have governed us for two centuries.

In 1976 President Ford vetoed legislation similar to that reported by the committee because it was "bad for the employee, bad for the Government, and bad for the public."

This legislation is bad for the Federal employee because it unleashes irresistible pressures to become politically active in partisan causes which they do not support.

This legislation is bad for the Federal Government because it would undercut the neutral, nonpartisan administration of programs by civil servants. It would nourish a working environment where politics replaces merit.

This legislation is bad for the public because it promotes employee interests above the will of the American people. The Federal work force is the servant of the American people, to act as their instrument—not as their foil.

Proponents of S. 185 continue to ignore the adverse impact of this legislation on the Government and on the American people and focus attention exclusively on the Federal employee. They would have you believe that the Hatch Act oppresses Federal employees and that S. 185 would set them free. The truth is the very opposite. The Hatch Act protects Federal employees from the inside and outside coercion.

The Hatch Act is the Federal employees' civil rights act. S. 185 would, in practice, restrict their freedom.

A similar debate might be held regarding section 603 of title 18, United

States Code. That provision, among other things, forbids the Senate staff from making campaign contributions to their respective Senators. This provision, it might be argued, robs Senate staffers of the right to contribute to Senate campaigns, a right enjoyed by the entire American people except for the oppressed few.

But we all know why this provision was passed and has been retained on the books. Section 603 was not enacted to oppress, or even to trade employee rights for the honor and privilege of Government service, but to protect the employee. Were it not for section 603 and similar provisions, it might become expected of Senate staffers to make such contributions.

Since it is not possible to outlaw expectations, the only way to protect Senate staffers is to prohibit this form of political activity.

Similar expectations will arise for Federal employees if Hatch Act protections are removed. Given the subtle nature of inferred expectations, penalties are ineffective in preventing the pressures an employee will feel to become actively involved in political causes in which the employee has no desire to participate.

The employee is thus deprived of his civil rights even though there is no civil rights violator. The majority's willingness to provide for greater punishment for violators reveals their fundamental misunderstanding of what S. 185 would do. They just do not get it.

On June 21, 1990, the day the Senate considered President Bush's veto, the New York Times published an editorial entitled, "Don't Destroy the Hatch Act."

The Times editorial stated, in part:

[Proponents] say the bill offers sufficient protection against political coercion. But that ignores reality. Mr. Bush rightly feared that without the Hatch Act excuse, Federal employees, including tax auditors and prosecutors, would inevitably confront subtle pressures to contribute money and time to partisan causes.

Mr. President, the Times is right. This would be the inevitable result of this legislation. Proponents of S. 185 seem oblivious to the expectations, the pressures, and the coercion that will spring forth if this legislation is enacted.

They rely on criminal sanctions, which according to President Bush's veto statement, "would add little if anything to the effectiveness of existing criminal statutes," and one clause of the bill which tracks an 1883 Executive order that no person in the Executive civil service shall "use his official authority or influence either to coerce the political action of any person or body or to interfere with any election."

As later history was to show, the 1883 Executive order did not adequately protect Federal employees. Its terms, like the provision in S. 185, did not address expectations. Its terms did not

address subtle pressures. Its terms did not address postelection reprisals.

These lapses are not the fault of the 1883 Executive order. It was not until Civil Service rule No. 1 was amended by President Theodore Roosevelt that it became an effective deterrent to the spoils system.

As amended, Civil Service rule No. 1 prohibited employees from taking "an active part in political management or political campaigns." Mr. President, S. 185 essentially repeals Civil Service rule No. 1—the fundamental safeguard of employees—and retains the prohibition on coercion. But this proved ineffective as standing alone. No wonder the employee is left so exposed to political pressure under S. 185.

The point is not only that S. 185 contains a poor formulation of protection for the Federal employee but also that no formulation can be adequate once employees are free to engage in partisan political activity including direct involvement in political campaigns. No drafting technique can overcome the proclivities of human nature.

Once Federal employees are free to engage in partisan political activity, it will only be human nature for them to believe that it would please their politically appointed superior to exercise their new political rights under S. 185 in a manner that pleases the superior. It will only be human nature for employees to try to get an edge on their competition by engaging in the partisan politics of the superior.

It will only be human nature for other employees who had not engaged in the partisan politics of the superior to feel it is necessary to do so to eliminate the edge of their competitors. Since it is only human nature to try to get ahead, employees will engage in political activity pleasing to the political hierarchy.

After two centuries of trial and error, America has come to appreciate the genius of a politically neutral Federal work force responsible to an elected President and his political appointees.

This system allows Government to be both responsive to popular will yet fair and impartial in the administration of our laws. This system rests squarely upon the Hatch Act. It is the reason why a politically neutral work force can function subordinate to political appointees without itself becoming politicized. S. 185 is a serious threat to the delicate balance of his much admired system.

The Hatch Act has served us well. In spite of all the efforts of Presidents through the years and in spite of all the civil service regulations, we never licked the problem of the spoils system until Congress enacted the Hatch Act in 1939. Since then, the Hatch Act has protected the Federal employee, fostered a more efficient and effective work force, and enhanced the confidence of the citizenry in the fairness

of their Government. It has been good for the employee, good for the Government, and good for the public.

Why do we now, in considering S. 185, risk a return to the spoils system? Why do we risk repealing the only remedy that has worked? Why do we risk undermining the merit system?

S. 185 would scuttle the only effective remedy for the spoils system this Nation has ever known even though there has been no clamor for change for the very class supposedly benefiting from the legislation. No governmentwide polls of Government employees have been offered to show their desire for change.

In fact, polls of Federal employees indicate that employees do not favor changes in the fundamental protections provided by the Hatch Act. More than 60 percent of employees surveyed by the Federal Executive Alumni Institute Association oppose changes in the Hatch Act. More than 70 percent of Senior Executive Service employees surveyed by the Senior Executive Association opposed changes.

In a 1989 Merit System Protection Board survey of nearly 16,000 employees, only 32 percent responded favorably to the question of whether they "would like to be able to be more politically active in partisan political activities."

While the Federal employee organizations and the postal unions support change, in contrast to Federal employees as a whole, the weight of other testimony given during hearings held by the committee in the 100th and 101st Congress, and this Congress, stands in opposition to this bill. Common Cause, the American Bar Association, the Federal Bar Association, the National Academy of Public Administration, the Chamber of Commerce, and the American Farm Bureau have all voiced, over time, strong opposition to fundamental changes in the Hatch Act.

This, of course, is illustrated in the chart here which shows that of the senior executive service, 63 percent do not support changes or to amend the Hatch Act. Only 22 percent do. This percentage drops down slightly as you go to the lower GM ratings. Those that are in the 13 to 15 bracket, 59 percent of them oppose amending the Hatch Act; in the case of GS-13 to GS-15, 56 percent. And then GS-12 and below, 52 percent are in opposition to 32 percent favoring. But in every group, the fact is that a majority is opposed to amending the Hatch Act. So it seems strange at this time that we would proceed with this kind of legislation.

In addition, scholars and former Government officials have likewise opposed the bill.

The central question before us is the quality of Government service that the American people should receive and the protection from political pressure that the Federal employee should enjoy.

That is why organizations not normally outspoken on these types of issues have come forward to voice vigorous opposition to this legislation. So why change? Some have cited first amendment concerns with the present law. The American Civil Liberties Union testified that they believe the Hatch Act violates the Constitution. However, on more than one occasion, the Supreme Court has specifically rejected the ACLU argument. Thus, there is no constitution imperative to vote for S. 185. So why change?

Proponents believe that S. 185 answers the administrative problem of how to draw a bright line between permissible and impermissible electioneering. They would permit partisan political activity off duty and prohibit such conduct on duty. Simple, is it not? The problem is, of course, that the bright line between on duty and off duty has little to do with Hatch Act concerns. As the Federal Bar Association made clear in testimony before our committee, the concern is whether expectations, pressure, and coercion are imposed upon the Federal employee and not the time of day the employee engages in partisan political actions. The fact that an employee engages in political conduct off duty does not answer the question whether he has felt pressure on duty, either through subtle expectations or actual coercion.

In upholding the constitutionality of the Hatch Act in *United Public Workers, CIO versus Mitchell*, the Supreme Court considered the question of off-duty political activity. And the majority held that, "We do not find persuasion in appellant's argument that such activities during free time are not subject to regulation even though admittedly political activities cannot be indulged in during working hours. The influence of political activity by Government employees, if evil in its effects on the service, the employees or people dealing with them, is hardly less so because that activity takes place after hours."

This so-called bright line of on duty and off duty of S. 185 is a mirage. This bright line distinction not only fails as it relates to the coercive pressures upon employees, but also on the grounds that the public will not distinguish between a work force that is partisan by night but appears neutral by day.

Consider the following analogy. Suppose we were at a baseball game and there were 60,000 fans supporting and cheering loudly for the home team. All of a sudden, all of the umpires join in the cheers. Would they be considered impartial? Proponents of S. 185 would argue the umpires would not be able to cheer on the job.

Well, suppose the umpires did not cheer on the job, but afterwards off the job they openly displayed their partisan support for the home team? Even

if they called every ball and strike and every out perfectly in the next game, every baseball fan would begin to doubt their impartiality.

Just like the umpires in this example, Federal employees who become actively involved in partisan politics, whether it is holding office in the national, State, or local Republican or Democratic Party organization or campaigning for a particular candidate in a partisan election, would become identified with a partisan call. Few of us would find it appropriate for employees of the Internal Revenue Service to engage in partisan politicking at night and to serve as tax auditors by day. Clearly, this type of activity will fundamentally alter the public's impression of a nonpartisan civil service.

Proponents also argue that this legislation is not a repeal of the Hatch Act but simply a reform. With that I disagree. I would just like to point out why that is not the case.

In the committee report, as it is pointed out, section 9(a) is widely regarded as the heart of the act. And the current law, the current section 9(a), specifically provides "an employee in an executive agency or an individual employed by the government of the District of Columbia may not"—underline those words may not—"take an active part in political management or in political campaigns." That is what the current law says. But what S. 185 would say is that an employee may take an active part in political management or in political campaigns. In effect, we are cutting out the guts, revoking, changing that part of the law which is regarded as the heart of the act.

The new protections afforded to Federal employees in this legislation are simply redundant of similar protections already provided in the criminal code. Instead, the Senate bill removes from title V the Hatch Act protections afforded civil service employees.

As I said, and am repeating here, section 9(a) of the current law, which the committee report readily acknowledges it widely regarded as part of the Hatch Act, states that an employee may not take a part in political management or in political campaigns. This is identical to civil service rule No. 1, as promulgated by President Roosevelt. S. 185 states that an employee may take an active part in political management or in political campaigns. So it is the very opposite. As I said, it is a virtual repeal of the current law.

In order to understand this clearly, one only has to compare what Federal employees may do now under the Hatch Act with what they may do under S. 185.

What employees may do now include the following: One, register to vote and

vote; two, contribute money to partisan political campaigns; three, express their views in private and in public, though not in a concerted way, to elicit support for a candidate or party; four, attend conventions and rallies, but only as a spectator; five, run as an independent candidate in certain partisan contests in designated areas with a high concentration of Federal employees; six, assist in nonpartisan voter registration drives; seven, campaign for or against political referendum questions; eight, participate as a nonpartisan poll watcher or election judge; nine, wear buttons off duty or subject to various agency restrictions on duty; ten, participate in nonpartisan campaigns.

For what additional activities employees could do under S. 185 off duty: first, he or she could hold office in a political party; two, distribute campaign literature and solicit votes; three, organize and participate in phone banks; four, organize and participate in political meetings; five, publicly endorse candidates and urge others to support them; six, solicit contributions to the PAC of the Federal employee organization to which both the employee and the donor belong.

The underlying principle and vital protections of Civil Service rule No. 1, as codified by the Hatch Act, are cut out by this legislation. By permitting such a wide range of active political participation, it renounces the principle of a neutral nonpolitical Federal work force. And from the Federal employee's perspective, the legislation is oblivious to the expectations, pressures, and coercion that would be born with its passage. It would strike the keystone from the arch of our merit system and would scuttle the only remedy that has worked to vanquish the evils of the spoils system.

Not only does this bill wipe out 54 years of a civil service protected by the Hatch Act, it prevents future Presidents from providing any protection by Executive order that they could if the entire Hatch Act were repealed. This legislation would prevent a future President from issuing an Executive order along the lines issued by Thomas Jefferson in 1801 or Theodore Roosevelt in 1907 to protect Federal employees. It not only repeals good policy, it replaces good policy with bad policy.

In 1801, an Executive order was issued under President Jefferson which stated that the right of a Federal officer to vote "is not meant to be restrained, but that it is expected that he will not"—repeat, will not—"attempt to influence the votes of others nor take any part in the business of electioneering."

Executive orders governing the political activity of Federal personnel were issued throughout the 19th century, including one by President William Henry Harrison in 1841 which stated:

It is not intended that any officer shall be restrained in the free and proper expression and maintenance of his opinions respecting public measures, or in the exercise to the fullest degree of the constitutional right of suffrage. But persons employed under the Government and paid for their services out of the Public Treasury are not expected to take an active or officious part in attempts to influence the minds or votes of others.

As mentioned previously, in 1907, President Theodore Roosevelt issued an Executive order which prohibited employees from "taking an active part in political management or political campaigns." In 1939, this Executive order was codified into law by a Democratic Congress under the leadership of a Democratic President. The Roosevelt Executive order became the heart of the Hatch Act, the very provision that would be struck by S. 185.

The Honorable Marvin Morse, representing the Federal Bar Association, testified before our committee that S. 185 would limit the authority of future Presidents to provide for such an Executive order. And in this respect, it is important to note that S. 185 is worse than a simple repeal of the Hatch Act.

Proponents of S. 185 have suggested that a President will retain the authority to prohibit certain sensitive employees from active involvement in political management or political campaigns. However, the text of S. 185 itself clearly indicates that agencies will have no such authority. S. 185 provides that an employee may take an active part in political management or in political campaigns. There is absolutely no authority provided for agencies to limit activity beyond the prohibitions already contained in S. 185.

Furthermore, S. 185 declares that:

It is the policy of Congress that employees should be encouraged to exercise fully, freely, and without fear of penalty or reprisal, and to the extent not expressly prohibited by law, their right to participate or to refrain from participating in the political processes of the Nation.

To me, this language states clearly and unequivocally that without an express prohibition stated in statute, the President or an agency will lack the necessary authority to provide for additional prohibitions beyond S. 185.

Thus, any administrative law judge, for example, who wishes to take an active part in political campaigns may do so, and no one—the President, a Cabinet secretary, or ethics officer—may restrain such activity.

Therefore, S. 185 is neither reform nor repeal of the Hatch Act, but something worse.

Proponents of S. 185 argue that Federal employees are confused by the regulations and opinions issued under the Hatch Act. The confusion, it is argued, has a chilling effect on currently permissible political activity.

And while this argument has some merit, proponents overstate its case. In upholding the constitutionality of the

Hatch Act, in United States Civil Service Commission versus National Association of Letter Carriers, the Court specifically considered the question of whether the act was unconstitutionally vague and overbroad.

In response, the Court held: "It seems to us that although the prohibitions may not satisfy those intent on finding fault at any cost, they"—that is the prohibitions—"are set out in terms that the ordinary person exercising ordinary common sense can sufficiently understand and comply with without serious sacrifice to the public interest."

In fact, the regulations governing what is considered permissible and impermissible political activities can be found in 5 CFR 733. There are 13 permissible activities and 16 impermissible activities found in these regulations.

And while it is possible for Federal employees to be confused by what is and is not permissible activity, I must reiterate that we do not believe the regulations are as confusing as the proponents purport them to be.

Proponents of reform frequently mention the several thousand administrative decisions of the former Civil Service Commission, which predated the passage of the Hatch Act in 1939, and the effect of these rulings on current interpretation and enforcement of the act.

As the Office of Special Counsel has pointed out, "Some individuals have erroneously referred to these decisions as 'rules' or 'regulations,' creating the false impression that there are some 3,000 rules and regulations currently governing political activity by Federal employees. Such individuals clearly misapprehend the legal and historical significance of those decisions."

(Mr. WELLSTONE assumed the chair.)

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, as I was saying, as the Office of Special Counsel has pointed out, some individuals have erroneously referred to these decisions as rules or regulations, creating the false impression that there are some 3,000 rules or regulations currently governing political activity by Federal employees. Such individuals clearly misapprehend the legal and historical significance of those decisions.

In addition, I do not understand the logic of the argument that if the implementation of a law is confusing, the law should be repealed. One would certainly hate to see this argument applied to the Bill of Rights, which has more nearly two centuries raised an endless stream of litigation designed to clarify its application. The appropriate response to the argument is to do what is necessary to eliminate the confusion.

Federal appellate court cases in 1988 in the 2d and 11th circuits have further clarified the issue of what is and what

is not permissible political action. The distinction drawn by the courts appears straightforward to us.

The courts held that the Hatch Act's prohibition against taking an "active part in political management or in political campaigns" encompasses only active participation in, on behalf of, or in connection with organized efforts of political parties or partisan committees, clubs, and candidates.

In an effort to clarify the existing regulations in light of these appellate court decisions, the Office of Personnel Management, in consultation with the Office of Special Counsel as well as the Department of Justice, should promulgate new regulations to clarify the restrictions on political activity.

This proposal would satisfy the best arguments the proponents for change without risking the benefits of the Hatch Act for American society.

This legislation strengthens the law, why is it that such a broad range of groups are opposed to changes in the Hatch Act? Public interest groups, such as Common Cause and the National Academy of Public Administration, are extremely concerned about the negative consequences of the bill.

Groups not generally interested in the details of Federal employment, such as the National Taxpayers Union, have expressed opposition to S. 185.

Why is it more than 100 newspapers, the guardians of first amendment rights, have written editorials opposed to this legislation? Why is it that a majority of Federal employees do not favor change in the Hatch Act?

These are not ridiculous extremes of opinion, but the mainstream of American public which is concerned about coercion of Government employees and the nonpartisan administration of Government.

Mr. President, as we debate this measure, I urge my colleagues to think carefully upon the impact this bill will have on the nonpartisan administration of Government. In my opinion, President Clinton, as I said, is the first President of this century who would sign such legislation. Proponents should think carefully about the bill they want to present him.

Witnesses before the committee advocated that certain sensitive employees be exempt from the bill, much in the same way the 1976 bill presented to President Ford contained an exclusion for sensitive employees at the Department of Justice, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the Internal Revenue Service. Should we exempt certain employees or agencies with sensitive positions?

Should we create a protective band around administrative law judges, career senior executive service employees, supervisors, and managers who work directly for political appointees?

Equally important, are we really prepared to overturn more than 100 years

of precedent and allow Federal employees to solicit money contributions—a prohibition which existed long before the Hatch Act?

Are we really prepared to allow Federal employees to become campaign managers and party leaders? If so, we must be prepared to deal with the abuse which is sure to follow, along with the public's belief that politics has once again crept into the nonpartisan administration of Government.

If the present Congress and President Clinton want to do away with the protections which have worked so well for so long in removing political pressure from the workings of the civil service and enhancing the public's image of a nonpartisan administration of Government services, then so be it. But it should be made clear that this bill not only overturns 54 years of the Hatch Act, but is a fundamental break from our Nation's history.

Repeal, reform, improvement, upgrade, or whatever it is called, should not prevent future Presidents from protecting employees in the same way as President Jefferson did in 1801 or President Roosevelt did by Executive order in 1907. But, unfortunately, it does.

Mr. President, as we start debate on this measure, I urge my colleagues to listen carefully to the amendments which will be offered. At a time when the public's confidence in government is very low, if not at an all-time nadir, this legislation would politicize our Federal Government.

Mr. President, as I mentioned, there are 106 editorials, 76 of which were written after the House vote, many of which deal with the Senate bill and the Hatch Act changes in general.

I would just like to read a few of these into the RECORD.

From Ohio, the Columbus Dispatch, May 26, 1993:

NO ESCAPE HATCH—CONGRESS SHOULD PRESERVE FEDERAL LAW

For many years, the Hatch Act has stood as a sturdy fence, shielding federal workers from the dangerous in-roads of politics—employees inside the fence, politics outside. ***

Any tinkering with the current law raises the possibility of undermining public confidence in the well-established nonpartisan execution of federal laws. ***

If the Hatch shield is lowered, there is grave danger that federal employees will become subject to partisan political pressures as they exercise their considerable powers. ***

Is it likely that a federal employee can be a fierce partisan at night—campaigning for his boss, perhaps—and then change into a completely nonpartisan employee by day? Of course not. ***

Simply put, the Hatch Act has been a valuable shield; it should be preserved intact.

From Illinois, the Bloomington Pantagraph, March 1, 1993:

HATCH ACT LIMITS SHOULDN'T BE LIFTED

The Hatch Act's restrictions on the involvement of federal employees in partisan

politics have served a useful purpose for more than 50 years.

Civil servants are supposed to serve the public, not political parties. Taxpayers should not have to second guess the motives of government workers carrying out their duties.

The appearance of impropriety can be almost as damaging as misconduct. It can destroy trust in government institutions. ***

The Hatch Act has worked well. Leave it alone.

From Iowa, the Des Moines Register, March 5, 1993:

DON'T SCRAP THE HATCH ACT—KEEP PARTISAN POLITICS OUT OF FEDERAL CIVIL SERVICE

The proposed gutting of the Hatch Act would allow federal employees to work in political campaigns or to solicit campaign funds in off-duty hours. The public is asked to believe that federal workers can be fierce political partisans at night, then change into completely nonpartisan civil servants by day. Hogwash. ***

Shield civil servants from political firings but at the same time ask them to refrain from engaging in politics themselves. That's a fair bargain that has both served the public and helped maintain the integrity of federal service.

From Tennessee, Paris Post-Intelligencer, May 24, 1993:

HATCH ACT REPEAL SEEMS UNBELIEVABLE

It seems unbelievable, but we seem about to lose a law which for 54 years has protected federal employees from being pressed into service as political flacks. ***

Repeal is proposed in the name of free speech, but it would create a climate in which government workers are likely to feel compelled to engage in politics. That is a worse offense against free speech.

From Virginia, the Newport News, Daily Press, February 26, 1993:

THE HATCH ACT—EASING POLITICAL LIMITS ON FEDERAL WORKERS A MISTAKE

The Hatch Act *** prevents the federal work force from becoming politicized. It limits the political influence of federal employees.

That is as should be, and efforts now under way in Congress to weaken the Hatch Act are misguided. The measure being considered would permit federal workers to participate in politics as long as they did so on their own time and did not try to intimidate co-workers. That's like telling the cat he can play with the canary if he promises not to eat it. ***

Most federal employees would not abuse their positions if they became involved in politics. Still, the door to such involvement should remain closed. Despite its flaws, the system works, and easing Hatch Act restrictions would not be in the best interests of the nation.

From Florida, the Daytona Beach News Journal, March 5, 1993:

DON'T MESS WITH THE HATCH ACT

The Hatch Act *** has done its job of shielding federal workers from undue political pressures. It has preserved a politically neutral civil service. ***

By opening the door to broader political action, the bill creates the potential for widespread abuse. ***

The protections of the Hatch Act should not be weakened. In this time of ever-more-expensive political campaigns, we may expect that federal workers would be subjected

to all manner of new fund-raising pressure, both subtle and overt. Now, even more than in the past, the Hatch Act needs to be kept strong. The Senate should take a much harder look at this proposal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these six editorials be printed in the RECORD in full.

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

[From the Columbus (OH) Dispatch, May 26, 1993]

NO ESCAPE HATCH—CONGRESS SHOULD PRESERVE FEDERAL LAW

For many years, the Hatch Act has stood as a sturdy fence, shielding federal workers from the dangerous inroads of politics—employees inside the fence, politics outside.

Every so often those who would tear down this fence marshal their forces in Congress. In 1976, Congress approved weakening the law, but fortunately then-President Ford vetoed the bill. Now there is in Congress another strong run at the Hatch Act. It should be stopped.

Why is this law so necessary? David Y. Denholm of the Public Service Research Council put the case well when he said:

"In addition to protecting the individual employee from political coercion, the Hatch Act serves to protect the general public from political intimidation by a partisan bureaucracy. The citizens of this nation have a right to federal programs and regulations whose administration and enforcement are free of political considerations or favoritism."

If the current legislation was passed, federal employees would be allowed to take part in political activity; indeed, in some cases they might be forced to do so. Soon, those in civil service would get the idea that better assignment, promotions and bonuses depended, at least in part, on partisan political activity.

Any tinkering with the current law raises the possibility of undermining public confidence in the well-established nonpartisan execution of federal laws. And it would tend to create distrust between political appointees and career executives, particularly when elections bring about a change of party. If the Hatch shield is lowered, there is grave danger that federal employees will become subject to partisan political pressures as they exercise their considerable powers.

The many millions of people who are affected by actions of federal employees should feel there are no outside considerations when important decisions are made. Is it likely that a federal employee can be a fierce partisan at night—campaigning for his boss, perhaps—and then change into a completely nonpartisan employee by day? Of course not.

Opponents of the Hatch Act argue that federal employees are stripped of their First Amendment rights. Yes, it is true that their political activity is somewhat restricted. But appeals to the courts that the law is unconstitutional have been fruitless.

When a challenge to the Hatch Act came before the Supreme Court, Justice Byron White upheld the law when he wrote: "Our judgment is that neither the First Amendment nor any other provision of the Constitution invalidates a law barring this kind of partisan political conduct by federal employees. Such a decision on our part would do no more than confirm the judgment of history, a judgment made by this country over the last century that it is in the best interest of the country * * * that federal service should depend on meritorious performance rather than political service."

Simply put, the Hatch Act has been a valuable shield; it should be preserved intact.

[From the Bloomington (IL) Pantagraph, Mar. 1, 1993]

HATCH ACT LIMITS SHOULDN'T BE LIFTED

House Democrats were thwarted in their attempt to push through modifications of the Hatch Act with little debate or opportunity to amend the proposal.

However, the issue is expected to arise again.

The Hatch Act's restrictions on the involvement of federal employees in partisan politics have served a useful purpose for more than 50 years. The Hatch Act has helped keep politics out of federal agencies.

Civil servants are supposed to serve the public, not political parties. Taxpayers should not have to second guess the motives of government workers carrying out their duties.

The appearance of impropriety can be almost as damaging as misconduct. It can destroy trust in government institutions.

Yes, the prohibitions on running for office and actively working in political campaigns do somewhat limit the rights of federal employees. However, that must be balanced with the rights of citizens to have impartial government agencies.

In addition, the Hatch Act protects federal workers from being forced into supporting a partisan political cause.

Proposed revisions in the Hatch Act would prohibit federal employees from coercing other employees to make donations or engage in political activity. However, subtle hints and implied favoritism would be difficult to police.

The heavy-handed manner in which House Democrats tried to rush through these changes should sound alarm bells. If this is such a good idea, then why was the Democratic leadership reluctant to engage in full, open debate and allow consideration of alternatives?

The Hatch Act has worked well. Leave it alone.

[From the Des Moines Register, Mar. 5, 1993]

DON'T SCRAP THE HATCH ACT

One of the messages of last fall's election was that people are fed up with insider privilege. They're tired of a system that seems to work more for the benefit of the servants than of those they are supposed to serve.

But if Congress got the message, you sure couldn't tell it by Wednesday's vote in the House. The vote was to gut the Hatch Act, the law that restricts political activity by federal employees. The effect will be to tilt the system a little more in favor of the insiders—in this case federal employees.

The vote is the payoff from years of lobbying by federal-employee unions. The Senate is expected to follow suit, and President Clinton is expected to sign the change into law. When that happens, a long-standing bargain between federal employees and the public will have been shattered.

The bargain was this: The public granted to federal employees more protection than ordinary workers get. They can't be fired arbitrarily, and they enjoy other protections generally not available in private-sector employment.

In exchange, the federal civil service is expected to perform its job with nonpartisan professionalism. To avoid any hint of politics, federal employees are forbidden to run for office, to take active part in campaigns, to hold office in political parties, or solicit campaign contributions.

Those are reasonable restrictions. The public has a right to expect that federal law be administered with absolute nonpartisan fairness. The proposed gutting of the Hatch Act would allow federal employees to work in political campaigns or to solicit campaign funds in off-duty hours. The public is asked to believe that federal workers can be fierce political partisans at night, then change into completely nonpartisan civil servants by day. Hogwash.

The unions seeking to gut the Hatch Act argue that employees are denied their "right" to be active in politics. No, the employees voluntarily agreed to give up partisan politics, when they accepted government employment. In exchange, they were given the protections of the civil-service system.

Now, the unions want it both ways. They want to be able to take part in politics, and thus gain the rewards that can come from giving campaign help to the politicians who set their salaries and vote on their benefits. But they want to keep their civil-service protections, too.

The public shouldn't stand for that one-sided deal. If federal employees want the benefits that they can gain from taking part in politics, they ought to be willing to accept the liabilities too. They should surrender their civil-service protection and go back to the old spoils system.

Better yet, everyone should stick with the original deal: Shield civil servants from political firings but at the same time ask them to refrain from engaging in politics themselves. That's a fair bargain that has both served the public and helped maintain the integrity of federal service.

[From the Paris (TN) Post-Intelligencer, May 24, 1993]

HATCH ACT REPEAL SEEMS UNBELIEVABLE

It seems unbelievable, but we seem about to lose a law which for 54 years has protected federal employees from being pressed into service as political flacks.

The House has already voted its repeal, the Senate seems poised to do so and President Bill Clinton says he will sign it.

Only if 41 senators can band together to sustain a filibuster, can the law be saved?

The law is the Hatch Act, passed in 1939 to free federal employees from onerous political pressure and to free taxpayers from having their employees used as re-election campaign workers for whoever is in office.

Repeal is being touted as a "reform" measure. Proponents say federal employees are being denied their political rights as citizens. Examine the law and judge for yourself:

The Hatch Act bars most federal employees from active participation in political campaigns, running for office or soliciting political donations from fellow workers or the public. The employees are still free to contribute to any political causes and candidates, belong to political parties and to work in off-duty hours for non-partisan causes.

Congress passed the Hatch Act to protect employees after learning that New Deal program managers were threatening civil servants with loss of their jobs if they did not campaign for Democratic politicians.

The chief sponsor, New Mexico Sen. Carl Hatch, was a Democrat. His sponsorship followed a bipartisan tradition dating to the earliest days of the republic. President Theodore Roosevelt, for instance, in 1907 declared, "Persons . . . in the competitive classified service, while retaining the right to vote as they please and to express privately their

opinions on all political subjects, shall take no part in political management or in political campaigns."

The Supreme Court three times has ruled that the act's restrictions on federal employee political activity are constitutional.

Common Cause, the citizen lobby which usually takes a pronounced liberal view of issues, has declared that Hatch Act repeal "opens the door to implicit coercion and abandons the fundamental concept of an unpoliticized civil service."

Repeal is proposed in the name of free speech, but it would create a climate in which government workers are likely to feel compelled to engage in politics. That is a worse offense against free speech.

How would you like to be asked for a political contribution by a federal employee who has authority in some matter in which you were seeking government approval?

[From the Newport News (VA) Daily Press, Feb. 28, 1993]

THE HATCH ACT: EASING POLITICAL LIMITS ON FEDERAL WORKERS A MISTAKE

People can choose whether to be federal employees. And if they decide to accept such employment, they should be willing to accept the limitations imposed by the Hatch Act.

The Hatch Act, passed in 1939, prevents the federal work force from becoming politicized. It limits the political influence of federal employees.

That is as it should be, and efforts now under way in Congress to weaken the Hatch Act are misguided. The measure being considered would permit federal workers to participate in politics as long as they did so on their own time and did not try to intimidate co-workers. That's like telling the cat he can play with the canary if he promises not to eat it.

Americans are fed up with the federal bureaucracy. They want to see it trimmed and made more efficient and responsive. That won't be accomplished by giving federal employees more power, but more power they will get if restrictions on political activities are lifted.

America's civil service system isn't perfect, and there is some degree of unfairness in the Hatch Act. Most federal employees would not abuse their positions if they became involved in politics. Still, the door to such involvement should remain closed. Despite its flaws, the system works, and easing Hatch Act restrictions would not be in the best interests of the nation.

[From the Daytona Beach (FL) News-Journal, Mar. 5, 1993]

DON'T MESS WITH HATCH ACT

The U.S. House of Representatives voted overwhelmingly Wednesday to weaken a law that has shielded federal workers from political pressures for more than half a century.

The Hatch Act was enacted in 1939 to protect employees from being coerced into working for political campaigns or shaken down for contributions. Although it has been a source of frustration to federal employee's unions and to federal workers who wish to get involved in political issues, the law has done its job of shielding federal workers from undue political pressures. It has preserved a politically neutral civil service.

The changes proposed in the House-passed bill would allow federal employees to run for nonpartisan political office—county council, for example—manage political campaigns and collect political donations.

Supporters of the bill say it also would toughen penalties for misuse of authority and improper soliciting of political contributions. And no political work could be done on the job.

Even so, by opening the door to broader political action, the bill creates the potential for widespread abuse.

Too many private employees are pressured into contributing to PACs. Now federal employees will feel that pressure, too, and a good deal more since their livelihoods usually are affected more directly by the decisions of those holding political office.

It is all too easy to see how an employee would feel coerced by his supervisor's political activities even if no overt threat is made or donation demanded.

Too often the off-the-job political activities allowed under these changes could find their way into the workplace. The line between the two is often more apparent than real.

The protections of the Hatch Act should not be weakened. In this time of ever-more-expensive political campaigns, we may expect that federal workers would be subjected to all manner of new fund-raising pressure, both subtle and overt. Now, even more than in the past, the Hatch Act needs to be kept strong. The Senate should take a much harder look at this proposal.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. GLENN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, it is almost difficult to know where to start to respond, because the assumptions made on many of the things that the distinguished Senator from Delaware has based his statement on are obviously based on such major changes in the Hatch Act that they could only come from consideration of what the House has passed.

As I said a little while ago in detailing the differences between the two bills, these are two very, very different pieces of legislation.

I do not disagree with the editorials that say that they disagree with the House bill that would permit solicitation of the general public for money for PAC's. I am not opposed to that. And allowing employees to run for partisan offices, I disagree with that.

Basically, the reference back to 1976, when President Ford vetoed the bill, if you look back at the provisions of that bill that he vetoed, it was basically what the House bill says today, which we do not agree with. That is throwing up a red herring, if I ever heard of one.

The Columbus Dispatch in my home State of Ohio was just referred to here a moment ago. In it, it referenced that, "In 1976, Congress approved weakening the law, but fortunately then-President Ford vetoed the bill." That bill was basically the Hatch Act, the House bill of today.

Now, the editorial stated if Hatch Act reform is passed "those in civil service would get the idea that better assignment, promotions and bonuses depended, at least in part, on partisan

political activity." They felt they could maybe be forced into that by "political intimidation by a partisan bureaucracy."

Now, that is a mighty big assumption, because that is not what is in S. 185. We provide tougher penalties for such coercion.

So they can throw up all kinds of "what ifs" in the Columbus Dispatch and some of the other papers quoted here, but they are not quotes from what this bill actually provides. This is not the House bill.

This is not the House bill. One of the main reasons the Hatch Act was passed in 1939 was to help protect employees hired on a patronage basis from improper political pressure. It was originally drafted as an amendment to the appropriations bill for WPA, Work Projects Administration.

We have a dramatically different situation. We have established civil service, competitive merit basis, we have different laws on the book, the Merit System Protection Board, among them, to protect Federal employees. This legislation does not, by any stretch of the imagination, unless you include the House bill, wipe out—the term that was used here—any civil service personnel protections. Political coercion is and would remain against the law, and with this bill would have tougher penalties than ever before for the Hatch Act. It would be against the law: 3 years incarceration in a prison, a \$5,000 fine, and lose your job if you coerce anyone.

The Columbus Dispatch editorial cites a 1976 veto of Hatch Act reform legislation by President Ford, as just quoted here. This legislation is different from the bill vetoed by President Ford. The 1976 bill would have allowed Federal employees to solicit political contributions from the general public. It would allow them to run for partisan political office. That is not provided for in S. 185. I disagree with those provisions also.

This legislation keeps current law prohibitions on soliciting from the public and running for partisan elective office. The Dispatch editorial assumes otherwise, I gather. The editorial alleges that this legislation might create employee interest groups inside the Government that might sabotage the will of the American people.

Federal employees are not political eunuchs. They have their own political views today and they are obligated to help carry out the legal policies of the administration, regardless of the employee's political proclivities.

In any case, even under current law, Federal employees can identify themselves now with a partisan cause or candidate. They can do it with a yard sign, that is legal; they can do it with a bumper sticker, that is legal; they can give a check up to \$1,000.

The New York Times editorial quoted a minute ago said if we pass this, my

goodness, it might be awful because people might be pushed into making a monetary contribution. They can give \$1,000 right now. They are acting as though something awful is going to happen here that they are going to be able to make a contribution. Yet the law, for a long time, said anybody, including civil servants, can give to a Federal candidate of their choice \$1,000. That is raising a red herring if I ever heard of one. That was in the New York Times.

Finally, the Columbus Dispatch editorial seems to suggest there is no constitutional imperative to vote for Hatch Act reform. In 1947, when the Supreme Court first considered the Hatch Act law, its opinion read:

This Court must balance the extent of guarantees of freedom against a congressional enactment to protect a democratic society against a supposed evil of political partisanship.

That is in *United Public Workers v. Mitchell*, 330 United States Code 75, 96, 1947. I would argue it is the job of this Congress to balance constitutional rights against this supposed evil.

I want to protect against evil in Government as much as anybody in the U.S. Senate. But I do not like it when these things are brought up, when obviously people are not aware, and some of the editorial writers are not aware of the differences between the House bill and the Senate bill. The Senate bill toughens up on the job, gives more protection for workers on the job, gives them a little more freedom off the job, but with very careful controls still in place.

So, Mr. President, the reference to editorials is one that I think should not carry much weight here because I do not think they are comparing the two bills properly. They are mainly concentrating their fire on the House bill and I, too, disagree with major parts of the House bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of Senator MOYNIHAN be added as a cosponsor to S. 185.

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

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, referring to some of the other arguments that have been made in the last hour or so, the legislation does not wipe out any civil service personnel protections. If you look at this in any fair way, the legislation strengthens current penalties for violations of the prohibitions against coercion.

As I mentioned before, it was brought up that the Hatch Act reform was vetoed by President Ford. Obviously, Presidents see danger in reform is the charge. But this legislation is very different from the Hatch Act reform bill that was vetoed by President Ford. That 1976 bill would have allowed Federal employees to solicit political contributions from the general public and to run for partisan elective office. That

is not in this legislation. This legislation keeps current law prohibitions on soliciting from the public and running for partisan elective office.

Congressional staff contributions were brought up stating it could be argued section 606 of title 18 which forbids congressional staff from making campaign contributions to their respective Members robs them of their political rights.

My reasons would be that the opponents attempt to analyze the situation of Federal employees with that of Senate staffers who are not permitted to make a contribution to their respective Senators. They say it could be argued this robs Senate staffers of the right to contribute to Senate campaigns. But I just think that analogy is wrong because S. 185 maintains current law which makes it illegal for a superior to accept a check from a subordinate employee and illegal for a superior to coerce a subordinate employee into writing a check. S. 185 is consistent with current Senate practice.

Mr. President, the charge has been made that the Hatch Act is not vague; that there are 13 permissible activities, 16 impermissible activities within the regs, not 3,000. The Supreme Court did not overturn the Hatch Act when the National Association of Letter Carriers case argued that the Hatch Act was unconstitutionally vague and overboard. That is the charge.

I respond: While opponents of Hatch Act reform reject the argument that current Hatch Act law is vague—others differ—an evaluation of the act was conducted in 1966 by the Bipartisan Commission on Political Activity of Government Personnel. That bipartisan commission was created by the Congress and charged with extensively studying the question of Hatch Act reform. The commission report indicated that the act needed to be clarified. It concluded that the act was confusing, was ambiguous, restrictive and negative in character. So we just disagree on that one.

Mr. President, we are getting clarification now as to what the agreement was between leadership last night, and we should know what amendments will be laid down shortly.

Until that time, I will proceed with some of my response to the distinguished floor manager on the other side of the aisle. He mentioned several times in the debate about the groups that are against S. 185. I do not need to take the time, I do not believe, to read all of these. They run over onto the second page here, so I guess 28 lines. There are probably 30 or 40, maybe, different groups here.

The first group that supports S. 185, support for it comes from the Equal Judicial Remedies Coalition. Part of that coalition, members of that coalition, are such diverse groups as the American Collectors Association; the

Commercial Law League of America; the National Federation of Independent Businesses, or FIB; the U.S. Chamber of Commerce; the American Bankers Association; the National Independent Automobile Dealers Association; the National Retail Federation; the Savings & Community Bankers of America; the U.S. Business and Industrial Council; National Association of Federal Credit Unions; National Apartment Association; Independent Sewing Machine Dealers' Association; Coalition of Higher Education Assistance Organizations; National Small Business United; Society of Industrial & Office Realtors; International Credit Association; Automotive Service Industry Association; Associated Credit Bureau; American Guild of Patient Account Management; National Association of Texaco Wholesalers; National Association of Realtors; and Citizens Against Government Waste.

I will not read all of these.

I ask unanimous consent that this total list be printed in the RECORD.

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

GROUPS THAT SUPPORT S. 185

The Equal Judicial Remedies Coalition including: American Collectors Association, Inc., Commercial Law League of America, National Federation of Independent Businesses, United States Chamber of Commerce, American Bankers Association, National Independent Automobile Dealers Association, National Retail Federation, Savings & Community Bankers of America, U.S. Business and Industrial Council, National Association of Federal Credit Unions, National Apartment Association, Independent Sewing Machine Dealers' Association, Coalition of Higher Education Assistance Organizations, National Small Business United, Society of Industrial & Office Realtors, International Credit Association, Automotive Service Industry Association, Associated Credit Bureaus, American Guild of Patient Account Management, National Association of Texaco Wholesalers, National Association of Realtors, Citizens Against Government Waste

National Association of Letter Carriers, AFL-CIO

National Federation of Federal Employees Federally Employed Women

International Association of Fire Fighters

The National Treasury Employee Union

American Federation of Government Employees, AFL-CIO

American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees

American Foreign Service Association

American Civil Liberties Union

American Postal Workers Union

American Psychiatric Association

Epsilon Sigma Phi

Federal Executive and Professional Association

Federal Managers Association

Graphic Communications International Union

International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers

International Union of Operating Engineers

Military Sea Transport Union SIU

National Association of Air Traffic Specialists

National Association of ASCS County Office Employees

National Association of Federal Veterinarians

National Association of Postal Supervisors
National Association of Postmasters of the United States

National Association of Retired Federal Employees

National Labor Relations Board Union
National League of Postmasters of the United States

National Postal Mail Handlers Union/LIUNA

National Rural Letter Carriers Association
Organization of Professional Employees of the Department of Agriculture

Overseas Education Association/NEA
Public Employee Department (AFL-CIO)
Service Employees International Union.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, it is quite an impressive list. As I indicated, the group that I read from there is the Equal Judicial Remedies Coalition, members of that group that support the changes made by S. 185.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, will the distinguished chairman yield for a question?

Mr. GLENN. I will.

Mr. ROTH. Are those endorsements of the garnishment provisions, or of the whole bill?

Mr. GLENN. I believe that is one of their interests, yes. But I am sure they are interested in the whole bill, also.

Mr. ROTH. But many of them, as I understand it, are only for the purpose of endorsing the garnishment provisions.

Mr. GLENN. You do not just endorse the garnishment provisions. That is part of the total of S. 185. You do not pass the garnishment as a separate act, as the distinguished Senator is well aware.

I indicate to my distinguished colleague from Delaware that they support passage. It is my understanding that the Equal Judicial Remedies Coalition, some of the members that I read, supports passage of S. 185 because it contains the wage garnishment provisions.

Mr. ROTH. May I ask the distinguished chairman how many of those organizations supported the legislation prior to the garnishment provision?

Mr. GLENN. I am not aware. I have no head count on that.

Mr. ROTH. Did they endorse it 2 years ago?

Mr. GLENN. I have not made a survey of who did what back then. I will be glad to try to do that if it is important.

Mr. President, it has been charged that the Hatch Act is vague, that there are 13 permissible activities, 16 impermissible within the regulations, not 3,000.

The Supreme Court did not overturn the Hatch Act when the National Association of Letter Carriers argued that the Hatch Act was unconstitutionally vague and overbroad. That is the charge. I say that, while opponents of

Hatch Act reform reject the argument that current Hatch Act law is vague, others differ. Evaluation of the act was conducted in 1986 and performed by a bipartisan commission created by the Congress and charged with extensively studying the question of Hatch Act reform. The commission report indicated that the act needed to be clarified.

That is all we do with this S. 185. We clarify the act; we do not repeal it. We modify it to make it more workable. It is a better act because of this. It is not gutted or repealed. It is a reform that is good. It prohibits even those abuses of the Hatch Act that occur in the workplace now. It stops them unequivocally, in place—no political activity on the job. I am surprised that there is not a rush to support that instead of objection to it.

The other part is that we give a little more freedom off the job, but still under very close control, so that if there is any coercion, any coercion whatsoever, the penalty can be as high as 3 years in jail, a \$5,000 fine, and you can lose your job if there is coercion. That is pretty tough.

So I think the likelihood of there being any coercion off the job is not right. I add that what we are talking about are things like running for the school board. Right now, they cannot do that. They are not permitted to do that. If you are living in a community and you have an interest in your kids' education and you are very concerned about it and you are concerned enough that you want to get on the school board and do something about it, you just want to be on the board and decide some of these things to get a better education for your children, can you run? No. You are prohibited. Why should that be? I think you should be able to run.

Let me get into the area of the senior executive service employees survey done some years ago. Reform opponents argue that more than 70 percent of senior executive service employees surveyed by the Senior Executives Association opposed changes in the Hatch Act. As I pointed out at the committee's April 30 hearing, that survey, according to the SEA itself, was not conclusive. The SEA survey said this:

It received the lowest response rate ever to any survey we have done, only 22 percent. The survey results were very disappointing to the association because they produced no definitive position from the membership. In addition to the low response rate, the responses themselves were very, very ambivalent and with a substantial number of questions not answered.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senior Executives Association letters to me of April 28, 1993, and November 28, 1989, be printed in the RECORD, because it gives more detail on the analysis of that survey.

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

SENIOR EXECUTIVES ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, April 28, 1993.

Hon. JOHN GLENN,
Chairman, Committee on Governmental Affairs,
U.S. Senate, Dirksen Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We understand that the subject of the Senior Executives Association's survey of its members in 1987 concerning changes to the Hatch Act came up at the hearing yesterday. We are writing to again clarify the purpose of the survey and its results, and SEA's current position.

1. The survey was done in 1987, approximately six years ago.

2. SEA received the lowest response rate ever to any survey we have done (22%).

3. The survey results were very disappointing to the Association, because they produced no definitive position from the membership.

4. In addition to the low response rate, the responses themselves were very ambivalent, with a substantial number of the questions not answered.

5. Only approximately half of those surveyed believed that the Association should oppose the Hatch Act Amendments, and the remainder did not specify one way or the other.

6. The Association itself has not taken a position on the Hatch Act changes proposed because of the ambivalence of its membership when surveyed in 1987.

7. The turnover in Association membership is approximately 10% per year. In addition, Association membership has grown from approximately 2200 in 1987 to nearly 3200 today. This would indicate that 60%-90% of the membership in the Association has changed since the survey was taken.

8. The Association concluded in our 1989 letter to you (see attached) that the survey was not valid for the purpose of the Association taking a position on the proposed Amendments to the Hatch Act. It has even less validity today, nearly four years later.

9. The Association takes no position on the proposed Amendments to the Hatch Act now being considered by your Committee.

We hope this will clarify the Association's position on this matter for your Committee. Thank you.

Sincerely,

G. JERRY SHAW,
General Counsel.

SENIOR EXECUTIVES ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, November 28, 1989.

Hon. JOHN GLENN,
Chairman, Committee on Governmental Affairs,
U.S. Senate, Dirksen Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In response to your letter of November 8, 1989, we are pleased to provide you with a clarification of the survey done by the Senior Executives Association in 1987.

During calendar year 1987, we had received a number of inquiries from our members about what the Association's position was on the proposed amendments to the Hatch Act being considered by the House of Representatives. Many of those inquiring had strong views either pro or con on the proposed amendments. In order to determine the overall position of the membership, the Board of Directors of SEA decided that a member survey would be the most appropriate vehicle. On October 27, 1987, we mailed to our membership of approximately 2200, a written survey specifically addressing the proposed Hatch Act amendments, and asking for the members' views. We asked that the survey be

returned to SEA within 30 days. After six weeks, we tabulated the survey results.

From the standpoint of the Association, the survey results were very disappointing. We received a total of 480 responses (approximately 22% response rate) which was the least number ever received by the Association in response to a written survey. In the past, our response rates had always exceeded 50%. In addition, we felt that the responses were very ambivalent. While 356 (74%) of those responding opposed the Hatch Act amendments described in the survey, only 251 (52%) believed that the Association should oppose the amendments. To the question "Should SEA take no position on the bill?", 223 (46%) of those responding did not answer this question.

After considering the matter carefully, the Board of Directors of SEA decided that they should take no position on the proposed Hatch Act amendments, since the response rate was so low (22%), since those responding who recommended that SEA oppose the legislation comprised only 11% of the membership, and since it was so difficult to communicate to our members and to the remainder of the SES population the many alternatives being considered in the legislation.

As a result, the Association has never adopted an official position on the proposed Hatch Act changes. We have no current plans to take any position on this proposed legislation in the near future.

Attached is a copy of the survey results for your information. We appreciate the opportunity to clarify this matter for you and for the Committee.

Sincerely,

G. JERRY SHAW,
General Counsel.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, according to the Merit System Protection Board survey of 16,000 employees, only 30 percent responded favorably to the question of whether "I would like to be able legally to be more active in partisan political activities." The charge is, obviously, Federal employees are not shackled by the Hatch Act. I have never argued that the vast majority of Federal and postal employees would jump actively into partisan politics no matter what happened. I assume these employees would probably be representative of the general population. Some people want to be involved and others do not.

The actual MSPS results are as follows, and the statement was: "I would like to be able legally to be more active in partisan political activities." Of the people responding, those who strongly agreed was 13 percent; agree, 19 percent; neither agree nor disagree, 41 percent; disagree, 19 percent; strongly disagree, 8 percent.

I do not know how you prove anything much one way or the other with that, because those who strongly agree with it is about 32 percent. Those who disagree strongly, about 27 percent, and those who do not have any feel one way or the other is about 41 percent. I submit that is probably not too far off the general population's attitude in this country. I do not think you improve anything with that one.

Mr. President, while we determine what the procedure is going to be here

this evening, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I want to briefly respond to some of the comments of the chairman. It seems to me that his remarks fail to understand that the protections of the Hatch Act include the limits placed on active partisan political participation by Federal employees. These limits protect employees from subtle pressures to become involved in partisan causes. This essential aspect of the Hatch Act was enacted in 1939 to protect Federal employees, not oppress them.

While the Senate bill contains some prohibitions on political activity that the 1976 bill did not, the thrust and intent of both the 1976 bill and S. 185 is to allow employees to be actively involved in partisan politics. The House bill, H.R. 20, would allow solicitation of the general public and running for partisan elective office at the local level. The administration has testified that it will support whatever bill is agreed to in conference.

The analogy to Senate staffers who are prohibited under current law from contributing to their respective Senators serves to illustrate that placing a limit on an individual's ability to perform some act is not the equivalent of limiting some fundamental right. In fact, the prohibition is put in place to protect employees by preventing inferred expectations and subtle pressures which will develop if such activity is allowed.

The New York Times editorial is anything but confusing.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the New York Times, June 21, 1990]

DON'T DESTROY THE HATCH ACT

President Bush was right to veto legislation easing Hatch Act restrictions on political activity by Federal employees. Now that the House has overridden his veto, a showdown looms in the Senate. The Senate would be well advised to uphold the veto and then consider a more modest revision of the act, preserving its valid protections against political abuse.

The act, passed in 1939 to forestall political exploitation of the expanding Federal work force, prohibits Government workers from "active" participation in partisan campaigns. Critics tend to exaggerate the extent to which the law is stifling, just as supporters overstate its benefits. Even "Hatched" employees remain free to vote, contribute money to candidates and volunteer in their off hours in non-partisan political activities.

The measure Mr. Bush vetoed would, like the Hatch Act, prohibit Federal employees from running for political office and soliciting public funds. However, it would lift other important restrictions on off-duty political activity. Civil servants would be free to serve as campaign and party officials and run as delegates to party conventions. More troubling, employees would no longer be barred from soliciting co-workers for contributions to the political action committees of the various Federal employee and postal unions.

Senator John Glenn, who supports the Hatch Act overhaul, says the bill offers sufficient protection against political coercion. But that ignores reality. Mr. Bush rightly feared that without the Hatch Act excuse, Federal employees, including tax auditors and prosecutors, would inevitably confront subtle pressures to contribute money and time to partisan causes.

Proponents of reform argue that the present curbs on partisan activity, though upheld by the Supreme Court, abridge free speech. But creating a climate in which government employees are likely to feel compelled to engage in politics also offends free speech.

Even so, there's widespread agreement that the Hatch Act is unduly restrictive and needlessly complex. Surely it's possible for Congress to devise a bill that simplifies the act while preserving its sensible protections against politicizing the Federal work force.

Mr. ROTH. In three cases, the Supreme Court has upheld the constitutionality of the Hatch Act. Thus, there is no constitutional imperative to vote for S. 185.

The survey by the Senior Executive Association was presented to the Committee on Governmental Affairs during consideration of this matter in the 100th Congress. It is printed in Senate Hearing 100-662. In a letter to the committee at the time, the president of the SEA wrote:

The Board of Directors felt that member input was critical with regard to the Hatch Act since strong arguments have been put forth for and against revision.

There was no mention whatsoever during the 100th Congress of the caveats which have been expressed by SEA.

Finally, the cite of a Merit System Protection Board survey in which less than one-third of Federal employees surveyed responded favorably to the question of whether they "would like to be able to be legally more active in partisan political activities" demonstrates that there is no government-wide support for the changes this bill is advocating.

We just received word that the Equal Judicial Remedies Coalition, the ones mentioned by the distinguished Senator, only supports garnishment and has not taken a position on the Hatch Act legislation itself.

AMENDMENT NO. 563

(Purpose: To clarify the penalties for a violation of the Act)

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. ROTH] proposes an amendment numbered 563.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 20, strike lines 2 through 10 and insert:

"An employee or individual who violates section 7323 or 7324 of this title shall be removed from his position, and funds appropriated for the position from which removed thereafter may not be used to pay the employee or individual. However, if the Merit System Protection Board finds by unanimous vote that the violation does not warrant removal, a penalty of not less than 30 days' suspension without pay shall be imposed by direction of the Board."

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, this amendment retains a provision in current law that an employee can be dismissed from his job for the first violation of the Hatch Act. Such action could only be taken after the Merit Systems Protection Board finds that a violation has taken place after a full, independent proceeding.

Under current law, the penalty for the first violation of the Hatch Act is a minimum of 30 days suspension and a maximum of dismissal. As amended on the Senate floor in the 101st Congress, the bill mandates that upon the second violation, the employee be dismissed. In addition, the legislation provides that an employee can remain in his position until all of his appeals are fully exhausted.

Mr. President, this amendment would clarify that an employee can be dismissed after one violation, as is the case under current law. An employee who is found by the Merit Systems Protection Board to have violated the law can appeal this decision. However, under current law, the burden is on the employee. If the employee is dismissed, he must gain an order from the Federal courts to remain in his employment.

The bill as it now reads would allow the employee to remain in his or her job until "all available appeals are final." This amendment would provide that the current penalty provision would continue to exist.

This amendment is also appropriate considering the type of violations which might occur if S. 185 is enacted. Under the bill, employees are expressly permitted to actively engage in political campaigns. Thus, it is less likely that a Hatch Act violation concerning an employee's active participation will occur. Violations remaining under S. 185 involve either coercion or those activities which are expressly prohibited by the bill. Any offender should not be given two bites at the apple, when even today, offenders can be dismissed for what would be considered one, lesser violation.

It should be noted that within the past several years, Federal and State

agencies have referred three major patronage matters to the Office of Special Counsel for administrative enforcement under the Hatch Act. Based upon these referrals, the special counsel filed charges against 25 individuals. Ten of these individuals were found by the Merit System Protection Board to have been involved in schemes to coerce political activity from their subordinates. The remaining 15 are awaiting trial on similar charges.

In some of these cases, extensive criminal investigations failed to produce sufficient evidence to support criminal charges in these cases—mainly because coercive activity is inherently difficult to prosecute at the criminal level which requires a beyond a reasonable doubt burden of proof. As mentioned, these matters involved superior political appointees soliciting political contributions in the form of cash, personal political services, dinner tickets and the like, from clerks and administrative personnel.

In two of these cases the Office of Special Counsel succeeded in obtaining meaningful penalties including debarment from future public employment against the director of the Akron Municipal Housing Authority and two of her subordinates.

In the other case, the Office of Special Counsel was successful in seeking similar penalties against several political and senior supervisory employees of the Niagara Frontier Transportation Authority for doing much the same thing. In both these instances, the special counsel has been successful in obtaining administrative sanctions against plainly unlawful behavior largely because the Hatch Act is on the books, and the evidentiary requirements of this administrative statute are far less demanding than those applicable to criminal proceeding under statutes such as title 18.

In March, the Office of Special Counsel filed a complaint with the Merit Systems Protection Board charging the Commissioner of the Tennessee Public Service Commission, his executive assistant, and 13 officers of the Motor Carrier Safety Division with violating the Hatch Act.

The Office of Special Counsel charged these employees with coercively soliciting subordinate employees for contributions of money and labor in support of the Commissioner's campaign. Mr. President, I am not making any judgment with respect to this case. These individuals are due their full due process rights before the Merit System Protection Board.

But Mr. President, the prior two cases mentioned clearly demonstrate that political coercion does exist. If the Hatch Act is violated, penalties must be imposed. This amendment simply makes clear that the penalties should not be changed from current law, and breaking the law even once can result in a dismissal from employment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from Ohio.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that no amendments be in order to the pending Roth amendment when the Senate resumes consideration of S. 185 at 10:30 a.m., Wednesday, July 14; and that, without intervening action or debate, the Senate then vote on or in relation to the Roth amendment.

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

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, when that vote occurs tomorrow morning after we come into session, I ask that the yeas and nays be ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBB). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Thomas, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 12 noon, a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Goetz, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2491. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2518. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and second times by unanimous consent and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2491. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 2518. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC-993. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report, consistent with the War Powers Act, relative to the deployment of a U.S. peace-keeping contingent to Macedonia; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-994. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on rescissions and deferrals; referred jointly, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified by the order of April 11, 1986, to the Committee on Appropriations, to the Committee on the Budget, to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry, to the Committee on Environment and Public Works, to the Committee on Finance, and to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-995. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of a revised deferral; referred jointly, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified by the order of April 11, 1986, to the Committee on Appropriations, to the Committee on the Budget, to the Committee on Finance, and to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-996. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of deferrals; referred jointly, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified by the order of April 11, 1986, to the Committee on Appropriations, to the Committee on the Budget, to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry and to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-997. A communication from the Acting General Sales Manager of the Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture,

transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the amending of a determination; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry.

EC-998. A communication from the Director of Defense Research and Engineering, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the obligation of funds in the chemical/biological defense programs during fiscal year 1992; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-999. A communication from the Director of Administration and Management, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Extraordinary Contractual Actions to Facilitate the National Defense;" to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1000. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, transmitting, pursuant to law, a certification of certain defense acquisition programs; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1001. A communication from the Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Requirements and Resources, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to defense manpower requirements for fiscal year 1994; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1002. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report containing the recommendations of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1003. A communication from the Acting Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report detailing enforcement actions taken by the Office during the twelve month period ending December 31, 1992; to the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs.

EC-1004. A communication from the Chairman of the Board of the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Administration's annual report for calendar year 1992; to the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs.

EC-1005. A communication from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's annual report on the state of fair housing; to the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs.

EC-1006. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the modernization of the National Weather Service; to the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation.

EC-1007. A communication from the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of sequestration preview for fiscal year 1994; referred jointly, pursuant to the order of August 4, 1977, to the Committee on the Budget, and to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1008. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on direct spending or receipts legislation within five days of enactment; to the Committee on the Budget.

EC-1009. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on direct spending or receipts legislation within five days of enactment; to the Committee on the Budget.

EC-1010. A communication from the Acting Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting,

pursuant to law, a report relative to consumer complaints filed against national banks; to the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation.

EC-1011. A communication from the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the implementation of the metric system; to the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation.

EC-1012. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a draft of proposed legislation to make permanent the authority of the Secretary of Commerce to conduct the Quarterly Financial Report Program; to the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation.

EC-1013. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Proposals Received in Response to the Clean Coal Technology V Program Opportunity Notice"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1014. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Summary of Expenditures of Rebates from the Low-Level Radioactive Waste Surcharge Escrow Account for Calendar Year 1992"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1015. A communication from the Deputy Associate Director for Compliance, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the refund of certain offshore lease revenues; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1016. A communication from the Deputy Associate Director for Compliance, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the refund of certain offshore lease revenues; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1017. A communication from the Deputy Associate Director for Compliance, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the refund of certain offshore lease revenues; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1018. A communication from the Deputy Associate Director for Compliance, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the refund of certain offshore lease revenues; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1019. A communication from the Deputy Associate Director for Compliance, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the refund of certain offshore lease revenues; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1020. A communication from the Deputy Associate Director for Compliance, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the refund of certain offshore lease revenues; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1021. A communication from the Deputy Associate Director for Compliance, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the refund of certain offshore lease revenues; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1022. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Government's helium program for fiscal year 1992; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1023. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Water and Science, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the

High Plains States Groundwater Demonstration Program; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1024. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the agreement on trade relations between the United States of America and Romania; to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. KENNEDY, from the Committee on Labor and Human Resources:

Report to accompany (S. 1150) to promote the achievement of national educational goals, to raise expectations through high standards for all students and schools, to encourage State and local school reform to make high expectations and standards a reality, to lay the foundation for an effective national job training system, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 103-85).

By Mr. INOUE, for the Committee on Indian Affairs, without amendment:

S. 442. A bill to provide for the maintenance of dams located on Indian lands by the Bureau of Indian Affairs or through contracts with Indian tribes (Rept. No. 103-86).

By Mr. INOUE, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, with amendments:

S. 654. A bill to amend the Indian Environmental General Assistance Program Act of 1992 to extend the authorization of appropriations (Rept. No. 103-87).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. NUNN:

S. 1213. A bill to make amendments to the Congressional charter for Group Hospitalization and Medical Services; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. DURENBERGER, and Mr. PRESSLER):

S. 1214. A bill to create an emergency relief fund for agricultural producers; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mrs. KASSEBAUM (for herself and Mr. SIMPSON):

S. 1215. A bill to increase the number of primary care providers in order to improve the nation's health care access and contain health care spending by the establishment of medical education reimbursement programs and other programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself and Mr. BURNS):

S. 1216. A bill to resolve the 107th Meridian boundary dispute between the Crow Indian Tribe, the Northern Cheyenne Indian Tribe, and the United States and various other issues pertaining to the Crow Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MITCHELL (for himself and Mr. DOLE) (by request):

S.J. Res. 110. A joint resolution approving the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (most-favored-nation treatment) to the products of Romania; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DECONCINI (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. RIEGLE,

Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. SASSER, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. DODD, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. KERRY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. PELL, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. HEFLIN, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. BURNS, Mr. COATS, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. PRESSLER, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. GLENN, Mr. DOLE, Mr. WOFFORD, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. METZENBAUM, Mr. MATHEWS, Mr. SIMON, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MACK, Mr. REID, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. LOTT, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. EXON, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FORD, Mr. INOUE, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PRYOR, and Mr. SARBANES):

S.J. Res. 111. A joint resolution to designate August 1, 1993, as "Helsinki Human Rights Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. NUNN:

S. 1213. A bill to make amendments to the congressional charter for Group Hospitalization and Medical Services; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

CONGRESSIONAL CHARTER FOR GROUP HOSPITALIZATION AND MEDICAL SERVICES, INC.

• Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I rise to offer a bill which will amend chapter 698 of Public Law 395, as amended, which is the Congressional charter for Group Hospitalization and Medical Services, Inc., the Blue Cross and Blue Shield plan located in the District of Columbia.

This bill is identical to a bill I introduced in the 102d Congress, S. 3092, which was enacted into law as part of the District of Columbia 1992 supplemental appropriations and rescissions and 1993 appropriations—Public Law 102-382, October 5, 1992. That legislation brought Group Hospitalization and Medical Services under the full regulatory authority of the Insurance Department of the District of Columbia. Unfortunately, that section of the law, section 137(d), calls for the provision to expire on September 30, 1993, making it necessary for the Congress to once again act. I am hopeful that this time, however, the Congress will make these changes permanent.

Mr. President, since that time, on January 26 and 27 of this year, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, of which I am chairman, of the Committee on Governmental Affairs, held investigative hearings relative to Group Hospitalization and Medical Services, Inc. The subcommittee heard testimony from a variety of witnesses, learning of management excesses and faulty business practices that may have been avoided had that Blue Cross and Blue Shield plan been properly regulated by the District of Columbia. As we learned last year, the Congress had,

in 1939, specifically exempted Group Hospitalization and Medical Services, Inc., from the insurance laws and regulations of the District of Columbia.

So, today I again introduce legislation to correct a problem whose scope is beyond the capability of any State, because the venue rests in the District of Columbia. Congress must act to permanently correct its own oversight, an oversight that was not foreseen in 1939, when the Congress chartered Group Hospitalization, Inc., the predecessor of the District of Columbia's Blue Cross and Blue Shield Plan, now known as Group Hospitalization and Medical Services, Inc. The 76th Congress, in Group Hospitalization's enabling legislation, exempted the corporation from the vast majority of the District's insurance regulation. Since then, and especially in the mid- to late 1980's, the corporation grew, surely beyond anything that could have been envisioned in 1939.

Mr. President, this piece of legislation is very simple and straightforward, and makes permanent what was already done just last year. It establishes the District of Columbia as the legal domicile for Group Hospitalization and Medical Services, Inc. It requires that the corporation be licensed in, and regulated by, the laws and regulations of the District of Columbia. It strikes article 7 of the charter, which exempted the corporation from regulation by the District of Columbia Insurance Commissioner, and it requires that the corporation reimburse the District of Columbia for the costs of examination and audit of the corporation, a standard requirement of the States in the regulation of this industry.

This legislation has been in place since October 5, 1992. The corporation, Group Hospitalization and Medical Services, Inc., and the government of the District of Columbia—specifically the Department of Insurance—have been operating under the statute since then. I believe the consumers, the Government, and the corporation have been better served by these changes to the congressional charter. I wholeheartedly feel that Congress must act now to make these changes permanent for the continued protection of the citizens who are served by this Blue Cross and Blue Shield plan.

This bill addresses such a narrow, undisputed, and critically dangerous regulatory loophole that I do not believe that we can afford to let this situation lapse back to the situation we faced last year. We must not delay its consideration. To do so would cause a lapse in the regulatory structure that has been put in place to address the problems we have uncovered in the insurance industry. To cause a lapse would also severely undermine the superintendent of insurance for the District of Columbia.

This bill must be enacted before the provisions contained in Public Law 102-382 expire so that the resulting havoc will be avoided altogether.

I ask unanimous consent that a section-by-section analysis of this legislation be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY

SECTION 1—LEGAL DOMICILE

This section establishes the legal domicile of Group Hospitalization and Medical Services, Incorporated, in the District of Columbia.

SECTION 2—REGULATORY AUTHORITY

This section establishes that the corporation will be licensed and regulated by the District of Columbia in accordance with the District's laws and regulations.

This section also strikes Section 7, which exempted the corporation from the insurance laws and regulations of the District of Columbia.

SECTION 3—REIMBURSEMENT OF REGULATORY COSTS BY THE CORPORATION

This section creates a new Section 7, which requires the corporation to reimburse the District of Columbia for the costs of regulation of the corporation and its affiliates and subsidiaries, including the costs of financial and market conduct examinations.

SECTION 4—EFFECTIVE DATE

This section establishes the effective date of the amendments contained in this Bill as the date of enactment of this bill.●

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. DURENBERGER, and Mr. PRESSLER):

S. 1214. A bill to create an emergency relief fund for agricultural producers; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EMERGENCY RELIEF FUND ACT OF 1993

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, in Iowa the rains are still falling and the rivers are still rising. And the hopes of many are sinking fast. As most have already seen on the newscasts, the cities of Des Moines and Davenport, to name just two, are beleaguered by overflowing rivers. Overlooked by the media—in my view at least—is the grim, silent despair now gripping Iowa's farmers.

For farmers lucky enough to get into the fields, rains washed away many of the seeds. Plants that survived, however, are experiencing poor emergence.

But for those farmers who couldn't complete their spring planting, the fall harvest will offer little.

Mr. President, there wasn't much corn knee high by the Fourth of July in Iowa; during the recent recess I saw mostly black fields, awash in water. For many farmers—still recovering from the farm credit crisis of the eighties and earlier crises—rains this year will threaten their livelihoods like they have never been threatened before.

Crop insurance will, in fact, provide some measure of relief, but the current system must be improved.

Under the current system, unless a special rider was purchased by mid-April, those who were prevented from planting are not covered by crop insurance. Those who purchased coverage for corn and were forced to plant soybeans are technically without coverage. And of course, those who didn't buy crop insurance are not covered at all.

Mr. President, I join my fellow Iowan, Congressman FRED GRANDY, in introducing a bill which would remedy the shortcomings in the Federal Crop Insurance system, and provide much needed relief to producers in the Midwest.

Simply put, this legislation would allow farmers who had earlier purchased crop insurance but did not elect the prevented planting rider to retroactively purchase a prevented planted option. For producers who did not purchase crop insurance this year, they can retroactively purchase a policy as well. Finally, for producers who planted corn, but had to switch to soybeans, those farmers would get to keep their corn level of indemnity after soybean income has been subtracted.

The benefits of this plan are many. It will probably provide producers with higher benefits than they would receive under disaster relief. And that relief would be provided more quickly. This legislation will also cover future disasters during this crop year. Though most of us have ruled out a drought this year, an early frost is certainly a concern. This legislation would obviate the need for any additional disaster legislation. Finally, it would provide a disciplined way to administer aid, and encourage farmers to actively manage their risks through Federal crop insurance.

Mr. President, the Senate must act quickly. Though the magnitude of the agricultural losses won't be known for certain until the fall harvest is complete, the farmer of the Upper Midwest desperately needs a signal of hope from Congress.

Mr. President, I pledge my support to the Agriculture Committee and the Appropriations Committee in crafting a means to deliver much-needed aid in a fiscally responsible manner.

By Mrs. KASSEBAUM (for herself and Mr. SIMPSON):

S. 1215. A bill to increase the number of primary care providers in order to improve the Nation's health care access and contain health care spending by the establishment of medical education reimbursement programs and other programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

PRIMARY MEDICAL CARE ACT OF 1993

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I rise to introduce legislation aimed at correcting the alarming and growing imbalance between primary care doctors and subspecialist physicians. This

bill also includes provisions to draw more primary care health care providers into rural underserved areas.

As Congress prepares to debate the President's health care reform proposal, the shortage of primary care providers remains a sleeper. Uncorrected, this imbalance could seriously threaten our efforts to control rising health care costs and to expand access to Americans in rural and other underserved areas.

Currently, less than one-third of American physicians are primary care providers. This compares to Canada, where 55 percent of providers are family physicians, and Western Europe, where a majority of providers are generalists. Most disturbing of all, less than 15 percent of currently graduating medical students are entering primary care training programs. And this despite the fact that an overwhelming majority of students polled entering the first year of medical school said they planned to go into primary care.

Mr. President, primary care physicians provide care at a fraction of the cost of specialists, and—according to a recent medical outcomes study—the quality of their care is equally good. Primary care physicians are also able to care for 85 percent of their patients' problems—without the added cost of subspecialty referrals. Finally, unlike subspecialists, who tend to congregate in highly populated geographic areas, the per-capita distribution of primary care physicians between rural and urban America is relatively the same.

Why do we have a shortage of primary care doctors? The reasons are many, including too many medical school curricula designed to produce subspecialists and strong incentives for specialization built into the current Medicare graduate medical education [GME] program. Also contributing to the problem are greater income levels for specialists and the resulting attractiveness of highly paid specialties for debt-burdened medical students.

Mr. President, the legislation I am introducing today touches on each of these problems, but its main focus is to reform the medical education system to provide greater emphasis on primary care. The legislation builds on a growing consensus in the health care and medical education communities that changes are needed in the way the United States trains doctors and other health professionals. Specifically, groups such as the Physician Payment Review Commission and the Public Health Service's Council on Graduate Medical Education are calling for greater emphasis on primary care in the financing of graduate medical education.

By far, the largest Federal involvement in graduate medical education occurs through the Medicare Program, which pays \$5 billion annually to

teaching hospitals to help them underwrite the cost of residency training. An additional \$270 million in Federal grant assistance is provided through the Public Health Service to primary care residencies and allied health, nursing, and medical schools.

A serious problem in the current Medicare GME system is that payments are made to teaching hospitals on a blanket, per-resident basis, without regard to the specialty being subsidized. What this means is that hospitals receive the same taxpayer subsidy for training subspecialists as they do for training primary care physicians—this despite the fact that primary care is where the shortages lie, and that subspecialty residents in many cases generate much better revenue for the teaching hospitals.

Another problem is that the current funding structure provides little incentive for community-based training outside the hospital, which is critical to effective primary care residency programs. Hospitals currently transfer only a limited amount of money to such sites, making it difficult to run quality primary care training programs.

Mr. President, the key provisions in the legislation I am introducing today would increase the Medicare direct medical education [DME] payments for primary care residents by 50 percent and maintain current DME weighting for subspecialty training positions associated with training consortia involving both hospital- and community-based training. This change, which is strictly budget neutral, would also reduce overall nonconsortia subspecialty resident reimbursements by an exactly proportionate amount.

In addition, teaching hospitals and health care training consortia wishing to receive Medicare assistance for their residency training programs must set salaries for primary care residents at least 20 percent higher than those paid to subspecialty residents.

These Medicare GME changes will result in improved status of primary care at academic health centers. With increased financial leverage, primary care departments will be able to lead changes in medical school curriculum and admission criteria to increase the number of students entering primary care residencies. In addition, with enhanced GME payments, primary care residencies will be able both to grow and to improve the quality of their programs.

Finally, higher primary care residency salaries will create a strong short-term material incentive to medical students to choose primary care residencies. Many of these students face debt burdens of greater than \$50,000 as they enter their residencies. This added salary incentive for primary care residents will also help offset the current deep bias toward spe-

cialty residencies caused by the anticipation of high incomes in private practice.

An important element of this legislation is the DME incentive it provides for the formation of health care training consortia. A health care training consortium would be composed of a medical school or medical schools, teaching hospitals, and many varieties of community-based training sites. In order to qualify for the federal reimbursement benefits, consortia would be required to produce at least 50 percent primary care physicians from the consortium medical schools.

The new consortia are designed to foster medical school and residency curriculum changes which will produce more primary care providers. They will also promote better integration of medical school and residency education and funding. Under this approach, both residents and medical students would receive improved exposure to community-based training.

Before I describe other components of my legislation, let me explain why I chose to use Medicare DME weighting instead of the so-called slotting advocated by some in the field. Under the slotting approach, the Federal Government would decide the number and type of residency programs it would continue to support. Advocates of this approach point to Canada, where the Government allows over 50 percent primary care positions. I am skeptical of this approach because I believe its application in the United States could lead to more bureaucratic centralization than I believe is appropriate. Furthermore, this approach would be very vulnerable to political pressure and congressional tinkering.

For those who are skeptical of the weighting approach I have taken in this legislation, I would point out the recent success of such weighting in New York State. Two years ago, New York State began to provide higher payments to primary care residency programs. While it is early to judge the success of this approach, many internal medicine and pediatric programs that once produced subspecialists are now making curriculum changes designed to produce primary care providers.

Mr. President, the legislation would also require teaching hospitals to account for the transfer of training funds to community-based primary care training sites and would allow teaching hospitals to receive GME payments for residents that train in nonhospital-owned facilities. The bill also provides increased Public Health Service funding for nurse practitioner and physician assistant training. Through a new demonstration grant program, States and nonprofit entities could examine the best mechanisms to retrain subspecialists in oversupply and to expand the practice of nurse practitioners and physician assistants.

Although a large focus of this bill is on the increased production of primary care providers, it also includes provisions to expand community-based primary care facilities and tax and loan forgiveness incentives to draw primary care providers into rural underserved areas. Many of these provisions are similar to those I introduced earlier this year as part of S. 325, my comprehensive BasicCare health care reform legislation.

Mr. President, as discussion of these issues develops, I would welcome any suggestions my colleagues or others may have for improving this legislation. I ask unanimous consent that my statement, a summary of this bill, and the legislation itself be made a part of the RECORD.

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

S. 1215

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the "Primary Medical Care Act of 1993".

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—INCREASING THE NUMBER OF PRIMARY CARE PROVIDERS

- Sec. 101. Findings.
 Sec. 102. Graduate medical education payments.
 Sec. 103. Approval of primary care and health care consortium programs for GME payments.
 Sec. 104. Health professions funding for nurse practitioner and physician assistant programs.
 Sec. 105. Primary care demonstration grants.
 Sec. 106. Health workforce oversight.

TITLE II—COMMUNITY HEALTH SERVICES EXPANSION

- Sec. 201. Establishment of grant program.
 Sec. 202. Program to provide for expansion of federally qualified health centers.

TITLE III—EXPANDING THE SUPPLY OF HEALTH PROFESSIONALS IN RURAL AREAS

- Sec. 301. Expansion of National Health Service Corps.
 Sec. 302. Tax incentives for practice in rural areas.

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

- Sec. 401. Effective date.

TITLE I—INCREASING THE NUMBER OF PRIMARY CARE PROVIDERS

SEC. 101. FINDINGS.

- Congress finds that—
- (1) not less than 50 percent of all medical residents should complete generalist training programs, and at least 50 percent of all physicians should become primary care providers;
 - (2) all primary care shortage areas should be eliminated, and disparities between the metropolitan and nonmetropolitan distribution of physicians should be reduced;
 - (3) the aggregate allopathic and osteopathic physician-to-population ratio should be maintained at 1993 levels;

(4) the total number of entry medical residency positions should be limited;

(5) the number of nurse practitioners and physician assistants should be increased; and

(6) community-based ambulatory training experiences for medical residents should be increased.

SEC. 102. GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION PAYMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (h) of section 1886 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ww(h)) is amended to read as follows:

“(h) GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION PAYMENTS.—

“(1) NATIONAL HEALTH WORKFORCE EDUCATION FUND.—

“(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a National Health Workforce Education Fund (hereafter referred to in this subsection as the ‘Fund’) to make payments in accordance with this subsection.

“(B) ALLOCATIONS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In providing for the Fund, the Secretary shall annually provide for an allocation of monies to the Fund from the trust funds established under parts A and B as the Secretary determines reasonably reflects the amount of DME payments and IME payments payable under such funds during fiscal year 1993.

“(ii) UPDATING TO THE FIRST COST REPORTING PERIOD.—The Secretary shall update the amount of funds allocated to the Fund under clause (i) by the percentage increase in the consumer price index during the 12-month cost reporting period described in such clause.

“(iii) AMOUNT FOR SUBSEQUENT COST REPORTING PERIODS.—For each cost reporting period, the amount of funds allocated to the Fund shall be equal to the amount determined under this subparagraph for the previous cost reporting period updated, through the midpoint of the period, by projecting the estimated percentage change in the consumer price index during the 12-month period ending at that midpoint, with appropriate adjustments to reflect previous under- or over-estimations under this subparagraph in the projected percentage change in the consumer price index.

“(C) DIVISION OF FUND.—The Secretary shall annually divide the Fund into subfunds. One subfund shall be established for DME payments (hereafter referred to in this subsection the ‘DME subfund’) and another subfund for IME payments (hereafter referred to in this subsection as the ‘IME subfund’). In determining the annual relative distribution of funds between the DME subfund and the IME subfund, the Secretary shall first consider the amount to be contained in the DME subfund. The IME subfund shall be equal to the amount of the Fund less the amount of the DME subfund.

“(D) DETERMINATION OF AMOUNT OF DME SUBFUND.—The Secretary shall annually determine the amount of the DME subfund. For the first cost reporting period, the DME subfund shall be equal to the amount of DME payments under parts A and B in 1993, updated by the percentage increase in the consumer price index during that 12-month cost reporting period. For subsequent cost reporting periods, such subfund shall be the greater of—

“(i) the amount of DME payments made from the Fund during the previous cost reporting period updated, through the midpoint of the period, by projecting the estimated percentage change in the consumer price index during the 12-month period ending at that midpoint, with appropriate adjustments to reflect previous under- or over-

estimations under this subparagraph in the projected percentage change in the consumer price index; or

“(ii) the projected amount of DME payments for such cost reporting period required for all primary care residents and health care training consortia residents in programs approved by the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration.

“(3) GUIDELINES FOR DISBURSEMENT OF GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION FUNDS.—

“(A) DME PAYMENTS.—

“(i) AMOUNT OF PAYMENT PER FTE RESIDENT.—The Secretary shall develop a payment amount per FTE resident, with respect to DME payments, that is not historically based, but shall accurately reflect the resident stipends, clinical faculty stipends, administrative expenses, and program operation overhead involved. The Secretary shall develop such a formula based upon a national average of such payments during the cost reporting period that ended in 1993.

“(ii) UPDATING TO THE FIRST COST REPORTING PERIOD.—The Secretary shall update the payment amount per FTE resident determined under clause (i) by the percentage increase in the consumer price index during the 12-month cost reporting period described in such clause.

“(iii) AMOUNT FOR SUBSEQUENT COST REPORTING PERIODS.—For each cost reporting period, the approved payment amount per FTE resident shall be equal to the amount determined under this subparagraph for the previous cost reporting period updated, through the midpoint of the period, by projecting the estimated percentage change in the consumer price index during the 12-month period ending at that midpoint, with appropriate adjustments to reflect previous under- or over-estimations under this subparagraph in the projected percentage change in the consumer price index.

“(B) HEALTH CARE TRAINING INSTITUTION PAYMENT AMOUNT PER RESIDENT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The payment amount, for a health care training institution's cost reporting period shall be equal to the product of—

“(I) the aggregate approved amount (as defined in clause (ii)) for that period; and

“(II) the health care training institution's medicare patient load (as defined in clause (iii)) for that period.

“(ii) AGGREGATE APPROVED AMOUNT.—As used in clause (i), the term ‘aggregate approved amount’ means, for a health care training institution cost reporting period, the product of—

“(I) the payment amount per FTE resident amount (as determined under subparagraph (A)) for that period;

“(II) the weighted average number of FTE (as determined under subparagraph (C)) in the health care training institution's approved medical residency training programs in that period.

“(iii) MEDICARE PATIENT LOAD.—As used in clause (i), the term ‘medicare patient load’ means, with respect to a health care training consortium's or a teaching hospital's cost reporting period, the fraction of the total number of inpatient-bed-days (as established by the Secretary) during the period which are attributable to patients with respect to whom payment may be under part A. For the purpose of this clause, for a health care training consortium, the fraction of the total number of inpatient-bed-days shall be calculated using the inpatient bed days of the teaching hospitals which are members of the consortium.

“(C) DETERMINATION OF FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT RESIDENTS.—

“(i) RULES.—The Secretary shall establish rules consistent with this subparagraph for the computation of the number of FTE residents in an approved medical residency training program.

“(ii) ADJUSTMENT FOR PART-YEAR OR PART-TIME RESIDENTS.—Such rules shall take into account individuals who serve as residents for only a portion of a period with a hospital or simultaneously with more than one hospital.

“(iii) WEIGHTING FACTORS.—Subject to clause (iv), such rules shall provide that, in calculating the number of FTE residents in an approved residency program for a resident who is in the resident's initial residency period—

“(I) with respect to each primary care resident in a primary care training program approved by the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration, the weighting factor is 1.5;

“(II) with respect to each nonprimary care resident in a training program which is part of a health care training consortia, approved by the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration, the weighting factor is 1.0; and

“(III) with respect to each nonprimary care resident in a training program that is not part of a health care training consortia approved by the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration, the weighting factor shall be the ratio of the subspecialty total divided by the product of the payment amount per FTE resident and the total number of residents who do not train in programs approved under section 753 of the Public Health Service Act as a primary care training program or a health care training consortium.

The subspecialty total for purposes of subclause (III) shall be the sum determined by subtracting the amount of DME payments that would be needed to provide reimbursements for residents who train in programs approved, under section 753 of the Public Health Service Act as a primary care training program or a health care training consortium from the amount of the DME subfund.

“(iv) FOREIGN MEDICAL GRADUATES REQUIRED TO PASS FMGEMS EXAMINATION.—Such rules shall provide that, in the case of an individual who is a foreign medical graduate, the individual shall not be counted as a resident, unless—

“(I) the individual has passed the FMGEMS examination; or

“(II) the individual has previously received certification from, or has previously passed the examination of, the Educational Commission for Foreign Medical Graduates.

“(v) COUNTING TIME SPENT IN OUTPATIENT SETTINGS.—Such rules shall provide that only time spent in activities relating to patient care shall be counted and that all the time so spent by a resident under an approved medical residency training program shall be counted towards the determination of full-time equivalency, without regard to the setting in which the activities are performed.

“(D) ASSURANCES.—In disbursing DME payments from the Fund, the Secretary, shall ensure that following:

“(i) A teaching hospital receiving DME payments from the Fund for its residents, other than those residents that are part of a health care training consortium, uses those funds to support the training of medical residents.

"(ii) A health care training consortium receiving DME payments may use such funds, at the sole discretion of such consortium, to support the training of medical students and medical residents to meet the training outcome requirements as described under section 753 of the Public Health Service Act.

"(iii) Assurances are obtained from the health care training consortia or teaching hospitals receiving such DME payments that such entities will compensate the appropriate primary care residents at not less than an amount that is 20 percent greater than the compensation paid to other residents.

"(E) COMPENSATION.—As used in subparagraph (D)(iii), the term 'compensation' means the total of salary, benefits, debt forgiveness, and all other presentations provided to residents, both monetary and material. Payments made to residents by a residency program either prior to or following the actual period of residency shall also be considered as compensation under this section.

"(4) DETERMINATION AS TO FUNDING OF PROGRAMS.—The Secretary shall, with respect to weighting factors for primary care training programs and health care training consortia under paragraph (3), use only such weights for programs or consortia approved by the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration under section 753 of the Public Health Service Act.

"(5) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this subsection:

"(A) APPROVED MEDICAL RESIDENCY TRAINING PROGRAM.—The term 'approved medical residency training program' means a residency or other postgraduate medical training program in which participation may be counted toward certification in a specialty or subspecialty and includes formal postgraduate training programs in geriatric medicine approved by the Secretary.

"(B) CONSUMER PRICE INDEX.—The term 'consumer price index' refers to the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (United States city average), as published by the Secretary of Commerce.

"(C) DIRECT MEDICAL EDUCATION PAYMENTS; DME.—The term 'direct medical education payments' means payments to a health care training institution that sponsors a residency program, to enable such institution to provide—

- "(i) resident and fellow stipends;
- "(ii) the salaries of clinical faculty;
- "(iii) administrative expenses; and
- "(iv) reimbursement for overhead expenses incurred for residency and fellowship physician training.

"(D) FOREIGN MEDICAL GRADUATE.—The term 'foreign medical graduate' means a resident who is not a graduate of—

"(i) a school of medicine accredited by the Liaison Committee on Medical Education of the American Medical Colleges (or approved by such Committee as meeting the standards necessary for such accreditation);

"(ii) a school of osteopathy accredited by the American Osteopathic Association, or approved by such Association as meeting the standards necessary for such accreditation; or

"(iii) a school of dentistry or podiatry that is accredited (or meets the standards for accreditation) by an organization recognized by the Secretary for such purpose.

"(E) FMGEMS EXAMINATION.—The term 'FMGEMS examination' means parts I and II of the Foreign Medical Graduate Examination in the Medical Sciences recognized by the Secretary for this purpose.

"(F) GENERALISTS.—The term 'generalists' means family physicians, general pediatricians, and general internists.

"(G) HEALTH CARE TRAINING CONSORTIUM.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—The term 'health care training consortium' means a local, State, or regional association approved by the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration under section 753 of the Public Health Service Act, that includes at least one school of medicine, teaching hospital, and ambulatory training site, organized in a manner so that at least 50 percent of the involved medical school's or schools' graduates become primary care providers during the year after such graduates complete their residency training.

"(ii) AMBULATORY TRAINING SITES.—As used in clause (i), the term 'ambulatory training sites' includes health maintenance organizations, community health centers and federally qualified health centers, migrant health centers, ambulatory offices or other appropriate educational and teaching sites as determined by the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration.

"(H) HEALTH CARE TRAINING INSTITUTION.—The term 'health care training institution' means a teaching hospital or a health care training consortium.

"(I) INDIRECT MEDICAL EDUCATION PAYMENTS; IME.—The term 'indirect medical education payments' means payments to teaching hospitals to enable such hospitals to pay the additional operating costs associated with the training of medical residents under section 1886(d)(5)(B). Such payments shall be referred to as 'IME payments'.

"(J) INITIAL RESIDENCY PERIOD.—(i) The term 'initial residency period' means the period of board eligibility. Except as provided in clause (ii), in no case shall the initial period of residency exceed an aggregate period of formal training of more than five years for any individual. The initial residency period shall be determined, with respect to a resident, as of the time the resident enters the residency training program.

"(ii) Notwithstanding clause (i), a period, of not more than two years, during which an individual is in a geriatric residency or fellowship program that meets such criteria as the Secretary may establish, shall be treated as part of the initial residency period, but shall not be counted against any limitation on the initial residency period.

"(K) PERIOD OF BOARD ELIGIBILITY.—

"(i) GENERAL RULE.—Subject to clauses (ii) and (iii), the term 'period of board eligibility' means, for a resident, the minimum number of years of formal training necessary to satisfy the requirements for initial board eligibility in the particular specialty for which the resident is training.

"(ii) APPLICATION OF DIRECTORY.—Except as provided in clause (iii), the period of board eligibility shall be such period specified in the Directory of Residency Training Programs published by the Accreditation Council on Graduate Medical Education.

"(iii) CHANGES IN PERIOD OF BOARD ELIGIBILITY.—If the Accreditation Council on Graduate Medical Education, in its Directory of Residency Training Programs—

"(I) increases the minimum number of years of formal training necessary to satisfy the requirements for a specialty, above the period specified in its 1993-1994 Directory, the Secretary may increase the period of board eligibility for that specialty, but not to exceed the period of board eligibility specified in that later Directory; or

"(II) decreases the minimum number of years of formal training necessary to satisfy

the requirements for a specialty, below the period specified in its 1993-1994 Directory, the Secretary may decrease the period of board eligibility for that specialty, but not below the period of board eligibility specified in that later Directory.

"(L) PRIMARY CARE.—The term 'primary care' means medical care that is characterized by the following elements:

"(i) First contact care for persons with undifferentiated health care concerns.

"(ii) Person-centered, comprehensive care that is not organ or problem specific.

"(iii) An orientation toward the longitudinal care of the patient.

"(iv) Responsibility for coordination of other health services as they relate to the patient's care.

"(M) PRIMARY CARE COMPETENCIES.—The term 'primary care competencies' means—

"(i) health promotion and disease prevention;

"(ii) the assessment or evaluation of common symptoms and physical signs;

"(iii) the management of common acute and chronic medical conditions, including behavioral conditions; or

"(iv) the identification and appropriate referral for other needed health care services.

"(N) PRIMARY CARE PROVIDERS.—The term 'primary care providers' means generalists and obstetrician/gynecologists, nurse practitioners, and physician assistants who utilize the primary care competencies to deliver primary care.

"(O) PRIMARY CARE RESIDENTS.—The term 'primary care residents' means medical residents in primary care training programs.

"(P) PRIMARY CARE TRAINING PROGRAMS.—The term 'primary care training programs' means—

"(i) all family practice residency programs; and

"(ii) residency programs for primary care providers that are approved by the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration in accordance with section 753 of the Public Health Service Act."

(b) IME PAYMENTS.—Subparagraph (B) of section 1886(d)(5) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ww(d)(5)(B)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting "(IME payments under subsection (h)), from the IME subfund established in subsection (h)," after "medical education,"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new clause:

"(v) In determining the additional payment amount, the Secretary shall reduce the amount of IME payments to teaching hospitals for a hospital cost reporting period by an appropriate cross-the-board percentage, in order to maintain IME subfund budget neutrality if—

"(I) such payments for resident provided services are projected to increase during the hospital cost reporting period; or

"(II) the amount of such subfund is reduced in accordance with subsection (h)(1)(C)."

SEC. 103. APPROVAL OF PRIMARY CARE AND HEALTH CARE CONSORTIUM PROGRAMS FOR GME PAYMENTS.

Part C of title VII of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 293j et seq.) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 753. APPROVAL OF PRIMARY CARE AND HEALTH CARE CONSORTIUM PROGRAMS FOR GME PAYMENTS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—

"(1) REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary, acting through the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration, shall,

for purposes of section 1886(h) of the Social Security Act—

“(A) establish criteria, based upon program curricula, that shall be utilized to determine which residencies in pediatrics, internal medicine, and obstetrics and gynecology shall be approved as primary care training programs;

“(B) approve primary care training programs, using the criteria established in paragraph (2); and

“(C) approve health care training consortium in accordance with paragraph (2).

“(2) TRANSITION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—During the period ending on June 30, 1997, a health care training consortium shall be approved if the consortium demonstrates that not less than 50 percent of the filled residency program positions of such consortium are in primary care training programs.

“(B) 1997-2001.—During the period beginning July 1, 1997, through June 30, 2001, a health care training consortium shall be approved if the consortium demonstrates that not less than 50 percent of the filled residency program positions of such consortium are in primary care training programs and not less than 50 percent of the medical school graduates from such health care training consortium with respect to the year involved enter primary care training programs.

“(C) POST 2001.—For each annual period beginning on July 1, 2001, health care training consortium shall be approved if such consortium demonstrates that not less than 50 percent of the 1997 graduates, and each subsequent class of graduates, from the consortium medical school or medical schools have become primary care providers.

“(b) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section:

“(1) GENERALISTS.—The term ‘generalists’ means family physicians, general pediatricians, and general internists.

“(2) HEALTH CARE TRAINING CONSORTIUM.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘health care training consortium’ means a local, State, or regional association approved by the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration that includes at least one school of medicine, teaching hospital, and ambulatory training site, organized in a manner so that at least 50 percent of the involved medical school's or schools' graduates become primary care providers during the year after such graduates complete their residency training.

“(B) AMBULATORY TRAINING SITES.—As used in subparagraph (A), the term ‘ambulatory training sites’ includes health maintenance organizations, community health centers and federally qualified health centers, migrant health centers, ambulatory offices or other appropriate educational and teaching sites as determined by the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration.

“(3) PRIMARY CARE.—The term ‘primary care’ means medical care that is characterized by the following elements:

“(A) First contact care for persons with undifferentiated health care concerns.

“(B) Person-centered, comprehensive care that is not organ or problem specific.

“(C) An orientation toward the longitudinal care of the patient.

“(D) Responsibility for coordination of other health services as they relate to the patient's care.

“(4) PRIMARY CARE COMPETENCIES.—The term ‘primary care competencies’ means—

“(A) health promotion and disease prevention;

“(B) the assessment or evaluation of common symptoms and physical signs;

“(C) the management of common acute and chronic medical conditions, including behavioral conditions; or

“(D) the identification and appropriate referral for other needed health care services.

“(5) PRIMARY CARE PROVIDERS.—The term ‘primary care providers’ means generalists and obstetrician/gynecologists, nurse practitioners, and physician assistants who utilize the primary care competencies to deliver primary care.

“(6) PRIMARY CARE RESIDENTS.—The term ‘primary care residents’ means medical residents in primary care training programs.

“(7) PRIMARY CARE TRAINING PROGRAMS.—The term ‘primary care training programs’ means—

“(A) all family practice residency programs; and

“(B) residency programs for primary care providers that are approved by the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration in accordance with this section.”

SEC. 104. HEALTH PROFESSIONS FUNDING FOR NURSE PRACTITIONER AND PHYSICIAN ASSISTANTS PROGRAMS.

(a) PHYSICIAN ASSISTANTS.—Section 750(d)(1) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 293n(d)(1)) is amended by striking “for each of the fiscal years 1993 through 1995” and inserting “for fiscal year 1993, \$11,250,000 for fiscal year 1994, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1995 and 1996”.

(b) NURSE PRACTITIONERS.—Section 822(d) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 296m(d)) is amended by striking “for each of the fiscal years 1993 and 1994” and inserting “for fiscal year 1993, \$25,000,000 for fiscal year 1994, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1995 and 1996”.

SEC. 105. PRIMARY CARE DEMONSTRATION GRANTS.

Part B of title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 243 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

“SEC. 320A. PRIMARY CARE DEMONSTRATION GRANTS.

“(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary, acting through the Health Resources and Services Administration, shall award grants to States or nonprofit entities to fund not less than 10 demonstration projects to enable such States or entities to evaluate one or more of the following:

“(1) State mechanisms, including changes in the scope of practice laws, to enhance the delivery of primary care by nurse practitioners or physician assistants.

“(2) The feasibility of, and the most effective means to train subspecialists to deliver primary care as primary care providers.

“(3) State mechanisms to increase the supply or improve the distribution of primary care providers.

“(b) APPLICATION.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section a State or nonprofit entity shall prepare and submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

“(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, \$9,000,000 for fiscal year 1994, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1995 through 1997.”

SEC. 106. HEALTH WORKFORCE OVERSIGHT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 301(a) of the Health Professions Education Extension

Amendments of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 295k note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “and” at the end thereof;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

“(3) maintain data bases concerning the supply and distribution of, and postgraduate training programs for, physicians and other primary care providers in the United States in order to make periodic recommendations with respect to subparagraphs (D) and (E) of paragraph (1).”

(b) FINAL REPORT.—Section 301(j) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking “FINAL” in the subsection heading; and

(2) by striking “final”.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 301(k) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

“(k) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to maintain the data bases required under subsection (a)(3), and for other purposes authorized by this section, \$8,000,000 for fiscal year 1994, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1995 through 1997.”

TITLE II—COMMUNITY HEALTH SERVICES EXPANSION

SEC. 201. ESTABLISHMENT OF GRANT PROGRAM.

Subpart I of part D of title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254b et seq.) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

“SEC. 330A. COMMUNITY-BASED PRIMARY HEALTH CARE GRANT PROGRAM.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish and administer a program to provide allotments to States to enable such States to provide grants for the creation or enhancement of community-based primary health care entities that provide services to low-income or medically underserved populations.

“(b) ALLOTMENTS TO STATES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—From the amount available for allotment under subsection (h) for a fiscal year, the Secretary shall allot to each State an amount equal to the product of the grant share of the State (as determined under paragraph (2)) multiplied by such amount available.

“(2) GRANT SHARE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the grant share of a State shall be the product of the need-adjusted population of the State (as determined under subparagraph (B)) multiplied by the Federal matching percentage of the State (as determined under subparagraph (C)), expressed as a percentage of the sum of the products of such factors for all States.

“(B) NEED-ADJUSTED POPULATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the need-adjusted population of a State shall be the product of the total population of the State (as estimated by the Secretary of Commerce) multiplied by the need index of the State (as determined under clause (ii)).

“(ii) NEED INDEX.—For purposes of clause (i), the need index of a State shall be the ratio of—

“(I) the weighted sum of the geographic percentage of the State (as determined under clause (iii)), the poverty percentage of the State (as determined under clause (iv)), and the multiple grant percentage of the State (as determined under clause (v)); to

“(II) the general population percentage of the State (as determined under clause (vi)).

"(iii) GEOGRAPHIC PERCENTAGE.—

"(I) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of clause (ii)(I), the geographic percentage of the State shall be the estimated population of the State that is residing in nonurbanized areas (as determined under subclause (II)) expressed as a percentage of the total nonurbanized population of all States.

"(II) NONURBANIZED POPULATION.—For purposes of subclause (I), the estimated population of the State that is residing in nonurbanized areas shall be one minus the urbanized population of the State (as determined using the most recent decennial census), expressed as a percentage of the total population of the State (as determined using the most recent decennial census), multiplied by the current estimated population of the State.

"(iv) POVERTY PERCENTAGE.—For purposes of clause (ii)(I), the poverty percentage of the State shall be the estimated number of people residing in the State with incomes below 200 percent of the income official poverty line (as determined by the Office of Management and Budget) expressed as a percentage of the total number of such people residing in all States.

"(v) MULTIPLE GRANT PERCENTAGE.—For purposes of clause (ii)(I), the multiple grant percentage of the State shall be the amount of Federal funding received by the State under grants awarded under sections 329, 330, and 340, expressed as a percentage of the total amounts received under such grants by all States. With respect to a State, such percentage shall not exceed twice the general population percentage of the State under clause (vi) or be less than one-half of the States general population percentage.

"(vi) GENERAL POPULATION PERCENTAGE.—For purposes of clause (ii)(II), the general population percentage of the State shall be the total population of the State (as determined by the Secretary of Commerce) expressed as a percentage of the total population of all States.

"(C) FEDERAL MATCHING PERCENTAGE.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the Federal matching percentage of the State shall be equal to one, less the State matching percentage (as determined under clause (ii)).

"(ii) STATE MATCHING PERCENTAGE.—For purposes of clause (i), the State matching percentage of the State shall be 0.25 multiplied by the ratio of the total taxable resource percentage (as determined under clause (iii)) to the need-adjusted population of the State (as determined under subparagraph (B)).

"(iii) TOTAL TAXABLE RESOURCE PERCENTAGE.—For purposes of clause (ii), the total taxable resources percentage of the State shall be the total taxable resources of a State (as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury) expressed as a percentage of the sum of the total taxable resources of all States.

"(3) ANNUAL ESTIMATES.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary of Commerce does not produce the annual estimates required under paragraph (2)(B)(iv), such estimates shall be determined by multiplying the percentage of the population of the State that is below 200 percent of the income official poverty line as determined using the most recent decennial census by the most recent estimate of the total population of the State. Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the calculations required under this subparagraph shall be made based on the most recent 3-year average of the total taxable resources of individuals within the State.

"(B) DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), the calculations required under such subparagraph with respect to the District of Columbia shall be based on the most recent 3-year average of the personal income of individuals residing within the District as a percentage of the personal income for all individuals residing within the District, as determined by the Secretary of Commerce.

"(4) MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—A State that receives an allotment under this section shall make available State resources (either directly or indirectly) to carry out this section in an amount that shall equal the State matching percentage for the State (as determined under paragraph (2)(C)(ii)) divided by the Federal matching percentage (as determined under paragraph (2)(C)).

"(c) APPLICATION.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible to receive an allotment under this section, a State shall prepare and submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may by regulation require.

"(2) ASSURANCES.—A State application submitted under paragraph (1) shall contain an assurance that—

"(A) the State will use amounts received under its allotment consistent with the requirements of this section; and

"(B) the State will provide, from non-Federal sources, the amounts required under subsection (b)(4).

"(d) USE OF FUNDS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The State shall use amounts received under this section to award grants to eligible public and nonprofit private entities, or consortia of such entities, within the State to enable such entities or consortia to provide services of the type described in paragraph (2) of section 329(h) to low-income or medically underserved populations.

"(2) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible to receive a grant under paragraph (1), an entity or consortium shall—

"(A) prepare and submit to the administering entity of the State, an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as such administering entity may require, including a plan for the provision of services of the type described in paragraph (3);

"(B) provide assurances that services will be provided under the grant at fee rates established or determined in accordance with section 330(e)(3)(F); and

"(C) provide assurances that in the case of services provided to individuals with health insurance, such insurance shall be used as the primary source of payment for such services.

"(3) SERVICES.—The services to be provided under a grant awarded under paragraph (1) shall include—

"(A) one or more of the types of primary health services described in section 330(b)(1);

"(B) one or more of the types of supplemental health services described in section 330(b)(2); and

"(C) any other services determined appropriate by the administering entity of the State.

"(4) TARGET POPULATIONS.—Entities or consortia receiving grants under paragraph (1) shall, in providing the services described in paragraph (3), substantially target populations of low-income or medically underserved populations within the State who reside in medically underserved or health professional shortage areas, areas certified as underserved under the rural health clinic

program, or other areas determined appropriate by the administering entity of the State, within the State.

"(5) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants under paragraph (1), the State shall—

"(A) give priority to entities or consortia that can demonstrate through the plan submitted under paragraph (2) that—

"(i) the services provided under the grant will expand the availability of primary care services to the maximum number of low-income or medically underserved populations who have no access to such care on the date of the grant award; and

"(ii) the delivery of services under the grant will be cost-effective; and

"(B) ensure that an equitable distribution of funds is achieved among urban and rural entities or consortia.

"(e) REPORTS AND AUDITS.—Each State shall prepare and submit to the Secretary annual reports concerning the State's activities under this section which shall be in such form and contain such information as the Secretary determines appropriate. Each such State shall establish fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure that amounts received under this section are being disbursed properly and are accounted for, and include the results of audits conducted under such procedures in the reports submitted under this subsection.

"(f) PAYMENTS.—

"(1) ENTITLEMENT.—Each State for which an application has been approved by the Secretary under this section shall be entitled to payments under this section for each fiscal year in an amount not to exceed the State's allotment under subsection (b) to be expended by the State in accordance with the terms of the application for the fiscal year for which the allotment is to be made.

"(2) METHOD OF PAYMENTS.—The Secretary may make payments to a State in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments, as the Secretary may determine.

"(3) STATE SPENDING OF PAYMENTS.—Payments to a State from the allotment under subsection (b) for any fiscal year must be expended by the State in that fiscal year or in the succeeding fiscal year.

"(g) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, the term 'administering entity of the State' means the agency or official designated by the chief executive officer of the State to administer the amounts provided to the State under this section.

"(h) FUNDING.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall use 50 percent of the amounts that the Secretary is required to utilize under section 330B(h) in each fiscal year to carry out this section."

SEC. 202. PROGRAM TO PROVIDE FOR EXPANSION OF FEDERALLY QUALIFIED HEALTH CENTERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart I of part D of title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254b et seq.) (as amended by section 201) is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 330B. PROGRAM TO PROVIDE FOR EXPANSION OF FEDERALLY QUALIFIED HEALTH CENTERS.

"(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES ACCESS PROGRAM.—From amounts appropriated under this section, the Secretary shall, acting through the Bureau of Health Care Delivery Assistance, award grants under this section to federally qualified health centers (hereafter referred to in this section as 'FQHCs') and other entities and organizations submitting applications under

this section (as described in subsection (c)) for the purpose of providing access to services for medically underserved populations (as defined in section 330(b)(3)) or in high impact areas (as defined in section 329(a)(5)) not currently being served by a FQHC.

“(b) ELIGIBILITY FOR GRANTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall award grants under this section to entities or organizations described in this paragraph and paragraph (2) which have submitted a proposal to the Secretary to expand such entities or organizations operations (including expansions to new sites (as determined necessary by the Secretary)) to serve medically underserved populations or high impact areas not currently served by a FQHC and which—

“(A) have as of the date of enactment of this section, been certified by the Secretary as a FQHC under section 1905(1)(2)(B) of the Social Security Act;

“(B) have submitted applications to the Secretary to qualify as FQHCs under section 1905(1)(2)(B) of the Social Security Act; or

“(C) have submitted a plan to the Secretary which provides that the entity or organization will meet the requirements to qualify as a FQHC when operational.

“(2) NON-FQHC ENTITIES.—

“(A) ELIGIBILITY.—The Secretary shall also make grants under this section to any public or private nonprofit agency, or any health care entity or organization which—

“(i) meets the requirements necessary to qualify as a FQHC, except the requirement that such agency, entity, or organization has a consumer majority governing board,

“(ii) has submitted a proposal to the Secretary to provide those services provided by a FQHC as defined in section 1905(1)(2)(B) of the Social Security Act, and

“(iii) is designed to promote access to primary care services or to reduce reliance on hospital emergency rooms or other high cost providers of primary health care services,

provided that the proposal described in clause (ii) is developed by the agency, entity, or organization (or such agencies, entities, or organizations acting in a consortium in a community) with the review and approval of the Governor of the State in which such agency, entity, or organization is located.

“(B) LIMITATION.—The Secretary shall provide in making grants to entities or organizations described in this paragraph that not more than 10 percent of the funds provided for grants under this section shall be made available for grants to such entities or organizations.

“(c) APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In order to be eligible to receive a grant under this section, a FQHC or other entity or organization must submit an application in such form and at such time as the Secretary shall prescribe and which meets the requirements of this subsection.

“(2) REQUIREMENTS.—An application submitted under this section must provide—

“(A)(i) for a schedule of fees or payments for the provision of the services provided by the entity or organization designed to cover its reasonable costs of operations; and

“(ii) for a corresponding schedule of discounts to be applied to such fees or payments, based upon the patient's ability to pay (determined by using a sliding scale formula based on the income of the patient);

“(B) assurances that the entity or organization provides services to persons who are eligible for benefits under title XVIII of the Social Security Act, for medical assistance under title XIX of such Act, or for assistance for medical expenses under any other public

assistance program or private health insurance program; and

“(C) assurances that the entity or organization has made and will continue to make every reasonable effort to collect reimbursement for services—

“(i) from persons eligible for assistance under any of the programs described in subparagraph (B); and

“(ii) from patients not entitled to benefits under any such programs.

“(d) LIMITATIONS ON USE OF FUNDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—From the amounts awarded to a FQHC or other entity or organization under this section, funds may be used for purposes of planning but may only be expended for the costs of—

“(A) assessing the needs of the populations or proposed areas to be served;

“(B) preparing a description of how the needs identified will be met; and

“(C) development of an implementation plan that addresses—

“(i) recruitment and training of personnel; and

“(ii) activities necessary to achieve operational status in order to meet FQHC requirements under 1905(1)(2)(B) of the Social Security Act.

“(2) RECRUITING, TRAINING, AND COMPENSATION OF STAFF.—From the amounts awarded to an entity or organization under this section, funds may be used for the purposes of paying for the costs of recruiting, training, and compensating staff (clinical and associated administrative personnel (to the extent such costs are not already reimbursed under title XIX of the Social Security Act or any other State or Federal program)) to the extent necessary to allow the entity or organization to operate at new or expanded existing sites.

“(3) FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT.—From the amounts awarded to an entity or organization under this section, funds may be expended for the purposes of acquiring facilities and equipment but only for the costs of—

“(A) construction of new buildings (to the extent that new construction is found to be the most cost-efficient approach by the Secretary);

“(B) acquiring, expanding, or modernizing existing facilities;

“(C) purchasing essential (as determined by the Secretary) equipment; and

“(D) amortization of principal and payment of interest on loans obtained for purposes of site construction, acquisition, modernization, or expansion, as well as necessary equipment.

“(4) SERVICES.—From the amounts awarded to an entity or organization under this section, funds may be expended for the payment of services but only for the costs of—

“(A) providing or arranging for the provision of all services through the entity or organization necessary to qualify such entity or organization as a FQHC under section 1905(1)(2)(B) of the Social Security Act;

“(B) providing or arranging for any other service that a FQHC may provide and be reimbursed for under title XIX of the Social Security Act; and

“(C) providing any unreimbursed costs of providing services as described in section 330(a) to patients.

“(e) PRIORITIES IN THE AWARDING OF GRANTS.—

“(1) CERTIFIED FQHCs.—The Secretary shall give priority in awarding grants under this section to entities and organizations which have, as of the date of enactment of this section, been certified as a FQHC under section

1905(1)(2)(B) of the Social Security Act and which have submitted a proposal to the Secretary to expand their operations (including expansion to new sites) to serve medically underserved populations for high impact areas not currently served by a FQHC. The Secretary shall give first priority in awarding grants under this section to those FQHCs or other entities or organizations which propose to serve populations with the highest degree of unmet need, and which can demonstrate the ability to expand their operations in the most efficient manner.

“(2) QUALIFIED FQHCs.—The Secretary shall give second priority in awarding grants to entities and organizations which have submitted applications to the Secretary which demonstrate that the entities or organizations will qualify as FQHCs under section 1905(1)(2)(B) of the Social Security Act before they provide or arrange for the provision of services supported by funds awarded under this section, and which are serving or proposing to serve medically underserved populations or high impact areas which are not currently served (or proposed to be served) by a FQHC.

“(3) EXPANDED SERVICES AND PROJECTS.—The Secretary shall give third priority in awarding grants in subsequent years to those FQHCs or other entities or organizations which have provided for expanded services and projects and are able to demonstrate that such entities or organizations will incur significant unreimbursed costs in providing such expanded services.

“(f) RETURN OF FUNDS TO SECRETARY FOR COSTS REIMBURSED FROM OTHER SOURCES.—To the extent that a FQHC or other entity or organization receiving funds under this section is reimbursed from another source for the provision of services to an individual, and does not use such increased reimbursement to expand services furnished, to expand areas served, to compensate for costs of unreimbursed services provided to patients, or to promote recruitment, training, or retention of personnel, such excess revenues shall be returned to the Secretary.

“(g) TERMINATION OF GRANTS.—

“(1) FAILURE TO MEET FQHC REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—With respect to any entity or organization that is receiving funds awarded under this section and which subsequently fails to meet the requirements to qualify as a FQHC under section 1905(1)(2)(B) of the Social Security Act or is an entity or organization that is not required to meet the requirements to qualify as a FQHC under section 1905(1)(2)(B) of the Social Security Act but fails to meet the requirements of this section, the Secretary shall terminate the award of funds under this section to such entity or organization.

“(B) NOTICE.—Prior to any termination of funds under this section to an entity or organization, the entity or organization shall be entitled to 60 days' prior notice of termination and, as provided by the Secretary in regulations, an opportunity to correct any deficiencies in order to allow the entity or organization to continue to receive funds under this section.

“(2) REQUIREMENTS.—Upon any termination of funding under this section, the Secretary may (to the extent practicable)—

“(A) sell any property (including equipment) acquired or constructed by the entity or organization using funds made available under this section or transfer such property to another FQHC, except that the Secretary

shall reimburse any costs which were incurred by the entity or organization in acquiring or constructing such property (including equipment) which were not supported by grants under this section; and

"(B) recoup any funds provided to an entity or organization terminated under this section.

"(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$600,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1994 through 1998."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall become effective with respect to services furnished by a federally qualified health center or other qualifying entity or organization described in this section beginning on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

TITLE III—EXPANDING THE SUPPLY OF HEALTH PROFESSIONALS IN RURAL AREAS

SEC. 301. EXPANSION OF NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE CORPS.

Section 338H(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254q(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking "and such sums" and all that follows through the end thereof and inserting "\$120,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1993 through 2000."; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as subparagraphs (B) and (C), respectively; and

(B) by inserting before subparagraph (B) (as so redesignated) the following new subparagraph:

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount appropriated under paragraph (1) for each fiscal year, the Secretary shall utilize 25 percent of such amount to carry out section 338A and 75 percent of such amount to carry out section 338B."

SEC. 302. TAX INCENTIVES FOR PRACTICE IN RURAL AREAS.

(a) NONREFUNDABLE CREDIT FOR CERTAIN PRIMARY HEALTH SERVICES PROVIDERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to nonrefundable personal credits) is amended by inserting after section 25 the following new section:

"SEC. 25A. PRIMARY HEALTH SERVICES PROVIDERS.

"(a) ALLOWANCE OF CREDIT.—In the case of a qualified primary health services provider, there is allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for any taxable year in a mandatory service period an amount equal to the product of—

"(1) the lesser of—

"(A) the number of months of such period occurring in such taxable year, or

"(B) 36 months, reduced by the number of months taken into account under this paragraph with respect to such provider for all preceding taxable years (whether or not in the same mandatory service period), multiplied by

"(2) \$1,000 (\$500 in the case of a qualified primary health services provider who is a physician assistant or a nurse practitioner).

"(b) QUALIFIED PRIMARY HEALTH SERVICES PROVIDER.—For purposes of this section, the term 'qualified primary health services provider' means any physician, physician assistant, or nurse practitioner who for any month during a mandatory service period is certified by the Bureau to be a primary health services provider who—

"(1) is providing primary health services—

"(A) full time, and

"(B) to individuals at least 80 percent of whom reside in a rural health professional shortage area,

"(2) is not receiving during such year a scholarship under the National Health Service Corps Scholarship Program or a loan repayment under the National Health Service Corps Loan Repayment Program,

"(3) is not fulfilling service obligations under such Programs, and

"(4) has not defaulted on such obligations.

"(c) MANDATORY SERVICE PERIOD.—For purposes of this section, the term 'mandatory service period' means the period of 60 consecutive calendar months beginning with the first month the taxpayer is a qualified primary health services provider.

"(d) DEFINITIONS AND SPECIAL RULES.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) BUREAU.—The term 'Bureau' means the Bureau of Health Care Delivery and Assistance, Health Resources and Services Administration of the United States Public Health Service.

"(2) PHYSICIAN.—The term 'physician' has the meaning given to such term by section 1861(r) of the Social Security Act.

"(3) PHYSICIAN ASSISTANT; NURSE PRACTITIONER.—The terms 'physician assistant' and 'nurse practitioner' have the meanings given to such terms by section 1861(aa)(3) of the Social Security Act.

"(4) PRIMARY HEALTH SERVICES PROVIDER.—The term 'primary health services provider' means a provider of primary health services (as defined in section 330(b)(1) of the Public Health Service Act).

"(5) RURAL HEALTH PROFESSIONAL SHORTAGE AREA.—The term 'rural health professional shortage area' means—

"(A) a rural health professional shortage area (as defined in section 332(a)(1)(A) of the Public Health Service Act) in a rural area (as determined under section 1866(d)(2)(D) of the Social Security Act), or

"(B) an area which is determined by the Secretary of Health and Human Services as equivalent to an area described in subparagraph (A) and which is designated by the Bureau of the Census as not urbanized,

"(C) a community that is certified as underserved by the Secretary for purposes of participation in the rural health clinic program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act.

"(e) RECAPTURE OF CREDIT.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—If, during any taxable year, there is a recapture event, then the tax of the taxpayer under this chapter for such taxable year shall be increased by an amount equal to the product of—

"(A) the applicable percentage, and

"(B) the aggregate unrecaptured credits allowed to such taxpayer under this section for all prior taxable years.

"(2) APPLICABLE RECAPTURE PERCENTAGE.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subsection, the applicable recapture percentage shall be determined from the following table:

"If the recapture event occurs during:	The applicable recapture percentage is:
Months 1-24	100
Months 25-36	75
Months 37-48	50
Months 49-60	25
Months 61 and thereafter	0.

"(B) TIMING.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), month 1 shall begin on the first day of the mandatory service period.

"(3) RECAPTURE EVENT DEFINED.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'recapture event' means

the failure of the taxpayer to be a qualified primary health services provider for any month during any mandatory service period.

"(B) CESSATION OF DESIGNATION.—The cessation of the designation of any area as a rural health professional shortage area after the beginning of the mandatory service period for any taxpayer shall not constitute a recapture event.

"(C) SECRETARIAL WAIVER.—The Secretary may waive any recapture event caused by extraordinary circumstances.

"(4) NO CREDITS AGAINST TAX.—Any increase in tax under this subsection shall not be treated as a tax imposed by this chapter for purposes of determining the amount of any credit under subpart A, B, or D of this part."

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 25 the following new item:

"Sec. 25A. Primary health services providers."

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE CORPS LOAN REPAYMENTS EXCLUDED FROM GROSS INCOME.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Part III of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to items specifically excluded from gross income) is amended by redesignating section 136 as section 137 and by inserting after section 135 the following new section:

"SEC. 136. NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE CORPS LOAN REPAYMENTS.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—Gross income shall not include any qualified loan repayment.

"(b) QUALIFIED LOAN REPAYMENT.—For purposes of this section, the term 'qualified loan repayment' means any payment made on behalf of the taxpayer by the National Health Service Corps Loan Repayment Program under section 338B(g) of the Public Health Service Act."

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (3) of section 338B(g) of the Public Health Service Act is amended by striking "Federal, State, or local" and inserting "State or local".

(3) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for part III of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking the item relating to section 136 and inserting the following:

"Sec. 136. National Health Service Corps loan repayments.

"Sec. 137. Cross references to other Acts."

(4) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to payments made under section 338B(g) of the Public Health Service Act after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) EXPENSING OF MEDICAL EQUIPMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 179 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to election to expense certain depreciable business assets) is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (1) of subsection (b) and inserting the following:

"(1) DOLLAR LIMITATION.—

"(A) GENERAL RULE.—The aggregate cost which may be taken into account under subsection (a) for any taxable year shall not exceed \$10,000.

"(B) RURAL HEALTH CARE PROPERTY.—In the case of rural health care property, the

aggregate cost which may be taken into account under subsection (a) for any taxable year shall not exceed \$25,000, reduced by the amount otherwise taken into account under subsection (a) for such year." and

(B) by adding at the end of subsection (d) the following new paragraph:

"(11) RURAL HEALTH CARE PROPERTY.—For purposes of this section, the term 'rural health care property' means section 179 property used by a physician (as defined in section 1861(r) of the Social Security Act) in the active conduct of such physician's full-time trade or business of providing primary health services (as defined in section 330(b)(1) of the Public Health Service Act) in a rural health professional shortage area (as defined in section 25A(d)(5))."

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to property placed in service in taxable years beginning after the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) DEDUCTION FOR STUDENT LOAN PAYMENTS BY MEDICAL PROFESSIONALS PRACTICING IN RURAL AREAS.—

(1) INTEREST ON STUDENT LOANS NOT TREATED AS PERSONAL INTEREST.—Section 163(h)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (defining personal interest) is amended by striking "and" at the end of subparagraph (D), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (E) and inserting ", and", and by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(F) any qualified medical education interest (within the meaning of subsection (k))."

(2) QUALIFIED MEDICAL EDUCATION INTEREST DEFINED.—Section 163 of such Code (relating to interest expenses) is amended by redesignating subsection (k) as subsection (l) and by inserting after subsection (j) the following new subsection:

"(k) QUALIFIED MEDICAL EDUCATION INTEREST OF MEDICAL PROFESSIONALS PRACTICING IN RURAL AREAS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of subsection (h)(2)(F), the term 'qualified medical education interest' means an amount which bears the same ratio to the interest paid on qualified educational loans during the taxable year by an individual performing services under a qualified rural medical practice agreement as—

"(A) the number of months during the taxable year during which such services were performed, bears to

"(B) the number of months in the taxable year.

"(2) DOLLAR LIMITATION.—The aggregate amount which may be treated as qualified medical education interest for any taxable year with respect to any individual shall not exceed \$5,000.

"(3) QUALIFIED RURAL MEDICAL PRACTICE AGREEMENT.—For purposes of this subsection—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified rural medical practice agreement' means a written agreement between an individual and an applicable rural community under which the individual agrees—

"(i) in the case of a medical doctor, upon completion of the individual's residency (or internship if no residency is required), or

"(ii) in the case of a registered nurse, nurse practitioner, or physician's assistant, upon completion of the education to which the qualified education loan relates,

to perform full-time services as such a medical professional in the applicable rural community for a period of 24 consecutive months. An individual and an applicable rural community may elect to have the agreement apply for 36 consecutive months rather than 24 months.

"(B) SPECIAL RULE FOR COMPUTING PERIODS.—An individual shall be treated as meeting the 24 or 36 consecutive month requirement under subparagraph (A) if, during each 12-consecutive month period within either such period, the individual performs full-time services as a medical doctor, registered nurse, nurse practitioner, or physician's assistant, whichever applies, in the applicable rural community during 9 of the months in such 12-consecutive month period. For purposes of this subsection, an individual meeting the requirements of the preceding sentence shall be treated as performing services during the entire 12-month period.

"(C) APPLICABLE RURAL COMMUNITY.—The term 'applicable rural community' means—

"(i) any political subdivision of a State which—

"(I) has a population of 5,000 or less, and

"(II) has a per capita income of \$15,000 or less, or

"(ii) an Indian reservation which has a per capita income of \$15,000 or less.

"(4) QUALIFIED EDUCATIONAL LOAN.—The term 'qualified educational loan' means any indebtedness to pay qualified tuition and related expenses (within the meaning of section 117(b)) and reasonable living expenses—

"(A) which are paid or incurred—

"(i) as a candidate for a degree as a medical doctor at an educational institution described in section 170(b)(1)(A)(ii), or

"(ii) in connection with courses of instruction at such an institution necessary for certification as a registered nurse, nurse practitioner, or physician's assistant, and

"(B) which are paid or incurred within a reasonable time before or after such indebtedness is incurred.

"(5) RECAPTURE.—If an individual fails to carry out a qualified rural medical practice agreement during any taxable year, then—

"(A) no deduction with respect to such agreement shall be allowable by reason of subsection (h)(2)(F) for such taxable year and any subsequent taxable year, and

"(B) there shall be included in gross income for such taxable year the aggregate amount of the deductions allowable under this section (by reason of subsection (h)(2)(F)) for all preceding taxable years.

"(6) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection, the terms 'registered nurse', 'nurse practitioner', and 'physician's assistant' have the meaning given such terms by section 1861 of the Social Security Act."

(3) DEDUCTION ALLOWED IN COMPUTING ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME.—Section 62(a) of such Code is amended by inserting after paragraph (13) the following new paragraph:

"(14) INTEREST ON STUDENT LOANS OF RURAL HEALTH PROFESSIONALS.—The deduction allowable by reason of section 163(h)(2)(F) (relating to student loan payments of medical professionals practicing in rural areas)."

(4) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS SEC. 401. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Unless specifically provided otherwise, this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall become effective on the date of enactment of this Act.

SUMMARY OF S. 1215

The purpose of this legislation is to increase the number of primary care providers in order to improve the nation's health care access and contain health care spending. In addition, this legislation would draw pri-

mary care providers into rural underserved areas.

KEY COMPONENTS

Medicare graduate medical education payments [GME] are modified to increase the number of primary care providers by establishing three different per-resident payment categories and eliminating GME payments for fellowship specialty training.

Primary care residency programs receive a 150 percent GME payment for each of their residents and reimburse their residents 20 percent more than specialty residents as an incentive for medical students to enter primary care.

Community-based training of residents is encouraged through the formation of medical training consortia composed of medical schools, ambulatory training facilities, and teaching hospitals. Each consortium receives its GME payments to produce 50 percent primary care providers from the consortium medical school(s) and may use the GME funds at the medical school(s) as well as the residency training sites.

To encourage the formation of the consortium, specialty residency training positions affiliated with a consortium receive a 100 percent GME payment while other specialty programs receive an annually calculated lower amount.

In order to meet the short-term for primary care providers, Public Health Service funding for nurse practitioner and physician assistant education is increased.

States are encouraged to develop innovative ways to improve primary care through a primary care state demonstration grant program which evaluates the feasibility of retraining specialists as primary care providers and tests state mechanisms to enhance the delivery of primary care by nurse practitioners or physician assistants.

A new program in the Public Health Service is created to expand the number of community health clinics and other federally qualified clinics. Under this new program, regulations which inhibit the formation of these clinics in rural areas are removed.

The supply of primary care providers in rural areas would be expanded through increasing national health service corps funding and providing a variety of tax credits and deductions for such providers.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

General Background

Consensus is growing in the health care and medical education communities that changes are needed in the way the United States trains doctors and other health professionals. Specifically, many are calling for changes in the financing of medical education to increase the production of primary care providers including physicians, nurse practitioners, and physician assistants.

The present system of health education has helped to produce a physician oversupply and to create an imbalance between subspecialists and primary care providers. These two problems are generally acknowledged to be a force behind high medical costs, as well as the shortage of providers in underserved areas.

Background on Current Financing of Graduate Medical Education

Currently, the biggest federal involvement in graduate medical education (GME) occurs through the Medicare program, which pays \$5 billion annually to teaching hospitals to help them underwrite the cost of residency training. In addition, the Public Health Service currently allocates over \$270 million to primary care residencies and allied

health, nursing, and medical schools. But, compared to Medicare GME, these funds are thought to have limited impact on the current supply and specialty-mix of the physician work force.

A serious problem in the current Medicare GME system is that payments are made to teaching hospitals on a blanket, per-resident and per-institution basis. As such, hospitals often administer residency positions to meet hospital service needs rather than community needs. Furthermore, hospitals transfer only a limited amount of money to community-based ambulatory care sites where most generalists receive their training.

Under the current Medicare GME system, funds are provided to teaching hospitals in two ways: First, Medicare provides direct medical education (DME) funding on a per-resident basis for the cost of stipends, faculty salaries, administrative expenses, and overhead. Second, Medicare also provides indirect medical education (IME) funding to pay for extra service costs incurred by teaching hospitals when residents treat Medicare patients. Medicare currently spends \$1.2 billion annually for DME and \$3.6 billion for IME, for a total of about \$5 billion annually.

I. Primary Care Provider Education

Goal: Increase the number of primary care providers in order to improve the nation's health care access and contain health care spending through changes in Medicare GME and Public Health Service health professions training funding.

A. Medicare GME Weighting

1. Weight primary care residents as 1.5 FTE for the purposes of calculating DME payments. Health care training institutions receiving such payments shall pay primary care residents 20 percent more than nonprimary care residents. Such weighting and primary care residency payments should increase the number of quality training programs and provide short-term incentives for medical students to enter primary care.

2. Weight all nonprimary care residents affiliated with health care training consortia as 1.0 FTE for the purposes of DME payments. Maintaining the 1.0 FTE weight for nonprimary care residents in consortia should help induce the formation of such entities. (See description of consortia below under B(1).)

3. Annually calculate a weight for all nonprimary care residents not affiliated with a health care training consortia to maintain DME budget neutrality. As payments for primary care and health care training consortia increase, this weight would eventually become 0, and thus, the number of specialty training programs subsidized by Medicare DME would decrease. As a result, the current overproduction of specialists would decline.

4. Eliminate the .5 FTE weight Medicare currently applies to fellowship training positions. Such specialist physicians are currently in oversupply.

B. Expand Ambulatory Training Experiences

1. Begin DME payments to health care training consortia. Such consortia would be composed of medical school(s), teaching hospitals, and community-based ambulatory training sites (i.e., physicians offices or community and rural health clinics). The DME payments would be used by a consortium, at its sole discretion, to meet an outcome requirement of producing 50 percent primary care providers from the consortium medical school(s). In addition to increasing community-based ambulatory experiences, such consortia would lead to changes in the medical school environment which would influence medical students to enter primary care.

2. Require teaching hospitals which receive DME payments to account for the use of those funds for residency programs. Currently, many teaching hospitals which receive DME payments for their primary care programs do not transfer those funds to such programs. As such, primary care training programs often receive insufficient financial support.

3. Allow teaching hospitals to receive DME funding for training received by their residents in nonhospital-owned community-based training facilities such as rural health clinics and private physicians' offices. Residents trained in such settings have a greater tendency to practice in rural and other underserved areas.

C. Other GME Changes

1. Establish a national average DME payment. For historical reasons, DME payments vary by hospital. As such, many residency programs may be overfunded, while others are underfunded.

2. Maintain GME budget neutrality by establishing a common GME fund with separate DME and IME subfunds. Transfer funds from the Medicare part A and part B trust funds in an amount equal to 1993 funding adjusted for inflation. In addition, protect the funding base for per-resident DME payments by increasing the DME fund, as needed, to cover the primary care and health care consortia weights, through a transfer of amounts from the IME subfund. As a result, teaching hospitals would be discouraged from increasing the number of their specialty training programs because IME service payments would decrease as the number of specialty training positions increase. Furthermore, protection of the DME funding base for primary care should encourage the formation of such positions.

3. Approve health care consortia and primary care training programs to receive increased DME weights. Based upon their curricula, the Health Resources and Services Administration, which currently oversees federal government health professions funding for primary care training programs, would approve primary care programs. HRSA would also approve health care training consortia, if such consortia train 50 percent primary care providers.

D. Nurse Practitioner and Physician Assistant Funding

1. Increase authorized funding for nurse practitioner and physician assistant training programs under Title VII and Title VIII of the Public Health Service Act. Increase the authorized funding for physician assistant programs to \$11.25 million and for nurse practitioner programs to \$25 million.

E. Establish Primary Care Demonstration Grants

1. Establish a \$9 million demonstration grant program for states and nonprofit entities to examine mechanisms to increase primary care. Grantees could examine one of the following:

a. State mechanisms, including changes in the scope of practice laws, to enhance the delivery of primary care by nurse practitioners or physician assistants.

b. The feasibility of, and the most effective means to train subspecialists to deliver primary care as primary care providers.

F. Council on Graduate Medical Education

1. In addition to its current responsibilities, charge the Council on Graduate Medical Education to evaluate the changes created by this act. Authorize \$8 million for this purpose.

II. Community Health Services Expansion

Goal: Increase federally funded primary care clinics in rural and other underserved areas.

A. New federal funding will be allocated for federally qualified health centers and community-based primary care clinics. Such centers would include community health centers and migrant health centers. In addition, rural health clinics, public health departments, and other local entities would be eligible to receive a portion of the \$600 million authorized amount. Such clinics would not have to meet all of the requirements which currently apply to the community health center program.

III. Expanding the Supply of Primary Care Providers in Rural Areas

Goal: Provide financial incentives to draw primary care providers into rural underserved areas.

A. Significantly expand funding for the National Health Service Corps, a program to place doctors and other health professionals in underserved areas, in exchange for scholarship or loan repayment assistance. Authorization is \$120 million for each of the next five years.

B. Allow a tax credit for physicians equal to \$1,000 a month for practice in a rural health professions shortage area. Nurse practitioners and physician assistants will be eligible for a similar credit equal to \$500 per month.

C. Provide additional tax incentives for rural practice including deductibility of National Health Service Corps loan repayments, the cost of basic medical equipment, and up to \$5,000 of student loan interest payments.

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself and Mr. BURNS):

S. 1216. A bill to resolve the 107th meridian boundary dispute between the Crow Indian Tribe, the Northern Cheyenne Indian Tribe, and the United States and various other issues pertaining to the Crow Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

CROW SETTLEMENT ACT

• Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I send a bill, the Crow Settlement Act, to the desk and ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

Last session, my colleague, Senator BURNS, and I made a good faith promise to the Crow Indian Tribe, a promise to help settle a century-old dispute that deprived the Crow Nation of 36,000 acres of land.

This land was promised by the Federal Government under the 1868 Fort Laramie Treaty. Yet, before they had the opportunity to begin settling upon this land, a surveying error stole away a significant piece of their reservation. Now, over 100 years later, the Crow Tribe is still seeking redress. It is time to correct this error, to compensate the Crow Tribe for what is rightfully theirs.

The disputed land is in the southeastern corner of Montana, north of the Wyoming border, south of the Yellowstone River. Under the Fort Laramie Treaty, the Crow Tribe's eastern boundary was designated as the 107th

meridian. Sixteen years later, the Northern Cheyenne Reservation was established with a western boundary as the 107th meridian. The two tribes lived as neighbors, sharing a common boundary. But in 1889-91, a U.S. surveying team erroneously drew the eastern boundary of the Crow Reservation one-fourth mile to the west. The Crow Tribe lost 36,000 acres of their tribal lands. Yet, this error was not discovered until the 1950's.

Throughout the intervening 60 years, patents to the minerals on these lands were given out to the Northern Cheyenne, Crow, and other holders. Almost 13,000 acres of the Crow Tribe's original land has been settled by the Northern Cheyenne Tribe.

Boundaries established by treaty constitute a solemn promise to a tribe by the U.S. Government, a promise of land to be given to the tribe in perpetuity. The land above, and the natural resources below, belong to the tribe. No one has the right to take away what is legally the Crows.

Introduction of this bill is one more step toward fixing a 100-year-old mistake. This bill is the product of lengthy negotiations among the Crow and Northern Cheyenne Tribes, Federal agencies, and the State of Montana. It provides a broad framework that may hold the key to a final resolution of this dispute. The bill has several provisions to compensate the Crow Tribe for the land they lost while not disrupting the Northern Cheyenne who have settled on the 13,000 acres they thought, in good faith, was theirs.

Like so many bills introduced in this body, this legislation is not a finished product. It will almost certainly be refined through both the Indian Affairs and Energy and Natural Resources Committees. But this bill is a step in the right direction.

I believe this bill holds the promise for an equitable settlement. This bill is not perfect; and this process is far from over. This legislation will seriously impact the Crow, Northern Cheyenne, the U.S. Government, and the people of Montana. During the process, everyone will have a chance to be heard.

Senator BURNS and I look forward to working with all parties to bring this issue to a close, to reverse the mistakes of history.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1216

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 "Crow Settlement Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to settle the dispute created by the Federal

Government's erroneous survey of the eastern boundary of the Crow Indian Reservation and to resolve various other issues pertaining to the Crow Indian Reservation.

(b) FINDINGS.—

(1) Under the Fort Laramie Treaty of 1868 (15 Stat. 649), the eastern boundary of the Crow Indian Reservation was established as the 107th Meridian for approximately 90 miles from the Yellowstone River to the boundary between Montana and Wyoming.

(2) Under 1884 and 1900 Executive orders, the western boundary of the Northern Cheyenne Reservation was established as the 107th Meridian. The 107th Meridian is the common boundary between the Crow and Northern Cheyenne Reservations for approximately 25 miles.

(3) From 1889 through 1891, a survey was conducted of the eastern boundary of the Crow Reservation. Instead of following the true 107th Meridian, the 1891 survey line strayed to the west. As a result of the erroneous survey, approximately 36,164 acres were excluded from the Crow Indian Reservation of which approximately 12,964 acres were included in the Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation. Vast deposits of low sulphur coal underlie the land excluded from the Crow Indian Reservation including the land included in the Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation.

(4) The erroneous nature of the survey was not discovered for several decades. Meanwhile, the areas along the 107th Meridian to the north and south of the Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation were opened to settlement in the late 1800's and early 1900's. Patents were issued to non-Indians and to the State of Montana for most of the surface land and a significant portion of the minerals in these areas between the 107th Meridian and the erroneous 1891 survey line. The 12,964 acres erroneously included in the Northern Cheyenne Reservation have been treated as part of the Northern Cheyenne Reservation and occupied by the Northern Cheyenne Tribe, Northern Cheyenne allottees and their successors in interest.

(5) Following the discovery of the erroneous 1891 survey line in the 1950's, bills to resolve the 107th Meridian boundary dispute were introduced in Congress in the 1960's and 1970's, but no bill was enacted into law.

(6) In 1966, the United States completed construction of Yellowstone Dam on the Crow Indian Reservation as part of the Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program. The Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program also included the Hardin Bench Irrigation Unit and other irrigation projects on the Crow Indian Reservation which have not yet been constructed.

(7) The operation of the Yellowstone Afterbay Dam by the Bureau of Reclamation has resulted in a significant water quality problem on the Big Horn River within the Crow Indian Reservation. Construction of a power plant and related facilities at the existing Yellowstone Afterbay Dam will solve that problem.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act:

(1) The term "Crow Tribe" means the Crow Tribe of Indians, the duly recognized governing body of the Crow Indian Reservation.

(2) The term "disputed area" means the land, approximately 36,165 acres, including the minerals, located between the 107th Meridian and the 1891 survey line.

(3) The term "1891 survey line" means the erroneous boundary line resulting from the survey of the 107th Meridian which was completed in 1891.

(4) The term "Northern Cheyenne Tribe" means the Northern Cheyenne Tribe of Indi-

ans, the duly recognized governing body of the Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation.

(5) The term "107th Meridian boundary dispute" means the dispute resulting from the disparity between the locations of the 107th Meridian and the 1891 survey line.

(6) The term "parcel No. 1" means the land, approximately 11,317 acres, including all minerals, within the area bounded on the south by the Montana/Wyoming border, on the east by the 107th Meridian, on the north by the extension to the west of the southern boundary of the Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation and on the west by the 1891 survey line.

(7) The term "parcel No. 2" means the land, approximately 12,964 acres, including all minerals, within the area bounded on the south by the extension to the west of the southern boundary of the Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation, on the east by the 107th Meridian, on the north by the extension to the west of the northern boundary of the Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation and on the west by the 1891 survey line.

(8) The term "parcel No. 3" means the land, approximately 2,469 acres, including all minerals, within the area bounded on the south by the extension to the west of the northern boundary of the Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation, on the east by the 107th Meridian, on the north by the northern boundary of the Crow Indian Reservation and on the west by the 1891 survey line.

(9) The term "parcel No. 4" means the land, approximately 9,415 acres, including all minerals, within the area bounded on the south by the northern boundary of the Crow Indian Reservation, on the east by the 107th Meridian, on the north by the midpoint of the Yellowstone River and on the west by the 1891 survey line.

(10) The word "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(11) The term "undisposed of coal" means coal which has not been conveyed to private parties or to the State of Montana by the United States.

(12) The term "undisposed of land" means surface land which has not been conveyed to private parties or to the State of Montana by the United States.

(13) The term "undisposed of oil, gas, coal methane or other minerals" means oil, gas, coal methane or other minerals except coal, which have not been conveyed to private parties or to the State of Montana by the United States.

SEC. 4. AUTHORITY TO SETTLE.

(a) CONTRACT WITH CROW TRIBE.—Subject to the terms and conditions of this Act, the Secretary shall enter into a contract with the Crow Tribe providing for the settlement of the 107th Meridian boundary dispute and other issues pertaining to the Crow Indian Reservation.

(b) CONTRACT WITH NORTHERN CHEYENNE TRIBE.—Subject to the terms and conditions of this Act, the Secretary shall enter into a contract with the Northern Cheyenne Tribe to resolve the issues with respect to the property within parcel No. 2.

(c) ENFORCEMENT OF CONTRACTS.—The contracts authorized in subsections (a) and (b) shall be enforceable pursuant to subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, or, where the remedies available under that Act do not provide adequate or complete relief, pursuant to section 1505 of title 28, United States Code.

SEC. 5. TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF SETTLEMENT CONTRACTS.

(a) CROW/NORTHERN CHEYENNE SETTLEMENT.—The contracts with the Crow and

Northern Cheyenne Tribes referred to in section 4 shall include the following terms and conditions with respect to the property within parcel No. 2:

(1) The surface boundary between the Crow and Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservations shall be the 1891 survey line and the ownership of the surface lands within parcel No. 2 shall be recognized as being vested in the United States in trust for the sole use and benefit of the Northern Cheyenne Tribe, Northern Cheyenne allottees or their successors in interest or other persons whose claims, rights, or interests are based on the 1891 survey line.

(2) With respect to the coal and other minerals within parcel No. 2 except for oil, gas, and coal methane, the boundary between the Crow and Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservations shall be the 1891 survey line and the ownership of such minerals shall be vested in the United States in trust for the sole use and benefit of the Northern Cheyenne Tribe.

(3) With respect to oil, gas, and coal methane within parcel No. 2, the boundary between the Crow and Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservations shall be the 107th Meridian and the ownership of such oil, gas and coal methane shall be vested in the United States in trust for the sole use and benefit of the Crow Tribe.

(4) The funds held in escrow by the Bureau of Indian Affairs derived from the lands and minerals within parcel No. 2, together with all of the interest earned on such funds, shall be divided equally between the Crow and Northern Cheyenne Tribes and may be used by each tribe for such purposes as it may determine.

(5) A disclaimer and relinquishment by the Crow Tribe of all right, title, claim or interest in the land and minerals within parcel No. 2 described in paragraphs (1) and (2), and to one-half of the funds described in paragraph (4), and a disclaimer and relinquishment by the Northern Cheyenne Tribe of all right, title, claim or interest in the minerals within parcel No. 2 described in paragraph (3), and to one-half of the funds described in paragraph (4).

(6) A release by the Northern Cheyenne Tribe of all persons and entities, including the United States and the Crow Tribe, for any and all liability arising out of the erroneous survey of the 107th Meridian, and a release by the Crow Tribe of all persons and entities, including the United States and the Northern Cheyenne Tribe, for any and all liability arising from the erroneous survey of the 107th Meridian.

(b) PROPERTY WITHIN PARCEL NOS. 1, 3 AND 4.—The contract with the Crow Tribe referred to in section 4 shall include the following terms and conditions with respect to the property within parcel Nos. 1, 3 and 4:

(1) Title to the undisposed of coal within parcel No. 1 shall be vested in the United States in trust for the sole use and benefit of the Crow Tribe and such coal shall be recognized as part of the Crow Indian Reservation.

(2) Title to the undisposed of surface lands within parcel Nos. 1, 3 and 4 shall be vested in the United States in trust for the sole use and benefit of the Crow Tribe and such land shall be recognized as part of the Crow Indian Reservation. Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this paragraph, the State of Montana shall retain the same civil and criminal authority over such lands in Parcel No. 4 that it currently has over lands restored to the Tribe under the Act of May 19, 1958, (72 Stat. 121).

(3) Title to the undisposed of oil, gas, coal methane or other minerals within parcel

Nos. 1, 3 and 4 shall be vested in the United States in trust for the sole use and benefit of the Crow Tribe and such minerals shall be recognized as part of the Crow Indian Reservation.

(4) A disclaimer and relinquishment by the Crow Tribe of all right, title, claim or interest in all the lands and minerals within parcel Nos. 1, 3 and 4, except for the rights, titles and interests recognized as beneficially owned by the Crow Tribe in paragraphs (1), (2) and (3).

(5) A release by the Crow Tribe of all persons and entities, including the United States, for any and all liability arising from the erroneous survey of the 107th Meridian.

(c) EXCHANGE OF PUBLIC LANDS.—As part of the settlement of the 107th Meridian boundary dispute with the Crow Tribe, the contract with the Crow Tribe referred to in section 4 shall include the following land exchange provisions:

(1) The Secretary shall negotiate with the State of Montana for the purpose of exchanging public lands within the State of Montana for up to approximately 46,625 acres of State trust lands within the Crow Indian Reservation and the disputed area. The value of the public lands and State trust lands exchanged pursuant to this provision shall be substantially equal. The value of improvements on such lands shall be given due consideration. Lands exchanged shall be selected so that the financial impact on local governments, if any, will be minimized. The Secretary shall provide such financial and other assistance to the State of Montana as may be necessary to obtain the appraisals and other administrative requirements necessary to accomplish this exchange. Upon the approval by the Secretary and the State of Montana of an exchange pursuant to this paragraph, the Secretary is authorized to receive title to such State trust lands involved in the exchange on behalf of the United States and to transfer title to the public lands involved in the exchange to the State of Montana by such means of conveyance as the Secretary deems appropriate. State trust lands acquired pursuant to the exchange shall be vested in the United States in trust for the sole use and benefit of the Crow Tribe and shall be deemed part of the Crow Indian Reservation.

(2) If, for any reason, the exchange for all or any portion of the State trust lands described in paragraph (1) is not completed within 5 years from the date of enactment of this Act, at the request of and in cooperation with the Crow Tribe, the Secretary shall develop and implement a program to provide the Crow Tribe with land in an amount sufficient to make up the difference between the value of all the State trust lands within the Crow Indian Reservation and the disputed area and the value of any State trust lands exchanged and acquired pursuant to paragraph (1). In carrying out this program, the Secretary is authorized to transfer title to public lands within the State of Montana to the Crow Tribe and to exchange public lands within the State of Montana for private lands of substantially equal value within the Crow Indian Reservation. The value of improvements on all such lands shall be given due consideration. Title to the public lands transferred pursuant to this paragraph, other than by exchange, and to the private lands acquired pursuant to this paragraph shall be vested in the United States in trust for the sole use and benefit of the Crow Tribe and shall be deemed part of the Crow Indian Reservation. Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this paragraph, the State of Mon-

tana shall retain civil and criminal authority over the surface only of any such lands in the event that any such lands are not contiguous to the existing Crow Reservation, which authority shall not be exclusive.

(d) YELLOWTAIL AFTERBAY POWER PLANT.—As part of the settlement of the 107th Meridian boundary dispute with the Crow Tribe and to bring the Federal Government's operation of Yellowtail Afterbay Dam into compliance with applicable water quality standards, the Secretary, subject to the availability of funds, shall construct and operate a power plant and bypass at the Yellowtail Afterbay Dam. The cost of constructing such power plant and bypass shall be non-reimbursable. The Secretary, in consultation and cooperation with the Secretary of Energy and the Crow Tribe, is authorized to sell or to make arrangements for the sale or marketing of the power generated at the Yellowtail Afterbay Dam to produce maximum revenues. Revenues from the sale of power generated at that power plant shall first be used to defray the costs incurred in the operation, maintenance and repair of the plant. The contract with the Crow Tribe referred to in section 4 of this Act shall provide that the remainder of the revenues from the sale of such power shall be transferred to the Crow Tribe and used for such purposes as the Crow Tribe may determine, subject to the Secretary's approval. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, the Crow Tribe, may, in its discretion, elect to utilize any portion of the power generated at the Yellowtail Afterbay Dam in lieu of receiving the revenues produced by the sale of that power.

(e) CROW TRIBAL TRUST FUND.—

(1) There is established in the Treasury of the United States a revolving account to be known as the "Crow Tribal Trust Account".

(2) Amounts in the Crow Tribal Trust Account shall be available, without fiscal year limitations, to the Secretary for distribution to the Crow Tribe in accordance with section 6(b), and other provisions of this Act.

(3) The Crow Tribal Trust Account shall consist of such amounts as are appropriated to it in accordance with the authorizations provided by this Act.

(4) As part of the settlement of the 107th Meridian boundary dispute and other issues pertaining to the Crow Indian Reservation, in the contract with the Crow Tribe referred to in section 4 of this Act, the Secretary, on behalf of the United States, shall pay, from moneys appropriated pursuant to this Act, into the Crow Tribal Trust Account \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 1994, and each of the next following 9 fiscal years.

(f) ADDITIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO CROW TRIBAL TRUST FUND.—In addition to the amounts authorized to be appropriated in subsection (e)(4), as part of the settlement of the 107th Meridian boundary dispute and other issues pertaining to the Crow Indian Reservation, in the contract with the Crow Tribe referred to in section 4 of this Act, the Secretary, on behalf of the United States, subject to the availability of moneys appropriated pursuant to this Act, shall pay the following amounts into the Crow Tribal Trust Account:

(1) Commencing with fiscal year 1994 and each fiscal year thereafter, an amount which shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable and equal to the amounts of royalties received and retained by the United States during the previous fiscal year from the East Decker, West Decker and Spring Creek coal mines in the State of Montana for the life of those mines, including any extensions of the existing leases or expansions to adjacent or

nearby coal deposits owned by the Federal Government.

(2) Commencing with fiscal year 1994, and each fiscal year thereafter, an amount, which shall be nonreimbursable and non-returnable, equal to the receipts from all deposits to the United States Treasury for the preceding fiscal year from the sale of power generated at Yellowtail Dam.

SEC. 6. ADMINISTRATION OF CROW TRIBAL TRUST FUND.

(a) **INVESTMENT.**—All sums deposited in, accruing to and remaining in the Crow Tribal Trust Account, shall be invested by the Secretary of the Treasury in interest-bearing deposits and securities in accordance with the Act of June 24, 1938 (52 Stat. 1037, 25 U.S.C. 162a).

(b) **DISTRIBUTION OF INTEREST.**—Only the interest received on moneys in the Crow Tribal Trust Account shall be available for distribution to the Crow Tribe, and then only for use for education, land acquisition, economic development, youth and elderly programs and other tribal purposes in accordance with plans and budgets developed by the Crow Tribe and approved by the Secretary; except that, subject to the Secretary's approval, up to 25 percent of the moneys in the Crow Tribal Trust Account at any time may be pledged by the Crow Tribe as security for commercial loans for economic development projects on or near the Crow Indian Reservation. No part of any moneys in the Crow Tribal Trust Account or of the interest earned on moneys in the Crow Tribal Account shall be distributed to members of the Crow Tribe on a per capita basis.

(c) **INTEREST ADJUSTMENTS.**—(1) If and to the extent that any portion of the sums described in section 5(e)(4) are appropriated after fiscal year 1994 and the following 9 fiscal years or in lesser amounts than provided in section 5(e)(4), there shall be deposited in the Crow Tribal Trust Fund, subject to appropriations, in addition to the full contributions, adjustments representing the interest income, as determined by the Secretary in his sole discretion, that would have been earned on any unpaid amounts had the amounts authorized in section 5(e)(4) been appropriated in full at the beginning of each fiscal year for fiscal years 1994 through 2003.

(2) If and to the extent that any portion of the sums described in sections 5(f)(1) and 5(f)(2) are appropriated and deposited in the Crow Tribal Trust Fund more than 60 days after the close of the preceding fiscal year or in lesser amounts than provided in those subsections, there shall be deposited in the Crow Tribal Trust Fund, subject to appropriations, in addition to the full contributions, adjustments representing the interest income, as determined by the Secretary in his sole discretion, that would have been earned on any unpaid amounts had the amounts authorized in sections 5(f)(1) and 5(f)(2) been appropriated and deposited in full in a timely manner.

SEC. 7. CROW IRRIGATION PROJECT.

At such time as the settlement contract between the Crow Tribe and the Secretary becomes effective, the authority of the Bureau of Reclamation to construct and operate the Hardin Bench, Little Horn, Custer Bench, Wyola, Benteen Flat, Battlefield and Crow Irrigation Projects on the Crow Indian Reservation as part of the Pick-Sloan Missouri River Basin Program is revoked; except that nothing in this Act shall affect the reserved water rights appurtenant to any lands within the Crow Indian Reservation.

SEC. 8. ELIGIBILITY FOR OTHER SERVICES NOT AFFECTED.

No payments pursuant to this Act shall result in the reduction or denial of any Federal

services or programs to the Crow Tribe, the Northern Cheyenne Tribe or any of their members, to which they are entitled, or eligible because of their status as federally recognized Indian tribes or members of such tribes. No payments pursuant to this Act shall be subject to Federal or State income tax.

SEC. 9. EXCHANGES OF LAND AND MINERALS.

Subject to the Secretary's approval, the Crow Tribe is authorized to exchange any of the Crow Tribe's land or minerals within the disputed area recognized or obtained pursuant to paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 5(b), or paragraph (1) of section 5(c) or any of the Crow Tribe's land obtained pursuant to paragraph (2) of section 5(c) for other land or minerals of substantially equivalent value within the Crow Indian Reservation. Lands or minerals received by the tribe in such exchange shall be considered to be vested in the United States in trust for the sole use and benefit of the Crow Tribe and a part of its reservation. Lands and minerals received by a non-Indian in such exchange shall be considered to be owned in fee.

SEC. 10. EFFECTIVENESS CONTRACTS.

The contracts entered into by the Crow Tribe and the Northern Cheyenne Tribe pursuant to this Act providing for the settlement of the 107th Meridian dispute and other issues pertaining to the Crow Indian Reservation shall not take effect until the contracts are approved and executed in accordance with the requirements and procedures set forth in each tribe's constitution.

SEC. 11. APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be required to implement the provisions of this Act.●

By Mr. DECONCINI (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. SASSER, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. DODD, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. KERRY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. PELL, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. HEFLIN, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. BURNS, Mr. COATS, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. PRESSLER, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. GLENN, Mr. DOLE, Mr. WOFFORD, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. METZENBAUM, Mr. MATHEWS, Mr. SIMON, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MACK, Mr. REID, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. LOTT, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. EXON, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FORD, Mr. INOUE, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PRYOR, and Mr. SARBANES):

S.J. Res. 111. A joint resolution to designate August 1, 1993, as "Helsinki Human Rights Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HELSENKI HUMAN RIGHTS DAY

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, as chairman of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, also known as the Helsinki Commission, I am pleased to introduce today, together with several of my colleagues, a joint resolution to authorize and re-

quest the President to designate August 1, 1993, as "Helsinki Human Rights Day."

On August 1, 1975, the leaders of 35 countries gathered in Helsinki to sign the final act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe [CSCE], also referred to as the Helsinki accords. This agreement launched a dynamic process which has contributed to the positive changes which have occurred in Europe in recent years. The Final Act, the seminal document of this process, covers major aspects of East-West relations, including military security, trade, economic cooperation, environment, scientific and cultural exchanges, as well as human rights and fundamental freedoms.

Membership in CSCE has grown significantly in light of sweeping political developments in Europe, including the demise of the Soviet Union and the former Yugoslavia. Today, 53 countries are participants in the CSCE process—51 Eurasian States, Canada, and the United States.

Human rights remains the cornerstone of the CSCE process. The participating States have recognized that human rights and fundamental freedoms are the birthright of all human beings and that protection and promotion of these rights is the first responsibility of government. The CSCE remains firmly committed to human rights, democracy, and the rule of law, and has encouraged peaceful change through free and fair elections.

Over the years, the CSCE has inspired individuals and groups to speak out on behalf of those denied their human rights. It has also served as a useful forum in which individual human rights cases could be raised. Hundreds of political prisoners have been released and thousands of families reunited as a result of pressure brought to bear within the framework of the Helsinki process. It has also been successful in chipping away at the barriers which artificially divided Europe for decades. We can be proud of our record of strong support for the CSCE.

Today, Europe is attempting to liberate itself from the legacy of the past, though problems persist. Of particular concern is the threat posed by ethnic strife in Nagorno-Karabakh, Moldova, the former Yugoslavia, and elsewhere. The CSCE can play an instrumental role in addressing this issue and others which have serious consequences for the future of Europe. In addition, it can further contribute to the political and economic transition taking place in much of East-Central Europe and the former Soviet Union.

The resolution we introduce today reaffirms our commitment to the Helsinki Accords and the vital importance of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms in advancing security and cooperation in Europe.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support the timely adoption of this

joint resolution and ask unanimous consent that the text of the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. J. RES. 111

Whereas August 1, 1993, is the 18th anniversary of the signing of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) (hereafter referred to as the "Helsinki Accords");

Whereas the participating States have declared that "the protection and promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms and the strengthening of democratic institutions continue to be a vital basis for our comprehensive security";

Whereas the participating States have declared that "respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the rights of persons belonging to national minorities, democracy, the rule of law, economic liberty, social justice, and environmental responsibility are our common aims";

Whereas the participating States have acknowledged that "there is still much work to be done in building democratic and pluralistic societies, where diversity is fully protected and respected in practice";

Whereas the war in Bosnia-Herzegovina has resulted in organized, systematic, and premeditated war crimes and genocide and threatens stability and security in Europe;

Whereas growing ethnic tensions, civil unrest, and egregious human rights violations in several of the newly admitted CSCE states, most notably in Tajikistan, are resulting in significant violations of CSCE commitments; and

Whereas the CSCE has contributed to positive developments in Europe by promoting and furthering respect for the human rights and fundamental freedoms of all individuals and groups and provides an appropriate framework for the further development of such rights and freedoms and genuine security and cooperation among the participating States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. HELSINKI HUMAN RIGHTS DAY.

(a) DESIGNATION.—August 1, 1993, the 18th anniversary of the signing of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, is designated as "Helsinki Human Rights Day".

(b) PROCLAMATION.—The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation reasserting America's commitment to full implementation of the human rights and humanitarian provisions of the Helsinki Accords, urging all signatory States to abide by their obligations under the Helsinki Accords, and encouraging the people of the United States to join the President and Congress in observance of Helsinki Human Rights Day with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

(c) HUMAN RIGHTS.—The President is requested to convey to all signatories of the Helsinki Accords that respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms continues to be a vital element of further progress in the ongoing Helsinki process; and to develop new proposals to advance the human rights objectives of the Helsinki process, and in so doing to address the major problems that remain.

SEC. 2. TRANSMITTAL.

The Secretary of State is directed to transmit copies of this joint resolution to the Am-

bassadors or representatives to the United States of the other 52 Helsinki signatory States.

• Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise today as a cosponsor of the Senate joint resolution designating August 1, 1993 as "Helsinki Human Rights Day." As a past Chairman and as the ranking Republican Senator on the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, better known as the Helsinki Commission, I have been, and I remain, a dedicated advocate of human rights and for the principles enunciated in the Helsinki accords and subsequent Helsinki process documents. Accordingly, it is a pleasure for me once again to cosponsor this annual resolution.

It would be more of a pleasure if the human rights principles set forth in the Helsinki accords and subsequent documents were being faithfully respected in and by all participating states. Clearly, this is not now the case.

The most dramatic violations of human rights have occurred and are still occurring in the former Yugoslavia. In fact, the brutal violation of human rights has been so widespread and flagrant that the United Nations has authorized the creation of an international war crimes tribunal for the first time since the end of World War II to try those accused of committing war crimes during the course of the Yugoslav conflict.

The Yugoslav situation is different in kind from the problems the Helsinki process faced when I served as Chairman in the mid-1980's. Then, our task was to press the Soviet Union and its Warsaw Pact allies to respect the commitments they made when they signed the Helsinki accords. While difficult, this was a task we knew how to accomplish. Through unrelenting public diplomacy and adroit private diplomacy, we made gains and had a real positive impact.

In fact, many of the leaders of the new Eastern European democracies have publicly acknowledged that our work helped them when they were persecuted dissidents, and helped keep alive hope of eventual liberation from Communist domination. In short, I believe that the Helsinki process was a substantial factor in the moral defeat of communism.

Once communism's moral authority was destroyed, so was its political legitimacy. After that, all that was left inside the hollow shell of the Communist utopian dream was the machinery of totalitarian oppression and a fundamentally flawed economic system, grinding down to collapse.

The Bosnia and Herzegovina chapter of the Yugoslav conflict is different from that situation in almost every important way. The principal violators of human rights are not the organs of an established totalitarian state, working to keep its subjects under control.

In contrast, in the former Yugoslavia, the worst violators, to the extent that media reports are accurate, appear not to be army or police forces of any of the successor states to the Yugoslav Republic. Instead, they appear to be loosely organized ethnic militias, the worst of which are reportedly no more than organized criminal gangs operating under the color of virulent ethnic partisanship in or on the edges of zones controlled by their sponsoring states' more formally organized forces.

Of course, the sponsoring states claim they do not control the militias, which allegedly arose spontaneously to defend their homes and families in the intercommunal war now raging there. They claim they do not condone or participate in the abuses we've all seen reported in the media. I do not believe their claims.

Serbia, in its drive to achieve its cherished goal, the creation of Greater Serbia, has, in my judgment, by far the most blood on its hands. The media have done an outstanding job—a job the international community has not taken on with anything like the vigor it deserves—of documenting the atrocities and outrages committed in the guise of ethnic cleansing. I believe Serbian President Milosevic and his cronies are at least morally responsible for the policy of ethnic cleansing, and should be held legally responsible for crimes committed to advance that policy.

I am deeply disappointed that the world community has chosen not to lift the arms embargo against Bosnia and Herzegovina and that this administration has backed away from its strike-and-lift position. I believe that, with dynamic leadership, we could have convinced our European allies that something needed to be done forcefully to stop the Bosnian horror.

Now, the world has accepted the results of the ethnic cleansing of Bosnia's Moslems and is prepared to ratify the results of this genocidal campaign through an internationally sanctioned peace settlement between the parties in conflict. I find this abhorrent.

In fact, I will predict that the international community is repeating a historic mistake—appeasing a conqueror because it is too hard to confront him. Slobodan Milosevic will not be deterred from creating Greater Serbia by world acceptance of the dismemberment by armed force of Bosnia and Herzegovina. In fact, it will merely encourage him.

If the world would not come to the armed assistance of Bosnia, a declared and internationally recognized independent state, how will the world respond to pleas for help from Kosovo, a province of Serbia, when its ethnically Albanian majority, which comprises approximately 90 percent of the population, is driven from its homes or killed by ultranationalist Serbs? The

United States will find itself in a particularly difficult position. President Bush declared that the United States would not accept the ethnic cleansing of Kosovo, and President Clinton has declared his agreement with that statement of U.S. policy.

Once the world tolerates genocide and ratifies the facts on the ground these war crimes created, it is hard to find a circumstance that would drive the world to consensus in support of armed intervention in Kosovo to halt more ethnic cleansing. Then, the United States could be left either to intervene unilaterally, a task that is becoming more difficult with every closed base and disestablished military unit, or to find words to retreat from a policy we won't back with military force.

The world community appears to be treating the negotiations to finally end the Bosnian conflict—son-of-Vance-Owen—as the end of the Yugoslav conflict. They appear to believe that once the disputes between the Moslems, Croats, and Serbs are settled in and around Bosnia, the world can relax.

I believe this is a mistake. I believe that the conflict will not be over until either Greater Serbia is established by force, or Serbia is militarily defeated and the war criminals are apprehended, tried, convicted, and punished. However historically justified the Serbians may believe their aspirations to a Greater Serbia are, in fact they are nothing more than a pretext for conquest and genocide. If the world does not condemn these conquests, and forcefully punish those who committed crimes to ethnically cleanse the conquered territories, much more blood will be spilled in the Balkans.

Unfortunately, the CSCE can do little more than send observers to affected areas. The tools we used against the Soviets and their allies in the mid-1980's, public diplomacy and private pressure, don't appear to apply here—people actively engaged in genocide don't embarrass or pressure easily. We can't shame them before the world community and threaten to cut off trade and other international intercourse with them. In this case, because of the conflict, the United Nations has already authorized almost every possible step short of armed attack on Serbia, and it has not stopped them.

Now, the Serbs have refused to renew the mandate for CSCE observers to remain in Kosovo and has said that it wants them out. They have not yet left. I believe the CSCE signatory states should make as public an effort as possible to press Serbia to renew the observers' mandate. Once they are gone, one of the few remaining barriers, flimsy as it is, to the ethnic cleansing of Kosovo will be removed, and the Balkans will be one step closer to a wider war.

I spoke earlier this year on the consequences a wider Balkan war could

have for the United States. The consequences are all bad. Rather than whistling past the Balkan graveyard, as we are doing with son-of-Vance-Owen, we should be actively and very publicly working to prevent an expanded war.

One of the lessons of this situation for the new administration is that Teddy Roosevelt was right—we should "speak softly and carry a big stick." As the new administration's defense budget cuts whittle our big stick smaller and smaller, we have to speak louder and louder in international affairs to get our point across. As the new administration cuts U.S. military capabilities, it also cuts the credibility of our diplomacy when we must deal with the world's bullies and aggressors.

Our performance so far in the Yugoslav tragedy does not inspire international confidence. We have taken positions and then fallen off of them. We have not been able to persuade our traditional allies to follow our lead. I believe that we could regain some of the ground we have lost by taking a more resolute approach to preventing an expanded Balkan war.

The Helsinki process can help the parties to the conflict return to peaceful relations with each other. However, because the present situation is one of armed conflict, the consensus-based Helsinki process cannot operate well. Once the conflict is over, and the parties see that they must live as neighbors again, the principles of the Helsinki accords and related documents provide useful guides for moving from war to a more durable peace.

Mr. President, because of the sad and violent context of this year's Helsinki Human Rights Day, I believe that it is all the more necessary for us to proclaim our continued devotion to the cause of human rights and our continued support for the Helsinki process. I urge my colleagues to join in support and vote for this resolution. ●

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 12

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, his name was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 12, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to make grants to States and local governments for the construction of projects in areas of high unemployment, and for other purposes.

S. 27

At the request of Mr. SARBANES, the names of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. GLENN], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBB], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. ROTH], and the Senator from California [Mrs. FEINSTEIN] were added as cosponsors of S. 27, a bill to authorize the Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity to establish a memorial to Martin Luther King, Jr., in the District of Columbia.

S. 70

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from Michigan

[Mr. LEVIN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 70, a bill to reauthorize the National Writing Project, and for other purposes.

S. 103

At the request of Mr. NICKLES, the name of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DURENBERGER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 103, a bill to fully apply the rights and protections of Federal civil rights and labor laws to employment by Congress.

S. 106

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Kansas [Mrs. KASSEBAUM] was added as a cosponsor of S. 106, a bill to modernize the United States Customs Service.

S. 185

At the request of Mr. GLENN, the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 185, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to restore to Federal civilian employees their right to participate voluntarily, as private citizens, in the political processes of the Nation, to protect such employees from improper political solicitations, and for other purposes.

S. 208

At the request of Mr. BUMPERS, the names of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS] were added as cosponsors of S. 208, a bill to reform the concessions policies of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

S. 289

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 289, a bill to amend section 118 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for certain exceptions from rules for determining contributions in aid of construction, and for other purposes.

S. 340

At the request of Mr. HEFLIN, the name of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. KERREY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 340, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to clarify the application of the Act with respect to alternate uses of new animal drugs and new drugs intended for human use, and for other purposes.

S. 401

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. FEINGOLD] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WALLOP] were added as cosponsors of S. 401, a bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to delay the effective date for penalties for States that do not have in effect safety belt and motorcycle helmet safety programs, and for other purposes.

S. 427

At the request of Mr. MITCHELL, the name of the Senator from Washington

[Mrs. MURRAY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 427, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit private foundations to use common investment funds.

S. 487

At the request of Mr. MITCHELL, the name of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBB] was added as a cosponsor of S. 487, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and modify the low-income housing tax credit.

S. 519

At the request of Mr. BUMPERS, the name of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD] was added as a cosponsor of S. 519, a bill to reduce Federal budget deficits by prohibiting further funding of the Trident II ballistic missile program.

S. 520

At the request of Mr. BUMPERS, the name of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD] was added as a cosponsor of S. 520, a bill to prohibit the expenditure of appropriated funds on the advanced solid rocket motor program.

S. 573

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the names of the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS], and the Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI] were added as cosponsors of S. 573, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a credit for the portion of employer social security taxes paid with respect to employee cash tips.

S. 575

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 575, a bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to improve the provisions of such act with respect to the health and safety of employees, and for other purposes.

S. 802

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 802, a bill to require the President to seek to obtain host nation payment of most or all of the overseas basing costs for forces of the Armed Forces of the United States in such nation, to limit the use of funds for paying overseas basing costs for U.S. forces, and for other purposes.

S. 823

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 823, a bill to amend the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 to improve the management of the National Wildlife Refuge System, and for other purposes.

S. 920

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Colorado

[Mr. CAMPBELL] was added as a cosponsor of S. 920, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to simplify the delivery of student loans to borrowers and eliminate borrower confusion; to provide a variety of repayment plans, including income contingent repayment through the EXCEL account, to borrowers so that they have flexibility in managing their student loan repayment obligations, and so that those obligations do not foreclose community service-oriented career choices for those borrowers; to replace, through an orderly transition, the Federal Family Education Loan Program with the Federal Direct Student Loan Program; to avoid the unnecessary cost, to taxpayers and borrowers, and administrative complexity associated with the Federal Family Education Loan Program through the use of a direct student loan program; and for other purposes.

S. 937

At the request of Mrs. KASSEBAUM, the name of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 937, a bill to provide for a 1-year delay in the applicability of certain regulations to certain municipal solid waste landfills under the Solid Waste Disposal Act.

S. 985

At the request of Mr. INOUE, the names of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BOND] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER] were added as cosponsors of S. 985, a bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act with respect to minor uses of pesticides, and for other purposes.

S. 1037

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1037, a bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1991 with respect to the application of such act.

S. 1063

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. LUGAR] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. BAUCUS] were added as cosponsors of S. 1063, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to clarify the treatment of a qualified football coaches plan.

S. 1151

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the name of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WALLOP] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1151, a bill to facilitate the flow of credit to small business by easing certain regulatory burdens on depository institutions, to require analysis of such burdens and their effectiveness, and for other purposes.

S. 1210

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD] was added as a co-

sponsor of S. 1210, a bill to amend the Agriculture Act of 1949 to require the Secretary of Agriculture to make prevented planting disaster payments for wheat, feed grains, upland cotton, and rice under certain circumstances, and for other purposes.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 35

At the request of Mr. PRESSLER, the names of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. AKAKA], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS], the Senator from Maine [Mr. COHEN], the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. DECONCINI], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. GLENN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. KEMPTHORNE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], the Senator from Florida [Mr. MACK], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. METZENBAUM], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. PACKWOOD], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SASSER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 35, a joint resolution to designate the month of November 1993, and the month of November 1994, each as "National Alzheimer's Disease Month."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 50

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the names of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BRYAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SASSER], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. PACKWOOD] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 50, a joint resolution to designate the weeks of September 19, 1993, through September 25, 1993, and of September 18, 1994, through September 24, 1994, as "National Rehabilitation Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 91

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the names of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BIDEN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 91, a joint resolution designating October 1993 and October 1994 as "National Domestic Violence Awareness Month."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 92

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the names of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. GLENN], the Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SASSER], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON], the Senator

from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI], the Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. AKAKA], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. METZENBAUM], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRADLEY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. WOFFORD], the Senator from Montana [Mr. BAUCUS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. LUGAR], the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Florida [Mr. MACK], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DURENBERGER], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. KOHL], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CAMPBELL], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. PACKWOOD], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WALLOP], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. KEMPTHORNE] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 92, a joint resolution to designate both the month of October 1993 and the month of October 1994 as "National Down Syndrome Awareness Month."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 94

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the names of the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. BROWN] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 94, a joint resolution to designate the week of October 3, 1993, through October 9, 1993, as "National Customer Service Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 97

At the request of Mr. PACKWOOD, the names of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. DECONCINI], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN], the Senator from Illinois [Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE], the Senator from Kansas [Mrs. KASSE-

BAUM], the Senator from Maine [Mr. COHEN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BOND], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. KERREY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG], the Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. METZENBAUM], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. WOFFORD], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SASSER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. KOHL], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WALLOP] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 97, a joint resolution to commemorate the sesquicentennial of the Oregon Trail.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 99

At the request of Mr. DECONCINI, the names of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. GLENN], the Senator from Illinois [Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BREAU], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. KEMPTHORNE], the Senator from Kansas [Mrs. KASSEBAUM], the Senator from Montana [Mr. BAUCUS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. ROTH], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. PACKWOOD], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 99, a joint resolution designating September 9, 1993, and April 21, 1994, each as "National D.A.R.E. Day."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 102

At the request of Mr. SASSER, the names of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. DECONCINI], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER], the Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. FORD], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. GLENN], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. METZENBAUM], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. AKAKA], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BRYAN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], the Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. WOFFORD], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON],

the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. KOHL], the Senator from Maine [Mr. COHEN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the Senator from Texas [Mrs. HUTCHISON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DURENBERGER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE], the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. KEMPTHORNE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. PACKWOOD], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BOND] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 102, a joint resolution to designate the months of October 1993 and October 1994 as "Country Music Month."

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 24

At the request of Mr. DANFORTH, the name of the Senator from California [Mrs. FEINSTEIN] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 24, a concurrent resolution concerning the removal of Russian troops from the independent Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 30

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 30, a concurrent resolution congratulating the Anti-Defamation League on the celebration of its 80th anniversary.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 31

At the request of Mr. DODD, the name of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BIDEN] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 31, a concurrent resolution concerning the emancipation of the Iranian Baha'i community.

SENATE RESOLUTION 128

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 128, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the protection to be accorded United States copyright-based industries under agreements entered into pursuant to the Uruguay Round of trade negotiations.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

HATCH ACT REFORM ACT

ROTH AMENDMENT NO. 563

Mr. ROTH proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 185) to amend title 5, United States Code, to restore Federal civilian employees their right to participate voluntarily, as private citizens, in the political processes of the Nation, to protect such employees from improper political solicitations, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 20, strike lines 2 through 10 and insert:

"An employee or individual who violates section 7323 or 7324 of this title shall be removed from his position, and funds appropriated for the position from which removed thereafter may not be used to pay the employee or individual. However, if the Merit System Protection Board finds by unanimous vote that the violation does not warrant removal, a penalty of not less than 30 days' suspension without pay shall be imposed by direction of the Board."

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I would like to announce for my colleagues and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony on S. 318, the Outer Continental Shelf Deep Water Royalty Relief Act and S. 727, the California Ocean Protection Act of 1993.

The hearing will take place on Tuesday, August 3, at 9:30 a.m. in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, First and C Streets, NE., Washington, DC.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the printed hearing record should send their comments to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC 20510, Attention: Heather Hart.

For further information, please contact Lisa Vehmas of the committee staff at 202-224-7555.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FEDERAL SERVICES, POST OFFICE, AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Subcommittee on Federal Services, Post Office, and Civil Service, of the Committee on Governmental Affairs, will hold a hearing on July 14, 1993, to hear different perspectives, from Federal employees and others on the recurring problems with bureaucracy, rising costs, inflexibility, and over reliance on private contractors of the Federal Government.

The hearing is scheduled for 9:30 a.m., in room 342 of the Dirksen Senate

Office Building. For further information, please contact Kim Weaver, subcommittee counsel, on 224-2254.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT MANAGEMENT

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, Committee on Governmental Affairs, will hold a hearing on S. 885, a bill to modify congressional restrictions, on gifts, on Monday, July 19, 1993, at 2 p.m. in room 342 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Indian Affairs will be holding a hearing on Thursday, July 15, 1993, beginning at 9:30 a.m. in 485 Russell Senate Office Building on the nomination of Ada Deer to be Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, U.S. Department of the Interior.

Those wishing additional information should contact the Select Committee on Indian Affairs at 224-2251.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet on Tuesday, July 13, 1993, at 3 p.m., in open session, to consider the nomination of Mr. John H. Dalton to be the Secretary of the Navy.

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

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate Tuesday, July 13, 1993, at 10 a.m. to hold a hearing on the nominations of Arthur Levitt, Jr., to be Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission; and Joseph Stiglitz and Alan Blinder to be members of the Council of Economic Advisers.

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

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet on July 13, 1993, at 2:30 p.m. on the nomination of Jolene M. Molitoris to be administrator of the Federal Railroad Administration.

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 13, 1993, at 2:30

p.m. to hold ambassadorial nomination hearings.

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO NAINOA THOMPSON

• Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize with great respect and admiration, Nainoa Thompson, first navigator of the Polynesian Voyaging Society.

Sailing from Hawaii to Tahiti and back to the Hokule'a, a twin-hulled fiber glass replica of an ancient Polynesian canoe, Mr. Thompson used the stars, sea, and sky as his only guides. Over thousands of miles, with little sleep, he proved that this could have been the way that Hawaii was originally discovered and settled by ancient Polynesians.

Having completed several similar voyages, each time demonstrating that the impossible was possible, Mr. Thompson now embarks on a journey of the utmost importance. Using the same skill of navigation without instruments, he will attempt to navigate a traditionally built vessel. This new canoe, the *Hawailoa*, is being constructed by hand of ohia hardwood and native vines and plants. In 1996, Mr. Thompson and his crew will set sail on the ultimate voyage, a journey that will certainly bring much pride to native Hawaiians.

Other members of the Thompson family have made significant contributions to native Hawaiian culture and people. Mr. Myron Thompson, Nainoa's father, is a trustee of the Kamehameha Schools/Bernice Pauahi Bishop Estate and is a strong advocate of native Hawaiians. He often comes before congressional committees to testify on the special needs of native Hawaiians. His dedication has resulted in the development and passage of legislation instrumental to the betterment of native Hawaiians.

Just recently, the Thompson family, came to Washington to meet with my staff and the staff at the National Air and Space Administration to discuss the *Hawailoa's* 1996 voyage and the possibilities it may have for our future in space. It is with much pleasure that I note that the Washington Post wrote a wonderful article describing Nainoa's dedication and perseverance and about his visit to our Nation's Capital.

I ask that the article be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

NAVIGATOR VOYAGES TO PACIFIC'S PAST WITH EYE TO FUTURE

(By Angus Phillips)

Nainoa Thompson reckons you can't frame the future without understanding the past. He's concerned about tomorrow, so for the past 20 years he's been plumbing 2,000 years

of Hawaiian history, much of which has been lost in the crush of modernization.

In his quest, Thompson, 40, first navigator of Polynesian Voyaging Society, has lain awake nights on the wide Pacific, plotting a sailing course between his native Hawaii and Tahiti with no instruments, using only the stars, the moon, the rising and setting sun and the feel of his twin-hulled sailing canoe in trade winds and sea.

He's waited weeks for the right weather to make a difficult easterly passage from Samoa to the Cook Islands, 711 miles in eight days; and another from the Cook Islands to Tahiti in seven days, going 600 miles against the prevailing winds. He's covered thousands of miles on sea passages with only his senses and instincts to steer by.

Thompson's aim in all this was to show how Hawaii likely was settled, as part of what he believes was an aggressive, eastward migration of seafarers from the South China Sea through Polynesia more than two millennia ago. But how did the original explorers manage upwind passages of 1,000 miles or more in primitive craft without any navigation tools—no charts, compasses, sextants, not even timepieces?

The only way to find out, Thompson believed, was to try it. So off he set, four times since 1976, at first guided by one of the last masters of primitive navigation in the Pacific, Mao Piailug of Micronesia, then on his own with the lives of his volunteer crew in his hands.

In 1980, on the second voyage of the sailing canoe Hokulea, a 60-foot fiberglass replica of a primitive Polynesian voyaging catamaran, Thompson was the rookie navigator for a Hawaiian crew sailing to Tahiti and back by the "star compass" Piailug had taught him to draw in his head.

Following the changing picture of the night sky he'd memorized at Piailug's direction, Thompson led his crew to their destination in 28 days, a month during which he slept no more than two hours a day, and only in 10-minute bursts, he said.

In 1985-87, he navigated Hokulea more than 16,000 miles through the Polynesian Triangle, to Tahiti, the Cook Islands, New Zealand and Samoa—all without instruments of any kind in what was dubbed "The Voyage of Rediscovery." And last year he took her to a Pacific Arts Festival in Raritonga, where he met other Polynesian seafarers who'd been inspired by Hokulea's success to retrace the voyages of their forebears.

Now Thompson and the Polynesian Voyaging Society are embarking on another journey. Next month they will launch the first true replica of an ancient Polynesian voyaging canoe, the 60-foot, twin-hulled Hawaiioloa, made from hollowed tree trunks, masts of ohia hardwood and sails and rigging of native vines and leaves.

The project, funded by federal grants through the native Hawaiian Culture and Arts Program, aims to determine whether a primitive, heavy, underpowered vessel with no navigational equipment could have made the 1,800-mile passage from the Marquesas to Hawaii, as some believe the first Hawaiian settlers did.

But Thompson, who was in Washington last week to update federal officials on the project, said he's got a long way to go before Hawaiioloa is ready for sea.

"She's two tons overweight," he said, as her builders struggle to make the vessel powerful enough to course through the Pacific's great swells without risking breaking up in heavy weather.

Sea trials at the end of July should provide hints where weight can be cut without peril,

he said. Then Hawaiioloa goes back in the shop for modifications. The voyage is slated for 1995.

By then, Thompson hopes to have fully trained a half-dozen more disciples in the art of steering by star compass, and will leave the burdens of sleepless navigation to others.

He already is moving on to the second half of his equation—using the lessons of the past to apply toward solving problems of the future.

The early voyages of Hokulea were warmly received by Hawaiians, who like many native American people, Thompson said, lack pride in their lost cultural heritage. The explorations, said Thompson, depicted their forebears as vigorous explorers, rather than hapless drifters who washed up on distant shores by accident.

When Hokulea reached Tahiti the first time, she was nearly swamped by enthusiastic Polynesians celebrating her success, and other Pacific island nations have since built replicas of traditional craft as a means of exploring their heritage and rediscovering their past.

That's a plus for the people of the Pacific, whose way of life has been buried under the barrage of Western culture in the past 150 years, said Thompson.

On a grander scale, he believes the world at large is heading for hard times, with population and consumption rising perilously and no new land or seas to turn to.

Thompson reckons humanity is on a threshold much like the one that beckoned Polynesian explorers thousands of years ago. Where his forebears put out boldly into a trackless sea, man has now just begun to explore the wilderness of space.

That's a place he knows well, said Thompson, whose stops in Washington last week included a visit with Daniel Goldin, administrator for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration who was a supporter of Hokulea's last voyage.

Space voyagers are guided by the very same heavenly bodies he has followed at sea, said Thompson. The past is prologue. ●

TRIBUTE TO DR. LAMAN A. GRAY, JR.

● Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to honor a Kentuckian who has spent his life healing others. Dr. Laman A. Gray, Jr., of Louisville, KY, is recognized as one of the premier cardiovascular surgeons in the world.

Dr. Gray, currently director of Division of Thoracic and Cardiovascular Surgery at the University of Louisville, has long been a pioneer in his field. In 1984, he performed the Commonwealth of Kentucky's first heart transplant. One of his many fortes has been the development of mechanical devices that can aid weak hearts, allowing patients the extra time they so desperately need. His high energy level and foresight help him tremendously in this area.

Mr. President, Dr. Gray wins high praise from his colleagues for his work ethic as well as his humble, low-key attitude. In a profession where egos can sometimes run amuck he is cherished for his interest in his associates' progress and success. In fact, Dr. Gray and his group are currently working on

a mechanical heart device known as the Novacor left ventricular assist device which is completely implanted in the patient's chest. This would allow patients to enjoy the benefit of a mechanical aid without the troubles of being reliant on a cumbersome outside device.

Dr. Gray continues to contribute to the medical field outside of the operating rooms and research labs as well. He is professor of surgery at the University of Louisville. His students are residents being trained to be the thoracic and cardiovascular surgeons. He lists as his goals in teaching these students not only helping them learn surgical fundamentals but also how to think and appreciate problems and perhaps most importantly, how to successfully combine skill and judgment.

These are lessons Dr. Gray has learned well over the years. He lists the traits for a surgeon as including "being technically exceptional, smart, able to make decisions, and compassionate toward the patients and their families." In addition, due to the evolving nature of medicine, Dr. Gray never stops learning and preparing in order to stay current in a field where state of the art can and does save lives.

Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing this outstanding native Louisvillian for his continuing contributions to the health and welfare of our society. In addition, I request that an article from the June 14, 1993, edition of Business First be included at this point.

The article follows:

MR. FIX-IT: GRAY AT HOME IN OPERATING ROOM, GARAGE
(By Eric Benmour)

When heart surgeon Laman Gray Jr. was growing up in Louisville, he took apart a car, wired his parents' house for sound and repaired a television.

Gray, 53, has built model ships, complete with riggings, and is currently rebuilding a 1935 Packard automobile.

"Laman is a mechanical genius," says his sister, Sandy Schreiber.

His natural talent for building and fixing, combined with the fact his father was a doctor, helped steer him into his chosen field.

As a heart surgeon, he performs bypasses and does surgery on valves; he performed Kentucky's first transplant in 1984; and he is involved in research with mechanical devices that can help weak hearts survive.

Gray is the director of the division of thoracic and cardiovascular surgery at the University of Louisville Department of Surgery. He is also a professor of surgery.

He conducts his research as part of his work with the School of Medicine, with financial help from Jewish Hospital.

"Dr. Gray is highly regarded as one of the premiere cardio-vascular surgeons in the world," says Henry Wagner, president and chief executive officer of Jewish Hospital HealthCare Services Inc.

Gray has an "insatiable interest in understanding how things work," Wagner says. "He's very much the engineer."

When asked to comment on a statement Gray made about being very "content" in his job, Wagner says: "He may be content, but

he has a high level of energy and he's never satisfied with what was done yesterday. He's always looking ahead to see how it can be done better."

At medical trade shows, Gray will look at "new gadgets," says Dr. Brian Ganzel, a heart surgeon who is a partner in a private practice with Gray.

The same behavior occurs when Gray goes to antique-car shows.

"He trolls the aisles and looks for parts for his car," Ganzel says.

He says Gray is very interested in research and supports the efforts of the other members of the private-practice group. In addition to Gray and Ganzel, the members are: Erle H. Austin III, Samuel B. Pollock, Jr., A. David Slater and Paul A. Spence. Like Gray, all of the group's members are affiliated with the university and involved in research.

One member, A. David Slater, is heading up a project in which muscle from the back is wrapped around the heart and stimulated in synchronicity with the heart so it will help strengthen the heart.

"He's not threatened by his associates being as good as he is," says Becky Adams, vice president for the Jewish Hospital Heart and Lung Institute. "He is very humble, very low-key."

Adams and others say the heart surgeon is modest, almost shy.

This trait was something he was born with, not a feature of his parents or only sibling who were more outgoing, his sister says.

But what Gray did learn growing up was medicine. His mother, Alice, was a nurse. His father, Laman Gray Sr., was a gynecologist. He died in 1992 at the age of 84. Alice Gray, 82, is still living.

"My father used to take us to hospitals on Sundays," says Schreiber, an antique appraiser.

In addition to going to the hospital with her father, Sandy Schreiber recalls traveling to Batesville, Ark., where their paternal grandfather was a physician.

While there, the youngsters used to visit a hospital in Batesville—run by their grandmother.

"We used to roller skate in the halls," Schreiber says. "It was like a home."

She says that made medicine a fun part of their lives, not something to fear, as it can be for some children.

"I decided I wanted to go into medicine when I was in college," Gray Jr. says. "I was always interested in science."

Working on the heart appealed to him because of his interest in working with his hands.

When he was doing his general surgery residency and his thoracic and cardiovascular surgery residency at the University of Michigan, from 1968 to 1974, the school was performing heart transplants.

Gray says he kept up with the progress of transplants when he returned to Louisville in 1974, as an assistant professor of surgery at U of L. Gray Sr. had moved from Arkansas to Louisville to take a teaching position at U of L.

Gray says he spent a "tremendous amount" of time preparing for his first heart transplant in 1984. Gray continues to be involved in the transplant surgery, but now, Ganzel is chief of the heart and lung transplant program.

In addition, Gray teaches students and residents in his work with U of L. He says working with them is "really intellectually very, very stimulating."

The residents are being trained to be thoracic (involving the chest, specifically the

lungs) and cardiovascular surgeons. They are all five years out of medical school and are board-certified general surgeons. They study at U of L for two additional years.

"They really keep you on your toes," Gray says. "That's what I enjoy a tremendous amount. If you say you do something, they're going to ask you why. They're always probing and asking you questions which make you think."

Gray says he teaches them not only the fundamentals of surgery, but how to think and appreciate problems—how to combine skill and judgment.

He says judgment is crucial during an operation.

"There are never two cases the same," Gray says. "When you start operating or dealing with a clinical problem, everything is different. Everybody is slightly different. You have to make decisions about where the bypasses should go, which ones you should and shouldn't do."

"In the valves you have to decide which valves to put in, how to take out the old valves."

His group repairs a lot of heart valves. "Frequently in surgery, one step cascades to the next. It's like a maze," Gray says.

Gray lists a variety of skills and traits that a good surgeon must have, including being technically exceptional; smart; able to make decisions; and compassionate toward the patients and their families.

While Gray has these skills and traits, he says he never stops learning. He can't rely solely on what he was taught in medical school because so many procedures and techniques have changed.

"You have to keep state of the art," Gray says.

Gray is helping redefine state of the art through his research on mechanical heart devices.

In March 1992, Business First reported on one such device that Gray implanted in a patient waiting for a transplant. She later received a heart and is doing well.

Gray says he is excited about the prospects for the mechanical heart, the "Novacor Left Ventricular Assist Device," because it is completely implanted in the patient's chest.

Now, the device is hooked to a large console. Eventually, Gray thinks the device can be implanted inside the patient's chest, with no wires coming out.

The Novacor would be powered by a battery source worn around the patient's waist, Gray says.

Gray was also a researcher on a product called the BVS 5000 Bi-Ventricular Support System made by Abiomed Inc. of Danvers, Mass.

The U.S. Food and Drug Administration has approved the device for sale in the United States. The BVS 5000 is a temporary-assist device intended to support the circulation in patients whose hearts have become too damaged to pump sufficient blood, according to Abiomed.

Gray's work with the device at Jewish Hospital was one of 11 sites where the BVS 5000 underwent testing.

Bruce J. Shook, vice president of clinical and regulatory affairs for Abiomed, has high praise for Gray.

"He's very open-minded, willing to try new things," Shook says. He says Gray is known in the cardiac-surgery world as being "on the cutting edge."

When asked why he does such research work, Gray says he wants to contribute to medicine of the future.

When asked how he keeps all his work straight, Gray says: "It's fun" and laughs.

"He feels fortunate and he feels blessed," says his wife, Julie. They have been married since 1967. They have three daughters: Juliet, 23, Alice, 20, and Virginia, 16.

Gray says one of his great rewards is seeing the improvements in people after heart surgery. He speaks about transplants in particular.

Before surgery, patients are "on their last legs. You do the transplants and in three months they're leading a normal life. And I mean, normal life. That is gratifying. It's so dramatic."

Gray says a typical morning for him begins with the alarm going off at 6:35.

"I'm usually in the hospital by about 10 minutes after 7," Gray says. And by 7:30 a.m., he's performing a bypass or valve surgery.

Gray says he normally finishes his first case by 11 a.m.

He then visits patients, beginning his second procedure around 1 p.m., finishing between 4 and 5 p.m. He usually gets home by 7:30 in the evening.

This doesn't include weekend hours or the time he is on call in case of emergency.

Nor does it include transplants, which can take five or six hours of surgery at a time.

When asked how he keeps alert during such a long procedure, Gray says: "You usually have a lot of adrenaline going. You get tired. (He laughs.) There isn't any question about it. It can be very grueling."

His sister says she is worried about her brother's health. She says his diet consists of peanut butter on crackers and Cokes. He doesn't exercise, either.

"He's in terrible shape physically," she says. "He sleeps very little."

Gray admits he should eat better and stay in better physical shape, but says he doesn't have time to exercise. His wife says he also doesn't like to exercise, especially after a long day.

His sister says she can't recall him being sick, other than an occasional cold.

Gray says he talks to patients about the importance of exercise and recognizes some inconsistencies between his comments to them and his actions.

"But I'm trying to make the effort," he says. His wife bought him an exercise bicycle.

"I'm trying to get better," Gray says.

As for his diet, he says it's bad. But he says he rarely has time for lunch and usually nibbles on food at the hospital.

Despite all the work with his hands, he says the only time he hurt himself was when he got thrown off a horse at a Wyoming dude ranch. He's gone there with his family every summer for the past 12 years.

"We always ride horses," Gray says. "I got thrown once and hurt my wrist. That slowed me down a little bit. I put my hand in a cast, took it off for surgery and put it back afterwards."

That was about 10 years ago.

Gray says he is very careful around the tools he uses in his garage.

Otherwise, not much slows him down. He admits, however, that being a heart surgeon can be very stressful because every decision has to be the right one.

And he sweats the details.

One morning recently, Gray faced a difficult case, says Mary Sue Carroll, clinical coordinator for the surgeon and his partners.

"He was almost antsy," Carroll says. "He was thinking about how tough it was going to be. It wasn't an element of fear. It's an element of thinking of all the details."

Gray says: "I relieve my stress because I have a lot of hobbies. What relaxes me most,

currently, is working on my car, which is a '35 Packard (that he is restoring). I really enjoy doing that."

Previously, he built a model ship complete with riggings. He also built a computerized model train.

In addition, Gray is a pilot. He says he takes his flying very seriously by keeping up-to-date with training.

He owns a twin-engine plane that he keeps at Bowman Field.

Gray, who learned how to fly when he was 17, says he has logged more than 2,000 hours as a pilot.

Gray flies his own plane within 1,000 miles. Otherwise, he flies commercial airlines.

"He likes to be busy," wife Julie says.

When he gets home at night, he wants to forget about work.

"His family is very important to him," Ganzel says. "We have to drag him to evening meetings during the week."

Gray says a good surgeon has to be committed to his work, which includes long hours.

The result can be sacrificing some personal things, he says.

"I think your family sacrifices, too. There's no question about it. I certainly wasn't at home with my family as much as I should have been."

His wife says Gray made a point to make it home for the family dinners, however.

Gray says his daughters may not have decided to follow him into medicine because of the long hours. But the heart surgeon has passed on many interests to his offspring, Julie Gray says.

For example, he taught them about photography and how to use his darkroom. In addition, Alice took a course in Medical ethics.

"They had long conversations about that," Julie says.

But none of them has shown an interest in flying, Gray says.

Despite the stress and long hours, Gray says he has no plans to retire.

"That would be boring," he says with a laugh.●

MR. DOLAN ELLIS, OFFICIAL ARIZONA BALLADEER

● Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, the good work that Mr. Dolan Ellis is doing as the official Arizona balladeer was recently brought to my attention. I would like to thank Mr. Ellis for all his years of service to our great State of Arizona.

Mr. President, I understand that Mr. Ellis has been the Arizona balladeer for the last 25 years under the appointment of 8 Governors; and that last year alone he performed for over 40,000 elementary schoolchildren in 100 Arizona schools teaching them Arizona history, folklore, and environmental awareness. Mr. President, Mr. Ellis' care and concern for Arizona's culture and environment is to be commended.

Mr. President, I would like Mr. Ellis to know how much I appreciate his commitment to Arizona. I am pleased to have brought Mr. Ellis to the attention of the Senate and I wish him every success in the future.●

TRIBUTE TO DON WESELY

● Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, it is an honor for me to recognize my

constituent Don Wesely for his many years of volunteer service. When I look at all that he has given to the city of Owatonna, MN, I am reminded of the true spirit and meaning of the term "public service."

While we debate the future course of the United States here on the floor of the Senate, individuals such as Don are making both our small towns and large cities better places in which to live. He and others like him are living proof that perhaps the solution to the problems which we face is not to be found solely on Capitol Hill, but also within those who have devoted themselves to helping those in need.

At a time when America is searching for a renewed sense of community, Don continues to exhibit qualities which enrich us all. He gives freely of himself without thought of personal gain or recognition, and his generous spirit of volunteerism has touched more lives than any of us can possibly imagine.●

TRIBUTE TO DIXON

● Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the town of Dixon in Webster County, KY.

Dixon, a small town nestled in the rolling hills of western Kentucky coal country, has a population of only 552. This small size is an asset to those who live in Dixon. Small town values are an ingrained tradition in this fine community. Due to their town's relative size, residents of Dixon enjoy the uncommon ability of knowing everyone else. This close-knit atmosphere is unmistakably an enviable quality that all communities should be able to possess.

Despite its small size, Dixon is not without its share of notable marks on history. Dixon was originally named after Archibald Dixon, a Lieutenant Governor and U.S. Senator from Henderson. In addition, the first settler of the region, William Jenkins, built a stagecoach inn known as Halfway House soon after he arrived in 1794. This resting place served as the important midpoint along the treacherous route between St. Louis and Nashville. Additionally, Dixon has been home to some very famous individuals. Poet, dramatist, and novelist Cale Young Rice was born in 1872 in Dixon. Frank Ramsey, a former University of Kentucky and Boston Celtic basketball star, currently resides in Dixon.

Dixon is a town with much to offer and I applaud its residents for maintaining small town traditions and values. It is far too often that communities lose touch with the many positive qualities of this healthy culture.

Mr. President, I respectfully request that a recent article from the Louisville Courier-Journal be printed in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article follows:

DIXON

(By Cynthia Crossley Eagles)

Chances are you'll never make it to Dixon. Western Kentucky, perhaps, but not Dixon.

Chances are that if you got to Western Kentucky you'd just go gliding by on the Western Kentucky Parkway or the Pennyrile Parkway and never give Dixon a second thought.

If so, here's what you'd miss:

A bank that's run by former University of Kentucky and Boston Celtics star Frank Ramsey.

A 90-year-old former school superintendent, Virgil Waggener, who last October was forced by illness to stop riding his blind old mare bareback to round up his cows.

A library where the assistant librarian, affectionately described as "Aunt Bea in Combat Boots," gets after people who leave overdue books and don't pay the fines.

"I got \$17 off one lady," said Judy Taylor. "And I chased one man to his car."

Then there's Charlie Bridwell, who most people know as "Hooter." He ambles back and forth between the loafers at the hardware store and the loafers on the courthouse benches across the street. If a coal truck happens to be bearing down on him as he crosses, Hooter just holds up his hand—and the truck stops.

And, of course, there's Luke, the big stray black and brown dog who has a cameo role in the daily routine around town. Luke's schedule on a recent day included a snooze at a downtown service station, followed by a nap at City Hall, followed by a doze at the fire station.

Luke's route depends on where city water superintendent Larry Parrish is going that day in his truck.

Dixon is a little town full of characters, and residents seem to love it that way. Everybody knows everyone else, which is hardly a surprise given the population of about 550.

Thus when someone sits on the couch in Ramsey's office at the Dixon Bank and asks him about a loan, Ramsey usually knows their family history.

"You know almost the whole genealogy of the family," said Ramsey, who went to the NBA in 1953 after he graduated from UK, then returned to his home in nearby Madisonville upon his retirement.

Such familiarity also makes most people feel safe in Dixon. To hear people tell it, no one locks their doors and everyone seems to leave their car keys in the ignition.

When residents go on vacation, says Peggy Poole, the city clerk, "you just tell the neighbor to feed the dog and off you go."

But familiarity can magnify tragedy, and the area has had more than its share.

Badly shaken by the 1989 Pyro mine disaster, in which 10 men died, the county now must cope with a fresh wound—the deaths of four teen-agers and the serious injuries of five more in an oil-tank explosion last Friday. The teens, all of whom were from Webster County, had gathered at the tank for an early Fourth of July party.

Four of the men who died in the Pyro blast were from Webster County. Those killed were part of a crew dismantling a mining machine at the William Station mine, just north of Wheatcroft, where explosive levels of methane had built up.

Coal production has resumed, although it's flowing from a new shaft and the mine is now called Caney Creek. The mine is operated by Costain Coal Inc., which had acquired Pyro shortly before the blast. But the tragedy remains fresh in people's minds as

developments occur in the federal criminal cases stemming from the disaster.

"This community was in shock for quite a while," said Dixon Mayor Jimmy Layne Frederick. "It was just hard to absorb. I had a friend myself who worked in that mine, had just come out on the same shift."

Said Webster County Judge-Executive James Townsend, "It just kinda tore the community up for a while. It was a two-fold sadness, since the mine superintendents and some involved in upper management... were getting blamed for what happened, and they lost family members also."

Yet there are also many people who think Webster County may be faced with mine tragedies in the future, as long as coal continues to play a big role in the local economy. Coal is the county's biggest employer, and Townsend says the severance tax alone provides about \$1 million of the county's \$4.8 million annual budget.

For those who don't work in the mines, jobs may be found in nearby Henderson or across the Ohio River in Evansville, Ind. Mayor Frederick commutes 48 miles to work—an hour-long trip, he says—to the Alcoa plant in Newburgh, Ind. Others commute to work at Evansville's Whirlpool plant.

That helps explain why a coal county has single-digit unemployment and a per capita income well above the state average. But despite positive economic figures, downtown Dixon has withered. The population of Providence, in Southern Webster County is seven-and-a-half times that of Dixon, making that town the retail center for the county. Providence has clothing stores, some fast-food restaurants and a car dealer.

Dixon has one grocery store, a hardware store, a convenience store, a gas station and two family-style restaurants. Even though it is the county seat, Dixon lacks even the usual string of law offices around its courthouse.

While other towns work to lure industry, Dixon spent a year just trying to get a drugstore to replace the town's only pharmacy whose long-time owner had retired. The recruitment effort failed.

"We contacted a school of pharmacy in Lexington, thinking someone right out of school would be interested. And we were offering a building," Frederick said. "But the big chains offer \$50,000 to \$55,000 a year, and you can't make that here."

Now Dixon doesn't plan to try for any industry—or anything else—until the town gets a sewer system. One is in the works for next year, to be built by the county. While most residents seem to see the need to end reliance on septic tanks, some older residents fear the increase in their utility bills. But they acknowledge that a sewer system might bring growth which might also bring a few stores within walking distance of their neighborhoods.

A recent visitor heard a lot of gripes about the lack of a grocery store, dry-goods store or convenience store "downtown." Webster Countians say they have to go to Madisonville or Henderson to find some things.

But there is a grocery store less than a mile from downtown, although it's on a road that seems unsafe for pedestrians because of its coal-truck traffic. And Charlie's Mini-Mart, located about a half-mile south of "downtown" Dixon, is also on the main road.

"I thought Dixon wanted a mini-mart, but eventually I realized they didn't," said owner Charlie Greenwood. "The lottery helps (bring customers in). But there are still people who don't realize we're here."

And that's in spite of the fact that Greenwood's store features the rear end of his son's 1975 Lincoln Continental. The creative auto salvage came about three years ago after the Lincoln caught fire because of a carburetor leak, Greenwood said. The fire destroyed all but the rear end, which was cut off the car and bolted onto the building. Greenwood added some Christmas lights, which he leaves on year-round to attract attention.

But now Greenwood is trying to sell the store because he's tired of working seven days a week for what he said amounts to \$7,000 a year, after taxes. He has had trouble selling it because of its underground gasoline storage tanks. No one wants the headache of getting them to meet the government's environmental standards, he said.

Meanwhile, what is within walking distance of most neighborhoods is Dixon Hardware, owned and operated by Bill Winstead and his family. Dixon Hardware can help you out if you're in need of a lawn mower, a plastic pipe elbow, a fan belt, a new screen, a popcorn popper or some bean or corn seed. Dixon Hardware can also fix you up if you need a 50-pound bag of "Fat Cat Fish Food," a two-cup aluminum percolator, a 10-quart ceramic and steel dish pan, or a new doorbell.

"Give your guests a happy feeling even before they step inside," says the sign on the sales rack for the "Ring-A-Tune" doorbell. "Never-ending favorite songs of the American People, (including) 'Oh! Susannah,' 'William Tell Overture,' and 'Battle Hymn of the Republic.'"

"We try to be as old-timey as we can get," said salesclerk Claude Winstead, who is Bill's uncle.

And there is some "development" just outside of Dixon. General contractor Mike Walker of Sebree is building a golf course development that he says will include 18-hole and nine-hole courses, riding and walking trails, a pay fishing lake and home sites. The nine-hole course at "Wildwood" and a clubhouse are already finished.

While Walker says he expects to draw golfers from the Henderson, Evansville and Madisonville areas, he grinned when a visitor suggested that his plan seemed ambitious.

"You're being kind," Walker said. "Other people have said I'm crazy."

FAMOUS FACTS AND FIGURES

Dixon, incorporated in 1861, was named for Archibald Dixon, a U.S. Senator and Lieutenant governor from Henderson who died in 1876. Webster County, created in 1860 from parts of Henderson, Hopkins and Union counties, is named for Daniel Webster, the famous New England orator and lawyer.

The man considered to be the first settler in the area, William Jenkins, built a stagecoach Inn five miles north of Dixon shortly after he arrived in 1794. Jenkins called his Inn the Halfway House to reflect its location on the Indian trail between Nashville and St. Louis. Jenkins was captured by a band of Indians around 1800. Local lore says he befriended the Indians during his seven-year stay; in return they pulled all the hair from his head to keep another tribe from scalping him.

Poet, novelist and dramatist Cale Young Rice was born in Dixon in 1872. His works include the book "From Dusk to Dusk" and an autobiography, "Bridging the Years." A poem, "The Mystic," won recognition in the United States and in England. In 1902, Rice, then living in Louisville, married another Louisvillian, Alice Hegan, author of the book "Mrs. Wiggs of the Cabbage Patch." Rice

died in 1943, less than a year after his wife. The house where he was born is owned by state Rep. Dorsey Ridley. •

NOTICE OF DETERMINATION BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS UNDER RULE 35, PARAGRAPH 4, REGARDING EDUCATIONAL TRAVEL

• Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, it is required by paragraph 4 of rule 35 that I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD notices of Senate employees who participate in programs, the principal objective of which is educational, sponsored by a foreign government or a foreign educational or charitable organization involving travel to a foreign country paid for by that foreign government or organization.

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for G. Robert Wallace, a member of the staff of Senator JOHNSTON, to participate in a program in China, sponsored by the Chinese People's Institute of Foreign Affairs, from August 7-21, 1993.

The committee determined that no Federal statute or Senate rule would prohibit participation by Mr. Wallace in this program.

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for Benjamin S. Cooper and Raymond M. Paul member of the staff of Senator JOHNSTON, to participate in a program in China, sponsored by the Chinese People's Institute of Foreign Affairs from August 7-21, 1993.

The committee determined that no Federal statute or Senate rule would prohibit participation by Mr. Cooper or Mr. Paul in this program.

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for Margaret Cummsky, a member of the staff of Senator INOUE, to participate in a program in Indonesia, sponsored by the Indonesian Parliament, from August 20-September 5, 1993.

The committee determined that no Federal statute or Senate rule would prohibit participation by Ms. Cummsky in this program.

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for Anne Smith, a member of the staff of Senator HELMS, to participate in a program in Germany, sponsored by the Hanns Seidel Foundation, from July 3-9, 1993.

The committee determined that no Federal statute or Senate rule would prohibit participation by Ms. Smith in this program.

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for Christine Ferguson, a member of the staff of Senator CHAFEE, to participate in a program in France, sponsored by the German Marshall Fund of the United States and the Franco-American Foundation from July 4-11, 1993.

The committee determined that no Federal statute or Senate rule would

prohibit participation by Ms. Ferguson in this program.

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for Paul Offner, a member of the staff of Senator MOYNIHAN, to participate in a program in France, sponsored by the German Marshall Fund of the United States and the Franco-American Foundation from July 4-11, 1993.

The committee determined that no Federal statute or Senate rule would prohibit participation by Mr. Offner in this program.

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for Roy Ramthun, a member of the staff of Senator PACKWOOD, to participate in a program in France, sponsored by the German Marshall Fund of the United States and the Franco-American Foundation from July 4-11, 1993.

The committee determined that no Federal statute or Senate rule would prohibit participation by Mr. Ramthun in this program.

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for Ellen R. Shaffer, a member of the staff of Senator WELLSTONE, to participate in a program in France, sponsored by the German Marshall Fund of the United States and the Franco-American Foundation from July 4-11, 1993.

The committee determined that no Federal statute or Senate rule would prohibit participation by Ms. Shaffer in this program.

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for Michael Hodson, a member of the staff of Senator PRYOR, to participate in a program in Japan, sponsored by the Association for Communication of Transcultural Study, from July 4-11, 1993.

The committee determined that no Federal statute or Senate rule would prohibit participation by Mr. Hodson in this program.

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for Darrel Jodrey, a member of the staff of Senator WOFFORD, to participate in a program in France, sponsored by the Franco-American Foundation and the German Marshall Fund of the United States, from July 3-11, 1993.

The committee determined that no Federal statute or Senate rule would prohibit participation by Ms. Jodrey in this program.●

REMARKS OF AMBASSADOR JOSEPH VERNER REED

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD remarks which the distinguished Ambassador Joseph Verner Reed delivered at the inaugural ceremony of the 89th Inter-Parliamentary Conference in New Delhi on April 12, 1993. I believe that my colleagues will find of great use these remarks and

those of Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali which Ambassador Reed delivered to the conference.

The remarks follow:

REMARKS BY AMBASSADOR JOSEPH VERNER REED, SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS FOR PUBLIC AFFAIRS, AND FROM THE SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS, DR. BOUTROS BOUTROS-GHALI, AT THE INAUGURAL CEREMONY OF THE 89TH INTER-PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE

ARMS REDUCTION, TRANSPARENCY, AND COLLECTIVE SECURITY: THE EMERGING INTERNATIONAL FRAMEWORK

Mr. President, Mr. Vice-President, Mr. Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker, Mr. President of the Inter-Parliamentary Council, Excellencies, Distinguished Delegates and Guests, it is a great honour and personal pleasure for me to be here to represent, Dr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, at this very important 89th Inter-Parliamentary Conference.

It is an even greater pleasure because the Conference is being held in New Delhi, the capital of a country that I love dearly and have great respect for. In more than two decades I have had the great pleasure of visiting India often, both in an official and in a private capacity. I have prided myself on my friendship with many of India's great Statesmen, Leaders and Diplomats, both here and in Washington. I freely confess that I have learned a great deal from their wisdom and sagacity.

Throughout the years I have been connected with the United Nations and with the Government of the United States. I have followed India's role in the United Nations with great admiration. India's skillful leadership of the Group of Non-Aligned Countries and her active and dynamic diplomacy at the Parliament of Man have earned my deepest admiration and respect.

One of the things that I admire most about India is that it is and continues to remain the world's largest democracy. And, India is a vital force in today's changing world.

A democratic form of Government, as you Parliamentarians know very well, is, despite its many problems, the only one that can satisfy the aspirations of people everywhere.

When I last had the privilege of being with you in Stockholm less than eight months ago, I expressed optimism at the growing number of democracies and democratically-elected Governments in the world. Today, alas, the picture is a little more sombre.

We are now at a critical juncture in international relations when many countries are suffering from the after-effects of the end of the Cold War. Some of them are in a particularly difficult situation, and are being tempted to give up their democratic rights and freedoms as they struggle to come to grips with the problems of the Post-Cold War era.

It is therefore, all the more commendable, that India, despite the many problems that it is currently facing, has maintained its democratic traditions and values with exemplary steadfastness and courage. This is the great legacy left to India and its people by the founding fathers of the Modern Indian Nation, and I sincerely hope that it will be a legacy that is preserved for the benefit of generations yet to come.

I salute India's devotion to democracy and wish India and the Indian people every success in the future.

It now gives me great pleasure to present a portion of the message of the Secretary-

General of the United Nations, Dr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, to the 89th Inter-Parliamentary Conference.

"Few aspects of international life have changed more profoundly in recent years than the pursuit of arms regulation and disarmament. A decade ago we were in the midst of a deadly arms race that was threatening to spin out of control. Military expenditures worldwide were rising dramatically. The nuclear arms race was preparing to spread to outer space. There was widespread public apprehension and justified alarm over the seemingly relentless build-up in both nuclear and conventional military forces.

"Much has changed, we have now pulled back from the nuclear armageddon. A new spirit of cooperation prevails. Significant progress has been achieved in a number of important areas. In particular, there have been impressive accomplishments in reducing strategic and nuclear weapons. The United States and the Russian Federation have concluded ten bilateral agreements. In the world's most heavily armed region—Europe—disarmament has already begun to encompass conventional weapons, and the process is gaining momentum.

"These are significant trends which deserve and require our encouragement and support.

"Although we have taken some necessary and important strides in dealing with the global threat created by the proliferation of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons of mass destruction, the world remains a dangerous place. As the spectre of nuclear annihilation has receded, we are not beginning to appreciate the high social, political, and human cost of our having saturated the globe with an overabundance of conventional arms.

"The situation is troubling when we consider that not only have arms sales increased dramatically over the past three decades, but so too has the level of sophistication and fire-power of the conventional arms being transferred. Buyers have increasingly demanded more sophisticated, state-of-the-art weaponry. Supplying countries, sensitive to increased competition, have increasingly been willing to sell such weaponry.

"Without the external constraints on conflicts which the Cold War imposed, the terrible consequences of our having successfully blanketed the globe with arms are now being brutally brought home to us. Rivalries, conflicts, and long suppressed ambitions have burst violently into the open. Armed with destructive new weaponry, localized and regional grievances have developed into matters of international significance and concern. In Cambodia, Western Sahara, Southern Africa, Somalia, in the territory of the former Yugoslavia, in the Middle East, and elsewhere, the results are plain for all to see.

"The end of the Cold War has made conventional arms limitation an urgent priority. We must now take advantage of the fact that the end of the Cold War has also made conventional arms limitation a realistic possibility.

"In my report entitled "New Dimensions of Arms Regulation and Disarmament in the Post-Cold War Era" I noted that the time had come for the practical integration of disarmament and arms regulation issues into the broader structure of the international peace and security agenda. My report also noted that it was now necessary to take a global approach to the process of disarmament. Lastly the report urged that we build upon and revitalize past achievements in arms regulations and arms reduction. Our

practical objective is now clear: We must achieve greater overall security at lower levels of armaments.

"In that connection your role as Parliamentarians is crucial. I appeal to you to work for and to support the important confidence-building efforts now underway. By actively encouraging your respective Governments, and by helping to build support among your fellow citizens, you can each have a positive and very practical impact on the work now underway. As elected representatives and parliamentarians from around the world, your support for this great endeavour can demonstrate in the most forceful way possible the powerful and inescapable link between the paramount human requirements of disarmament, development, and democracy."

That, distinguished guests, was the synopsis of the message of the Secretary-General. The full text of the message of the Secretary-General will be available to you shortly.

Mr. President, Mr. Vice-President, Mr. Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker, Mr. President of the Inter-Parliamentary Council, Excellencies and Distinguished Delegates.

I thank you on behalf of the Secretary-General and on my own behalf. I wish the 89th Inter-Parliamentary Conference every success. ●

THE IMPORTANCE OF DEMOCRACY

● Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, the Baghdad-born author Kenan Makiya is one of the clearest voices in the Middle East for the spread of democratic values. His latest book, "Cruelty and Silence," seeks to transform the political discourse in the Arab world by confronting intellectuals in the Middle East with the realities of political cruelty in the region. The Iraq Foundation, which he helped to found in 1991, is committed to a vision of a future Iraq built on the principles of democracy, civil liberties, and the rule of law.

Mr. Makiya, currently a fellow at Harvard University's Center for Middle Eastern Studies, recently wrote to the president of the National Endowment for Democracy upon learning of the vote in the House of Representatives to terminate all funding for the endowment. His strong message is a warning to all of us that without the kind of outside support which the endowment provides to democrats struggling against authoritarianism, the desperate people suffering under repressive regimes such as those of Saddam Hussein are doomed to continue to suffer for many years to come, with potentially disastrous consequences for our country and the rest of the world. I ask that this letter be printed in the RECORD, and recommend that all of my colleagues read his words carefully.

The letter follows:

HARVARD UNIVERSITY,
CENTER FOR MIDDLE EASTERN STUDIES,
Cambridge, MA, June 28, 1993.

CARL GERSHMAN,
National Endowment for Democracy, Washington, DC.

DEAR CARL: I am writing in shock and amazement, having just heard the news that

the House of Representatives has voted to cut off its support for the National Endowment of Democracy. I wish to convey to you my strong and deeply felt support for the work done by the N.E.D. to promote democracy around the world, and in particular, Iraq, the country of my birth.

There is not a shadow of doubt in my mind that without the work of outside supporters of democracy such as the N.E.D., even the hope for a democratic future in Iraq would be almost non-existent. Because of what the N.E.D. has done for Iraq since the Gulf war, it has been possible for Iraqi writers and human rights activists to get their ideas and aspirations into Iraq itself. By supporting, for instance, the Iraq Foundation and the signature-collecting campaign known as Charter 91, it has been possible to get thousands of pamphlets into Iraq communicating ideas which have long been banned and sealed off from the populace. Reports still reach me of the effect of this kind of work in creating a new and enriching climate of ideas on issues of democracy, toleration of difference, secularism and the imperative for a central focus on human rights in the building of a new order in Iraq. I know for a fact that none of this would have been possible without the backing of the National Endowment for Democracy.

Please communicate the contents of this letter to whomsoever you think might be swayed by it, or be in a position to reverse this disastrous decision. The work of the National Endowment for Democracy affects millions of lives and must continue.

Sincerely,

KENAN MAKIYA,
Author of "Republic of Year
and Cruelty and Silence." ●

MANAGED COMPETITION "A HEALTH PLAN THAT CAN WORK"

● Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, as I have said many times in this Chamber, the core issue in health care reform is containing costs. But in our rush to reach this goal, are we simply going to abandon the market for a regime of Federal regulation? Or are we going to do all we can to make the market work?

Fortune magazine recently took up that question. In "A Health Plan That Can Work," Edmund Faltermayer deftly explains how managed competition can create a sound health care market that will produce the system Americans want and deserve. In fact, some of the ideas behind this approach are already being tested in our States by managed care organizations and other innovative health care providers.

In the Minneapolis-St. Paul area, for example, managed competition-type reforms have succeeded in lowering the cost of health insurance from 10 percent above the national average to 15 percent below the average—in just 10 years.

The point is, Government regulation in the form of a single-payer system doesn't get at the backbone of rising costs—fee-for-service medicine. With insurers guaranteed to pick up the tab, there is no incentive to control the cost and type of care prescribed. A

competitive environment, however, opens the door to improving quality, cost-effectiveness and access to preventive care. This occurs by changing the way medicine is practiced and medicine is purchased, and that is the route to better health care.

Mr. President, I request that the text of "A Health Plan That Can Work" be included in the RECORD.

The article follows:

A HEALTH PLAN THAT CAN WORK (By Edmund Faltermayer)

It's 2005 and the impossible is happening. For the fifth straight year America's health care outlays are declining as a percent of GDP. That's not so amazing, since most people are now enrolled in fiercely competing HMOs and other managed-care organizations that catch diseases early, often using low-tech procedures and medical personnel who aren't even doctors. Don't worry, these health plans don't skimp on high-tech treatment when it's called for. But they press for continuous quality improvement in all they do and weigh the cost effectiveness of alternative procedures, relying on a national board to decide which expensive and controversial new ones should be covered. Far from feeling hopelessly passive, as in the dark ages of 1993, medical consumers revel in an explosion of information—much of it electronic—that helps them to dispute doctors' proposals for treatment and to decide whether to switch from one health organization to another at the yearly sign-up time.

If this sounds like pure hallucination, get ready for a surprise. Most of the elements of tomorrow's medical system already exist or are starting to sprout, even without national health care legislation. William Link, the executive vice president of Prudential, who oversees its big HMO and health insurance operations from Newark, New Jersey, says the changes reshaping his industry "will continue to mushroom if government doesn't get in the way." What's mainly needed from the package that Bill Clinton hopes to announce in mid-June aside from coverage for the nation's 37 million uninsured, are deftly drawn rules that will speed the transformation of American medicine by lubricating the engine of competition.

The danger is that Washington will blow it by throwing sand in the gears. While key decisions have yet to be made, hints and leaks from the White House suggest that the President and the task force headed by Hillary Rodham Clinton lean strongly toward price controls and spending caps as a way to hold down costs. At the same time, the White House wants to encourage flexibility by leaving enforcement of these caps to the states. That combination could give us the worst of both worlds; heavy-handed pricing rules imposed 50 different ways. To appreciate what is at stake, imagine where the computer revolution would be if politicians had decided early on to smother it with regulation.

In Fortune's view, the way to get health care reform right is to stick to the set of proposals that sail under the flag of "managed competition." This concept has been refined over the years by the Jackson Hole Group, a policy research organization supported by insurers, provider groups, and corporate health insurance buyers. Meeting in craggy Wyoming, an informal assemblage of insurance executives, HMO chiefs, reform-minded physicians, and others have fashioned a blueprint for inducing vigorous competition in an industry in which supply—

mainly doctors capable of cowing patients—has long been able to influence demand, thereby hurling the nation's medical bill into hyperspace. In the world according to Jackson Hole, managed-care networks operating on fixed yearly revenues would battle as never before for the business of strongly price-conscious buyers.

Under managed competition, which President Clinton embraced during his campaign, all employers would be required to buy a nationally set package of basic health insurance for their workers. A reform called "community rating" would bar insurers from offering affordable plans only to the young and robust while hoisting premiums for sickness-prone workers—or dumping them, as can happen now. To bolster the buying clout of small employers and save on administrative expenses, managed competition would require that they buy coverage through newly created organizations called health insurance purchasing cooperatives, or HIPCs (pronounced HIP-icks). These most likely would be government-chartered, nonprofit outfits and would provide much of the management in managed competition.

In big companies and small, according to the Jackson Hole blueprint, employees would pay more if they chose expensive health plans over cheaper ones during an annual sign-up period. An added inducement to comparison shop: a proposed cap on the income tax exclusion granted health insurance. If an employee's insurance premiums were more expensive than coverage at the lowest-cost HMO in the area, he or she would have to pay the difference in after-tax dollars.

The overarching purpose of these carefully altered arrangements, says Dr. Paul Ellwood, founder of the Jackson Hole Group and the leading apostle of the HMO movement, "is to reform the way people buy and use health care." A medical system driven by market forces, Ellwood believes, would save money in a way that government spending limits and price controls cannot, and thereby lessen the bill for covering the uninsured. What about the others who currently fall through the cracks, including many of the unemployed? The Jackson Hole crowd believe that the savings to the U.S. Treasury from capping that now open-ended tax subsidy would generate much of the money needed to provide them coverage.

Alas, a funny thing has been happening to managed competition on its way to the Oval Office. Some of its elements are alive, such as requiring all employers to cover their workers, community rating to end cherry-picking, pricing that would make consumers cost-conscious, a standard benefits package, and maybe even a limit on the tax break granted gold-plated health plans. But sources close to the task force describe management consultant Ira Magaziner, its operating head, as a believer in the market who is outnumbered by social engineers. Many on Clinton's health care team, including Health and Human Services Secretary Donna Shalala, apparently yearn for a "single payer" system akin to Canada's.

In such an arrangement the government would reimburse all medical bills just as it does now for the elderly under Medicare. One huge flaw in this scheme is that it would leave largely intact the main engine behind rising health care spending, the conventional fee-for-service system, under which individual doctors charge separately for each procedure, and an insurer—in this case the government—dutifully picks up the bill. With no competitive mechanism to discipline costs, any single-payer scheme is almost inevitably driven to price controls or fixed budgets.

The Clinton task force hasn't gone to Canada yet, but it has gone astray. Instead of relying on competition alone, it appears to favor temporary price controls until its reforms are fully in place. Even after that, the White House talks of limiting the rate at which health premiums could rise. HIPCs, renamed "health alliances" by the Clintonites, might be given the task of enforcing a slice of an overall spending limit for U.S. medical outlays—the "global budget" that the President has long favored. States might also be given the option of creating a mini single-payer system. Complains CEO Stephen Wiggins of Oxford Health Plans, an HMO headquartered in Darien, Connecticut: "They've gone so far to the left it's astonishing." Wiggins, a Clinton supporter in the election, says he wishes he could have his vote back.

What's so bad about price controls? The main trouble is that they never work for long, just as they have not prevented Medicare spending on physicians' fees from rising 12% annually during the past ten years. Doctors circumvent Medicare fee limits by seeing patients more often or piling on more tests. Setting an annual lid on premium increases, moreover, would kill competition instead of spurring it by giving both efficient and inefficient plans a price rise that they would feel entitled to. Once controls go on, says James McLane, CEO of Aetna Health Plans in Hartford and a top price controller in the Nixon years, the incentives shift to gaming the system rather than improving health care. Price controls, says he, "will take people's eye off the ball."

And what's so bad about the heavy-handed health alliances the task force seems to fancy? Well, they could turn out as different from the original idea of the HIPC as a Pentagon office procuring warplanes is from a farmers' market. Economist Alain Enthoven of Stanford University, a key Jackson Hole thinker who coined the term managed competition, describes the ideal HIPC as a "price taker, not a price maker." Only in areas too sparsely populated to support competing HMOs, says Enthoven, would a HIPC need to take an active role in buying health care. Elsewhere, its function would be to inform small companies of the prices quoted by various plans, run the annual enrollment process, act as a financial clearinghouse, and monitor HMO quality data. "That's it," says Enthoven, who says he's "profoundly concerned" about the direction in which the White House task force has been moving.

One especially disturbing idea on the table would force medium-size and large companies, say those with more than 1,000 workers, to buy their health coverage through the new health alliances and make them pay for it with a uniform payroll tax. While this proposition appeals to some major corporations, it is bad policy because it would greatly reduce the number of big, active players out there influencing the price and quality of health care. Warns Ellwood: "It will destroy the market. There is no point in having employer-paid health insurance unless you have multiple buyers seeing who can get the best deal."

Happily, even as the reformers argue, the medical system goes right on changing itself. From the skeptical comments of some Congressmen—including House Ways and Means Chairman Dan Rostenkowski, who has likened managed competition to "Star Wars"—one might guess that this system is some futuristic invention. In fact, most of its pieces are up and running, here and there, around the U.S.

HIPCs? Some 100 regional business coalitions have already sprung up on a voluntary basis, many of which buy health insurance for their members. Community rating? Some 30 states have passed laws limiting insurers' ability to base premiums on medical history, and a half dozen have legislated broader managed competition schemes or are about to. Says Washington consultant Robert Laszewski: "The states are going 100 mph."

As for HMOs, enrollment jumped 7.2% in 1992 to 41.4 million, more than four times the total at the start of the Eighties. Buyers are showing that they can be price-conscious with health insurance just as they are with grocery shopping. When employers make employees pay extra to enroll in more expensive plans that allow unlimited choice of physicians, as Xerox and some state employers do, workers tend to switch to lower-priced HMOs (Fortune, December 28, 1992). Doctors as well as patients are climbing aboard these prepaid plans. Rather than face the cost and long hours of running a solo practice. Dr. James Thomas of Rutland, Vermont, who was already seeing patients for Community Health Plan, an HMO, has joined it as a salaried physician. Says Thomas: "The handwriting was on the wall."

Competition may also be starting to lasso costs. A survey of employers by the Foster Higgins consulting firm shows that in 1992 the average health insurance premium, counting the employee's contribution, rose 10.1%. Though still high, it is the smallest increase in five years. While premiums for traditional fee-for-service plans jumped 14.2%, those of HMOs—one-fifth cheaper to begin with—were up only 8.8%. "As far as I'm concerned, we're in managed competition right now," says Dr. Barry Schwartz, medical director for the Capital District Physicians Health Plan in Albany, New York.

If Washington doesn't screw things up and, instead, fosters flat-out competition, a host of promising new approaches could turn the U.S. medical system into a model for the world. Among them:

PUSH PREVENTION

The sicker you get under the prevailing fee-for-service health system, the more money flows to doctors and hospitals. By contrast, HMOs, which operate with a fixed yearly income per enrollee, have powerful financial reasons to keep you well. At Group Health, a division of Minneapolis' HealthPartners, 55% of women over 50 received mammograms last year, compared with a state average of 36%. Dr. George Isham, medical director of HealthPartners, says the plan keeps track of how dutifully individual physicians advise women to come in for the tests. Says Isham: "If a doctor is below average, we don't kick him out, but we have a conversation."

Two years ago Prudential's HMO in Baltimore launched a program to encourage pregnant low-income women to come in for prenatal care. Instead of parting with a nominal sum for each visit, as is customary with prepaid plans, women are handed \$10 in cash. They not only receive the usual physical checkups but also are counseled—eat well, stay off alcohol and drugs—in the hope that they will carry their babies to term. So far some \$40,000 has been paid out under the program, less than the \$50,000 the health plan might easily spend on just one premature baby, and HMO officials estimate that a couple of dozen premature births have been prevented.

TRY LOW-TECH TREATMENTS

"If I had my way," says Dr. C. Everett Koop, former U.S. Surgeon General, "we'd

have doctors more inclined to have conversations with patients than to order a battery of tests." Koop is the founder of an institute at Dartmouth Medical School bearing his name, which, among other things, promotes low-tech alternatives to the fancier stuff. One Koop favorite: a set of relatively cheap and uncomplicated methods for sparing diabetics the foot and leg amputations to which they are particularly vulnerable. The techniques were originally developed for lepers in Third World countries, where dependable electricity and high-tech equipment are often lacking.

Diabetics, like lepers, often lose feeling in their feet and ignore sores that can become seriously infected. But podiatrist Dr. William Coleman of the Ochsner Clinic in New Orleans, one of the few U.S. institutions that extensively practice these techniques, tries to head off trouble. With relatively simple devices, such as a strand of nylon pressed against the foot at many points, he locates insensitive areas and advises the patient how to avoid injury. When sores are present, he prescribes special shoes to relieve pressure on them. U.S. government studies suggest that these methods could help avert about half the 50,000 foot and leg amputations performed each year on diabetics. Says Coleman: "Too often these feet are lopped off in cavalier fashion."

STRETCH THE SUPPLY OF DOCTORS

Why use an expensive physician to fit a patient with contact lenses, interpret allergy tests, or even deliver babies if a "physician extender" can do the job just as well? The past decade has seen a doubling in the ranks of physician assistants—latter-day versions of army medics, who have two to four years of post-high school education—and of nurse practitioners and midwives. FHP Health Care, a Southern California HMO, is increasingly using physician extenders to control costs. At FHP's clinics, nurse-midwives, whose pay starts at \$55,000, vs. \$150,000 for an obstetrician, handle more than 80% of the uncomplicated childbirths.

On its own, FHP trains physician extenders to do sigmoidoscopies to probe for colorectal cancer, and to take the place of a second doctor in cataract operations and in laparoscopic surgery, a less invasive technique than the traditional kind. Dr. Robert Larsen, in charge of training and staffing at FHP, says nurse practitioners can be especially valuable in taking over routine testing now done by family physicians, who are expected to be in short supply in the next few years. Extenders "might not pick up the subtleties of a problem" that doctors would catch, Larsen says, but FHP believes it might be possible to operate with a ratio of one extender for every four physicians. Would this deny patients proper care? Not if the HMO monitors the outcome of treatment—a crucial element in making health reform work.

THINK QUALITY

Continuous quality improvement saves not only money but also the time—even the lives—of patients. In Atlanta the Prudential HMO found that 80% of its patients admitted to a major hospital for chest pains turned out to have no heart disease. Says Dr. Ronald Tipton, director of the HMO's medical group: "It was habit. Chest pain, bingo, you go to the hospital." A quality team, studying the matter, arranged for more folks to be examined speedily in outpatient settings like cardiologists' offices, paring the figure to 60%.

Cost-conscious HMOs are not the only ones trying to heal smarter. The Williamsport

Hospital and Medical Center in central Pennsylvania, with 325 beds, is the smallest hospital to win the Commitment to Quality award. Given by Healthcare Forum, a nonprofit association of industry leaders, and the executive search firm Witt/Kieffer Ford Hadelman & Lloyd, the award is health care's answer to the Baldrige. Donald Creamer, Williamsport's president, launched the quality drive nine years ago because a more competitive environment appeared to be coming, he says, and "we wanted to survive and thrive." In just two years the hospital's rehabilitation center, which serves those recovering from strokes, accidents, and other impairments, improved patients' ability to function by 25%, while releasing them sooner and charging less than the regional average.

GET SERIOUS ABOUT COSTS

Health care spending has skyrocketed mainly because, in a classic fee-for-service insurance plan, cost is no object. HMOs, forced by their prepaid revenue stream to live in the real world of finite resources, have no choice but to economize. Minneapolis's HealthPartners has a guideline spelling out when it is appropriate to use the expensive antibiotic cephalosporin instead of the far cheaper ampicillin. Kaiser Permanente's Southern California region has listed some situations when patients with knee injuries don't need costly magnetic resonance scans. So great is the potential for saving additional money, says Dr. David Lawrence, CEO of Kaiser's parent foundation, that there is no need to ration costly procedures, say, for the aged. Says Lawrence: "It will be a long time before we will have to say, 'Stop doing something for a segment of the population because it's too expensive.'"

The key is not to deny care but to emphasize less costly versions, even in situations where doctors may resist. In the mid-Eighties, drug companies developed a new form of the dye injected into patients so doctors can view the functioning of coronary arteries of kidneys on an X-ray screen. Fewer patients get adverse reactions from the new dye, but the price is ten to 15 times higher. A year ago Kaiser's Southern California region, feeling competitive pressures to hold down premium increases, approved a guideline strongly encouraging use of the old, less expensive version except for high-risk patients. The only drawback: A small percentage of patients would have severe but nonfatal reactions such as vomiting.

Writing in the *Journal of the American Medical Association*, Dr. David Eddy, a consultant to Kaiser who helped formulate the guideline, estimates that it will cause 40 additional bad reactions a year among the region's 2.3 million Kaiser members. But the plan and its members will come out ahead, Eddy figures. The estimated \$3.5 million saved annually would be enough, for example, to aggressively seek out women who have not received Pap tests, thereby preventing 100 deaths from cervical cancer. Compliance isn't mandatory, though radiologists must fill out a form when they use the expensive dye and state their reasons. The guideline must be having some effect because Kaiser has been buying less of it.

PICK NEW TECHNOLOGIES WITH CARE

Organ transplants, artificial hips, genetically engineered drugs, and other dazzling advances have also helped put health care spending in overdrive. Gerald Kominski, a researcher at UCLA, figures that "technology diffusion" has accounted for a third of the rise in hospital costs for Medicare pa-

tients along. But why isn't this trend offset to a significant degree by technologies that cut costs, as they do in such fields as electronics? Part of the problem, says Kominski, is that under the perverse incentives of fee-for-service medicine, doctors err on the side of more technology, not less. "If the service is insured," he says, "and it's not going to do any harm even though you don't know it's beneficial, why not go ahead?"

HMO's often put their food down on questionable technologies. "If the patient insists even though it doesn't make economic or medical sense, we say no," says medical director Isham of HealthPartners. But it's not easy to turn down a woman with advanced breast cancer who insists on bone marrow transplants costing \$90,000 to \$150,000. One of the most controversial treatments in medicine today, these subject the patient to high-dose chemotherapy, which gravely weakens the immune system. Then, to restore immunity, doctors reinfuse some of the woman's own bone marrow that was removed and stored in advance. The treatment alone kills up to 12% of patients, fewer than one woman in four survives for five years after the transplants.

That's an improvement over standard-dose chemotherapy without transplants, advocates of this technique argue. But the National Cancer Institute, which is sponsoring clinical trials, considers the issue unresolved. In the meantime, some women are suing successfully to force insurers to pay for the transplant, and two states have passed laws that would require more of them.

Dr. Don Nielsen, quality consultant at Kaiser headquarters in Oakland, rightly points out that the only way to handle such matters is to establish a national board, with government and consumer representation, that would decide when a new technology has moved beyond the experimental stage. Says he: "That would level the playing field among health plans and take the matter away from the courts." The Jackson Hole Group, and evidently the Clinton task force, also favor centralizing such decisions in one national body.

INFORM THE CONSUMER

With the kind of information now becoming available, tomorrow's patients could make today's look as ignorant as serfs in bygone centuries when Bibles were chained to pulpits. For consumers seeking instant enlightenment, Jeffrey Lerner of ECRI, a nonprofit Pennsylvania group that does technology assessments, hopes to put understandable, up-to-date information explaining hundreds of procedures on a computer network in the next few years. Dartmouth's Foundation for Informed Medical Decision Making has already produced five interactive video-disks that are marketed by Sony, with seven more in preparation. These allow patients in doctor's offices to seek detailed information about various forms of surgery and other treatments. At one of HealthPartners' medical centers in Minneapolis, 42 men over a 12-month period watched a Dartmouth video on the pros and cons of surgery for benign prostate enlargement; all decided against the operation.

The aim is not necessarily to deter surgery—some videos may prompt more of it—but to give patients a say in the matter. "Report cards" could also help consumers choose among health plans if they had a menu of them to select from. Right now, aside from data on how many enrollees leave and an HMO's own satisfaction surveys—which don't always ask the same questions—

consumers must rely on anecdotal, word-of-mouth information. House hunters checking out school systems have a much easier time, since they can compare such objective data as SAT scores and average class size.

All this would change if HMOs and other managed-care plans had to supply comparable information to consumers on the quality of their services. That can't happen soon enough for Jackson Hole's Ellwood. He maintains that one of the most important boons of managed competition would be "the restructuring of the health system into units that can be held accountable." Urged on by corporate benefits managers, the National Committee for Quality Assurance (NCQA), a nonprofit Washington organization that accredits managed-care plans, recently won agreement from representatives of 30 organizations—among them Blue Cross, Kaiser Permanente, and HealthPartners—on what kinds of data should go into a report card. Says Janet Corrigan, the NCQA's vice president for planning and development: "The fact that 30 managed-care plans are willing to be compared publicly is a significant step forward."

The first data should go to consumers in 1994. Initially, the report card will focus mainly on how many HMO members get preventive services, such as prenatal care and child immunizations, as well as patient satisfaction. Ellwood would like to include far more information on how successfully each plan handles ailments. A recent Jackson Hole paper shows a prototypical report card with 15 entries rated by symbols ranging from best to worst, in Consumer Reports fashion. Five entries show medical outcomes, such as hip fracture recovery and the death rate of heart attack victims.

Couldn't health plans cook the books to make their performance look better than it is? David Lansky, a medical outcomes researcher in Portland, Oregon, who designed the Jackson Hole report card, says that auditing would be necessary. Still, he says, "the plans can't cook what the public thinks of their quality." A groundbreaking survey of 1,700 members of three health plans in Des Moines has shown significant variations in customer satisfaction. Dr. John Williamson of Salt Lake City, a pioneer in the measurement of medical outcomes and an adviser to the White House task force, says, "Customer satisfaction is a powerful means of getting plans to pay attention to the consumer."

How badly will they want to? That depends on whether Washington goes for competition or controls. Despite the discouraging leaks, it's hard to believe the President will not move his health reform plan back toward the center, because without broad public support it is doomed. Says Tennessee Congressman Jim Cooper, a conservative Democrat who introduced reform legislation along Jackson Hole lines last year: "You've got to have a strong bipartisan consensus when you are reshaping one-seventh of the U.S. economy."

Republican Senator David Durenberger of Minnesota, a managed-competition backer who sits on two committees that handle health legislation, puts it more precisely: "The Administration has got to come to grips with the reality that the Republicans will determine whether this thing passes." Durenberger adds that the briefing sessions that Hillary Clinton has held on Capitol Hill leave him feeling optimistic about what the White House will send up: "She's very good, very positive, and she's still learning." Here's hoping he's right. ●

TIBET

● Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I would like to speak today about Tibet. It is easy for the world to forget about Tibet, a sparsely populated country high in the shadow of the Himalayas. What really obscures our view of Tibet, however, is the looming shadow of China, which threatens to blot out Tibet and Tibetan culture forever.

China invaded Tibet in 1950. In over four decades of occupation, the Chinese have destroyed over 6,000 monasteries. Over 1 million Tibetans have reportedly been killed, including thousands of Buddhist monks with irreplaceable cultural and religious knowledge. Countless other Tibetans have fled into exile, including the Dalai Lama. The Chinese have transferred thousands of Han Chinese into Tibet in an attempt to flood the indigenous Tibetans with a foreign population. The Chinese continue to tear down sacred Tibetan temples to make way for stores and apartment buildings. The behavior of the Chinese in Tibet has been called cultural genocide, the deliberate destruction of a heritage.

I visited Tibet in August 1988 and was able to see firsthand the suffering that the Tibetan people must endure. In the spring of 1989, I urged the Senate to turn its attention to Chinese oppression in Tibet just as we did toward human rights abuses in the old Soviet Union. I argued that enough letters, resolutions, and pressure from the United States could make a difference in China. I still believe this to be true, but it will require more than an occasional, isolated gesture.

One such measure in the legislation that we passed granting most-favored-nation status for China. It ties the renewal of this status to the end of Chinese religious persecution in Tibet, among other conditions. Although it is one of many human rights hurdles for China to clear, we must not lose sight of this important stipulation, and we must insist that China retreat from its oppressive policy in Tibet.

It is particularly important that we come to Tibet's assistance now, as China has begun another crackdown on Tibet. Earlier this year the Communist Party issued an order to purge officials in Tibet who are not loyal enough to the party, or who demonstrate too much sympathy for the Tibetan people. Opponents are detained and imprisoned for even peaceful displays of their dissident religious or political views.

The Dalai Lama is the religious leader of Buddhist Tibet, and I have been fortunate to meet with him on several occasions. He represents the spirit of Tibet and symbolizes all that Tibet stands to lose at the hands of the Chinese. The Tibetan people are still devoutly loyal to him. I was dismayed to learn that the Dalai Lama was recently denied the opportunity to formally address the World Convention on Human

Rights. It is shameful that a nation as notorious for human rights violations as China was able to exert so much influence at the World Convention, while the Dalai Lama—a Nobel Peace Prize laureate—was excluded from formal participation.

It is imperative that the United States take the lead in bringing international censure to bear on China for her treatment of Tibet. As each monastery is torn down, as each monk is slain, a piece of Tibet's history is lost for eternity. And as the Tibetan past slips into oblivion, so does the Tibetan future. ●

BALTIC FREEDOM DAY

● Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the memory of the tens of thousands of innocent Baltic men, women, and children who fell victim to mass deportation at the hands of their Soviet occupiers in June 1941. Our remembrance of this tragic event on June 14, symbolizes America's continuing commitment to the Baltic States, which for so long had been subjugated to Soviet domination and occupation.

This decade has ushered in a new and promising era of freedom and hope for the people in the Baltic Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. In order to ensure that democracy and freedom continue to develop, our Nation and the international community must support the efforts of the Baltic States to strengthen their sovereignty and independence from their powerful neighbor to the east.

During 1990, all three Baltic Republics proclaimed their independence from the Soviet Union. Shortly afterward, the fledgling governments weathered a renewed military threat during the August 1991 coup attempt led by Soviet hard-liners. Since then, great strides have been made by these determined people to safeguard their sovereignty, developing democratic institutions and reforming and restructuring their economies. Still, much more needs to be accomplished. Fifty years of unjust Soviet occupation have done great damage to the economic, political, and social institutions of the Baltic States. Our role must be one of providing assistance to these nations in their efforts to become vital members of the world community.

Today, while all of the Baltic States enjoy international recognition as independent nations, their fundamental sovereignty continues to be violated by the continuing presence of thousands of Russian troops. My colleagues and I continue to urge our Government and other nations to press for an end to this inexcusable infringement that has endured even after the end of the cold war and the collapse of the Soviet Union.

On April 1, 1993, before the Clinton-Yeltsin economic summit, 16 Senators

joined me in writing to President Clinton, urging him to remind President Yeltsin of the United States commitment to ensuring the early, orderly, and complete withdrawal of Russian troops from the Baltics. It is my firm belief that as Russia moves to embrace democratic ideals and traditions, it must also be supportive of other newly independent states.

As we remember the mass deportation of the Baltic peoples away from their homelands, we must renew our conviction and determination to ensure that the Baltic States gain absolute independence.●

THE NEED FOR CREATING A SINGLE, INDEPENDENT FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION AGENCY

● Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, I rise today to urge my colleagues' support for a bill that will initiate a much-needed reform of the Government's food safety and inspection system.

Next week I will introduce my proposal to integrate the Government's food safety and inspection powers in a single, independent agency. This agency would issue a uniform set of regulations, and apply the latest technological know-how to the Government's food testing procedures.

Just last Friday on National Public Radio's "Talk of the Nation" show, Lester Crawford, executive vice president for Science of the Food Processors Association and former administrator of the USDA's Food Safety and Inspection Service under President Bush, said that he considers the creation of a single, integrated Government agency a "terrific idea."

"I'm one of the few still-living human beings who worked in all agencies * * * and I always wondered why it was that we were not all reporting to the same Cabinet secretary. I think it would be a capital idea," Crawford said.

The Nation's good health depends on a safe, diverse, and affordable food supply. Please join me in creating the food safety and inspection system Americans deserve.●

THE TRIAL OF THE TIRASPOL SIX

● Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, on February 24, 1993, I placed a statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with regard to the arrest and detention of six citizens of the Republic of Moldova: Ilie Ilascu, Alexandru Lesco, Andrei Invantoc, Viaceslav Garbuz, Tudor Petrov, and Petru Godiac. At that time, these men were in prison, awaiting trial for the murders last spring of two local officials in the separatist Dniestr Republic. While not wishing to prejudge any legal proceeding, it seemed clear to me that the circumstances surrounding this case and

the treatment of the detained men deserved careful scrutiny from the human rights community worldwide. That is why in December 1992, Helsinki Commission Cochairman STENY HOYER and I sent a cable to the general prosecutor in Tiraspol, Boris Luchik, urging humane treatment for the prisoners and immediate access by representatives of international organizations.

Unfortunately, despite increased international attention and concern, the treatment of these six men and the conduct of their current trial—which began on April 21, 1993—continues to fall short of international human rights standards. Indeed, the legitimacy of the court itself is in question, as the self-proclaimed Dniestr Republic is not recognized as a sovereign state. International human rights observers from the Romanian Helsinki Committee and the International Human Rights Law Group have described a courtroom atmosphere in which the defendants were held in cages while the openly hostile audience jeered and cried out against them, creating a highly prejudicial atmosphere.

In its assessment of the fifth hearing of the trial of the Tiraspol Six, which took place on May 24, 1993, the International Rights Law Group raised three serious concerns about the fairness of the trial:

First, there is some question regarding the court's impartiality, mandated by article 10 of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights and article 14 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights;

Second, some of the defendants' lawyers have exhibited reluctance to fully defend their client's interests as required by article 11 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and article 14 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights; and

Third, the court rejected a defense attorney's request for an investigation into human rights violations against the defendants during their detention under article 14 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights despite credible allegations of wrongdoing.

Members of the Helsinki Commission staff met June 24, with a delegation of Moldovan parliamentarians, which included one of the defense attorneys for the Tiraspol Six, Mr. Gheorghe Amihalachioaie. They shared with the Commission their serious concern for the fate of these men, and presented us with a Declaration of the Parliament of the Republic of Moldova on the trial of the six detainees.

As Chairman of the Helsinki Commission, I once again appeal to the authorities in Tiraspol to demonstrate their respect for international law by ensuring human treatment for the detainees, and a fair trial by an independent, impartial, and legally constituted

court. Cochairman HOYER and I have sent a telegram to Mr. Igor Smirnov of the executive committee of the city of Tiraspol urging him to comply with these requests. The Helsinki Commission will continue to monitor carefully the case against the Tiraspol Six.●

TRIBUTE TO JOHN PERKINS, TIRELESS ADVOCATE FOR WORKING MEN AND WOMEN

● Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I rise to offer a well-deserved tribute today to a friend, an outstanding American and a tireless advocate for working men and women: Mr. John Perkins.

For more than four decades, John Perkins has been an integral part of the American labor movement, serving since 1982 as director of the AFL-CIO's Committee on Political Education [COPE].

Mr. Perkins has numerous titles. Labor leader. Parent. Political analyst. Organizer. But above all, John Perkins is a builder.

More than 40 years ago—in 1952—John Perkins joined the Carpenters Union in Elkhart, IN. He served as business manager of his local for 11 years. During that time he rose to leadership of the Indiana State Building and Construction Trades Council.

John Perkins then turned his talents to the national level. He joined the COPE staff in Washington in 1971, and became director in 1982.

Howell Raines wrote in the New York Times the following year—1983—that John Perkins is widely credited among Democratic Party professionals with bringing modern campaign technology and an aggressive new spirit to COPE, the political arm of the federation.

Several months before his appointment as COPE director, Mr. Perkins impressed union leaders by organization the Solidarity Day March in Washington September 19, 1981. He got credit for assembling a crowd of more than 200,000 * * *.

Indeed, that is John Perkins' trademark—organize and get results. During his 20-plus years with COPE, he built coalitions, he built respect, and he built power for the working men and women of this country.

Much of the landmark legislation of the last two decades to expand voter registration, to help workers, to promote fairness, and to ensure human dignity has built on foundations laid by the handiwork of John Perkins. In a fitting tribute during his final year as COPE director, Congress approved the motor-voter bill to enhance public participation in our democracy.

"John Perkins has worked tirelessly to modernize COPE into what it is today—the envy of State and national political operations for both parties," said AFL-CIO President Lane Kirkland this spring. No one could have said it better.

John Perkins now enters into richly deserved retirement. We are sad to see

him go. But perhaps we should remember the words of another famous labor leader, Joe Hill of the IWW, who just before his passing away said to a friend, "Don't waste any time mourning—organize."

That is the true spiritual meaning of John Perkins' work for the American labor movement. John Perkins is a builder. He devoted his career to building progress, which can be seen every day in lives of countless men and women who have been affected by his leadership.●

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JULY 14, 1993

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 9 a.m. on Wednesday, July 14; that following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date and the time for the two leaders reserved for their use later in the day; that there then be a period for morning business not to extend beyond 10:30 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each, with the first hour of morning business under the control of Senator WALLOP, or his designee, and that Senator BENNETT be recognized for up to 30 minutes; and that the Senate then resume consideration of S. 185, as under the previous order.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, the previous order just referred to provides that a vote will occur at 10:30 a.m. tomorrow on the Roth amendment to S. 185. So all Senators should be aware that a vote will occur on, or in relation to, I should say, the Roth amendment at 10:30 a.m. tomorrow.

Senators should also be prepared for a lengthy session tomorrow and on Thursday, as we attempt to make progress on this bill. We have been advised by our Republican colleagues that they wish to offer a number of amendments. We have not yet been advised of the substance of those amendments. I encourage any Senator who has an amendment to be prepared to come to the floor and offer it during the day tomorrow. We will have a lengthy session tomorrow and Thursday, as is necessary to make what I hope will be good progress on this bill.

RECESS UNTIL TOMORROW AT 9 A.M.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate today, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess, as previously ordered.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:27 p.m., recessed until Wednesday, July 14, 1993, at 9 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 13, 1993:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

JAMES J. BLANCHARD, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO CANADA.

WALTER C. CARRINGTON, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF NIGERIA.

JEFFREY DAVIDOW, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF VENEZUELA.

THOMAS J. DODD, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE ORIENTAL REPUBLIC OF URUGUAY.

STUART E. EIZENSTAT, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES, WITH THE RANK AND STATUS OF AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY.

DONALD C. JOHNSON, OF TEXAS, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO MONGOLIA.

RICHARD MENIFEE MOOSE, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR MANAGEMENT, VICE J. BRIAN ATWOOD, RESIGNED.

MARY M. RAISER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, FOR THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR DURING HER TENURE OF SERVICE AS CHIEF OF PROTOCOL FOR THE WHITE HOUSE.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

JAMES E. HALL, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD FOR THE TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 1997, VICE CHRISTOPHER A. HART, TERM EXPIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

LOUISE FRANKEL STOLL, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION, VICE KATE LEADER MOORE, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

GEORGE MUNOZ, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, VICE DAVID M. NUMMY, RESIGNED.

GEORGE MUNOZ, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER, DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY, VICE DAVID M. NUMMY, RESIGNED.

RESOLUTION TRUST CORPORATION

STANLEY G. TATE, OF FLORIDA, TO BE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, RESOLUTION TRUST CORPORATION, VICE ALBERT V. CASEY, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

CHARLES ROBERT TETZLAFF, OF VERMONT, TO BE U.S. ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF VERMONT FOR THE TERM OF 4 YEARS, VICE GEORGE J. TERWILLIGER, III, RESIGNED.

WILLIAM DAVID WILMOTH, OF WEST VIRGINIA, TO BE U.S. ATTORNEY FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA FOR THE TERM OF 4 YEARS VICE WILLIAM A. KOLIBASH, TERM EXPIRED.

FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED PERSONS OF THE AGENCIES INDICATED FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF THE CLASSES STATED, AND ALSO FOR THE OTHER APPOINTMENTS INDICATED HEREWITH:

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS ONE, CONSULAR OFFICER AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

ALAN R. HURDUS, OF NEW YORK

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS TWO, CONSULAR OFFICERS AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

DENNIS MARTIN BRYANT, OF VIRGINIA
MICHAEL WAYNE CLINEBELL, OF WEST VIRGINIA
DANIEL GOWEN, OF FLORIDA
PATRICIA A. MOSER, OF VIRGINIA
CRAIG R. NORDBY, OF ILLINOIS
WILLIAM R. TEEBO, OF MARYLAND
WAYNE J. WATSON, OF TEXAS

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS THREE, CONSULAR OFFICERS AND SECRETARIES

IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

THOMAS X. D'AMICO, OF TEXAS
JOHN F. LORD, OF MARYLAND
MARY H. O'MARA, OF VIRGINIA
JOHN MICHAEL PHEE, OF CALIFORNIA

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS FOUR, CONSULAR OFFICER AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

FRANK J. YACENDA, OF FLORIDA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENTS OF STATE AND COMMERCE TO BE CONSULAR OFFICERS AND/OR SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, AS INDICATED:

CONSULAR OFFICERS AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

ALFRED BEN ANZALDUA, OF ARIZONA
CARROLL JOSEPH AUSTIN, OF VIRGINIA
GREGORY L. AVRAKOTOS, OF VIRGINIA
TAMARA L. BAKER, OF TENNESSEE
DAVID A. BEAM, OF VIRGINIA
HEIDI L. BENNER, OF PENNSYLVANIA
DREW GARDNER BLAKENY, OF TEXAS
DONALD ARMIN BLOME, OF ILLINOIS
ROBERT B. BOYLES, OF VIRGINIA
DANIEL JOHN BUSHBY, OF VIRGINIA
PADRAIG PEARSE DECLAN BYRNE, OF WASHINGTON
KAY-ANNE CANON, OF WASHINGTON
SALLY A. COCHRAN, OF FLORIDA
DAVID CONFORI, OF CALIFORNIA
JANICE A. CORBETT, OF OHIO
AMY LYNN DAWSON, OF VIRGINIA
JAMES PATRICK DEHART, OF OREGON
STEPHEN A. DRUZAK, OF WASHINGTON
THOMAS S. DYMAN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
LAURA A. EAGLEEYE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MARY EILEEN EARL, OF VIRGINIA
LINDA LAURENTS EICHLATT, OF TEXAS
RUTA DAINAUSKAS ELVKIS, OF ILLINOIS
MARGO GRIMM EULE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
STEPHANIE JANE FOSSAN, OF VIRGINIA
JEFFREY R. GERLACH, OF GEORGIA
CECILIA M. GUZIK, OF VIRGINIA
CHRISTOPHER SCOTT HEGADORN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
SHIRLEY J. HERVEY, OF VIRGINIA
BRIAN C. HOGAN, OF VIRGINIA
THOMAS SCOTT JENNINGS, OF ILLINOIS
RUSSELL P. JOHNSON, OF FLORIDA
HARRY RUSSELL KAMIAN, OF CALIFORNIA
PAUL E. KIRCHLIN, OF VIRGINIA
MARC E. KNAPPER, OF CALIFORNIA
SUSAN MICHELLE KOHN, OF FLORIDA
MARGARET L. KONSKI, OF VIRGINIA
BLAIR L. LABARGE, OF VIRGINIA
WILLIAM SCOTT LAIDLAW, OF CALIFORNIA
BERNARD EDWARD LINK, OF VIRGINIA
LEE MACFAGGART, OF WASHINGTON
DAVID R. MARLOWE, OF VIRGINIA
ROBERT S. MAY, OF CALIFORNIA
JAMES A. NCAUGHT, OF ILLINOIS
CAROLYN P. MEISENGER, OF VIRGINIA
EAMON H. MORAN, OF CALIFORNIA
MARY JANE PELLA, OF MARYLAND
NEIL M. PERETZ, OF FLORIDA
JEFFREY JOHN PERRY, OF VIRGINIA
LARRY P. PLEASANT, OF MARYLAND
J. BRUCE PRIOR, OF WASHINGTON
DAVID F. REAMES, OF VIRGINIA
CARL M. ROSENE, OF TEXAS
KAI RYSSDAL, OF VIRGINIA
NORMAN THATCHER SCHARPF, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

C. MICHAEL SCHNEIDER, OF VIRGINIA
JENNIFER L. SCHOOLS, OF TEXAS
PAUL F. SCHULTZ, III, OF VIRGINIA
DONALD MARK SHEEHAN, OF VIRGINIA
JOHN D. SHIPPY, OF TEXAS
JUSTIN HICKS SIBERELL, OF CALIFORNIA
WILLIAM B. SMITH, JR., OF FLORIDA
THOMAS Y. SYLVESTER, OF MARYLAND
ANTHONY SYRETT, OF WASHINGTON
SERGIO ENRIQUE TORRES, OF NEW YORK
HERBERT SMITH TRAUB, III, OF GEORGIA
ARNOLDO VELA, OF TEXAS
J. RICHARD WALSH, OF ALABAMA
THOMAS J. WALSH, OF VIRGINIA
BENJAMIN WEBER, OF NEW JERSEY
LAUREN ANNIS WRIGHT, OF NEW JERSEY
DAVID K. YOUNG, OF FLORIDA
GEORGE J. ZIMMERMAN, OF VIRGINIA
DARCY FLOCK ZOTTER, OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE ARMY

THE UNITED STATES ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OFFICERS NAMED HEREIN FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE GRADES INDICATED BELOW, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTIONS 593(A), 3385 AND 3392:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. FRED H. CASEY xxx-xx-x
BRIG. GEN. MICHAEL W. DAVIDSON xxx-xx-x

BRIG. GEN. GERALD A. MILLER xxx-xx-x...
BRIG. GEN. GARY J. WHIPPLE xxx-xx-x...
To be brigadier general

COL. ALEXANDER H. BURGIN xxx-xx-x...
COL. JOSEPH W. CAMP, JR. xxx-xx-x...
COL. DONALD M. EWING xxx-xx-x...
COL. WAYNE C. MAJORS xxx-xx-x...
COL. GARY D. MAYNARD xxx-xx-x...
COL. WALTER F. PUDLOWSKI, JR. xxx-xx-x...
COL. ALLEN J. STRAWBRIDGE, JR. xxx-xx-x...
COL. MORRIS L. PIPPIN xxx-xx-x...
COL. PHILIP H. PUSHKIN xxx-xx-x...
COL. HAROLD E. BOWMAN xxx-xx-x...
COL. THOMAS E. BUCK xxx-xx-x...
COL. BERNARD J. CAHILL xxx-xx-x...
COL. CARROLL D. CHILDERS xxx-xx-x...
COL. JOSE A. DIAZ xxx-xx-x...
COL. JOHN A. HAYS xxx-xx-x...
COL. JOHN L. JONES xxx-xx-x...
COL. GARY E. LEBLANC xxx-xx-x...
COL. THOMAS L. MCCULLOUGH xxx-xx-x...
COL. ROGER E. ROWE xxx-xx-x...
COL. ERROL H. VAN EATON xxx-xx-x...
COL. EDISON O. HAYES xxx-xx-x...
COL. EUGENE L. RICHARDSON xxx-xx-x...
COL. ROBERT V. TAYLOR xxx-xx-x...
COL. ALFRED E. TOBIN xxx-xx-x...

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER TO BE PLACED ON THE RETIRED LIST IN THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 1370:

To be admiral

ADM. WILLIAM D. SMITH, U.S. NAVY xxx-xx-x...

THE FOLLOWING NAMED REAR ADMIRALS (LOWER HALF) OF THE RESERVE OF THE U.S. NAVY FOR PERMANENT PROMOTION TO THE GRADE OF REAR ADMIRAL IN THE LINE, AS INDICATED, PURSUANT TO THE PROVISION OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 5912:

UNRESTRICTED LINE OFFICER

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (IH) GRANT THOMAS HOLLETT, JR. xxx-xx-x...
S. NAVAL RESERVE.
REAR ADM. (IH) TIM MCCALL JENKINS xxx-xx-x... xxx-xx-x...
U.S. NAVAL RESERVE.
REAR ADM. (IH) JOHN JACOB MUMAW xxx-xx-x... xxx-xx-x...
U.S. NAVAL RESERVE.

UNRESTRICTED LINE OFFICER (TRAINING AND ADMINISTRATION OF RESERVE)

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (IH) JAMES DUANE OLSON, I xxx-xx-x... xxx-xx-x...
U.S. NAVAL RESERVE.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS, ON THE ACTIVE DUTY LIST, FOR PROMOTION TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE U.S. ARMY IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 624, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE:

CHAPLAIN

To be colonel

JOHN W. BRINSFIELD xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL L. BROYLES xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL D. CHILLEN xxx-xx-x...
GARY R. COUNCELL xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS R. DECKER xxx-xx-x...
GREGORY J. DEMMA xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT D. HARRISON xxx-xx-x...
DAVID H. HICKS xxx-xx-x...
DAVID L. HOWARD xxx-xx-x...
GERALD E. MARTIN xxx-xx-x...
JOSEPH E. MILLER xxx-xx-x...
LOWELL P. MOORE xxx-xx-x...
MALCOLM ROBERTS II xxx-xx-x...
JAMES E. RUSSELL xxx-xx-x...
ERVIN L. SHIREY xxx-xx-x...

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS, ON THE ACTIVE DUTY LIST, FOR PROMOTION TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE U.S. ARMY IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 624, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE. THE OFFICERS INDICATED BY ASTERISK ARE ALSO NOMINATED FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 581, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE:

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

To be major

*AADLAND, REBECCA L. xxx-xx-x...
*APPLEWHITE, LARRY W. xxx-xx-x...
*ARDNER, DAVID B. xxx-xx-x...
*BABB, THOMAS A. xxx-xx-x...
*BABEU, LORRAINE A. xxx-xx-x...
*BARRETT, LAMONT E. xxx-xx-x...
BATES, BRUCE B. xxx-xx-x...
BLANCHETTE, GLENN W. xxx-xx-x...
*BOELL, RAYMOND L. xxx-xx-x...
*BOWER, MARK W. xxx-xx-x...
*BROCKER, DONALD J. W. xxx-xx-x...
BUCHNOWSKI, RANDY L. xxx-xx-x...
BUDINGER, ANN C. xxx-xx-x...

BUKARTEK, JOHN V. xxx-xx-x...
*CAMP, JAMES M. xxx-xx-x...
CANESTRINI, KENNETH xxx-xx-x...
*CANNON, CHARLES E. xxx-xx-x...
CASS, SCOTT F. xxx-xx-x...
*CHANG, ROBERTA K. xxx-xx-x...
CHISHOLM, LISA P. xxx-xx-x...
CHOWEN, STEVEN H. xxx-xx-x...
CLAYSON, EDWARD L. xxx-xx-x...
*COLEMAN, LANG K. xxx-xx-x...
*CONWAY, LARRY L. xxx-xx-x...
*COOK, JOHN P. xxx-xx-x...
COOLEY, JUDITH K. xxx-xx-x...
COSME, JOEL xxx-xx-x...
*CRESCI, ANTHONY B. xxx-xx-x...
*CUMMINGS, LAURIE A. xxx-xx-x...
DANCHENKO, JEFFREY xxx-xx-x...
*DEJESUS, ORTIZ A. xxx-xx-x...
*DEJESUS, RAFAEL B. xxx-xx-x...
*DELANO, KENNETH A. xxx-xx-x...
EDWARDS, ROBERT J. xxx-xx-x...
FAIREY, JOHN D. xxx-xx-x...
FANNING, WILLIAM M. xxx-xx-x...
*FLYNN, DANIEL P. xxx-xx-x...
*GAMERL, JAMES M. xxx-xx-x...
*GLENESK, NEIL G. xxx-xx-x...
*GRAY, ROBERT E. xxx-xx-x...
HANF, DARRELL J. xxx-xx-x...
*HANSEN, CURTIS S. xxx-xx-x...
*HASEWINKLE, WILLIAM xxx-xx-x...
*HAWKINS, EPREM M. xxx-xx-x...
HEBRON, BERNARD F. xxx-xx-x...
HERRON, GEORGIA L. xxx-xx-x...
HERSCHBERGER, GARY xxx-xx-x...
*HILL, DUANE N. xxx-xx-x...
HOFF, BARBARA H. xxx-xx-x...
*HOROSKO, STEVE III xxx-xx-x...
HOWARD, REGINALD W. xxx-xx-x...
*HULKOVICH, PAUL R. xxx-xx-x...
*ICOVETTA, GLENN T. xxx-xx-x...
IPPOLITO, ANASTASIA xxx-xx-x...
*JENKINS, WANDA J. xxx-xx-x...
*JONES, DAVID D. xxx-xx-x...
JONESLUGO, PATSY R. xxx-xx-x...
*JOY, VAN A. xxx-xx-x...
*KOVAK, BRUCE C. xxx-xx-x...
*KOZLOWSKI, LOUIS P. xxx-xx-x...
*LABADIE, CAROL W. xxx-xx-x...
*LARKIN, MITZIE A. xxx-xx-x...
LEDoux, MICHAEL H. xxx-xx-x...
LEMAY, KAREN A. xxx-xx-x...
LETT, DONALD R. xxx-xx-x...
*LITTLE, THOMAS J. xxx-xx-x...
LOPEZ, JOSE L. xxx-xx-x...
LOWRY, MARK A. xxx-xx-x...
*MACDONALD, DAVID L. xxx-xx-x...
*MC DONALD, MICHAEL S. xxx-xx-x...
MELANSON, MARK A. xxx-xx-x...
METZGER, MARK A. xxx-xx-x...
MILSTREY, ERIC G. xxx-xx-x...
MITCHELL, BARRY H. xxx-xx-x...
MITCHELL, RICHARD S. xxx-xx-x...
MOORE, TIMOTHY J. xxx-xx-x...
*MOSLEY, MURIEL A. xxx-xx-x...
*MUNIZ, GILBERT M. xxx-xx-x...
*MURDOCK, BONNIE M. xxx-xx-x...
NECHANICKY, JEFF A. xxx-xx-x...
*NEWCOMBE, WILLIAM III xxx-xx-x...
ORRICO, DANIEL P. xxx-xx-x...
ORRICO, DIANE M. xxx-xx-x...
*OVERSTREET, HEIDI xxx-xx-x...
OWENS, KELVIN B. xxx-xx-x...
*PAYNE, SAM JR. xxx-xx-x...
*PELLETIER, JAMES J. xxx-xx-x...
PERRY, AUDREY L. xxx-xx-x...
PERRY, DENISE A. xxx-xx-x...
*PERRY, ELAINE S. xxx-xx-x...
QUINLIVAN, JOHN D. xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT, LEON L. xxx-xx-x...
*ROUNDTREE, BRIAN I. xxx-xx-x...
*ROWBOTHAM, MICHAEL xxx-xx-x...
*SCONCE, FREDDIE xxx-xx-x...
SHAUL, PETER T. xxx-xx-x...
*SIGNAIGO, JAMES A. xxx-xx-x...
SLIFE, HARRY F. xxx-xx-x...
SMETANA, WAYNE R. xxx-xx-x...
SMITH, DAWN M. xxx-xx-x...
*SMITH, THOMAS C. xxx-xx-x...
*SOUTHWELL, GARY D. xxx-xx-x...
*STANFIELD, BARBARA xxx-xx-x...
*STEPHENS, KATHERINE xxx-xx-x...
*STEVENS, MARC J. xxx-xx-x...
*STEWART, ROBERT L. xxx-xx-x...
STILL, JAY F. xxx-xx-x...
*STONE, LAWRENCE J. xxx-xx-x...
SYVERTSON, ROBERT L. xxx-xx-x...
SYVERTSON, TRACEY, L. xxx-xx-x...
*THOMAS, COLLEEN A. xxx-xx-x...
*THOMPSON, EVANS, B. xxx-xx-x...
*TORO, ANGEL M. xxx-xx-x...
TRAKOWSKI, JOHN H. xxx-xx-x...
*UNGER, JEFFREY M. xxx-xx-x...
WADDELL, JAMES A. xxx-xx-x...
WEIR, ALAN F. xxx-xx-x...
WEST, DONALD K. xxx-xx-x...
*WHALEY, ANTHONY K. xxx-xx-x...
*WHITE, ANTHONY E. xxx-xx-x...
*WYATT, TRACY O. xxx-xx-x...
YAMAMOTO, ALAN M. xxx-xx-x...
ZEMO, JOHN F. xxx-xx-x...
ZIEGLER, DERICK B. xxx-xx-x...

ARMY MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS
To be major

*DAVIS, MARTHA A. xxx-xx-x...
DILLY, GEORGE A. xxx-xx-x...
*FINEGAN, FRANCIS E. xxx-xx-x...
*GORCZYCA, CYNTHIA J. xxx-xx-x...
*GREEDIAGIN, ANN xxx-xx-x...
*HECKEL, HEIDI A. xxx-xx-x...
*LAURIN, MARY J. xxx-xx-x...
MILLS, MEGAN K. xxx-xx-x...
RICE, HOWARD A. xxx-xx-x...
ROWBOTHAM, LINDA L. xxx-xx-x...
SCHNEIDER, THERESA xxx-xx-x...
*SHEAR, JAMES J. xxx-xx-x...
*SMITH, LOUIS, H. xxx-xx-x...
*WORLEY, MARIA A. xxx-xx-x...

VETERINARY CORPS

To be major

*ADAMS, TIMOTHY K. xxx-xx-x...
*BAUMBARTNER, ROXANN xxx-xx-x...
*BULEY, MICHAEL A. xxx-xx-x...
*CARPENTER, CALVIN B. xxx-xx-x...
*CHUMLEY, PERRY R. xxx-xx-x...
*COCKMAN, THOMAS R. xxx-xx-x...
*COLGIN, LOIS M. xxx-xx-x...
*GOLD, MARK B. xxx-xx-x...
*HAECKER, ELLIEN E. xxx-xx-x...
*MOSEY, JANET xxx-xx-x...
*POPPE, JOHN L. xxx-xx-x...
*ROLFE, DAVID S. xxx-xx-x...
RUBLE, DAVID L. xxx-xx-x...
*SERCOVICH, MARK J. xxx-xx-x...
*WATTERS, STEEN M. xxx-xx-x...
*WILTSHIRE, NORMAN D. xxx-xx-x...

ARMY NURSE CORPS

To be major

*ADELFIO, JANET, S. xxx-xx-x...
*ALBRITTON, JEFFREY xxx-xx-x...
*ALTENBURG, SUSAN C. xxx-xx-x...
*ANDERSON, ROGER H. xxx-xx-x...
BAILLY, CHERYL M. xxx-xx-x...
*BAUER, LINDA M. xxx-xx-x...
*BELL, JOSIE, Z. xxx-xx-x...
*BELMONT, CLIFFETTE xxx-xx-x...
*BERES, KIMBERLY A. xxx-xx-x...
*BISSELL, JULIE M. xxx-xx-x...
*BORK, RAYMOND H. xxx-xx-x...
*BOUCHER, ROBERT L. xxx-xx-x...
*BOYLAN, MICHELLE M. xxx-xx-x...
*BRASWELL, GWENDOLYN xxx-xx-x...
*BREHM, ARTHUR W. xxx-xx-x...
*BROCK, WILLIAM A. xxx-xx-x...
*BROWN, ARLENE R. xxx-xx-x...
*BURGESS, DORIS A. xxx-xx-x...
*BYTLER, DAVID R. xxx-xx-x...
*CARROLL, CHERYL xxx-xx-x...
*CASSIDY, CARLA L. xxx-xx-x...
CHAPMAN, THOMAS H. xxx-xx-x...
*CHURCH, JAMES A. xxx-xx-x...
*CLEMMONS, MARCIA xxx-xx-x...
*COX, GEORGE H. xxx-xx-x...
*COX, RUTH M. xxx-xx-x...
*CURRY, SHERLYN V. xxx-xx-x...
*DAVILA FLORES, YOLAN xxx-xx-x...
*DEGENHARDT, RAYMOND xxx-xx-x...
*DUNKIN, JAMES A. xxx-xx-x...
*DURAN, LAURIE L. xxx-xx-x...
*ELLIS, TINA M. xxx-xx-x...
ESLICK, RONALD G. xxx-xx-x...
*FELTZ, MARCIA A. xxx-xx-x...
*FERGUSON, SHERI L. xxx-xx-x...
*FINCH, JULIE A. xxx-xx-x...
*FINN, LOUISE L. xxx-xx-x...
*FIORE, JANET E. xxx-xx-x...
*FOX, GEORGE J. xxx-xx-x...
FRITZ, LORRAINE A. xxx-xx-x...
*GILBERT, BARBARA A. xxx-xx-x...
*GREENE, JOYCE A. xxx-xx-x...
*HALDORSON, ERICK A. xxx-xx-x...
*HALL, TERESA I. xxx-xx-x...
*HANNAH, RITA K. xxx-xx-x...
*HARDY, ALVIN E. xxx-xx-x...
*HERNANDEZ, DAVID xxx-xx-x...
*HICKMAN, FREIDA C. xxx-xx-x...
*HODGES, MARK E. xxx-xx-x...
HODGES, ROBERT S. xxx-xx-x...
*HOLAWAY, STEVEN L. xxx-xx-x...
*HOOD, ROBERT K. xxx-xx-x...
HOUGH, CHARLOTTE L. xxx-xx-x...
*HUGHES, NANCY J. xxx-xx-x...
*HUNDLEY, LINDA L. xxx-xx-x...
*HUNT, DONNA L. xxx-xx-x...
*JACKSON, SANDRA A. xxx-xx-x...
*JERDE, JEFFREY L. xxx-xx-x...
*JOHNSON, DIANNE xxx-xx-x...
*JOHNSON, JIMMY L. xxx-xx-x...
*JOHNSON, JULIE M. xxx-xx-x...
*JOLITZ, CAROLYN M. xxx-xx-x...
*JONES, LAGAUNDA C. xxx-xx-x...
*JORDAN, SANDRA D. xxx-xx-x...
*KELLY, MARK E. xxx-xx-x...
*KELTY, DAVID L. xxx-xx-x...
*KIM, JUNG S. xxx-xx-x...
*KNIG, KATHY D. xxx-xx-x...
*LABABEE, JAMES xxx-xx-x...
*LEATHERMAN, JOYCE L. xxx-xx-x...
*LEE, JANET Y. xxx-xx-x...

- *LONG, GLORIA R.
- *MARCHI, ROBERT
- *MARK, DEBRA D.
- *MARTIN, PAUL K.
- *MASI, KATHLEEN R.
- *MAXWELL, GLORIA J.
- *MCNEILL, CAROLYN M.
- *MCPHERSON, TERESA Y.
- *MOORE, ROBERT J.
- *MORALES, MAGNIA S.
- *MORRISMAGBE, MISHA
- *MURPHY, LAURA A.
- *MURRAY, CELIA R.
- *MYERS, SUSAN M.
- *NASH, BEULAH L.
- *NELSON, WADE M.
- *NOBLE, LILLY Y.
- *NORTON, PAAMELA A.
- *OBRIEN, VALENTINE
- *PALASCHAK, KRISTINE
- *PARE, JOHN P.
- *PERKIN, JANE E.
- *PERRA, ELLEEN L.

- *PETERSON, DAVID D.
- *PIEKLIK, SUZANNE R.
- *POWELL, JACK R.
- *PYTLEWSKI, JANE B.
- *RAMNARINESINGH, SUS
- *RAMOS, MARTINEZ A.
- *RAWSON, HANCE J.
- *RAY, CAROLYN L.
- *RISALITI, MARIA D.
- *ROBERTS, JENNIE E.
- *ROGERS, LAURA W.
- *ROSKOVENSKY, DENISE
- *ROSS, ANGELA M.
- *ROTH, STACY A.
- *RUIZ, JUDITH
- *SAVIGNAC, ARMINIUS
- *SCIBA, JANICE M.
- *SEBASTIAN, BRADLEY
- *SELZER, ROGER A.
- *SHARP, SIDNEY L.
- *SINGH, TONY D.
- *SMITH, CAROLYNN
- *SMITH, SUSAN G.

- *SOUZA, KERRY L.
- *SPEARS, GLENNA M.
- *SPURGEON, KAREN A.
- *STANLEY, JOYCE D.
- *STEWART, DELLA W.
- *STONE, ROCKY L.
- *SULLIVAN, THERESA M.
- *SUMMERS, ELLEN C.
- *TAYLOR, THERESA A.
- *TELLITOCCHI, REGINA
- *THOMPSON, CARA L.
- *TIMMERMAN, KRISTINE
- *TUNSTALL, SUSAN M.
- *VAN, STONE R.
- *VOELKER, KEVIN R.
- *VOEPEL, SUZANNA
- *WADE, NAOMI B.
- *WALSH, KEVIN M.
- *WALLIS, JAMES W.
- *WOODWARD, JOHN B.
- *WRIGHT, MARIE L.

the following committee members:

Office of the Clerk
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20540

Hon. Thomas S. Foley
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Wash-
ington, DC

Dear Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to the per-
mission granted in Clause 2 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 1:47 a.m. and the Senate
passed without amendment H.R. 388, H.J.
Res. 381 and appoints additional conferees
H.R. 381
With great respect,
Sincerely yours,
DONALD K. ANDERSON
Clerk, House of Representatives

the following committee members:

Office of the Clerk
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20540

Hon. Thomas S. Foley
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Wash-
ington, DC

Dear Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to the per-
mission granted in Clause 2 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 1:47 a.m. and the Senate
passed without amendment H.R. 388, H.J.
Res. 381 and appoints additional conferees
H.R. 381
With great respect,
Sincerely yours,
DONALD K. ANDERSON
Clerk, House of Representatives

the following committee members:

Office of the Clerk
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20540

Hon. Thomas S. Foley
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Wash-
ington, DC

Dear Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to the per-
mission granted in Clause 2 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 1:47 a.m. and the Senate
passed without amendment H.R. 388, H.J.
Res. 381 and appoints additional conferees
H.R. 381
With great respect,
Sincerely yours,
DONALD K. ANDERSON
Clerk, House of Representatives

CLINTON BUDDER TO PROMOTE SMALL BUSINESSES

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

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, when it comes to the restoration of the econ-
omy, no one will dispute the impor-
tance of small businesses.

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

First, the Clinton budget will promote 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 35-percent deduction for health care premiums. This will help 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 maintained for the overwhelming majority of small busi-
nesses.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of Public Law 98-304, as amended by section 1 of Public Law 99-7 and the order of the House of Representatives, July 1, 1988, authorizing the Speaker and the minority leader to appoint conferees and to make appointing conferees authorized by law or by the House, the Speaker on Friday, July 2, 1993, did appoint to the U.S. Delegation to the Transatlantic Assembly of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe the following Members of the House:

Mr. HAMILTON of Indiana, Vice Chair-
man; Mr. HUYER of Maryland, Mr. GARDNER of Connecticut, Mr. LANTOS of California, Mr. MCGOVERN of Indiana, Mr. GARNER of Maryland, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. SANDOZ of New York.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hollen, 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. 411. An act to amend title 38, United States Code regarding the collection of certain payments for shipments via motor carrier carriers of the party and consignment goods foreign forwarders, and for other purposes.

S. 404. An act to redesignate the United Post Office located at the West College Street in Johnson, Tennessee, as the "New Haverly Office."

S. 403. An act to make miscellaneous and technical corrections to the Immigration and Nationality Act and related provisions of law.

S. 402. An act to amend the Field Milk Promotion Act of 1950 to define field milk products to exclude the milking process, and for other purposes.

S. 401. An act to amend the Government Printing the terms of the Government Printing

□ The shaded area represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1:47 p.m.
Words in the shaded area were inserted or appended rather than spoken by a Member of the House on the floor.

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. APPLGATE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. APPLGATE. 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 the 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 the 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
Ballenger	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	Molinar	Wolf
Gilman	Moorhead	Young (AK)
Gingrich	Morella	Zeliff
Goodlatte	Myers	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—36

Barton	Ewing	Mollohan
Blackwell	Galleghy	Moran
Boehert	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 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 multievent 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. INSLLEE.
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. VISCLOSKEY.

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 Nation 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.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

EMERGENCY PLAN TO PREVENT
ISSUANCE OF VISAS TO TERROR-
ISTS, HOUSE CONCURRENT RESO-
LUTION 119

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1993

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing House Concurrent Resolution 119, in an effort to bring to the attention of the highest levels of the State Department, as well as the American people, the deplorable conditions that exist in our State Department overseas visa processing system in preventing terrorists and other criminal elements from gaining visas to travel freely to the United States.

Recent terrorist events in New York, from the Trade Tower bombing, to the thwarted plot to blow up the U.N. complex and New York City commuter tunnels and attacks on our political leaders, make it clear that international terrorism has come home to America's own soil. It is no longer a problem just in the Middle East, or on the continent of Europe, it is a serious and real threat on the streets and in the offices and buildings of America's very own cities.

My concurrent resolution simply calls for preparation of an emergency plan by the Secretary of State in 60 days to improve the visa process, and report to the Congress on his plan. The Secretary's plan should set out what can be done to immediately close the glaring hole in America's front line defense against terrorists, and other criminal elements that would enter the United States and mean this Nation harm, on visas obtained at our overseas U.N. Embassies and consular posts. Antiquated microfiche records of possible terrorists in overseas high threat posts that process visa applicants, is totally unacceptable in this day and age of modern communications and computer technology. The neglect of our visa processing system at the State Department has gone on long enough.

Quite frankly, when the conditions I have outlined in my concurrent resolution are examined by my colleagues, they will readily agree I am confident, that the visa control system is badly broken, outdated, and needs immediate high level attention. From outdated and inefficient microfiche equipment and lack of basic information sharing, both within the State Department itself, and among U.S. law enforcement agencies and others, the visa lookout system intended to deny potential terrorists, and other criminal elements, easy access to the United States, is badly in need of repair.

With America's very safety at stake, the Secretary of State himself needs to take personal charge of the problem and bring the visa processing situation under control. My resolution intends to bring about change, which the American people will surely demand once they

realize the extent of the hole in our national defenses against terrorism at our U.S. Embassies and consular posts that issue visas to travel to the United States.

The unbelievable bungling reflected in the mistaken issuance of the visa to Sheik Omar Abdel Rahman while he was on the State Department's own visa lookout list, can only be addressed by a top-to-bottom reform of the entire system under the personal and direct supervision of the Secretary of State. The Secretary must drain this swamp himself.

My resolution will hopefully bring about an emergency plan and appropriate response from the Secretary of State within 60 days, that will help make the visa lookout system at the Department of State the front line defense against terrorists that the America people expect from our State Department.

Accordingly I ask my colleagues to join with me in cosponsoring House Concurrent Resolution 119, and helping to bring public pressure to bear on the State Department and those responsible for administering our overseas visa processing function.

The bill follows:

H. CON. RES. 119

Whereas recent terrorist acts in the United States have made it abundantly clear that terrorism has come to American soil, and now threatens the very security of the Nation;

Whereas it is evident from recent revelations that the State Department's current visa operations and procedures are not adequate to provide a modern front line defense to prevent terrorists from entering the United States under visas provided by United States embassies and consular posts around the world;

Whereas many overseas State Department posts are still using outdated and inefficient microfiche systems to maintain visa lookout and watch lists for known or suspected terrorists who may seek United States visas to travel to the United States;

Whereas the lookout list microfiche system is outdated, not easily maintained or updated in a timely fashion, is labor intensive and easily subject to human error, and is totally inadequate and outmoded in this era of modern communications and travel;

Whereas many United States embassy and consular posts are still on the outdated microfiche system in many areas of the world where the threat is great from terrorists and drug dealers or narcotics traffickers who may desire visas to enter the United States;

Whereas the microfiche visa lookout system has already resulted in the unfortunate and mistaken entry of radical Sheik Omar Abdel Rahman into the United States on a United States visa, despite his links to known terrorist activities prior to issuance of the visa;

Whereas the mistaken issuance of the visa to Sheik Rahman in error in Khartoum in 1990, despite the fact he was on the State Department's lookout list on microfiche at this post for possible terrorist links, has created

numerous and serious problems for the United States, including his possible inspiration and encouragement of terrorism following his entry into the United States, both here and in Egypt by his followers;

Whereas several of Sheik Rahman's followers have been arrested in connection with the New York Trade Tower bombing or relating to a terrorist plot to attack the United Nations complex, New York City commuter tunnels, the Secretary General of the United Nations, and political leaders in the United States, and many of those arrested entered the United States with visas issued by the State Department;

Whereas the entry of Sheik Rahman into the United States by the mistaken issuance of a visa by the State Department has even reportedly strained our relations with the Government of Egypt;

Whereas it is also evident that the necessary information sharing within the State Department, and with other United States law enforcement and intelligence agencies on possible terrorists or other criminal elements, is not being conducted on an appropriate basis to make the visa lookout system current and effective enough to prevent possible terrorists from entering the United States with visas;

Whereas the shortcomings and failures in the current visa processing system at the Department of State have been well known by the Department for many years and no major overhaul, improvements, or recommendations to overhaul the system are forthcoming from the Department of State, the Inspector General, or the General Accounting Office for several months;

Whereas a 1991 Department of State Inspector General audit of the visa referral system at the Department found serious shortcomings in the automated visa lookout system (AVOLS), including "Information regarding foreign nationals with serious grounds for visa ineligibility" was not always in the automated visa lookout system even though government agencies had this information available;

Whereas the same 1991 audit also found that "At one post visited it was determined that not all convicted drug traffickers in the Drug Enforcement Agency local data base were in AVOLS";

Whereas the same 1991 audit went on to find that "The absence of this information (law enforcement data) poses a serious problem to the nonimmigrant visa process since it can result in the issuance of visas to dangerous and undesirable individuals.";

Whereas the Department of State, on the basis of the 1991 audit, has been on notice of the shortcomings in the visa lookout system for more than 2 years, and apparently little or no progress has been made to improve the system;

Whereas recently the Secretary of State has personally acknowledged the need to modernize the visa system to meet the new threat of terrorism directly targeted at the United States;

Whereas the American people demand and expect the Department of State to maintain an effective and modern system to prevent terrorists from obtaining visas to travel to

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

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

the United States and threaten property, institutions, and lives in the United States;

Whereas the current visa processing system and procedures at the Department of State are totally incapable in meeting the new threat of international terrorism to the United States and threaten the very security and safety of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the Secretary of State, within 60 days after the date of adoption of this resolution, should submit a report to the Congress setting forth an emergency plan to improve visa issuance procedures and equipment and to modernize the visa processing system including—

(1) short-term and immediate plans to modernize high threat United States posts around the globe now currently on outdated microfiche;

(2) plans to improve information sharing within the Department of State itself to keep the visa lookout system current and updated on possible terrorist who might seek visas to travel to the United States;

(3) plans to improve information sharing with other United States agencies to provide timely and efficient exchange of information for inclusion in the visa lookout system to prevent terrorists and other alien criminal elements from gaining access to the United States under visas issued by United States embassies and consular posts overseas;

(4) a date certain when the Department of State will resume checking the criminal record histories of visa applicants with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, prior to issuance of any visa, as was the case prior to 1991; and

(5) long-term plans to make the visa lookout and watch system a modern and effective tool to prevent terrorists, and other criminal elements, from gaining easy access to the United States under visas issued by United States embassies or overseas consular posts.

HARRISON HOUSE NURSING CENTER EARNS PREMIER AWARD

HON. DAVID MANN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1993

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to recognize the Harrison Nursing Center which recently earned the Ohio Health Care Association's Premier Award. It is the highest award for excellence given to providers of long-term care in Ohio. Harrison House is only the second facility in the State to receive this special recognition.

I extend my congratulations to the management and dedicated staff of Harrison House on their outstanding professional achievement.

TRIBUTE TO FRANK LINK

HON. PAUL E. GILLMOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1993

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a true public servant. Mr. Frank Link is retiring as the city manager of San-

dy, OH, after serving in that post for the past 21 years. He has gone about his duties with dedication and distinction.

But Mr. Link's record of service goes far beyond his position as city manager. He has been active in community organizations such as the Heart Association, the Jaycees, the Rotary, and the Sandusky Central Catholic Foundation, to name a few.

Too often we focus on the negative aspects of society. That is why I feel it is important to recognize citizens that have made a positive impact on their community. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring a true public servant, Mr. Frank Link. He has set a fine example to which all of us in this body can aspire.

TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF LOUISE EDRINGTON

HON. LUCIEN E. BLACKWELL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1993

Mr. BLACKWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives to pay tribute to the memory of Mrs. Louise Edrington, a truly beloved woman who dedicated her life here on Earth to the Lord above.

Louise was always there for her family and friends, and took no greater pleasure than in serving the Lord at her church, The Church of God of Prophecy, where she served in several distinguished capacities. Louise was always ready to help the congregation, and dedicated nearly all of her waking hours to the betterment of the church and the entire community.

Those who knew Louise Edrington would be quick to attest to her compassion, kindness, and extraordinary generosity. Louise was always ready to help others before helping herself, and she lived her life with the greatest sense of dignity.

Mr. Speaker, Louise Edrington touched the lives of so many people, and no doubt, her presence made the world a better place for many. I would like to ask my colleagues to rise as we pay our respects to this gracious and dear woman. On behalf of the entire U.S. Congress, I would like to express my most sincere condolences to Louise's beloved husband Henry, her entire family whom she loved dearly, and of course, her cherished friends at the congregation of the Church of God of Prophecy, where Louise's legacy of kindness and virtue will endure forever. May God bless Louise Edrington, who is certainly at peace as she walks with her Lord.

A TRIBUTE TO THOMAS BENJAMIN SHARPE

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1993

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention the fine work and outstanding service of Tom Sharpe

who is retiring from the county of San Bernardino following 38 years of dedicated service. He will be recognized at a dinner in his honor at the San Bernardino Elks Lodge on July 23.

Thomas Benjamin Sharpe was born in Covina, CA, and graduated as a straight A student from San Bernardino High School in 1951. Tom graduated from San Bernardino Valley College in 1953 and used a 3-year scholarship to attend Colorado State Mine University. Tom was married to his wife Pat in 1956, had four children between 1958-62, and owned his own drafting business with offices in Palm Springs, Desert Hot Springs, Redlands, and Loma Linda.

Tom began his career with San Bernardino County on August 31, 1955 when he was hired by the County Highway Department. Over the years, he has received numerous promotions: Engineering assistant II, 1958; right-of-way engineering department, 1959; engineering assistant IV in the FAS design division, 1960; engineer, 1962; engineer II, 1964; principal engineering technician, 1965; right-of-way engineer, 1967; and senior right-of-way engineer, 1973.

To say the least, Tom will be missed. His professionalism and innovative, flexible approach to his work is well known and admired by those who have worked by his side.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me, our colleagues, and Tom's many friends in recognizing the many contributions Tom has made in 38 years of service to San Bernardino County. His commitment to, and support of our community has made a tremendous difference in all of our lives. It is fitting that the House of Representatives recognize him for his contributions today.

ENERGY TAX WOULD HURT STATE BUSINESSES AND TAXPAYERS

HON. TOBY ROTH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1993

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, rarely has anything in Washington been subject to so much obfuscation and rhetoric as the Clinton tax plan. Taxes masquerade as spending cuts and paying more in taxes is somehow an American's patriotic duty. In addition, we are supposed to believe that the largest tax increase in history is the only way to achieve real deficit reduction, even as Clinton's own budget calls for over \$200 billion in new Government spending.

In reality the Clinton tax plan is nothing more than a cleverly wrapped version of the old-fashioned tax-and-spend plans of past years. Simply put, if the Clinton tax plan becomes law it will cause inflation, unemployment, and recession.

A recent article in the Milwaukee Sentinel by Mary Jo K. Paque exposes in plain language the horrendous effect that just one portion of President Clinton's tax plan—the energy tax—would have on the American economy. I recommend it as essential reading for all Members of Congress.

**ENERGY TAX WOULD HURT STATE
BUSINESSES—AND TAXPAYERS**

(Reaction from Mary Jo K. Paque, director of government affairs, Metropolitan Milwaukee Association of Commerce)

Earlier this month, President Clinton acknowledged the negative impacts of his proposed Btu tax, and the plan seemed to be dead.

However, with the announcement by his budget director Wednesday that the administration will fight to restore a version of the Btu tax in the House-Senate conference committee, it is clear he does not recognize that an energy tax "compromise," or another business tax increase, would contain the same fatal flaws.

Any new energy tax would only serve to hurt U.S. companies and leave them unable to compete on an international level. If we are to revitalize the economy and create new jobs, spending cuts must be a priority—not a last resort.

The impact of an energy tax on our balance of trade also must be considered. American manufacturers and farmers would be forced to raise prices to cover higher energy costs. Foreign competitors—who wouldn't be subject to the tax—would gain market share, resulting in an even larger trade deficit.

Wisconsin's energy intensive manufacturing companies such as Harnischfeger, Briggs & Stratton and A.O. Smith would be particularly hard-hit, as would those relying on energy intensive raw materials, such as steel and chemicals.

Where the new tax can be passed on to the consumer, the results are equally disastrous. Higher prices mean increasing inflation and government costs, leading to reduced consumption, a depressed GDP and, again, increased unemployment.

Candidate Clinton promised a middle-income tax cut, but his new energy tax would mean a major middle-income tax hike through rising prices on utility bills, gasoline and virtually everything made or transported in the United States.

Energy costs account for 7% of the consumer price index; thus, any increase in cost will have an inflationary impact on items from clothing to furniture to food.

According to estimates by Wisconsin's Division of Energy and Intergovernmental Relations, Wisconsin consumers and businesses would pay an additional \$473.7 million on their energy bills every year.

Former Carter Energy Secretary James Schlesinger estimates a family of four earning \$40,000 a year would pay an average \$470 more a year due to the Clinton energy tax.

In addition, according to the National Association of Manufacturers, the energy tax would reduce employment by 610,000, reduce our GDP by \$73 billion and reduce investments in future productivity.

The Btu tax is especially dangerous because it is a stealth tax. Consumers pay in the form of higher prices, so it's not noticeable—and it's easier to raise.

Ways and Means Committee Chairman Dan Rostenkowski (D-Ill.) said about the value added tax, "We can keep incrementally turning up the percentages and you wouldn't even know it." The same holds true for a Btu or other energy tax.

But perhaps the most problematic aspect of the Clinton plan is that it will not accomplish its basic purpose—to reduce the deficit. Since World War II, for every \$1 Congress increased taxes, it spent \$1.59.

This tax plan is not going to reverse that trend.

First, more than half of the revenue from the Clinton energy tax will not go to deficit reduction.

Second, \$36 billion dollars in new spending is only part of the total of more than \$200 billion in new spending contained in the Clinton economic plan. Two-thirds of those taxes will be used for new spending, not to reduce the deficit.

Clinton's bill contains \$6.06 in new taxes for every \$1 in spending cuts—a net tax increase of \$291 billion.

Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan (D-N.Y.), the Democratic chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, called it "the largest tax increase in the history of public finance in the United States or anywhere else in the world."

Republicans and Democrats alike are urging the president to drop the new energy tax and cut more spending—for the sake of the economy.

Let's hope he'll listen—for the sake of the economy.

**CONGRESSMEN PETER DEUTSCH,
LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART, ROBERT
MENENDEZ, AND CONGRESS-
WOMAN ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN
OFFER TRIBUTE TO CWO STEVEN
M. KABICK**

HON. PETER DEUTSCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1993

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, we rise today to honor CWO Steven M. Kabick, U.S. Coast Guard, a dedicated seaman and loyal supporter of the causes of the Key West community. Chief Warrant Officer Kabick retires on Friday, July 16, 1993, in Key West, FL, after over 21 years of faithful service to the Coast Guard.

After having attained his enlisted goal of scoring No. 1 on the servicewide exam and appearing on the top of the promotion list for advancement to master chief quartermaster with under 15 years of service, Officer Kabick accepted his commission to warrant officer in 1987, and last served as a security officer in Key West. Officer Kabick wears a permanent Cutterman's Pin for years of sea service aboard a number of Coast Guard vessels, including the U.S. Coast Guard Cutter [USCGC] *Blackthorn*, USCGC *Salvia*, USCGC *Kaw*, and finally as the executive officer aboard the USCGC *Cape York* during the Grenada invasion in 1984. In addition, Officer Kabick has numerous personal and unit awards including the Coast Guard Commendation Medal, two Coast Guard Achievement Medals and four Commandant Letter of Commendation Ribbon bars.

Chief Warrant Officer Kabick leaves the Key West community with his wife Maritia and his two sons, where he will be best remembered for his work with hurricane and disaster preparedness, and for his efforts to ease the painful transition of the large number of Cuban immigrants. Perhaps no part of the Key West populace will miss Officer Kabick more than his numerous friends in the Cuban-American community, to whom he has dedicated a great deal of his life. Officer Kabick was one of the founders of Hogar de Transito Para Los Refugiados Cubanos, an organization founded in the wake of Hurricane Andrew independ-

ently of the Coast Guard and the Immigration and Naturalization Service [INS] to establish a halfway house for the many Cuban immigrants that arrived in Key West in August and September of 1992.

Because of Andrew's devastation to the greater Miami area, INS notified the Coast Guard that all Cuban immigrants would be sent to Key West, creating a nearly overwhelming situation for USCG Group Key West. Officer Kabick was able to acquire support from local Key West church groups, World Relief, Inc., and Community Relations Services [CRS] to establish an organization capable of accepting Cuban immigrants from group Key West and later placing them in the south Florida community. With the help of CRS, Officer Kabick was able to furnish the halfway house with used equipment. As a result, a problem that had been discussed without resolution at the Coast Guard and the INS was solved because of Officer Kabick's philanthropy, creativity, and the priceless work of Hogar de Transito Para Los Refugiados Cubanos.

The U.S. Coast Guard, the city of Key West, and the entire Cuban-American community of south Florida will greatly miss the leadership of this devoted and passionate man. We join them in expressing our gratitude and admiration for CWO Kabick's many achievements and contributions, both as an officer and as a tireless advocate of the cares and concerns of south Florida. We wish him luck with all his future endeavors.

**TRINITY LOWER EAST SIDE LU-
THERAN PARISH BREAKS
GROUND ON NEW CHURCH**

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1993

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding achievements of the Trinity Lower East Side Lutheran Parish located in my New York City district. On April 25, 1993, 500 members of the community gathered at Avenue B and Ninth Street to celebrate the groundbreaking of a new church and community center for their parish. The celebration included joyful songs and musical selections, as well as a procession of clergy and choirs representing congregations from the entire New York metropolitan area.

The Trinity Lower East Side Lutheran Parish's commitment to the community shines as brightly today as it did 150 years ago when Pastor Theodore Brohm held his first service on June 4, 1843. From its earliest days, the Trinity Parish has been an integral part of the Lower East Side community, one of our Nation's most historic neighborhoods. It has provided a center for the enlightenment and education of generations of children, a refuge for the weary, and a haven for the troubled. Indeed, Pastor Brohm's dedication has carried forth through the years as the Trinity Lower East Side Lutheran Parish continues to serve the community. The parish now offers Sunday School, a daily afterschool program, a summer day camp, a soup kitchen, as well as many

other volunteer programs to help enrich the lives of thousands of New Yorkers.

In 1843, Pastor Brohm was forced to teach school from the basement of his own home. April's groundbreaking marks the latest chapter in the Trinity Lower East Side Parish's century and a half of growth and development. The new church will be equipped to meet the needs of the community and will also serve as a visible witness to the work of the Lutheran Church in the entire New York Metropolitan Synod.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join with me today in congratulating all those who have dedicated their time and effort to the construction of this new church and community center. This groundbreaking is an example of how much can be achieved when we work together for a greater goal and a symbol of hope for our future. Those who have donated their efforts to this project are to be recognized for their outstanding community involvement.

A TRIBUTE TO RAYMOND W.
SPORE

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1993

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to pay tribute to Chief Raymond W. Spore of the West Plainfield Fire District, who recently retired after 18 years of dedicated service to the community.

Chief Spore began his career in fire protection in 1974, when he joined the West Plainfield Fire Protection District. After several years of service, Ray was elected vice president of the Volunteers Association in April of 1982. The next September, he was elected captain, specifically as a medical officer. Finally, Ray was appointed chief of the West Plainfield Fire District [WPF] in November of 1987.

During his career in fire service, Chief Spore underwent extensive training in several fields of fire protection including incident command, prevention, hazardous materials, instructor 1 series, aircraft disaster management, and fire sprinkler systems. Furthermore, Ray was one of the first emergency medical technicians in the WPF.

As chief, Ray was the force behind many of the significant accomplishments achieved by the fire district. He promoted training that resulted in all WPF volunteers achieving State certification at the volunteer firefighter I level. Chief Spore also worked with the Yolo County Board of Supervisors to promote a rural residential sprinkler amendment and participated in the Supervisors' Fire Advisory Board. He secured the adoption of the Uniform Fire Code by the WPF and established a prevention division within the WPF. Furthermore, Ray supported the formation of the Yolo County critical incident stress management team.

Ray's accomplishments had early beginnings, prior to his career in fire prevention. After living in Mexico for the first 6 years of his life, Ray and his family moved to California where he attended school. While attending

junior high school, Ray was selected to attend Boys' State in Sacramento. He later attended junior college in El Centro and received his bachelor of science degree in entomology from the University of California, Davis. Ray continued his academic success at the University of California, San Francisco, and earned his doctor of dental surgery in 1964. In 1965, Ray opened his own dental practice.

In addition to his many years of community service, Ray is an active participant in many local organizations. He selflessly gives his time to the junior chamber of commerce, Davis Chamber of Commerce, the Elks Lodge, the Kiwanis, and the Masonic Lodge.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have the opportunity to recognize Ray Spore's outstanding career in the fire protection profession. I ask my colleagues to join me today in wishing Ray a prosperous and fulfilling retirement, and continued success in the years to come.

A TRIBUTE TO THE NEW HAMPSHIRE PARTICIPANTS OF THE ODYSSEY OF THE MIND PROGRAM

HON. DICK SWETT

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1993

Mr. SWETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the students who participated in this year's Odyssey of the Mind Program. I would also like to commend the parents, teachers, and other volunteers who donated their time and effort to help these students obtain such a high level of academic achievement.

The 1 million Odyssey of the Mind participants, ranging in age from kindergarten to graduate school, creatively solve complex problems using the teamwork approach.

The Odyssey began with students competing against their fellow schoolmates for the right to represent their institution in later State, regional, or provincial contests. These competitions culminated at the world finals at the University of Maryland in College Park. It included representatives from over 700 teams from over 18 countries in addition to those from the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in commending each and every one of the students who participated in the Odyssey of the Mind Program. In particular, I would like to laud the accomplishments of those participants from my district in New Hampshire. They are: Kevin Mortimer, Andy La Mora, Chris Breault, John Morgan, Dan Vail, Laura King, Laura Gagliuso, Luke D'Alessandro, Kevin Morrissey, Joey Bartolo, Ankica Pogorzelski, Rachel Karajgi, Christy Liu, Jillian Hack, Carol Snaithe, Mike Golding, Robby Fischer, Katelyn Powers, Joe Slattery, Nick Matthews, Kathy Newcomb, Chris Massie, Neal Pelletier, Wayne Burton, Allison Gumbel, Beth Merchant, Brian Belanger, Anne McCourt, Christopher Bassett, Erin Gumbel, Matt Newcomb, Mark Norris, Matt Crowley, Steve Bull, Thomas Bassett, Kitty McCourt, Pam Williams, Kristin Celentano, Christine Webster, Abby Call, Michael Lynn, Robin

Goulette, Melanie Roberge, Jeremy Scott, Jared McGuire, Jason Alosky, Kara Hubbard, Katie Wright, Jason Carbol, Craig Halbmaier, Krystal Aube, Shanna Theriault, Bethany Arsenault, Kevin Griffin, Jeremy Hinton, April Frechette, Jason Carbol, Jan Massie, Judy Newcomb, Tom Mortimer, Richard Gagliuso, Sherrie Vail, Richard Goulette, John Merchant, Vaughn McCourt.

Mr. Speaker, I need not remind my colleagues that America's children are America's future. It is unfortunate that so many times our Nation focuses on the faults of our youth and neglects students, like these, who are participating in truly worthwhile activities. A sound educational system must be at the top of our list of priorities if we are to remain the vanguard of the new world order. I encourage my colleagues to join me in support of educational programs like Odyssey of the Mind, and in congratulating these remarkable young Americans.

TRIBUTE TO REV. DAVID L.
RANDOLPH, SR.

HON. LUCIEN E. BLACKWELL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1993

Mr. BLACKWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives to pay tribute to one of Philadelphia's most beloved clergymen. On Friday, July 9, Rev. David L. Randolph, Sr., will be honored at an appreciation service by the South Philadelphia Cluster of Churches. To commemorate this most special occasion, I would like to take a moment to reflect on the remarkable career of this outstanding individual.

Born the youngest of eight children to the late Rev. Samuel B. Randolph and Rev. Mary Randolph in Oxford, PA, it is clear that Reverend Randolph was born into a family of the utmost piety. Following his successful advancement through the public school system, Reverend Randolph attended Lincoln and Temple Universities where he received his bachelor of arts degree in business administration. Reverend Randolph then expanded upon his initial degree by attending Manna Bible College, Philadelphia College of the Bible, and Southeastern University, where he received his master's of divinity degree.

Mr. Speaker, from 1956 to 1959, Reverend Randolph served his country with the greatest sense of honor and duty as a lance corporal in the U.S. Marine Corps. One year later in 1960, he was ordained as elder and pastor of the First Church, Mount Zion AME Church in Ellendale, DE, where he will long be remembered for erecting their first parsonage. From 1966 to 1971, he served as pastor of the Richard Allen, AME Church in St. Georges, Bermuda.

From 1971 to 1989, Reverend Randolph served as the pastor of Tyree AME Church in Philadelphia, where he undertook extraordinary capital improvements to renovate the sanctuary. Reverend Randolph is also the founder, and organizer of Tyree's Older Adult Center, which has provided a countless number of seniors with an invaluable resource center.

Mr. Speaker, from 1989 to 1993, Reverend Randolph was the pastor of Zion, AME Church in Philadelphia. Presently, he serves as pastor of the Metropolitan AME Church in New York. In addition, Reverend Randolph still serves a congregation in Bermuda, and as chairman of the education committee and chaplain staff at Presbyterian Hospital. Reverend Randolph was elected as a delegate to the General Conference in 1971, and he continues to serve diligently in that capacity.

Mr. Speaker, Rev. David L. Randolph, Sr., has also been a major asset to our community. As a member of PUSH, the NAACP, and the New Direction Rehabilitation Center, just to name a few, Reverend Randolph has constantly dedicated his time and boundless energy to the betterment of our community.

I would like to ask my colleagues to rise and join me in paying our greatest tributes to Rev. David L. Randolph, Sr. I would also like to extend our warmest appreciation to Reverend Randolph's beloved wife Nancy, and their son, David, Jr. On behalf of the entire U.S. Congress, I would like to offer my greatest thanks and appreciation to Rev. David L. Randolph, Sr. May God continue to bless and smile on this truly great man.

A TRIBUTE TO DR. BRUCE LENSCH

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1993

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention the fine work and outstanding service of my very good friend, Dr. Bruce Lensch of Chino, CA. Bruce will be honored for his many years of service at a dinner in his honor later this year.

Bruce is one of those rare individuals who not only excels in his chosen profession but has given back a great deal to the community. He has provided a great deal of leadership in a number of church, school and service club projects, served as a city councilman, and initiated successful fundraising efforts for local charities through communitywide recreational events. In addition, Bruce founded and led the Chino Civic Authority, the agency responsible for the rebirth of the city's new civic center including the new civic buildings, courthouses, library and senior citizens' center.

Bruce is also very well known for his years of service promoting beneficial health legislation. For several decades, he has served the dental profession as either president or chairman of many local, State, and national organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me, our colleagues, Bruce's wife Audrey, and his many friends in honoring this outstanding man. His commitment, dedication and many years of service has enriched us all and our community. It is fitting that the House of Representatives recognize him for his contributions today.

A TRIBUTE TO BRUCE CHRISTENSEN, PRESIDENT OF MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD ASSOCIATION

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1993

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on July 16, 1993, the employees of Mare Island Naval Shipyard in Vallejo, CA, will say goodbye to Bruce Christensen as he retires after 35 years of Government service. But judging from his extensive community involvement, I am certain this will not be the last we see of this accomplished man. It gives me great pleasure to offer this special recognition of his contributions to his community and to this country.

Mr. Christensen began his career in Government service at the Mare Island Naval Shipyard in 1957, holding various engineering positions. Through his hard work and dedication, he became the shipyard's head nuclear engineer.

Throughout the years, Bruce Christensen has held many professional positions as well. He is the president of the National Association of Naval Shipyards and a former chairman of the Northern California Naval Civilian Employees Council.

Mr. Christensen's community service boasts a notable record of activities, including president of the Junior Chamber of Commerce, president of the California Junior Chamber of International Senators, member of the Vallejo Chamber of Commerce armed services committee, and currently a member of the Mare Island Helmsmen Toastmasters.

I had the honor of working with Bruce as members of the mayor of Vallejo's base closure steering committee in our advocacy of Mare Island Naval Shipyard during the base closure and realignment process. Throughout our fight to keep the shipyard open, Bruce, who was president of the Mare Island Naval Shipyard Association, acted as one of our strongest leaders, a valued counselor, and a stern defender of Mare Island's employees and their families. Bruce helped us deliver before the Defense Base Realignment and Closure Commission what one Commissioner described as the best presentation he has seen to date.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join his wife Sharon; his children Bruce, Mike, and Cathy; his grandchildren; and his friends in honoring this truly accomplished and dedicated man. Bruce Christensen has earned our deepest respect and admiration for his service to the U.S. Navy and the city of Vallejo.

I ask that my fellow Members of the House of Representatives join me in wishing Bruce Christensen the very best in his retirement. I know we will continue to hear from him and benefit from his future achievements.

JOSEPH A. ZODL WRITES BOOK REGARDING SMALL BUSINESSES

HON. SAM COPPERSMITH

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1993

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a book by a constituent of mine, Joseph A. Z odl, entitled "Export—Import: Everything You and Your Company Need to Know to Compete in World Markets." I recommend this book to you and to your small business constituents.

Mr. Z odl has written a much needed guide for small businesses interested in selling internationally. With the coming of the North American Free Trade Agreement and with the progress I hope to see from the Uruguay round of GATT, many small businesses will want and will need to add export and import. This book will make this transition easier for those businesses.

The globalization of international trade means every business must think about foreign markets. No longer can any business, no matter how small, write off exporting as too complicated or unnecessary. In his book, Mr. Z odl has explained and simplified marketing a product abroad, contacting and contracting with a potential distributor, setting up an order system, and creating a payment plan. With the aid of this easy-to-read, step-by-step approach, small businesses will have the information they must have to compete in the global economy.

VOLUNTARY PRICE INCREASES EXCEED INFLATION REPORTS BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1993

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, as part of their grassroots disinformation campaign, the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association [PMA] continues to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars on ads which attempt to convince Congress and the public that the drug price problem is under control. But the evidence continues to indicate the contrary.

Last month I noted that the PMA's ads refer to a price index which shows the retail price changes of 20 prescriptions which include dispensing fees and markups. Using this index they claim that drug price inflation for May is approximately equal to the general rate of inflation, as measured by the Consumer Price Index—Urban [CPI-U]. What they do not show is that drug price inflation in May 1993 was 4.5 percent as compared to the general rate of inflation of 3.2 percent. The index which measures manufacturers' drug price changes is the Producer Price Index [PPI] for pharmaceuticals. The table below compares the year-over-year changes in drug prices, general inflation and the difference between the two.

CHANGES IN INFLATION AND DRUG PRICES

[In percent]

	General inflation CPI-U	PPI-drug manufacturers price increases	Drug inflation exceeds CPI-U
From May 1992 to May 1993 ...	3.2	4.5	+1.3

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics calculates subindices of specific therapeutic groups of pharmaceutical products within the Producer Price Index. The table below presents the 1-year price increases in five major therapeutic categories. The table also shows the amount by which these increases exceeded general inflation in May 1993.

CHANGES IN PRICE FOR SPECIFIC THERAPEUTIC CATEGORIES

[In percent]

	Anal- gesics	Antiarrhythmics	Diabetes therapy	Diuretics	Muscle relaxants
Price up by	5.4	7.0	5.2	6.7	8.5
Exceeds CPI by	2.2	3.8	2.0	3.5	5.3

The straight facts indicate that pharmaceutical companies are continuing to increase their price voluntarily. To provide a fair balance for consumers, insurers, and manufacturers, I have proposed this creation of a Prescription Drug Prices Review Board. This Board would set reasonable limits on drug price increases and establish a mechanism for public review of new, excessive drug prices when necessary. To date, 30 of your colleagues have already cosponsored H.R. 916. I urge you to do the same.

AID EFFORTS IN THE FORMER SOVIET UNION

HON. NORMAN D. DICKS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1993

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely pleased to learn that the U.S. Government, through the Agency for International Development [AID], has enlisted the boundless creativity, technology, and capital resources of American agribusiness and agriculture in its foreign assistance response to New Independent States of the former Soviet Union [NIS].

The NIS Task Force of AID has designed and implemented an innovative public-private sector partnership for development that, using both public and private funds and resources, will engage American agribusiness and agriculture as catalysts for development—to help the peoples of the NIS move from communism to democracy and pluralism, from central planning to free and market-based economies. The name of this important public-private sector partnership for development? The Food Systems Restructuring Program.

Before I describe the specifics of the Food Systems Restructuring Program and particularly as they relate to my home State, Washington, let me compliment AID and their NIS Task Force for initiating such a dramatic and historic program, a program every bit as dramatic and historic as the events to which it re-

sponds. AID's NIS Task Force concluded, and rightly so I might add, that if it formed a collaborative partner relationship with American agribusiness, it could leverage the private sector's enormous ability, know-how, and resources to help AID address the truly enormous and daunting development challenges which exist in the NIS.

Mr. Speaker, I observe that the administration has repeatedly stated its support for a public-private sector partnership for development like the Food Systems Restructuring Program. Secretary of State Warren Christopher has said:

In an era in which economic competition is eclipsing ideological rivalry, it is time for diplomacy that seeks to assure access for U.S. businesses to expanding global markets. *** We must organize our foreign policy around the goal of promoting the spread of democracy and markets abroad.

And President Clinton added:

American jobs and prosperity are reason enough for us to be working at mastering the essentials of the global economy, but far more is at stake. For this new fabric of commerce will also shape global prosperity or the lack of it and with it the prospect of people around the world for democracy, freedom, and peace. *** we need to promote the steady expansion of growth in the developing world, not only because it's in our interest but because it will help them as well.

I fully agree with the President. A public-private sector partnership like the Food Systems Restructuring Program by promoting growth in the emerging democracies and economies of the NIS, therefore is in all Americans' interest, and consequently will help them—the peoples of the NIS—and us. The program will strengthen American agriculture and agribusiness, better position them in an increasingly competitive global market, and help them deliver American trade, investment, creativity, and capital to the NIS. And increased American trade and investment in the NIS will create jobs here in America, jobs for Americans. A 1992 Federal Reserve study found that more than the value of the dollar, the level of investment spending worldwide determines the level of U.S. exports (New York Times, 5/10/92). And more U.S. exports mean more jobs for American workers.

The Food Systems Restructuring Program will benefit the peoples of the NIS by transferring American know-how, trade, and investment—assistance which will in turn encourage democracy, economic empowerment, and social and political stability—exactly what the peoples of the NIS have said they want and need. They do not want more useless studies, more delegations, more consultants. They want American trade and investment. They want American private enterprise as joint venture partners.

But perhaps the biggest winner from a public-private sector partnership for development like the Food Systems Restructuring Program are the American people themselves, receiving from their highly leveraged taxpayer dollars more "technical assistance bang for the buck." And everyone indirectly benefits as the public-private sector foreign assistance partnership draws our countries, economies, and peoples closer together—encouraging economic growth and creating jobs and economic opportunity on both sides of the ocean.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to announce with special pride that a Seattle-based agribusiness, TPC Foods, Inc., has received from the Citizens Network for Foreign Affairs, one of the three implementors of the Food Systems Restructuring Program, a subgrant to assist in restructuring the Russian Far East food system.

What is the Citizens Network's Food Systems Restructuring Program? To begin, the Citizens Network created the Citizens Network Agribusiness Alliance [CNA] in 1991 to respond to the historic changes taking place in the former Soviet Union and bloc. The CNA is a consortium of over 150 major American agribusinesses, trade associations, farm and commodity organizations, and universities, representing the best agriculture infrastructure in the world.

The CNA's strategy is basically twofold: To directly employ American agribusinesses and enterprises in assisting the peoples of the NIS in the development of sustainable democracies and market-based agriculture economies, and to highlight the U.S. economic stake in expanding markets for American business and workers through the development of trade and investment linkages that benefit the economies of both the United States and the NIS.

AID asked the Citizens Network to engage its CNA agribusiness members' unsurpassed expertise and experience in the NIS through the Food Systems Restructuring Program. In response to an AID competitive request for applications [RFA], the Citizens Network put together a proposal which brought to bare the unparalleled resources and experience of 24 of America's leading international food and agribusiness companies, representing more than 30 years of experience in the former Soviet Union and an aggregate financial investment in the past 5 years alone of almost \$100 million. The Citizens Network proposal generated a pool of potential projects valued at more than \$700 million dollars, almost 75 percent of which would be directly financed by the American agribusinesses and their NIS joint venture partners.

The Citizens Network received a 4-year, \$44.5 million award from AID under the Food Systems Restructuring Program to provide subgrants to American agribusinesses and their NIS joint venture partners to help create efficient and effective food systems in the NIS. The CNA Food Systems Restructuring Program will have lasting impact on the economies and societies of the NIS by providing technical assistance and American know-how to break the bottlenecks in the food chain, and by increasing trade and investment in the NIS. The program addresses the areas of greatest need in the NIS: the post-harvest food system; that is, storage and handling, processing, distribution, communications, wholesale and retail marketing, banking and credit, and policy reform.

Back to my home State. TPC Foods and its Giant joint venture partners, will work to build a comprehensive and integrated market-driven, privately owned food system in the Primorski Krai. The project will fundamentally change the food industry in Russia by operating the first realistic model of a food system which, based on private ownership and American practices, is designed specifically for the

realities of Russia and to serve Russian consumers. For every \$1 of public funds, TPC Foods and its Russian partners will contribute almost \$4. TPC Foods has extensive experience in Russia, having worked in the Russian Far East for more than 2 years.

TPC Foods has a hard job ahead of it. The situation in the Russian Far East appears bleak. For want of an alternative to state subsidies several enterprises are going bankrupt and giving up on privatization entirely. In the short-term, the Giant joint venture will make the situation less bleak by hiring many Russians over the next several months and organizing a massive training effort through Giant University. The implementation of the TPC Foods project will provide substantial momentum toward privatization throughout the region's food system and will create a series of opportunities upon which regional government reform can capitalize.

The single most critical problem facing the NIS as it strives to adopt a democratic political system in a stable economy based on free market principles, is ensuring a steady supply of quality food to its people. The TPC Foods project will work to show the Russians positive and real examples of how a market economy improves peoples' lives—sorely needed to ensure the continuation of the political and economic reform process. It is therefore exceptionally critical that a functioning model of a comprehensive food system model be created to demonstrate visible results as soon as possible.

As a public-private sector partnership between AID and American agriculture and agribusiness, the CNAA Food Systems Restructuring Program, as exemplified by the TPC Foods project, represents an unprecedented effort to spark the creative involvement of the American private business sector in support of sustainable international development activities in the NIS. And Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by reiterating that based on all the evidence, based on good old American common sense, based on the axiom: always get the right person to do the job—I believe that a public-private sector partnership for development like the CNAA Food Systems Restructuring Program is indeed the brightest future of America's foreign assistance beyond the borders of the NIS, beyond the 20th century.

CONGRESS PAYS TRIBUTE TO
PAUL J. PROPER, SR., FORMER
SHERIFF OF COLUMBIA COUNTY,
NY

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1993

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I'd like all of you to join me today in honoring a special man.

First, I should ask what we can do for a man after he's had a building named after him, because that's what has happened to Paul J. Proper, Sr., former sheriff of Columbia County, NY.

In a recent ceremony, the Public Safety Building in Greenport was renamed in honor

of Mr. Proper, who spent 26 years in law enforcement and was elected to four terms as sheriff.

During his 13 years as sheriff, Mr. Proper sold the board of supervisors on a much-needed new jail and public safety building. He was also responsible for many organizational changes, such as bringing in competitive civil service exams and upgrading the department's in-service training program. His peers thought enough of him to make him president of the New York State Sheriff's Association.

Mr. Proper worked under two sheriffs, Dewey Lawrence and Frank Appleton, before getting the top slot himself. His successor, James Bertram, worked under Mr. Proper for 13 years. Sheriff Bertram is quick to credit his predecessor for turning over to him a well-organized department.

The Public Safety Building, completed in 1988, represents an increase to 120 jail cells from the old facility's 56 cells, and brought all departmental functions under one roof.

Columbia County previously had to farm out some of its prisoners to other counties. Now, the Columbia County actually generates revenues housing prisoners from other counties.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, if you know Paul Proper, and if you know his record and the impact he's had on local law enforcement, you would know that naming the Public Safety Building for him was the right thing to do. The building will serve as a fitting monument for one of the finest public servants I've ever met.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I would ask all Members to join me in adding our own tribute to Paul J. Proper, Sr., an outstanding figure in law enforcement, a great American, and a good friend.

HONORING JAMES LAROCCA

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1993

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my constituents on Long Island in honoring James L. Larocca, a most unique and effective individual who is retiring as president of the Long Island Association.

James Larocca has created over these many years a record of service that has expanded and enhanced the Long Island communities and its many residents. Early on in his law career, Mr. Larocca began an involvement with public service that grew into a model for effective leadership. He served as counsel to the vice-chairman of the National Commission on Water Quality, as well as counsel to New York's Gov. Hugh Carey in Washington, DC. Serving as New York State's first commissioner of energy, he chaired the State's Energy and Development Authority. Recognizing his distinct ability as a leader and innovator, Gov. Mario Cuomo, in 1983, appointed Mr. Larocca commissioner of transportation, where he spearheaded the \$1.25 billion Rebuild New York Program.

It was not long before the people of Long Island realized the tremendous capabilities possessed by Mr. Larocca, and he agreed to assume the presidency of the Long Island Asso-

ciation, the region's largest business and civic organization.

Jim Larocca's activities serve as a model for productive leadership and dedication to public improvement. He cochairs the New Long Island Partnership Inc. and is vice chairman of the Long Island Housing Partnership Inc. He is a member of the council of the State University at Stony Brook and a member of the Board of Visitors the Marine Science Research Center. In addition, he also serves as a member of the Governor's School-Business Alliance Task Force and the Long Island Business Development Council, as well as the Governor's Citizen Advisory Council on Bias.

In recognition of his many accomplishments and contributions, Mr. Larocca has received the American Society for Public Administration's Charles Evans Hughes award and the prestigious George M. Estabrook award from Hofstra University.

Mr. Speaker, as James Larocca moves on to enhance the field of law, I ask all the Members of the House of Representatives to join with me in paying homage to this truly exceptional citizen.

TRIBUTE TO PATRICK B. GILLESPIE

HON. LUCIEN E. BLACKWELL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1993

Mr. BLACKWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives to pay tribute to a man who has constantly dedicated his time and boundless energy to the cause of helping others. As the Philadelphia chapter of Unico National prepares to present their prestigious "Salute to Labor" Gold Medal Award to Mr. Patrick B. Gillespie, I would like to take a moment to reflect on the remarkable achievements of this outstanding individual.

As a 27-year veteran of Operating Engineers Local No. 542, Pat is now in his 11th year of service as the Philadelphia Building and Construction Trades Council's business manager. In this demanding capacity, Pat is charged with the responsibility of being the voice for approximately 130 business agents in the building and construction trades.

That position alone could certainly occupy the time and energy of an average person, but Mr. Speaker, Pat Gillespie is no average person. In addition to his work as business manager, Pat finds time to serve as vice-president of the Philadelphia AFL-CIO Council, cochairman of Built Rite, an executive committee member of Independence Blue Cross, and the Philadelphia Industrial Development Comm. just to name a few.

Pat Gillespie's service to his country and the great city of Philadelphia is unparalleled. As a former State representative, Pat was well respected for his outstanding legislative abilities, and his reputation for fighting for his constituents in Harrisburg. Pat has also been a member of the Greater Philadelphia First Corp., the Philadelphia Bar Association Foundation, and the Philadelphia Criminal Justice Comm.

Mr. Speaker, Pat Gillespie is also deeply involved in several charitable endeavors. The

Variety Club, Deborah Hospital, and the United Cerebral Palsy Association have all benefited from Pat Gillespie's giant and gracious heart. Pat has also been recognized for his renowned leadership abilities, receiving the Torch of Liberty Award from the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, and the 1991 Outstanding Labor Leader Award from Laborers Local 322 Friends of Labor.

Mr. Speaker, having had the good fortune to know Pat Gillespie for a great many years, I can personally attest to his outstanding leadership abilities, and his warm and giving personality. He is a friend whom you can always count on, and a confidant whom you can always trust. I would like to ask my colleagues to rise and join me in paying our greatest tributes to Mr. Patrick B. Gillespie. On behalf of the entire U.S. Congress, I would like to thank you Pat, for all of your unfailing years of dedicated service to the city of Philadelphia, and the United States of America.

COST OF GOVERNMENT DAY

HON. J. DENNIS HASTERT

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1993

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to the celebration of Cost of Government Day. It's hard to believe, but Americans must work until today, more than half of the year, to pay the combined costs of taxes, government spending, and regulation. Starting tomorrow, Americans can begin to work for themselves. The regulatory system imposed by the Federal Government is far too heavy-handed. A recent report states that total regulation costs for the average American family will run over \$8,000 a year. These hidden taxes are on everything from groceries to a haircut. The redtape burden is then compounded by the State and Federal taxes that they must pay.

Too often, it seems like those inside the beltway forget that American businesses—especially small business—create the jobs and products that drive our economy. And too often, the most well-intentioned regulations do nothing but create an expanding web of forms and paperwork.

It is time that we stop running Illinois business from Washington. It is time that we ease their burden so that they can, in turn, create jobs and get our economy growing again.

WHIRLPOOL AND ITS WORKERS ARE CONGRATULATED

HON. BART GORDON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1993

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Whirlpool Corp. for winning the \$30 million competition to develop a CFC-free super-efficient refrigerator. This competitive bid process was sponsored by the Super Efficient Refrigeration Program, Inc. [SERP], energy-efficient, ozone-friendly refrigerators.

Whirlpool won the environmental contest over 13 other companies that submitted bids. Whirlpool employees in my district in LaVergne, TN, as well as workers at Whirlpool plants in Benton Harbor, MI, Evansville, IN, and Fort Smith, AR, led the companywide effort which has resulted in development of a 22-cubic-foot, side-by-side refrigerator-freezer that not only exceeds the 1993 Federal energy efficiency requirements by 25 to 50 percent but also contains no ozone-damaging CFC's.

SERP is a nonprofit corporation comprised of 24 utilities, in collaboration with the Environmental Protection Agency, the Natural Resources Defense Council, the Electric Power Research Institute, and the American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy.

I applaud this type of market initiative that brings together government and business in cooperation rather than as adversaries. In the end, these kinds of partnerships can be a model for joint efforts to produce new industrial techniques and manufacturing processes that will maintain our Nation's role as the world's economic and technological leader.

The consumer is also the winner, since domestic electric bills will decrease while the refrigerator will provide all the latest design features, styles and conveniences at a cost comparable to current like-sized refrigerators.

I congratulate Whirlpool Corp. for its global leadership and most of all, I congratulate the workers who have once again shown that American ingenuity is the best in the world.

IN MEMORY OF PATRICK LIPPERT

HON. DAN GLICKMAN

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1993

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in sadness to share with my colleagues the death of a friend, not only of mine but of young people throughout this Nation. Patrick Lippert, the executive director of Rock the Vote, passed away yesterday. A young man, he was, nonetheless, a singularly powerful and effective force of change.

Under this tireless and remarkable leadership, Rock the Vote—a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization dedicated to encouraging young people to register and vote—metamorphosed into a singularly successful operation, giving young people a vote and a stake in their futures. The recent signing into law of the motor-voter bill was but one of Patrick's accomplishments. More generally, by soliciting the help of America's most popular young stars of film and music, Patrick made it cool for young people to register to vote and to take seriously the challenges facing this Nation.

This success was a direct result of Patrick's idealism, his passion, and his irresistible personality. Patrick had an energy and a charm that won him friends too numerous to count and a manner that made each of his friends feel that they were special and important. Of course, among Patrick's friends are some of the most well-known and successful people in the entertainment world. But, star status in itself did not matter to Patrick. What mattered

to Patrick was that they get involved in making this country a better place.

In fact, Patrick was personally responsible for taking many a young actor or actress by the hand and leading them into dedicated work on the environment or voter registration. But, when Patrick touched them, they were committed for life. They, in turn, would then work to get other young people involved.

Many of us in this body have participated in the Congressional High School Art Exhibition opening and have seen the excitement and sheer joy of winning art students in our districts who have had the opportunity to meet and have their pictures taken with Tom Cruise, Sarah Jessica Parker or Meg Ryan. What many of my colleagues do not know is that Patrick made this possible, to the extent that young actors would virtually compete to join these students in Washington—often flying across the country to do so.

Quite simply, Patrick had a magical quality, one that he put to use to empower young people, to make sure that they always knew that their lives and their voices counted.

Patrick's death is a loss, and I extend my deepest and most heartfelt condolences to his entire family. But, Patrick's legacy lives on, in the hand of that young man or woman—one of millions—who reaches out to cast his vote and says to himself or herself, "I make a difference."

SPENDING CUTS HAVE A WAY OF BEING FORGOTTEN

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1993

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of all my colleagues the following article by Ronald Reagan, which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on July 8, 1993. Former President Reagan has, in this article, once again reminded all of us why he was twice elected President, and why the Reagan era was a time of jobs, prosperity, and hope.

President Reagan reminds us of two big truths, one economic, one political. The economic truth is that we can't have jobs and economic growth unless we give investors the incentive to invest, and that incentive is lower marginal and capital gains tax rates. The big political truth, which some Democrats seem intent on relearning the hard way, is not to believe in congressional assurances of spending cuts in future budgets.

As Ronald Reagan says, at his age he lives by three rules: "Don't buy green fruit. Don't sign up for long-term magazine subscriptions. And don't believe in 'future spending cuts'."

The article follows:

HURRY UP AND WAIT

(By Ronald Reagan)

Anyone who's ever been in the military has heard the expression, "Hurry up and wait."

Although it won't admit it, the Clinton administration is telling the American people the same thing. Through its new tax-and-spend plans, it wants to "hurry up" with the tax increases—the largest in the 217-year history of this country. But as for the "spending cuts" that are supposed to offset the

taxes and reduce the deficit—well, we'll just have to wait . . . and wait . . . and wait. Much of the so-called deficit reduction through spending cuts isn't scheduled to take place until four or five years from now.

Take it from one who dealt with a Democrat-controlled Congress: Despite the "assurances," "promises," "pledges" and "commitments" you are given, the spending cuts have a way of being forgotten or quietly lobbied out of future budgets. But the tax increases are as certain to come as, well, death and taxes.

In 1982, Congress wanted to raise taxes. It promised it would cut federal spending by \$3 for every \$1 in new taxes. Being a new kid in town, I agreed to this. Unfortunately, although the taxes went into effect, Congress never cut spending by even a penny.

In the latest round, several key Democratic senators made it clear that the budget President Clinton lobbied through the House was too heavy on taxes and too light on spending cuts. They wanted to get closer to what the administration had first proposed but later reversed. That is, \$3 of spending cuts for every \$1 of new taxes. Sound familiar?

PROMISING START

The senators were off to a promising start when they decided to rid the budget package of the so-called BTU tax. This was to be a broad-based tax on all energy. It was the stealth bomber of taxes for, once passed, its rates could be gradually increased without the average taxpayer noticeably feeling the pinch. In the House, several industries and groups managed to exempt themselves from the tax, effectively turning it into a Swiss cheese tax—full of holes. The Senate Finance Committee was wise to knock it out entirely. They then stirred into the budget several new ingredients to take its place, but they forgot an essential one: economic growth.

Economic growth is created by people who produce things. The more that's produced to meet increasing demand, the more new jobs and services are created in turn. Other than short-term make-work projects, the government does not create jobs; the private sector does. How? By investing in new plants and equipment, and by researching and developing new products. And how does the private sector do all that? By having enough corporate profits to reinvest and enough incentives to make such expenditures desirable. What will they get from the Democratic Senate's budget bill? The opposite incentives: inhibitors to growth.

The main inhibitors are a capital-gains tax increase and higher income-tax rates on some of our most productive citizens. For example, the bill would raise the capital-gains rate of 30.8% from 28%. Who pays capital-gains taxes? Proponents of high rates paint a picture of wealthy coupon-clippers who have not been paying their "fair share." The real picture is very different. An important source of capital gains are investors who provide venture capital to promising high-tech start-up companies. This higher tax will discourage them from making such investments. Rather than turn over their funds by taking their gains and moving on to new investments, they will tend to hold on, waiting for an improved tax climate down the road. No new jobs there.

If anything, cuts in the capital-gains tax rate are in order. The last time this occurred, with passage of the Steiger Amendment in 1978, there was a very large increase the next year in the amount of venture capital available to new businesses. Alas, some

politicians, now as then, lack the courage and the realism to explain back home that it is necessary to let someone make a profit in order to create the pool of investment money that makes jobs.

What the White House has been camouflaging with its class warfare rhetoric is that a substantial portion (about 40 percent) of the nation's small businesses are taxed under the so-called "Subchapter S" provision of the tax code, by which corporate profits are paid at the individual rates of the owners. The income-tax increase will hit hard at these businesses, historically our greatest source of job creation.

As it is, not only capital-gains and individual income-tax rates will go up, but the corporate income tax will go up as well under the Clinton-Senate budget. And Social Security recipients who earn more than \$32,000 a year will have 85 percent of their long-ago-paid for benefits taxed. This is a disincentive for healthy, productive older people who want to work.

Basic economic behavior is not very complicated. If you give people incentives to invest, they'll do it. If you put obstacles in their way, they will either work around the obstacles or sit tight until these are removed.

Simply put, the Clinton administration seems to favor more government as the answer to stimulating the economy and reducing the deficit. To them, I ask this question: Apart from the defense and security of our country, how many cases can you name where the government has run a program or provided a service with greater efficiency than the private sector?

With regard to raising revenues, we've seen time and time again that increased taxes only result in decreased government revenues. Working people eventually reach a point when it just doesn't make economic sense to work a little harder or invest a little more of their money if the resulting income is only to be lost to higher taxes.

After witnessing the failed policies of its Democratic predecessors, I thought the Clinton administration would come up with something new. But, as the film "Jurassic Park" has shown us, some people are willing to go to great lengths to resurrect dinosaurs.

In the early 1980s we set out to create conditions that would expand the U.S. economy. We passed tax cuts across the board for every taxpayer. We eliminated income taxes altogether for lower-income citizens. All of this triggered a 92-month economic expansion, the longest peacetime boom in the nation's history. During that expansion some 19 million jobs and tens of thousands of new businesses were created. And the expanding economy increased federal revenues.

MISSING INCENTIVES

The other half of the successful growth mix of the 1980s—incentives—is virtually missing in the new budget. Indeed, the increased capital-gains, incomes and corporate taxes may result in job shrinkage and reduced investment in R&D and new companies. Both the original Clinton budget and the Senate Democrats' substitute seem to be based on the old lower-the-bridge theory. That obstructs economic flow. What we need to do instead is raise the river.

I urge the budget makers to take another, more realistic, look at the budgeting process. Each year's budget should stand or fall on its own. If there are to be tax increases, let's see the spending cuts the same year, not at some point down the road. Not only will such an approach add more honesty to the system, but it may also actually accomplish the goal of deficit reduction.

I hate to be impatient, but I've been around long enough to have doubts about spending cuts that won't be seen for five years, if ever. In fact, at my age, I live by three rules: Don't buy green fruit. Don't sign up for long-term magazine subscriptions. And don't believe in "future spending cuts."

CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM D. FORD
HONORS IVA L. MECKS

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1993

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this year we have placed a special emphasis on the importance of family. I rise today in recognition of Iva L. Mecks, one of my constituents, who has dedicated herself to serving the children and families of Wayne County, MI. This summer Iva is retiring after 25 years of devoted service from Out Wayne County Head Start.

Iva Mecks began her affiliation with Head Start in the summer of 1968 when she volunteered as a classroom assistant teaching creative dramatics for Westwood Head Start. That fall Westwood Head Start employed her as their parent coordinator. She spent the next 2 years there and in 1970 she joined the Out Wayne County Head Start staff as the grantee parent involvement coordinator. In this capacity she organized the first Head Start Policy Council. She continues to work closely with the policy council in her position today as grantee administrative assistant.

Iva Mecks has also been active in Head Start on the State level. As one of its original members, she has served as an officer for the Michigan Head Start Association. Mrs. Mecks was recognized for her exceptional contributions to Head Start at a Project Head Start 15th anniversary celebration at the White House.

She devotes her spare time to her husband, six children, five grandchildren, and even one great-grandchild. She also sews wedding gowns, bridesmaids' dresses, and Easter suits and enjoys baking and decorating cakes for all occasions, especially wedding cakes. She is an active member of the Second Grace United Methodist Church. Iva sings in the Wesleyan Choir and performs biblical dances. Upon her retirement on August 31, 1993, she plans to open an art and drama school for children.

Iva Mecks exemplifies the meaning of dedication and family. She has touched a countless number of lives in her 25 years of service. She is always discovering new ways to celebrate and encourage family and is a continuing inspiration to us all.

INTRODUCTION OF LAND TRANSFER LEGISLATION

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1993

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, Representative HERGER and I are introducing today legislation

which will facilitate a land transfer in northern California. This land transfer will allow the Bureau of Land Management [BLM] to add a critical piece of property to the Gene Chappie/Shasta OHV Area.

The intent of this legislation is to allow a parcel of land which was acquired by the Forest Service to be exchanged by BLM in order to achieve the land exchange. The Forest Service land is an isolated tract which was acquired for the Delta Point Lookout on April 20, 1936, under the Emergency Civil Works Act of March 31, 1933. The lookout is no longer needed, and was removed from the parcel, returning the land to its former unimproved status.

The Forest Service parcel is entirely surrounded by private lands, which are owned by the Cibula family of northern California. Consequently, the Cibulas have long been interested in acquiring this parcel. By the same token, the Cibula family owns the parcel of land sought by BLM for purposes of expanding the Gene Chappie/Shasta OHV Area. The Cibulas will consider giving up their parcel only if they can obtain the Forest Service parcel their property surrounds. They will not accept a cash transaction, nor will they accept other offered lands. Therefore, the only apparent way for BLM to acquire the parcel for the OHV area is to be able to offer the Cibulas the land acquired by the Forest Service.

Although the Forest Service is fully willing and cooperative in the effort, under existing legal authorities the Forest Service is authorized to dispose of the acquired parcel only in return for lands which become part of the National Forest System. Since the Cibula parcel is needed for a BLM public domain project, there is no apparent way to achieve the shared goals of the Forest Service, BLM, and the Cibulas under existing law.

The legislation Representative HERGER and I are introducing today will allow the Cibulas to work with the two Federal agencies in order to work out the mutually agreeable transaction: the Cibulas will receive the Forest Service parcel in exchange for their family parcel, which will be received by BLM.

His legislation does not require the exchange to take place; it merely allows the parties to proceed should terms agreeable to BLM, the Forest Service, and the Cibulas be established. Our legislation also recognizes all the Federal legal requirements for land exchanges.

Mr. Speaker, our legislation should not be controversial; it merely serves as a mechanism in order to allow BLM, the Forest Service, and a private citizen to exchange properties to the advantage of all concerned, including the Federal Government. It is our hope that this legislation receives an early hearing and is soon considered by the House.

LACK OF FUNDING FOR NED—A SETBACK FOR DEMOCRACY

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1993

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, the cause of democracy recently suffered a setback with a

vote of the House of Representatives to eliminate funding for the National Endowment for Democracy. As I argued at the time, NED is a cost effective addition to the U.S. Government's support for democratic institution building around the world. As an independent organization, NED is able to reach areas to which our Government may not have access. The kind of people-to-people programs sponsored by NED are aimed at developing indigenous expertise to support democratic institutions. This foundation provides the stability necessary to sustain the major economic, social, and political reforms being undertaken in several countries.

There are many others who recognize the significant service that NED provides on behalf of our national democratic values.

The New York Times column of July 13, 1993, by A.M. Rosenthal articulating the value of funding the National Endowment for Democracy follows:

CAN IT BE HAPPENING?

(By A.M. Rosenthal)

Iraqis fighting Saddam Hussein say one American organization in particular helps keep alive their hopes that democracy has a chance in their country. China's dissidents, at home or in exile, know and bless its name—the National Endowment for Democracy.

So do veterans of Polish Solidarity and the Czech freedom movement. They are emotional in their thanks for past aid and passionate in their hope that other freedom fighters facing their own make-or-break years will get the help they did.

What they got was a little money and a lot of political comradeship. The money went for things like presses, books and pamphlets to spread about in lands parched for information and free thought, new political groups for labor and women, observers to watch out for election fraud—basic sustenance. The comradeship came in visits to America, to talk with working people and intellectuals like them, and in the knowledge that they would be remembered not just at time of crisis, but all the time.

From its beginning in 1983 the N.E.D. had the support of the President in office—Reagan, Bush, Clinton. Both major political parties are strong for it, as are the A.F.L.-C.I.O. and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

The Clinton Administration even asked for an increase in its budget—from about \$30 million to \$50 million. The Administration, and the leaders of both parties, figured that in tight times the N.E.D. was one of the best political and ethical bargains in the budget.

So in response to the achievements of the organization, the sweeping political bipartisanship, the backing of labor and business, the gratitude and hope of freedom fighters past and present, the House of Representatives voted to wipe out the whole thing.

When I heard that I thought there must be some mistake—not the N.E.D., for Heaven's sake. But there it is in the Congressional Record for June 22—all N.E.D. money eliminated by a vote of 243 to 181 on a motion by Representative Paul E. Kanjorski, Democrat of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Kanjorski got right to the heart of it. What else could it mean but conspiracy, an "unholy alliance," when so many important groups, Democratic and Republican, labor and management, support the same organization?

The statesman-sleuth figured it out. Instead of having to go through the Federal

bureaucracy, the N.E.D. is allowed by law to distribute its money through allied American foundations and directly to foreign democrats—openly, audited by the U.S. Government all along the line. Ah, cries Mr. Kanjorski, the political, business and labor big shots love the N.E.D. because they help decide how the money is spent.

Anyway, he wants to know, who needs it with the Berlin wall fallen? Mr. Kanjorski wanted to kill the N.E.D. before the wall even cracked but I can't find that in his speech.

The story has meaning, and danger, beyond even the fate of the N.E.D. Mr. Kanjorski won with the help of first-term members—the majority of freshmen Democrats and Republicans.

What were they saying? That democracy is none of our business? That democracy now has a free ride? That the U.S. was interested only in defeating Communism and did not and does not give one damn what follows after—Fascism, militarism, chaos, democracy, makes no difference to us? Can they be that cynical, those who voted for the execution of N.E.D.? Or was it that they really did not know exactly what the N.E.D. was, or who those foreigners were: today's Walesas and Havel's?

In the Senate the N.E.D. will have a chance to get its budget restored. If that fails, the loss will be to America and to millions of people who still believe we care for their freedom, at least enough to maintain one of the smallest publicly funded organizations in Washington.

Letters are coming in from the endangered species of democrats—from Burmese suffering under a military junta, from Kurds, from the Caribbean and Africa, from an Iraqi writer, from Serbian democrats, from the former President of Lithuania, from Chinese in exile. All say what the N.E.D. means to people like them, and plead it be saved.

This is my own letter, to my Senators. Please write or phone yours now. Otherwise, we are Kanjorskis.

MOST-FAVORED-NATION STATUS FOR ROMANIA

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1993

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, Romania is in the midst of great reform. Democracy has taken root in this formerly communist country and continues to flourish. Romania's progress in economic, social and foreign policy has been admirable. It is time that we acknowledge Romania's progress. It is time to consider most favored trade status for Romania.

Romania's political system continues its transition towards democracy. The recent election provide that opposition politics are alive and well in Romania. Over 18 political parties—including one which represented the political interests of Romania's Hungarian minority—united under the banner of the Democratic Convention during the recent elections. According to staff of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, who visited Romania in the fall of 1992, those elections were free and fair. Additionally, human rights have been bolstered in Romania with the Jewish and Hungarian minorities being allowed greater freedom. The most troubling problems to many in

the West is the plight of the thousands of orphans as a result of past government policy. The Romanian Government has pursued a remedy to this situation and recently passed a law which should ease the restriction on foreigners try to adopt Romanian orphans.

Economically, Romania has moved decidedly toward freer market. The government has embarked on land reform and economic privatization of state assets. Romanian investment laws have been amended to allow for greater foreign investment and to encourage joint ventures. The Romanian Government has also made inroads toward diminishing, and in some instances, eliminating state subsidies. These reforms, however, have had negative consequences for the quality of life of the Romanian people. It is in our interest and the interests of Romania that we renew our ties to this emerging democracy.

The vast majority of U.S. trading partners enjoy MFN status, including most new democracies of Eastern Europe. Extending MFN would send a signal to Romania indicating United States support for Romania's economic, political, and cultural reforms. Romania holds the promise of becoming a thriving economy in this rapidly developing corner of the globe. Prior to 1987 United States trade with Romania was robust and United States businesses will be the beneficiary of a newly developing Romanian economy. Romania is in the midst of transition and the United States' interests can be served through extending most favored trade status to Romania.

CARLISLE TOWNSHIP FIRE DEPARTMENT CELEBRATES 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. SHERROD BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1993

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the accomplishments of the Carlisle Township Fire Department, on the occasion of their 50th anniversary.

Thanks to the great foresight of trustees Walter Hadaway, Carl Diedrick Sr., H.H. Druesendahl; and clerk, George Robson, the Carlisle Township Fire Department was founded in March 1942. Seeing that the city of Elyria could no longer supply adequate fire protection for the township, the late Harold Bruce was appointed by the trustees to head the effort to form a township fire department.

Chief Bruce began to train men at the old West Carlisle Schoolhouse. Soon, however, it became apparent that this building would not accommodate the needs of the department. It was necessary to add an additional wing onto the building in order to house the two firetrucks. Carlisle Township was the first township in Lorain County to have its own full-time, 24-hour fire department. Dedicated volunteer firemen took turns manning the station at night and on weekends.

The department's first recorded fire call was on July 17, 1943, just 17 days after being organized. A barn was struck by lightning on the B.J. Squires farm at the corner of routes 301 and 10. Even with the fire breaking out when

most of the firemen were already home for the evening, the department was able to save the barn which was situated just 20 feet away from a larger cattle barn. The newly organized fire department had passed its first test. They have proven their worth many times since that first call 50 years ago.

As of June 1, 1993, the Carlisle Township Fire Department has responded to 4,885 calls. These calls have been answered under the leadership of only two fire chiefs, the late Harold E. Bruce, Sr., and the present chief, Raymond R. Hildebrandt.

Through the hard work and dedication of many people, Carlisle Township now has four full-time firemen and 30 volunteers. These individuals, as well as all past members of the department, should be commended for their efforts; they have contributed much, and have helped the lives of many. Please join me in saluting those who have served the Carlisle Township Fire Department.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding citizen from my district, Mr. Donald Simms, as he celebrates over 50 years of service to the Carlisle Fire Department.

Appointed as a volunteer firefighter on June 21, 1943, Mr. Simms became one of the charter members when the Carlisle Fire Department was organized on July 1, 1943.

Mr. Simms was promoted to lieutenant in 1949, and was elevated to the position of captain in 1958. He is the only original charter member who is still active in the department today. On January 1, 1971, Mr. Simms was promoted to assistant chief, the position he still holds today.

Throughout his 50 years of service, Mr. Simms has been involved in every major project attempted by the department. Appointed as a training officer for Carlisle Fire Department, Mr. Simms has played a part in the training of every firefighter currently in the department. In addition Mr. Simms served as an instructor in firefighting techniques for the North Central Fireman's Association.

Having 50 years of firefighting skills and experience, Mr. Simms has been involved in many worthwhile programs. It was Mr. Simms' insight in fire safety which led to the procurement of a fire safety house for the North Central Fireman's Association. This house is used to teach schoolchildren the correct behavior in case of a fire in the home.

Mr. Simms is an invaluable asset to the Carlisle Fire Department. His contributions have been great, and his commitment exemplary. It is an honor to have someone of his caliber living in my district. Please join me in saluting Mr. Simms for his many accomplishments.

LETTER OF SUPPORT FOR THE CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL ACT OF 1993

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1993

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, there is an enormous need in this Nation for available and suitable organ donors. Currently, there are

more than 26,400 individuals waiting for organ transplants in the United States and thousands more awaiting tissue transplantation. A new name is added to the national patient waiting list approximately every 20 minutes. Last year alone, more than 2,500 adults and children died while awaiting a transplantation.

On February 18, I introduced H.R. 1012, the Gift of Life Congressional Medal Act of 1993 to increase awareness of the donor shortage and to effectively encourage such donation. The "Gift of Life" medal would be awarded to individual donors or their families in recognition of the courage it took to provide a stranger with the most precious gift imaginable—life.

I urge my colleagues to help generate additional donors and honor those who have donated by cosponsoring H.R. 1012, the Gift of Life Congressional Medal Act. I would also like to share with my colleagues a letter I received from the son of an organ transplant recipient. I believe his letter does a fantastic job of explaining why the "Gift of Life" medal is needed and worthy of your support.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STARK: Thank you for your efforts on behalf of transplant donors. I feel the gift of life medals to honor donor families would be a wonderful tribute to the memory of their loved one and the strength of the family.

In April of 1991, my mother received a liver transplant at the University of Wisconsin. The liver was the most precious gift imaginable. Mom is doing great, and dotes on her first grandchild, born in October of 1992. The transplant gave her the opportunity to see and love that child. At the time of her surgery, there were seven people in the hospital that received organs from one donor . . . kidneys, liver, corneas, pancreas and more! It was a miracle, but probably a tough decision for the donor's family. I wish there were a way to thank them.

The Gift of Life medals would be a terrific way to express the gratitude of the recipients families. It's funny how you don't really think about organ donation until it happens to someone you love. The medals would be proof that heroes don't always have to save children from burning buildings or foil a bank robbery. A hero is also the one who gave a precious gift . . . or the family who made the decision to help others. Again, thank you, Congressman Stark, and best of luck in your efforts to make the Gift of Life medals legislation a reality.

JUSTICE DELAYED IS JUSTICE DENIED

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1993

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak for those employees whose rights have not yet been addressed. I am speaking of a group of hardworking Food Lion supermarket employees. Our Government has failed to protect them from an abusive employer, and our Government has been unresponsive in bringing the violator to justice.

As Chairman of the House Government Operations Subcommittee on Employment and Housing during the last several Congresses, I conducted an extensive investigation of Food

Lion which uncovered widespread and blatant violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act. At these hearings we heard testimony by employees who worked as many as 30 hours of overtime a week without pay. The Department of Labor conceded it had had significant problems in enforcing the Fair Labor Standards Act and revealed that it had found substantial overtime and child labor violations at Food Lion. The Department of Labor's investigation of Food Lion found over 1,400 child labor violations which was the largest number for which a single employer has been cited.

Eight months ago, Food Lion agreed to waive the statute of limitations for all wage and hour law violations involved in the Food Lion investigation. This was intended to allow the Department of Labor and Food Lion to reach an acceptable settlement while preserving the potential value of employees claims against Food Lion. On May 6 of this year, the Department of Labor extended the waiver for another 3 months. Because of this second extension, thousands of current and former Food Lion workers are no closer to receiving the wages legally owed them.

Labor Department officials assured Congress that they were preparing to take action. And yet, to date we have seen only bureaucratic delays. I want to emphasize, however, that my concern is not directed at the new Secretary of Labor. The Bush administration's Labor Department failed to act and stonewalled on this case and, unfortunately, that tired bureaucratic mentality continues today.

Mr. Speaker, employers like Food Lion should not be permitted to continue to willfully violate our labor laws with impunity. The Labor Department has determined Food Lion to be in violation of our labor laws in hundreds of cases over the years. And in the face of the Labor Department's conclusions, Food Lion's reaction has been one of denial. Instead of admitting to their unscrupulous and unlawful labor policies and seeking solutions, they have blamed everyone else but themselves including the media, Congress, and even the aggrieved workers themselves.

For hundreds of Food Lion employees, justice delayed is justice denied. We have had enough of bureaucratic delays. I urge my colleagues to join me in calling on the Department of Labor to conclude this investigation without further delay. The Department of Labor's nonaggressive enforcement policy and Food Lion's continued delaying tactics only serve to shortchange American workers of the legal protection and wages to which they are entitled under the law.

COMMEMORATING THE CENTURY
COUNCIL'S SECOND ANNIVERSARY

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1993

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, the key to reducing the number of fatal alcohol related crashes is to have tough antidrunk driving laws on the books, to make sure the public is aware of those laws, and to ensure that those laws are swiftly and effectively enforced.

In my home State, the Nebraska State Legislature recently enacted an administrative license revocation [ALR] law, which permits a police officer immediately to seize the license of a driver whose blood alcohol content exceeds the legal limit or who refuses to take a blood alcohol content test.

Many Nebraskans, including Mothers Against Drunk Driving and the Nebraska Department of Motor Vehicles, helped make this law possible. A special role, however, was played by the Century Council, a not-for-profit organization dedicated to reducing alcohol abuse across the United States. The council hired a skilled advocate to persuade the Nebraska Legislature to move on the bill. The council also underwrote, with the Nebraska Department of Motor Vehicles, a series of public service announcements that more than doubled public awareness of the new law in the weeks before it took effect.

For the past 2 years, the Century Council has been working in support of ALR laws and other effective responses to the problems of drunken driving and underage drinking. The council's efforts are underwritten by over 500 concerned companies in the licensed beverage industry. This Member congratulates the Century Council on its second anniversary, and urges the council and its underwriters to keep up the good work.

A MAGNIFICENT POINT OF LIGHT
FOR HEALTH CARE: DR. DONALD
J. SCHERL, PRESIDENT, THE
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW
YORK HEALTH SCIENCE CENTER
AT BROOKLYN

HON. MAJOR R. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1992

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Donald J. Scherl is a dedicated health professional who was and has been a man ahead of his time. His insight into providing quality health care for the country and more importantly Brooklyn, NY, has distinguished him as an expert in the field of clinical and basic science research. As a trailblazer, Dr. Scherl has been a pioneer in defining new and creative ways to educate and train health care professionals in handling and understanding the special concerns and needs of women and children with AIDS.

Dr. Donald J. Scherl was appointed president of the SUNY Health Science Center in May, 1981. Throughout his tenure, Dr. Scherl has worked diligently to redefine the role of the center and its relationship to the people in the surrounding community. As a research scientist, he has received national prominence by bringing much needed attention to the importance of clinical research and thus attracting, over the years, a number of noted expert physicians from around the country to Brooklyn.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that since Dr. Scherl's appointment, external research funding has grown 100 percent and enrollment at the center in Ph.D. programs is the highest in over a decade. Enrollment in all center academic programs reflect Dr. Scherl's commitment to educating minority students for

health science careers. The newly built \$52 million Health Science Education Building—the latest symbol of the center's renewed vitality—is one of the most sophisticated health education facilities in the country.

Before coming to Brooklyn, Dr. Scherl was associate professor and acting chairman of the Harvard University Department of Psychiatry at the Children's Hospital Medical Center and served as Massachusetts Undersecretary of Human Services.

Dr. Scherl, who received his M.D. from Harvard, is active both nationally and locally in numerous medical organizations, foundations, and task forces. He is president of the Greater New York Hospital Association, a trustee of the Hospital Association of New York State, has just completed a term as chairman of the Association of Academic Health Center's Task Force on Health Promotion and Disease Prevention, and is a member of the editorial board of the Archives of General Psychiatry. He currently serves the American Psychiatric Association as chairman of the budget committee and of the work group on the relative value scale after having chaired the council on economic affairs for 4 years.

Mr. Speaker, the master plan for the improvement of health care in America must develop many components. At the heart of his great effort we must not forget to recognize the vital role of the medical profession. In addition, to the professional contributions of doctors, we must also welcome their general social wisdom. It is an honor to salute Dr. Donald J. Scherl a magnificent point of light for health care.

TRIBUTE TO FRANK MARES

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1993

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, significant progress has been made in recent years toward creating new areas of economic opportunity for Americans with disabilities. In my home State of Colorado, the Department of Rehabilitation Services has been in the forefront of this national effort, and a prime example of this leadership was recently brought to my attention through an article published in the Career College Times.

Under the headline, "Blind Student Prepares for Court Reporting Career," this article tells the story of Frank Mares, a musician currently enrolled in the Denver Academy of Court Reporting. Blind since birth, Mr. Mares plans on graduation to work as a court reporter, a career made possible by the great technological strides now being made in that profession.

Mr. Speaker, the story of Frank Mares that follows is both inspirational and instructive:

Frank Mares worked for some 20 years as a professional musician in the Denver area. But recently he decided it was time to seek retraining in another field, and eventually he enrolled in the Denver Academy of Court Reporting in Denver, CO.

Mares, who has been blind since birth, demonstrates the importance of electronic technology, as well as motivation, in career accessibility. (He was also born deaf, but his

hearing was restored when he was 2 years old.)

Court reporting was just one of the options provided by the Colorado Department of Rehabilitation Services, Mares says. He is currently enrolled in a three-year course at the Denver institution.

"I really enjoy school," he emphasizes. "I didn't just stumble into this field; I chose it because it combines keyboards with law. I've always enjoyed law, and my years as a musician mean I'm familiar with keyboards."

Although one might think eyesight is a requirement for court reporting, as the reporter may be asked to read back from a transcript, Mares cites current technology that helps him to do the job as well as a sighted person. He has a Braille navigator, which converts his computer or Stenograph input into a Braille printout. The only concern he mentions is making sure the reporter receives descriptions of exhibits, which he cannot see as they are presented during the proceeding.

On the down side, Mares says court reporting is probably the only career where a Braille navigator must be used instead of a speech synthesizer, which converts input into audible form. The problem is that listening to depositions and court proceedings is central to the reporter's work, so additional sound would interfere.

Mares points to both the stresses and the rewards of the court reporting course. "It's a very hard school to go to, but the school is much harder than the job will be," he says. Students must be able to transcribe up to 225 words per minute to be eligible for graduation, while normal speech is only 125-150 words per minute.

Upon graduation, Mares plans to work free-lance as a court reporter so he can also continue his musical career.

GOOD CAP, BAD CAP

HON. MICHAEL A. ANDREWS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1993

Mr. ANDREWS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in today's issue of the Washington Post, Alain C. Enthoven, professor of management at Stanford University Graduate School of Business, writes that a tax cap which merely limits the range of employee health benefits is a bad idea. He argues that restraining health care prices requires a tax cap that ends the unlimited tax subsidies for the choice of a health plan regardless of its cost. I commend the following op ed to my colleagues:

GOOD CAP, BAD CAP

(By Alain C. Enthoven)

The main reason health care costs are soaring is that practically all the incentives in the field reward decisions to increase cost. Fee-for-service payment encourages doctors and hospitals to choose the most costly method of treatment. Meanwhile, insured patients have little or no reason to care about the costs.

Health system reform isn't going to be effective unless we get the basic economic incentives right—that is, unless we let people keep for themselves the savings that result from their economical choices.

Many employers offer employees a choice of plans and pay the full cost of any plan the employees choose, in part because it is tax-

free to the employee, without limit. This practice deprives employees of the reward for choosing the less costly health care plan. Worse yet, it deprives the health plans of any incentive to cut cost and price. In fact, the incentive provided by this practice is for the low-cost plans to raise premiums to just below the most expensive level (a practice known as "shadow pricing").

The best answer to this problem is for employers to offer their workers choices that include the most efficient HMOs, and then contribute toward the employee's purchase of coverage only as much as it costs to subscribe to these lowest-priced plans. This makes employees responsible for paying the difference if they want a plan with a higher premium. It gives employees motivation to seek the best value for the money, and health plans an incentive to try to provide it.

Unfortunately, there is a provision in the Internal Revenue Code that cuts the effectiveness of this responsible policy in half. Let me use my employer, Stanford University, as an example.

Stanford offers families a choice among four health plans, including Kaiser Permanente, the lowest-priced, at about \$420 per month, and the Blue Shield Preferred Provider plan at about \$520. Under the terms of Section 125 of the Internal Revenue Code, the employee who wants to choose the Blue Shield plan can ask Stanford to reduce his or her salary by the \$100 premium difference and to pay the premium for the employee with pre-tax dollars.

The effect of this is that the additional cost to the employee of the higher-priced plan is only about \$50 per month in net-after-tax income. (The precise tax saving will depend on the employee's specific circumstances, but 50 percent is a pretty good approximation for large numbers of people.) Where does the other \$50 come from? From tax remission, of course, which will contribute about \$70 billion this year to the federal government's revenue loss.

This provision is in effect a heavy tax on health care cost containment. The family that chooses the cheaper Kaiser plan, by not taking advantage of the larger tax break that goes with choosing Blue Shield, will pay \$50 per month more in taxes than the family that picks Blue Shield. In a nation desperate for health care cost containment, it makes no sense to tax it.

The most destructive aspect of this situation is the effect it has on the incentive of the least costly plan to reduce further its cost and price. The tax code cuts in half the health plan's marketplace reward (i.e., more subscribers) for restraining price. No wonder we don't see enough price restraint.

The cure for this perverse incentive is a cap on the employee's tax break, set at amounts (for individual, couple and family coverages) that do not exceed the prices of the lowest-priced plan that meets quality and coverage standards ("the good cap"). Employers must be required to make fixed-dollar contributions that do not vary with choice of plan. It would make sense to adjust the tax cap for health costs or wage levels in each region. Employer cost savings could be passed on to employees through wages.

The same tax break for health insurance should be extended to the self-employed, to workers whose employers do not provide coverage, to pre-Medicare retirees—in short, to individuals who currently buy coverage with after-tax dollars.

A reasonable version of such a cap might save the federal budget some \$20 billion a

year. Without it, the budget's revenue loss will continue to grow rapidly. This saving would be an excellent source of funds to subsidize coverage for the poor. The "good cap" corrects health incentives and raises revenue without raising the marginal income tax rates.

Under one proposal floated recently by the administration (I call it the "bad cap"), employees could have—to use the Stanford example again—either the \$420 Kaiser plan or the \$520 Blue Shield plan tax-free, provided both covered no more than the federally specified benefits package. Ironically, under this concept, if the Kaiser plan passed on some of its economies in the form of benefits better than the federally specified package—such as more extensive home care—employer contributions to it would be taxable!

The bad cap simply does not address the incentives problem. With no tax cap or "the bad cap," states will not be able to do managed competition effectively. The federal government would continue to be in the way, taxing efficient choices, subsidizing wasteful choices.

To achieve good policy, the president must be willing to fight for a plan that gets the basic incentives right. A consensus favoring an ineffective program might be a short-term political success, but it would be a long-run economic failure.

TRIBUTE TO THE STARS AND STRIPES

HON. CHRISTOPHER COX

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1993

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, my friend and constituent, Dr. Jo Ellen Allen, recently brought to my attention this moving and eloquent tribute to the Stars and Stripes.

In light of the recent nationwide celebration in honor of our Nation's birthday, I wish to share it with my colleagues.

MY NAME IS OLD GLORY

(By Don Miller)

I am the flag of the United States of America. My name is Old Glory. I fly atop the world's tallest buildings. I stand watch in America's halls of justice. I fly majestically over great institutes of learning. I stand guard with the greatest military power in the world.

Look up! And see me! I stand for peace—honor—truth—and Justice. I stand for freedom. I am confident—and I am arrogant and proud.

When I am flown with my fellow banners my head is a little higher. My colors a little truer. I bow to no one. I am recognized all over the world. I am honored—I am saluted—I am respected—I am revered—I am loved, and I am feared.

I have fought every battle of every war for more than 200 years: Gettysburg, Shilo, Appomattox, San Juan Hill, the trenches of France, the Argonne Forest, Anzio, Rome, the beaches of Normandy, the Deserts of Africa, the cane fields of the Philippines, the rice paddies and jungles of Guam, Okinawa, Japan, Korea, Viet Nam and scores of places long forgotten by all those who were with me. I was there. I led my soldiers—I followed them, I watched over them. They love me. I was on a small hill in Iwo Jima. I was dirty, battle worn and tired, but my soldiers cheered me, and I was proud.

I have been soiled, burned, torn and trampled on the streets of countries I have helped to set free. It does not hurt, for I am invincible. I have been soiled, burned, torn and trampled on the streets of my own country, and when it is by those whom with I have served in battle—it hurts, but I shall overcome—for I am strong.

I have slipped the bonds of earth and stand watch over the uncharted new frontiers of space from my vantage point on the moon.

I have been a silent witness to all of America's finest hours. But my finest hour comes when I am torn into strips to be used for bandages for my wounded comrades on the field of battle, when I fly at half mast to honor soldiers, and when I lie in trembling arms of a grieving mother at the graveside of her fallen son. I am proud my name is Old Glory. Long may I wave. Dear God—long may I wave.

RUSSIAN AID

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1993

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to a piece that has just been published by the Center for Security Policy. The article shows how the recent Russian aid package that we just passed here in the House may be contributing to the perpetuation of imperialistic tendencies in Moscow.

As you know, on June 25, Russia cut off gas supplies to Estonia, just 1 day after President Yeltsin compared Estonia's citizenship laws to apartheid. Mr. Speaker, we all know this is poppycock. While we may not agree entirely with Estonian laws, the notion of massive human rights violations of Russians, as Moscow claims, is preposterous. Virtually every international rights-monitoring group, including our own Helsinki Commission staff, has verified this.

What worries me, Mr. Speaker, is that a large part of the administration's aid package, which we endorsed wholesale, is in the form of direct assistance to Russia's oil and gas sector. Not only does this not make economic sense, as we are propping up an archaic state-owned industry, it also allows Russia to wield its energy weapon against helpless republics like Estonia.

Russia's action, even though they have apparently resumed gas deliveries, also underscores the futility of another of the administration's aid ideas, that of building houses for Russian soldiers returning from the Baltics. President Yeltsin's recent statements about Estonia, as well as his remarks at Vancouver, can leave no doubt whatsoever that the real reason for the slow Russian pullout from the Baltics is to exert political pressure on Estonia and Latvia, and not a supposed housing shortage in Russia.

The Soviets got out of Afghanistan, Vietnam, and most of Eastern Europe without us building houses for their soldiers. Are we to believe that just now, with only 40,000 Baltic troops to go, they just suddenly ran out of apartments? Housing is a big problem in Russia, but that is too much to believe for me.

Besides, where is the reform in this proposal? Where is the freedom? In addition to

being tantamount to ransom, in addition to being based on a false premise, it is just another statist idea. It is just more public housing, and public housing has been a resounding failure in Russia. It is just more central planning. These soldiers will not even get to choose where they will live. The Russian Government, like it has for decades, will decide.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that when this bill comes to conference, we will do the right thing and kill some of these aid proposals. Any program that involves government-to-government aid, any program that props up state-owned industries, any program which pays ransom to get the Russians to retrench, and any program that allows Russia to bully its neighbors should be ripped out of the bill and forbidden by Congress. They will all be a waste of money and may even do much harm. We owe the taxpayers, the Estonians, the Russians, and all of the former Soviet people no less.

I thank the Speaker for the time and would like to insert the brief from the Center for Security Policy into the RECORD.

HARBINGER OF THINGS TO COME? RUSSIAN ENERGY SECTOR IMPOSES BOYCOTT ON ESTONIA AFTER GETTING U.S. AID

WASHINGTON, D.C.—With the world's attention squarely focussed over the weekend on the U.S. strike against Saddam Hussein's intelligence facilities, President Boris Yeltsin conducted a strike of his own: He abruptly halted natural gas supplies to Estonia—a move eerily reminiscent of the 1990 energy blockade imposed on the Baltic states by then-Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev.

This declaration of economic war followed a 24 June threat by Yeltsin that Russia "has possibilities to remind" Estonians of "some geopolitical and demographic realities." The reason: Russian nationalists' agitation over alleged mistreatment of fellow Russians at the hands of majority populations in Estonia (and other former Soviet republics). In a statement issued by his press office, Yeltsin said "It must be understood that Russia cannot remain a disinterested observer if the ethnic Russian population were to show a natural desire to defend itself against crude discrimination."

HARDLY "APARTHEID"

On 21 June, Estonia's parliament enacted legislation which prohibits residence permits to persons who have previously worked for the Soviet Union's secret police or to current and retired Soviet military officers. The law requires non-citizens to apply for a residence permit within one year. All permanent residents, however, will be permitted to vote—regardless of ethnic background.

Moscow hysterically condemned the new citizenship law stating that "it can be regarded as the practice of ethnic cleansing and the introduction of an Estonian version of apartheid." This stance derives from Russia's claim that all Soviet citizens who have settled in Estonia during its occupation by the USSR must be accorded full citizenship rights.

Under international law, formerly occupied states are not obliged to make such a concession. Such a practice would, after all, equate the rights of those who have wrongly suffered occupation with their oppressors. It could even encourage such occupations and forced resettlement of populations in the affected territory for the express purpose of assuring the occupying power of its continued domination even after physical control is relinquished.

Importantly, investigations into allegations of Estonian mistreatment of Russian nationals have been conducted by both the United Nations and the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) this spring. They found no evidence of international discrimination against the Russian-speaking minority. Indeed, some 14 inquiries by various international organizations have been received by Estonia and all have concluded that human rights are fully guaranteed in Estonia.

OMINOUS PATTERN OF RUSSIAN COERCION

Regrettably, Russia's energy boycott is but the latest in a series of steps taken in recent months against its Baltic neighbor. These include the following:

Last year, Russia froze and confiscated \$80 million of Estonia's assets when the Estonian government discarded the ruble and introduced its own currency.

Russia has been dragging its feet on its commitment to withdraw the remaining 8,000 troops from the tiny Baltic republic, and is unlikely to meet its promised target date of 1 August for the withdrawal of all forces. Indeed, Russian negotiators have lately begun talking instead in terms of 1999 for a complete withdrawal.

On 29 May, Russia began construction of what is planned to be the largest commercial port on the Baltic Sea at Ust-Luga, adjacent to the Russian-Estonian border. Estonians are fearful that the facility, scheduled to be completed by 1995, will take traffic away from ports located in the Baltic states. The Russians are seeking funds from the U.S.-supported European Bank for Reconstruction and Development for the project.

Russia attempted to thwart Estonia's entry into the Council of Europe and, when it was nonetheless admitted nearly unanimously on 13 May, Russian Foreign Minister Andrei Kozyrev sent an angry letter, decrying Estonia's membership as "premature."

In April, Russia's Northwestern Group of Forces engaged in a four-day exercise on how to capture strategic facilities in the Baltic states.

THE REAL REASON FOR RUSSIA'S FURY—ENVY?

In contrast with Russia and most of the other former Soviet republics that are coping poorly with deteriorating economic conditions, Estonia's economy is thriving. As the Washington Post reported on 21 June 1993:

"[Estonia has become] a model of stability and serenity. . . . Estonia has taken drastic steps that no other former Soviet republic has yet been willing to risk. It cut off subsidies to industry, allowed prices to rise freely while keeping wages down, prohibited its central bank from printing new money and forced itself to live under a balanced budget."

Where Russia's deficit is burgeoning and the value of its currency is plunging, Estonia's leaders have taken practical steps to control both. The Estonian government is operating under laws requiring a balanced state budget and tying the issuing of additional currency to the increases in gold and foreign currency reserves. Inflation, once at a monthly rate of 100 percent, is down to 3 percent. U.S. Ambassador Strobe Talbott, who visited Estonia on 14-15 May, praised the country's radical reforms and urged other former Soviet republics to adopt their model. He enthused, "Estonia is a success story, a political and economic miracle."

"MESSAGE TO MICHEL: GAZPROM'S WAY OF SAYING THANK-YOU FOR U.S. CREDITS"

The mechanism for implementing President Yeltsin's energy blockade of Estonia is

the Russian state-owned enterprise, Gazprom. Gazprom's vice president, Bogdan Budzulyak, however, claimed that the cut-off of gas supplies to the Estonians which occurred last Friday was undertaken over Estonia's failure to pay \$8 million for previously delivered supplies—even though this amount represents just 10 percent of the \$80 million in Estonian funds expropriated by Russia last year. In February, Gazprom threatened to stop its gas shipments to Ukraine. Just over one month ago, Gazprom employed similar tactics against Lithuania, halving its natural gas supplies and threatening to cut off supplies altogether. On Monday, Russia made good on its promise and suspended deliveries of natural gas to its Lithuanian commercial customers.

Interestingly, Gazprom is the beneficiary of an \$86.2 million direct loan approved by the U.S. Export-Import Bank in February 1993 in order to finance the sale of close to 300 Caterpillar earth-movers to Russia. These machines are to be used for the development of a large pipeline system connecting the Yamal peninsula to Gazprom's existing gas pipeline network west of Torzhok.

At the time, Russia was non-creditworthy and would ordinarily have been denied such an Eximbank loan. When House Minority Leader Bob Michel (R-IL) and Senator Paul Simon (D-IL) applied political pressure in favor of the transaction, the normal taxpayer protections were set aside and Eximbank financing for their constituent's sale was approved by the Clinton Administration. In a letter to House Banking Chairman Henry Gonzalez on 16 March 1993, however, Eximbank's Director Rita Rodriguez conceded that "All transactions in Russia carry a substantial risk. Because of Russia's arrearages . . . we assumed that 27% of the loan would not be recovered."

DON'T JUST STAND THERE, DO SOMETHING

The Clinton Administration should strongly condemn Russia's heavy-handed pressure tactics against Estonia and other former Soviet republics. At the very least, cooperation between the United States and Russia in the energy area—notably the massive financial assistance Moscow is slated to obtain under Eximbank's Oil and Gas Framework Agreement—should be made contingent upon the Kremlin refraining from the use of its energy resources as a weapon of economic warfare.

There are a number of vehicles for implementing such conditionality. For example,

on 15 April, Eximbank issued a preliminary commitment of \$500 million to Russia's Ministry of Fuel and Energy pending the finalization of the Agreement. The World Bank is now considering an application Russia submitted last month for a waiver of the Bank's negative pledge clause—a precondition for Eximbank funding. Implementation of the former and approval of the latter should be put on hold.

Another Western leverage point could be the EBRD's underwriting of the Ust-Luga port project. In any event, the United States and its Western allies should take steps to reduce the Baltic states' dependence on Russian gas supplies.

THE BOTTOM LINE

Previous experience with the Kremlin's coercive use of energy supplies as a precursor to more violent action against the Baltic states and other victims of Soviet imperialism requires that the United States and its G-7 partners make clear where they stand: Energy embargoes—or the threat of such embargoes—will preclude Western energy-related assistance to Russia.

The Center for Security Policy believes that it is vastly more important for the G-7 to support properly structured, conditioned and transparent privatization efforts in the former Soviet Union than for the West to augment Russia's capability to threaten its neighbors by withholding energy resources. Although Russia reportedly resumed its gas supplies to Estonia today, it must be disabused of the notion that the West will ignore such actions and proceed with loans and technical support for the purpose of revitalizing Russia's energy sector even as Moscow once again seeks to use the power of that sector for unacceptable purposes.

COMMENDATION TO NEW MEXICO'S FINEST STUDENTS OF THE FIRST CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

HON. STEVEN SCHIFF

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1993

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the winners of the Congressional Certifi-

cate of Merit. These students, from the First Congressional District, are graduating seniors honored for their outstanding academic, community, and personal achievements. It gives me great honor to announce them to you today. They are:

- Erica DeBois, Albuquerque Academy.
- Sarina Hazeltine, Albuquerque Evening School.
- Yvonne Castillo, Albuquerque High School.
- Shaia Riboni, Albuquerque School on Wheels.
- Harper L. Phillips, Bernalillo High School.
- Lisa J. Collins, Cibola High School.
- Jennifer Miver, Del Norte High School.
- Kirk Cessac, Eldorado High School.
- Julie Ford, Estanica High School.
- Amy Dawn Henderson, Evangel Christian Academy.
- Jason Chavez, Freedom High School.
- Dana Pappas, Highland High School.
- Clinton Snead, Hope Christian High School.
- Carrie Parker, La Cueva High School.
- Elise M. McHugh, Los Lunas High School.
- Mario Trujillo, Manzano High School.
- Cindy de la Fe, Menaul High School.
- Tate Whale, Moriarty High School.
- Julie A. Rodriguez, Mountainair High School.
- Julie Saine, New Futures High School.
- Brian MacFarlane, Rio Grande High School.
- Sharon E. O'Connell, St. Pius X High School.
- Nanonbah Becker, Sandia High School.
- Barnaby and Christopher Peake, Sandia Preparatory School.
- Jaymie A. Yost, Valley High School.
- Cindy Corriz, West Mesa High School.

As a member representing the First Congressional District of New Mexico, I, along with all New Mexicans, are proud of these individuals and wish them the very best in their future endeavors.