HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, July 29, 1993*

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 29, 1993.

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

THOMAS S. FOLEY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

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

Of all the gifts that You have so freely given, O God, we pray that we treasure the gift of thanksgiving and the spirit of gratitude. We are aware that all the necessary duties of daily living require time and attention and there seems to be little occasion for reflection and appreciation and praise to You, O God, and to family and friends. Encourage us to find great value in the moments that we have to offer our thanksgiving and appreciation and open our eyes and enhance our awareness to all the blessings that we have received this day and every day. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. TORKILDSEN. 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. Pursuant to rule I, the Chair will postpone the vote on the approval of the Journal until later in the day.

The point of order of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Pledge of Allegiance will be led by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOBSON].

Mr. HOBSON led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 236. An act to establish the Snake River Birds of Prey National Conservation Area in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 2683. An act to extend the operation of the migrant student record transfer system.

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

H.R. 798. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to codify the rates of disability compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for survivors of such veterans as such rates took effect on December 1, 1992.

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

S. 1131. An act to extent the method of computing the average subscription charges under section 8906(a) of title 5, United States Code, relating to Federal employee health benefits programs.

FREEDOM FOR JOHN DEMJANJUK

(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, the Israeli Supreme Court has overturned the conviction that John Demjanjuk was the infamous Ivan the Terrible of the Treblinka death camp.

I want to commend Israel for reaffirming to this Government and the American people why we have so much faith in them as a free nation.

I would like to say that Israel has taught America and Congress a lesson that individual rights should never be clouded by controversy or sensitivity. Congress did not and failed to do the things that Israel did and that America is better for it and Israel certainly is historically much more powerful in that regard.

But now the issue of Mr. Demjanjuk, a free man without a country, must be dealt with.

I will be coming to the Congress with a private bill that will say to return Mr. Demjanjuk to America and revisit and review his citizenship status. Let us get to the bottom of this. Let us get to all the facts and ferret through them and deal with this great issue.

Certainly Congress has enough courage and backbone to do that.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask President Clinton to help initiate the biggest manhunt in world history. For 15 years we have allowed a man named Ivan Marczenko, 9 years older and taller, a long scar on the neck, the real Ivan, to go free. He may still be alive in Eastern Europe. We are going to ask that the people of all the free world get together and have the biggest manhunt in history to find maybe the worst criminal in our history.

AMERICANS WANT TO CUT SPENDING, NOT RAISE TAXES

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

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise because I have noticed that a number of our Democratic friends seem confused by the outcome of the Lieutenant Governor's election in Arkansas. They seem concerned that for only the fourth time in the 20th century a Republican has won a statewide office in Arkansas. They seem a little apprehensive that in the President's home State the voters have spoken and by 51 to 49 they rejected the President's party and they elected a Republican in Arkansas.

Well, when you start talking about 7-cent-a-gallon and 9-cent-a-gallon gas taxes and you get outside of the subways of New York and outside of the elevated in Chicago and you have people who drive and you suddenly have people in a place like Fayetteville, Pine Bluff, or Little Rock thinking about trying to drive somewhere and they think about the Democratic tax increase that is going to burden them and they think about their families, not being able to go for a Sunday ride or not being able to get to the grocery

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

store and they think about how much it is going to cost them to drive to work, they say, "Do I want to vote Democrat for a bigger tax increase or do I want to vote Republican to send a signal that it is time to cut spending first? It is time to help."

In Arkansas, as in Texas, as in Jersey City, as in Los Angeles, as in district after district in special elections, voters are saying, "Gee, maybe I don't want a Democratic tax increase and maybe 7 cents or 9 cents a gallon more on my gas tax is just too much to give the Democrats to spend in Washington on their special interest patronage politics."

THE PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC PLAN

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, this week we continue to make progress on implementing President Clinton's economic plan, the largest deficit reduction plan in history. It will put our Nation back on the right track.

This is the change we want. It is good for the middle class. And—most of all—it will really work.

The President's plan makes the spending cuts and tough choices that we only heard a lot about over the last 12 years. President Clinton's plan cuts $83 billion in entitlement spending ranging from Medicare to agriculture. His plan also cuts $41 billion in discretionary spending including foreign aid.

No matter how you slice it, President Clinton's plan really cuts spending.

Mr. Speaker, the American people should be proud that their President has the courage to address our Nation's problems and secure the brightest future for ourselves and our children.

TWENTY-SEVEN NEW TAX INCREASES IN 27 WEEKS

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

Mr. PAXON. Mr. Speaker, at the 100-day mark of the Clinton administration, we took a look at the record of this administration and the Democratic Party on taxes and we came up with 14 new tax proposals in 14 weeks. That was Clinton at 100 days, and we thought to ourselves that they could not possibly devise any more ways to exact punishment from the American people in the form of taxes.

Wrong, absolutely wrong. I am shocked, quite frankly, because we took a look now here at the 27th week mark of the Clinton administration and the Democrats, unbridled control of the House and the Senate. And what have they done? They have come up with 27 new or increased taxes in 27 weeks, Clinton and the Democrats.

Mr. Speaker, if the Democrats had applied themselves so diligently to finding ways to cut spending during that time, 27 new ways to cut spending, we would have been happy to join them; but 27 ways to raise taxes in 27 weeks, it is time to end this tax madness. This is even before the reconciliation committee is done and before the health care reforms are done.

Mr. Speaker, 27 taxes in 27 weeks, that is too much for taxpayers anywhere in the United States.

□ 1010

THOU SHALT NOT BEAR FALSE WITNESS

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

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Coalition is calling senior citizens and deliberately misleading them about the President's deficit reduction plan.

A distraught 83-year-old woman was told President Clinton and I would tax her Social Security. That is simply not true. She gets only $267 a month in Social Security plus a small pension. She will never have to pay taxes on her Social Security under any bill I or the President have supported.

When I told her the truth, she said, "But I listen to Pat Robertson every night; I don't believe he would lie to me."

Mr. Speaker, the betrayal of such trust should cause those responsible to hang their heads in shame.

If they want to criticize the President's budget plan and me for supporting it, so be it. But to purposefully frighten older Americans for political gain is immoral and indecent.

Clearly, the Christian Coalition has forgotten the Ninth Commandment: "Thou shalt not bear false witness."

THE ABYSS

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

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, stuffed in the pages of the Washington Post was this revealing headline: "Clinton Woos Reluctant Lawmakers on Economic Package."

Over the last several weeks, we have heard members of the Democratic majority condemn Republicans for opposing the largest tax increase in history. We have heard the majority trumpet the Clinton tax plan as the greatest economic stimulant since the California gold rush. We have sat through speech after speech about how this plan will actually help small business.

But the President was not trying to woo Republicans to support his package. No, he was trying to woo Members of his own party. And his hard sell is not working.

Let me quote from one prominent Member of the other body:

> So far, what I see moving through the conference committee does not do enough to put our economic house in order. I think we better step back from the abyss and work on a bipartisan approach now.

Mr. Speaker, this issue is not about partisan politics. We need to step back from the abyss.

MEDICAID HEALTH ALLOWANCE ACT OF 1993 BRIDGING THE GAP

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

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill that will reform Medicaid at a time when Medicaid reform is absolutely critical. The solution, the Medicaid Health Allowance Act of 1993, addresses two of the biggest obstacles facing health care reform; namely, skyrocketing Medicaid costs and a growing population of Americans unable to afford health insurance.

This proposal helps to solve both problems. It does so by allowing States to redirect Medicaid funds into health allowance programs. These programs enroll eligible individuals in private market health plans that hold down inflation. For States that participate, it curbs inflation of health care costs and provides relief to States which are suffering from double-digit inflation of Medicaid.

It also insures more people, now, Medicaid covers less than 50 percent of people under the poverty level, leaving 10 million people, living in poverty, uninsured. This creates a gap—people who cannot qualify for Medicaid and who cannot afford to buy insurance. Expanded access provides coverage for those in the gap, and an option exists to extend coverage to the working poor above the poverty level.

The extra cost to insure these people is covered by redirecting the Federal disproportionate share already paid to States for uncompensated hospital care to the poor. No new taxes or spending is required.

We know such programs work and that people gain better care and live healthier lives. I have seen it work with the Dayton area health plan which has been able to achieve tremendous cost savings, and it is working in other States as well.

With this plan, you insure more people at a lower cost per person. You minimize expensive and inefficient emergency room hospital care, and you provide higher quality of care.

THE JOLLY GIGANTE VERDE

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to tell my colleagues the story of the Green Giant who moved to Mexico and changed his name and the American workers who lost their jobs as a result.

For years the Jolly Green Giant has encouraged Americans to eat his vegetables. Frozen vegetables such as this were packaged at a Watsonville, CA, plant that employed over 1,000 workers, mostly minority women, who earned enough to support their families, educate their children, and have something left for their retirement.

Then the Pillsbury Corp. decided to move the Green Giant to Irapuato, Mexico, where he became the Gigante Verde. Today the Watsonville plant employs fewer than 200 workers. Over a hundred American workers who earned $7.61 per hour, plus benefits, were replaced by Mexican workers who earned less than $4 a day.

Mr. Speaker, the familiar symbol of the Green Giant has not changed, and the prices at the stores are no lower. American consumers do not know that their vegetables are now processed in Mexico rather than California.

Let us stop NAFTA and the movement of more of our jobs south of the border.

REJECT THE GAS TAX

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

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, as the conferees look to and lean toward a gas tax to solve the budget impasse, a resolution passed by the Democrat-controlled Public Transportation Committee of the Arkansas State Legislature makes imminent good sense, and they, in urging the Arkansas delegation to oppose a gas tax, remind us that the gasoline tax for deficit-reduction purposes would be a regressive tax that would affect the poor to a greater extent than those at other income levels.

They remind us that most household vehicle miles of travel are not discretionary, and only 30 percent of the miles traveled are for social or recreational purposes, and that there continues to exist a substantial need to rehabilitate the Nation's transportation infrastructure. Motor fuel taxes should remain dedicated to transportation purposes alone.

Mr. Speaker, the Governor who succeeded Bill Clinton in Arkansas, Governor Tucker, tells us to the extent the Federal gas tax is imminent it will be more difficult to have that as an available resource for highway programs in the States.

We need to defeat this. In fact, the headline on the cover of this month's Money magazine says it well: "Act now. Beat the biggest tax hike ever."

That is good advice for this Congress.

TRIBUTE TO "THE GHOST OF BATAAN" ON HIS 80TH BIRTHDAY

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

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to M. Sgt. Abie Abraham, USA, of Butler, PA. Mr. Abraham is known as "The Ghost of Bataan." Sergeant Abraham was stationed in the Philippines in 1941. When the Japanese attacked, his battalion was immediately embroiled in one of the most terrible battles in United States military history.

The holding action at Bataan as well as the ensuing Bataan Death March, are counted among the most horrifying examples of treatment of prisoners of war. It is to the courage of all of these men in uniform that I salute Sergeant Abraham.

Not only did Sergeant Abraham survive this experience, but he also wrote a book about the ordeal of these brave men. Sent back to the Philippines by General MacArthur in 1951, Sergeant Abraham exhumed and recovered the bodies of his fellow soldiers who fell. From those actions, he was given the title, "The Ghost of Bataan."

Mr. Speaker, I call upon my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to this great American and honored soldier on this, his 80th birthday.

□ 1020

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE STEVEN PANKOW, FORMER MAYOR OF BUFFALO, NY

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

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise before the House today. On Sunday, July 25, Buffalo, NY, lost one of its most respected mayors, Steven Pankow, who passed away after a brief illness at the age of 85.

He was born to Ukrainian parents in the old first ward and attended Buffalo public schools until the age of 16, wh left school to work.

Mayor Pankow was elected Erie County clerk in 1950. He served as mayor of the city of Buffalo during the city's golden era in the 1950's. In a 1985 interview, Steven Pankow said he wanted the people of Buffalo to remember him as having done something good for the city and its people.

I believe he far surpassed his goal. Mayor Pankow is credited with the creation of the port authority and the youth board, as well as playing a key role in the revitalization of the police athletic league baseball program for children.

Steven Pankow was also known as the people's mayor for as he once said in a recent interview, "I always had time to listen to all the people."

Steven Pankow was the embodiment of the hands-on mayor. He enjoyed being involved in the daily affairs of government. People could observe him taking his daily excursion around the city to the various governmental departments to confirm that everything was operating smoothly.

He is survived by his wife of 63 years, Mary, and she has our prayers. Mayor Pankow will be sorely missed as a friend and colleague. The people of Buffalo should be proud that they had a man such as Steven Pankow to serve them so well, and they should realize the difference his presence made in their lives.

D-DAY APPROACHING FOR RECONCILIATION

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

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, we are approaching what might be called the economic equivalent of D-day. We heard this morning that by this evening in all likelihood the conferees will make a decision on the reconciliation package, the great budget bill which is designed to pull America out of economic doldrums and to reduce our debt and our deficit and get us on the right course for the next century.

We in the House will have to make a decision next week whether to go or not to go, whether to act or refrain from acting. I hope the decision of the House is to move forward and to take action and pass the reconciliation bill. I said earlier here in the well that I believe the worst thing we can do is to do nothing.

We may have differences of opinion in good faith about too much taxes or too little, or too little spending or too much, but the end result of it is that there will never be a perfect package. But there may be a perfect time in which to take action, and I think we are approaching that time, and the House should take action.

BIG OIL AND BIG GOVERNMENT JOIN FORCES ON THE GASOLINE TAX

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in a touching display of patriotism Big Oil came out in favor of the Clinton gas-tax increase. Now, was that not thoughtful of them?

Big Oil and Big Government have now lined up to stick it to the little man, the working man, and the middle class. What else is new?

Who are these folks we are talking about? Not silk-stocking oil refiners but factory workers who have to drive to cities to get their work, rural people who drive 40 or 50 miles a day, small contractors, bakers, and florists who have to drive to deliver their goods and services.

Mr. Speaker, if this tax increase passes, Big Oil and Big Government will as always survive, but will the working class and the middle class survive? I do not know. I really do not know, and I am not convinced that this thing will do anything for deficit reduction at all, as promised. But I do know this: It will increase taxes, and it will be hard on the working class.

Mr. Speaker, I am sticking with the bipartisan coalition of Democrats and Republicans on my vote.

THE EARNED INCOME TAX CREDIT AND WELFARE REFORM

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

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that no one likes to think about taxes or talk about taxes, let alone pay additional taxes, but there is one situation where we should very explicitly talk about a tax, and that is the earned income tax credit.

Arcane? Yes, but not for long. This credit is a very big part of the President's economic budget. Last fall we found out the American people had no faith in our welfare system. They wanted reform. The earned income tax credit is the first step toward welfare reform. It means that people who work hard, 40 hours a week, do not have their paychecks devastated by deductions. It means that people can take care of their families and themselves and not fall into the abyss of welfare.

Mr. Speaker, part of the President's package is that earned income tax credit, something we are going to learn to like, something that will make America better.

DEFICIT REDUCTION IS PROMISE OF CLINTON BUDGET

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

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Speaker, today we are faced with two budget plans. One that represents real deficit reduction. Real change, and real hope for our children's future. President Clinton's plan will reduce the deficit by $500 billion in the next 5 years; $500 billion, achieved by spending and entitlement cuts that are real and equitable.

It is the first real move toward deficit reduction in the past 12 years.

And what is the response of the Republicans in the House and Senate? An attempt to continue the gridlock of the past 12 years.

An unrealistic budget that falls $100 billion short of President Clinton's deficit reduction plan. An attempt to protect their wealthy friends and hurt the middle class, the working class, and the poor by slashing Medicare and Medicaid and forcing the American people to accept fewer police officers, less AIDS research, less education funding and less worker training.

It is time to break the gridlock. It is time for change and time to rise above petty partisan rhetoric and do what we were sent here to do: reduce the deficit by adopting a sensible and equitable plan. One that offers meaningful reduction, and real hope for our future.

TAXES ARE FOREVER

(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:

Promised spending cuts and Higher Taxes
The President's plan is what he asks of us,
While in theory, it all sounds so nice,
Keep in mind this piece of advice,
There's one thing we all must remember,
While these cuts are but fleeting,
The Taxes are forever.

That is the truth of the administration's tax plan. The President's taxes will last forever unless a new law is passed to rescind them, while the administration's spending cuts must be discovered 2 years from now. Like 1990, the taxes came $100 billion strong, the promised cuts never came.

That means that taxes in this Democrat-controlled Congress will keep on hitting the middle class year after year starting at the beginning of this year.

Spending cuts, on the other hand, are promised far in the future. In fact, 60 percent of the President's spending cuts are promised in the last 2 years of this reconciliation bill.

In the President's budget plan, the spending cuts are illusionary, but the taxes are forever.

MEMBERS URGED TO PASS THE CLINTON RECONCILIATION BILL

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

Mr. KOPETSKI. Mr. Speaker, over the last week much has been written and said about the President's deficit-reduction plan. Let us cut through all the rhetoric and focus our attention on the task the President has begun and we must finish.

Our country needs deficit reduction. We need to cut the deficit by $500 billion, which is what the President's plan will do.

We need to return to tax fairness in this country. Under this plan those who cannot afford to bear the costs of deficit reduction will not pay any additional taxes. These are the people making under $30,000 a year. For those between $30,000 and $140,000, the cost will be about $50 per year, less than $1 a week for a sound economic future.

There has been a lot of talk about the Clinton plan hurting small business. In fact, the plan provides unprecedented incentives for small business to create jobs and sustain real economic growth. And it is not just any job. This plan is designed to create high-paying jobs and stronger job opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, let us help America. Let us show the American people that Congress can act responsibly. Let us pass the President's reconciliation bill.

□ 1030

SOAK THE RICH, SINK THE ECONOMY

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in his rush to soak the rich, President Clinton is willing to sink the economy and drown the middle class. High income and business taxes punish the successful and the employers who create America's jobs.

The President does not say that two-thirds of the wealthy are small businesses that file individual income tax returns. These small businesses create 80 percent of America's new jobs. President Clinton says he wants more jobs, but you do not do that by punishing the people who do the job-creating.

He adds another tax and another job-loser to his economic plan with his gas tax. His only spending cuts are defense cuts—over twice as large as promised during the campaign—and they will cut another half a million jobs.

It is clear his economics plan, the largest tax hike in history, is a jobs killer not a jobs creator. That is why Americans oppose it when they find out what's in it. The President should quit trying to sell a pig-in-a-poke, tax-and-spend plan, and try developing a poke-in-a-pig one to cut spending first.

REPUBLICANS AGAINST DOING ANYTHING

(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 question is, when do we do anything? Listen to those opponents on the other side. Apparently the answer is never. They

weep about those who would drive to work and pay, yes, one dollar a week more possibly in gas tax and from a rural area, I understand that. But what they are not telling you is that over 80 percent of the tax increases will fall upon those making over $140,000 a year.

They talk about failure to have any cuts. But they do not tell you there are 200 specific cuts, and that in their budget they planned over $66 billion of unspecified cuts. Find their cuts.

They talk about small business and weep about that, not telling anybody that 96 percent of businesses are not affected or actually have a positive benefit from this plan.

What they do not talk about is change. What they tell you is they are against the deficit, they are against taxes, they are against taxing the rich. They are against any cuts that hurt. But what they will not tell you is they are against doing anything. We do not have that luxury anymore.

THE ELECTION IN ARKANSAS

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker. how do the people of Arkansas feel about Bill Clinton's Presidency?

Are they impressed with the administration's tax plan? Do they want more Democratic leadership in their State?

Well, if you look at Tuesday's election for Arkansas Lieutenant Governor, the answer to all of those questions is no. The loser said, "There was a hostile climate out there to the Democratic Party in general and to Bill Clinton in particular."

For the first time since Bill Clinton lost to Frank White for Governor, a Republican has won a statewide election in Arkansas.

This stunning upset tells me several things.

First, the people of Arkansas do not want higher taxes, and more government spending, any more than the rest of us do.

Second, change is coming, but not the kind of change the Democrats want. The American people are rejecting the policies of tax and spend.

Now we know the secret. The people of Arkansas sent Bill Clinton here for a reason. That reason was to get him out of Arkansas.

GOP BECOMING A PARTY WITHOUT A PURPOSE

(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, the American people understand partisan politics. Not a single Republican Congressman voted for President Clinton's economic growth plan. Not a single Republican Congressman would vote for the rule to bring President Clinton's flood disaster to this floor. The Republicans are in tight formation and lock step opposing the Clinton administration.

But Americans know that the Clinton plan is a step in the right direction. They want both parties to come together, to create jobs, to help small business, do something about our deficit and get America moving again.

Sixty-seven business leaders from both political parties met with the President yesterday to endorse his efforts to reduce the deficit and get our economy moving. But will a single Republican Congressman have the courage to vote against gridlock? Will one Republican step forward to support the change Americans asked for last November?

The Grand Old Party, unfortunately, is becoming a party without a purpose.

CHRISTIAN COALITION'S RIGHT TO BE HEARD

(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, I appreciate the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] making a great speech for Republicans everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in defense of the Christian Coalition. It seems they have been caught committing democracy. They are trying to spare this Nation the effects of the Clinton tax-and-pretend budget. Mr. Speaker, there are some in this Chamber who believe that Christians, like well-behaved children, should be seen and not heard. They do not complain when Hollywood produces a countless stream of movies, television shows, and record albums that offend Christians. They do not complain when the ACLU and other groups make every possible effort to stamp out Christianity in our public discourse. They do not complain when the current administration consistently takes actions that outrage Christian sensibilities. But the minute a group of like-minded Catholics, Jews, and Evangelical Protestants actually tries to become active in the tax fight, they scream that this is unfair, that it is unjust, that Christians should remain silent.

Mr. Speaker, the sheer hypocrisy of this attitude leaves me breathless. I, for one, am thankful that a group has come forward to speak for millions of Americans who do not want their taxes raised. I will support the Christian Coalition's right to be heard, and I sincerely hope they will be heard more often.

Christians will not remain silent. We are here to stay.

PUT PEOPLE FIRST

(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, in the campaign President Clinton said that all Americans who work should not live below the poverty line. The President fulfills this promise and once again honors his commitment to American families, this time by including the earned income tax credit in his economic plan.

Under this provision, American families whose earnings are below the poverty line will receive a tax credit. This investment in people will help reduce the deficit by helping more Americans become taxpayers.

The earned income tax credit is a first step in welfare reform. In fact, it is essential to welfare reform.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the President's plan to invest in people and reduce the deficit. I urge them to do this and help Americans choose work, not welfare, choose jobs, not dependence; choose hope, not despair. Let us join the President in putting people first.

Mr. Speaker, today's Wall Street Journal reported what many of us already know from speaking to our constituents: Americans favor President Clinton's economic plan and they want it passed. Let us get on with the job.

WHAT IF TAX INCREASES WEAKEN THE ECONOMY?

(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, I rise today to bring to the attention of other Members the possible adverse impact of relying on tax increases to reduce the deficit.

If the economy grows by just 1 percent less than expected over the next 5 years, the deficit will increase $366 billion.

If the unemployment rate increases just 1 percent over the next 5 years, and the budget resolution assumes a rosey decrease to 5.7 percent by 1998, the deficit will increase $289 billion.

If interest rates rise just 1 percent, the deficit over the next 5 years will increase $155 billion.

Mr. Speaker, these figures have been confirmed by the Congressional Budget Office this past spring in their Economic and Budget Outlook: Fiscal Years 1994–98.

Mr. Speaker, I contend that adopting a budget reduction package that relieves on huge tax increases will hurt the economy. One can describe the rational for the current mix of tax increases as fairness, but tax increases in general, reduce economic growth—increasing taxes does not create economic growth.

It is ironic that this body is again talking about increasing taxes. The American people remember the last time we increased taxes and increased spending. The 1990 tax bill did not help the economy. Instead, it cost us jobs, it put us at a competitive disadvantage, and it robbed the American taxpayers of more of there hard earned money.

In 5 years, the current plan will bring us deeper into debt.

EARNED INCOME TAX CREDIT

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, lost in the din and bickering and name-calling that we call debate on the President's deficit reduction plan, everyone has been all to silent, except for a few of my colleagues, on one of the most important aspects of the Clinton budget, and that is the tax break for 15 million hardworking, lower income families.

The budget bill will include over $20 billion to boost the wages of full-time working poor in the form of the earned income tax credit. And what will the EITC do? Well, it sends two messages: For too long we have told people it is easier to stay on welfare than to work. No longer. Under the Clinton plan, there is an incentive for people to work.

□ 1040

And we have told poor working people, do not work that hard, do not struggle up there, because it almost does not pay. Welfare is all right.

The EITC gives that incentive to those poor working families to stay working.

Mr. Speaker, this EITC is a very important turning point in our budget plan, and I urge Members to vote for the President's plan which contains the EITC.

HIGHER TAXES

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, here is what the Democrats think we will believe.

If we raise Federal gasoline taxes by 42 percent, that will help the economy. If we raise Federal gasoline taxes by 42 percent, only the rich will pay. If we raise the taxes of Social Security recipients, that will help the economy. If we make small businessmen work 2 out of every 5 days to pay their Federal taxes, that will help the economy.

If we raise taxes on earned income of successful employers, that will help the economy.

If Members believe all of that, they will deserve exactly what they are going to get, higher taxes, a weakened economy, less jobs, an increased deficit, more debt, and economic stagnation.

REPUBLICAN ATTACK DOGS

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, as I listen to the 1-minutes of the Republicans, I notice the large difference between 1993 and 1990.

In 1990, the Democrats met President Bush halfway. The slogan of the Republicans today is, "Mr. President, we will meet you November 1994."

A Wall Street Journal poll asked the people whether Republicans are opposing the President for political reasons or are interested in offering a reasonable, realistic alternative. Sixty-four percent say the GOP is acting for political reasons. That is confirmed by their speeches again today.

The minority is wallowing in negativism. They do not talk about their own plan that has over $100 billion in unspecified cuts.

They wrap themselves around the middle-class families of this country, but they lost $1,000 a year in real income in the last years of the Bush administration.

The public wants better from the Republicans than attack dogs.

SCHIZOPHRENIA IN THE HOUSE

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

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I have detected one more case of schizophrenia in the Congress. On the one hand, some of our colleagues tell us that this budget, this reconciliation does not cut spending at all; in about the same breath, they say they are cutting the military spending too deeply. So they are cutting spending; they are not cutting spending.

As near as I can tell from the critics, the worst thing we can do for this economy is to have the Government pay its bills.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I ask for a moment of silence from all Members of this Chamber for all those who all die horribly today because they have used tobacco products.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2348, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2348) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF FLORIDA

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. YOUNG of Florida moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill H.R. 2348 be instructed to agree to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the motion directs House conferees to accept a Senate amendment disallowing the no-year appropriation of funds, $100,000, to the Architect's contingent expense account.

These funds are appropriated to enable the Architect to make surveys and studies and to meet unforeseen expenses of the Architect in his care of the buildings and grounds of our Capitol.

There are presently $97,000 in fiscal year 1993 funds remaining in this account which are available until September 30. Because last year's appropriations bill refused to allow these funds on a no-year basis, after that date, any remaining funds will be returned to the Treasury.

In addition to the fiscal year 1993 funds, there is also an additional $116,000 in no-year funds available for contingent expenses. This $116,000 and the $100,000 appropriation in this legislation should be more than enough to cover any expenses incurred in fiscal year 1994.

Rather than continue to allow taxpayer dollars to accrue in this account we should spend only what we need and allow the rest to be returned to the Treasury.

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

Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentleman's point. I think it is a good one. I certainly would support his instruction.

I think we should accept the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct

offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG].

The motion to instruct was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. FAZIO, MORAN, OBEY, MURTHA, CARR of Michigan, CHAPMAN, YOUNG of Florida, PACKARD, TAYLOR of North Carolina, and MCDADE.

There was no objection.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question de novo of the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The Journal was approved.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 1994 AND 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 193 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2200.

□ 1049

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 further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2200) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, space flight, control, and data communications, construction of facilities, research and program management, and Inspector General, and for other purposes, with Mrs. UNSOELD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

□ 1050

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Friday, July 23, 1993, title I was open for amendment at any point. Pending is the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COLLINS].

Is there further debate on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COLLINS]?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALKER AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COLLINS OF GEORGIA

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALKER as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. COLLINS of Georgia: Page 25, after line 10 insert the following new section:

SEC. 121. AUTHORIZATIONS AVAILABLE FOR DISASTER RELIEF.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, 1 percent of the amounts authorized to be appropriated under sections 100 and 101(a) shall also be authorized to be appropriated for purposes of carrying out disaster relief activities in response to major disasters declared by the President, if the President requests the use of such percentage for such purposes.

Mr. WALKER (during the reading). Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, this amendment differs in language from that originally offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COLLINS], but it gets at the purpose that the gentleman was looking to do. I congratulate him for focusing the House on an effort to begin setting aside money for disaster relief.

The intent of the amendment is to make 1 percent of the authorization available for either NASA programs or disaster relief, but not both. When the President declares a major disaster, this request that 1 percent of the amount of NASA, there is up to 1 percent of the money there that will be authorized to go for that if the President requests it. It will then be up to the appropriators, as is the case now, to appropriate that amount. That would provide $148 million in fiscal 1994, $155 million in 1995, and $89 million thereafter through the year 2000.

Again, Madam Chairman, I appreciate the work that the gentleman from Georgia did. I, too, have been working to try to find a way to get to 1 percent of appropriation bills set aside for disaster relief. This moves us in a similar kind of direction, assures that the money is actually in the accounts should it be needed, and I think we have some agreement that this is the direction we ought to go from both the gentleman from Georgia and from the chairman.

Mr. BROWN of California. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BROWN of California. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I appreciate the efforts that the gentleman has made in working together with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COLLINS] to make this a more acceptable amendment. It does do what the gentleman indicates, but it leaves the discretion to the President with regard to the actual use of the money for disaster purposes, which allows me to support the amendment, assuming it is agreeable to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Pennsylvania yielding to me.

Madam Chairman, I appreciate what the gentleman has done with offering this substitute amendment. I fully agree with it, and accept it.

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Chairman, first of all, let me commend both gentlemen, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COLLINS].

Madam Chairman, in the few moments I have, I would like to express my support for the Collins amendment, as amended.

Over the last few days, this country has witnessed an ongoing debate in this House over a more responsible approach to financing disaster relief.

Mr. COLLINS' amendment reflects a change in attitude toward disaster relief. He would authorize the appropriations to reallocate 1 percent of NASA's funding to disaster assistance whenever the President declares a disaster emergency.

This amendment does not pay for the flood relief—not even close. But it does signal a new attitude in this body that we should incorporate disaster assistance into our deficit calculations.

My friends, on Tuesday we passed up a golden opportunity to stop our old ways of using the fiction of off-budget accounting to pay for disaster relief.

A bipartisan effort nearly succeeded in forcing the leadership of this House to allow several amendments to the disaster relief bill to cut Federal spending by skimming a small percentage off each appropriations bill, thereby asking the Government itself to sacrifice to help those people suffering in our Nation's heartland.

While the House just narrowly missed making a large step toward deficit reduction, here is a chance today at a less radical, but nonetheless real step in the direction of financing deficit relief. Let us vote for the Collins amendment and restore some fiscal sanity to our Nation's Government.

Madam Chairman, I really appreciate the gentleman yielding, and again I commend both gentleman, because they certainly are people who are fiscally responsible. They are noted for it, and we commend them for it.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I would like to offer my appreciation to the chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], for his acceptance of the amendment, as amended, and the bipartisan cooperation from the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] as a substitute for the amendment

offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COLLINS].

The amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COLLINS], as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALKER: Page 25, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following new section:

SEC. 121. FACILITY PLAN AND ANALYSIS.

Within 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit to the Congress a plan for utilizing the facilities acquired by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in Yellow Creek, Mississippi, that includes an analysis of—

(1) the increased costs or savings that would result from using these new facilities to support activities that are consistent with the programs authorized by this Act; and

(2) the costs and benefits of disposing of those facilities as surplus government assets.

Mr. WALKER (during the reading). Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, this is a fairly simple amendment that I think we are prepared to have accepted, as well. It simply asks that NASA provide Congress with a plan on possible uses of the ASRM facility in Yellow Creek, Mississippi. Since the House has now voted to terminate the ASRM program and does not wish to transfer current solid rocket motor work to this almost completed facility, Congress needs to know what the options are for this plant.

This amendment simply has us look and try to figure out what those options are.

Mr. BROWN of California. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BROWN of California. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chairman, I commend the gentleman on his amendment, and on our side, we are willing to accept it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title I?

If not, the Clerk will designate title II.

The text of title II is as follows:

TITLE II—ADVANCED SPACE TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM.

SEC. 201. POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States that—

(1) the Administrator, in planning for national programs in space science and application, aeronautical research, space flight, advanced concepts and technology, and exploration, shall consider ways in which the competitiveness of the United States in advanced space technologies can be enhanced;

(2) the Administrator shall work closely with other Federal agencies, States, local governments, and industry to coordinate and execute the advanced space technology investment activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration;

(3) opportunities for investment in advanced space technologies that advance the competitiveness of the United States shall be identified in concert with United States industry; and

(4) the Administrator shall encourage the establishment of industry-led consortia to maximize the opportunities described in paragraph (3).

SEC. 202. ADVANCED SPACE TECHNOLOGY INVESTMENT PROGRAM.

(a) COMPETITIVE PROGRAM.—The Administrator shall establish a competitive program under this section—

(1) to advance the capabilities of United States space technology;

(2) to encourage industry-led consortia to develop advanced space technologies that advance the competitiveness of the United States; and

(3) to encourage participation by industrial participants not part of the traditional Federal contracting base.

(b) ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANTS.—

(1) GENERAL RULE.—Single firms, consortia or cooperative arrangements among 2 or more eligible firms, or a nonprofit research organization established by 2 or more eligible firms, are eligible participants under this section. Such eligible participants may include participation by Federal laboratories, institutions of higher education, State agencies, and other entities.

(c) CRITERIA.—In selecting from among applicants for financial assistance under this section, the Administrator shall consider—

(1) the potential of the proposed project to develop advanced space technologies that enhance the long-term ability of the United States to make advances in space transportation, exploration, experimentation, and commerce;

(2) the application's scientific and technical merit;

(3) the extent of funding provided by industry;

(4) the potential for long-term commercial application of the technologies in nongovernmental markets;

(5) the likelihood that the goals and objectives of the proposed application will not be achieved without financial assistance under this section; and

(6) such other criteria as the Administrator considers appropriate.

(d) NON-FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION.—The Administrator shall ensure that the amount of the funds provided by the Federal Government under this section does not exceed the total amount provided by non-Federal participants for any one application. The Administrator shall ensure that not less than 30 percent of total funding for any project for which financial assistance is made available under this section is provided by industry.

(e) FINANCING MECHANISMS.—The Administrator shall make full use of the various authorities available under section 203(c)(5) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 to carry out this section, especially when applied to eligible firms which are not part of the traditional Federal contracting base.

SEC. 203. COORDINATION WITH EXISTING PROGRAMS.

The Administrator shall coordinate existing activities within the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, including the Small Business Innovation Research Program and Independent Research and Development activities conducted by industry, with the advanced space technology investment activities established under this title. The Administrator shall coordinate such advanced space technology investment activities with existing programs of the Department of Commerce, the Department of Defense, the Department of Energy, and other Federal agencies to maximize the United States investment in advanced space technology.

SEC. 204. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

The Administrator shall assess the advanced space technology investment activities established under this title, and shall submit a report to Congress on the results of such activities to accompany the President's budget request for fiscal year 1996.

SEC. 205. DEFINITIONS.

For the purposes of this title—

(1) the term "advanced space technology" means technologies which are fundamentally new capabilities requiring basic research, as opposed to evolutions of current technologies and systems;

(2) the term "eligible firm" means a business entity—

(A) that conducts a significant level of its research, development, engineering, and manufacturing activities in the United States;

(B) the majority ownership or control of which is held by United States citizens; or

(C) with a parent company that is incorporated in a country, the government of which—

(i) permits the participation of firms incorporated in the United States in research and development consortia to which the government of that country provides funding directly or indirectly through international organizations; and

(ii) affords adequate and effective protection for the intellectual property rights of firms incorporated in the United States,

and that maintains substantial employment in the United States and agrees to promote the manufacturing within the United States of products resulting from technologies developed under this title;

(3) the term "Federal laboratory" has the meaning given such term in section 4(6) of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980; and

(4) the term "United States" means the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and any other territory or possession of the United States.

SEC. 206. TECHNOLOGY PROCUREMENT INITIATIVE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall coordinate National Aeronautics and Space Administration resources in the areas of procurement, commercial programs, and advanced technology in order to—

(1) fairly assess and procure commercially available technology from the marketplace in the most efficient manner practicable;

(2) achieve a continuous pattern of integrating advanced technology from the commercial sector into the missions and programs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration;

(3) incorporate private sector buying and bidding procedures, including fixed price contracts, into procurements; and

(4) provide incentives for cost-plus contractors of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to integrate commercially available technology in subsystem contracts on a fixed-price basis.

(b) CERTIFICATION.—Upon solicitation of any procurement for space hardware, technology, or services that are not commercially available, the Administrator shall certify, by publication of a notice and opportunity to comment in the Commerce Business Daily, for each such procurement action, that no functional equivalent, commercially available space hardware, technology, or service exists and that no commercial method of procurement is available.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to title II of the bill?

If not, the Clerk will designate title III.

The text of title III is as follows:

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS RELATING TO SPACE ACTIVITIES

SEC. 301. TRANSMISSION OF BUDGET ESTIMATES.

The Administrator shall, at the time of submission of the President's annual budget request for every fiscal year, transmit to the Congress—

(1) a five-year budget detailing the estimated development costs for each individual program under the jurisdiction of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for which development costs are expected to exceed $200,000,000; and

(2) an estimate of the life-cycle costs associated with each such program.

SEC. 302. COMMERCIAL SPACE LAUNCH ACT AMENDMENTS.

(a) AMENDMENTS.—The Commercial Space Launch Act (49 U.S.C. App. 2601 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 4—

(A) by inserting "from Earth" after "if any," in paragraph (2);

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (9) through (12) as paragraphs (11) through (14), respectively; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (8) the following new paragraphs:

"(9) 'reenter' and 'reentry' mean to return purposefully, or attempt to return, a reentry vehicle and payload, if any, from Earth orbit or outer space to Earth;

"(10) 'reentry vehicle' means any vehicle designed to return from Earth orbit or outer space to Earth substantially intact;";

(2) in section 6(a), by inserting ", or reenter a reentry vehicle," after "operate a launch site" each place it appears;

(3) in section 6(a)(2) and (3), by striking "section 4(11)" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "section 4(14)";

(4) in section 6(a)(3)(A), by inserting "or reentry" after "such launch or operation";

(5) in section 6(a)(3), by inserting ", or reentry of a reentry vehicle," after "operation of a launch site" each place it appears;

(6) in section 6(b)(1)—

(A) by striking "launch license" and inserting in lieu thereof "license";

(B) by inserting "or reenter" after "shall not launch";

(C) by inserting "or reentry" after "relate to the launch"; and

(D) by inserting "or reentered" after "to be launched";

(7) in section 6(b)(2)—

(A) by inserting "or reentry" after "prevent the launch";

(B) by striking "holder of a launch license" and inserting in lieu thereof "licensee"; and

(C) by inserting "or reentry" after "determines that the launch";

(8) in section 6(c)(1), by inserting "or reentry of a reentry vehicle" after "operation of a launch site";

(9) in section 7, by striking "both" and inserting in lieu thereof "for reentering one or more reentry vehicles";

(10) in sections 8(a), 9(b), 11(a), 11(b), 12(a)(2)(B), and 12(b), by inserting ", or reentry of a reentry vehicle," after "operation of a launch site" each place it appears;

(11) in section 8(b), by inserting "and the reentry of reentry vehicles," after "operation of launch sites,";

(12) in section 11(a), by inserting "or reentry" after "launch or operation";

(13) in section 12(a)(1), by inserting "or reentry" after "prevent the launch";

(14) in section 12(b), by inserting "or reentry" after "prevent the launch";

(15) in section 14(a)(1)—

(A) by inserting "or reentry site" after "observers at any launch site"; and

(B) by inserting "or reentry vehicle" after "assembly of a launch vehicle";

(16) in section 15(b)(4)(A)—

(A) by inserting "and reentries" after "ensure that the launches";

(B) by inserting "or reentry date commitment" after "launch date commitment";

(C) by inserting "or reentry" after "obtained for a launch";

(D) by inserting ", reentry sites," after "United States launch sites";

(E) by inserting "or reentry site" after "access to a launch site";

(F) by inserting ", or services related to a reentry," after "amount for launch services"; and

(G) by inserting "or reentry" after "the scheduled launch";

(17) in section 15(b)(4)(B), by inserting "or reentry" after "prompt launching";

(18) in section 15(c), by inserting "or reentry" after "launch site";

(19) in section 16(a)(1)(A) and (B), by inserting "or reentry" after "any particular launch" each place it appears;

(20) in section 16(a)(1)(C) and (D), by inserting "or a reentry" after "launch services" each place it appears;

(21) in section 16(a)(2), by inserting "or reentry" after "launch services";

(22) in section 16(b)(1) and (4) (A) and (B), by inserting "or reentry" after "particular launch" each place it appears;

(23) in section 17(b)(2)(A)—

(A) by inserting "reentry site," after "launch site,"; and

(B) by inserting "or reentry vehicle" after "site of a launch vehicle";

(24) in section 21(a), by inserting "and reentry" after "approval of space launch";

(25) in section 21(b)—

(A) by inserting ", reentry vehicle," after "A launch vehicle"; and

(B) by inserting "or reentry" after "the launching";

(26) in section 21(c)(1)—

(A) by striking "or" in subparagraph (B);

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D); and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraph:

"(C) reentry of a reentry vehicle, or";

(27) in section 21(c)(2), by inserting "reentry," after "launch,";

(28) in section 22(a)—

(A) by striking "ending after the date of enactment of this Act and before October 1, 1989"; and

(B) by inserting "and reentries" after "further commercial launches"; and

(29) in section 24, by inserting "There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary $4,467,000 to carry out this Act for fiscal year 1994." after "$4,900,000 to carry out this Act.".

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary of Transportation shall submit to Congress an annual report to accompany the President's budget request which reviews the performance of the regulatory activities and the effectiveness of the Office of Commercial Space Transportation.

SEC. 303. SPACE TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE MATCHING GRANTS.

In order to ensure the continued resiliency of the Nation's space transportation infrastructure, the Secretary of Transportation is authorized to make project grants to public agencies in accordance with section 505 of Public Law 102–588. There are authorized to be appropriated for such grants, $10,000,000 for fiscal year 1995. Such funds shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 304. OFFICE OF SPACE COMMERCE AUTHORIZATION.

(a) ROLE OF THE OFFICE OF SPACE COMMERCE.—The Office of Space Commerce of the Department of Commerce shall be responsible for the development and coordination of all policy recommendations and activities pertaining to commercial activities in space except those functions and activities explicitly authorized in statute to other Federal agencies. In carrying out this responsibility, such Office shall consult with other Federal agencies as appropriate, including the Department of Transportation, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Department of Defense, the Department of State, and the Office of the United States Trade Representative.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In order to carry out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce for the Office of Space Commerce, $538,000 for fiscal year 1994.

SEC. 305. USE OF DOMESTIC PRODUCTS.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the Administrator shall ensure that procurements are conducted in compliance with sections 2 through 4 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a through 10c, popularly known as the "Buy American Act").

(b) LIMITATIONS.—This section shall apply only to procurements made for which—

(1) amounts are authorized by this Act to be made available; and

(2) solications for bids are issued after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) INAPPLICABILITY IN CASE OF VIOLATION OF INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT.—This section shall not apply to the extent that the United States Trade Representative determines that a procurement described in subsection (b) would be in violation of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade or an international agreement to which the United States is a party.

(d) PURCHASE OF AMERICAN MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—

(1) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that any recipient of a grant under this Act, or under any amendment made by this Act, should purchase, when available and cost-effective, American made equipment and products when expending grant monies.

(2) NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE.—In allocating grants under this Act, or under any amendment made by this Act, the Secretary shall provide to each recipient a notice describing the statement made in paragraph (1) by the Congress.

SEC. 306. REQUIREMENT FOR INDEPENDENT COST ANALYSIS.

The Chief Financial Officer for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall be responsible for conducting independent cost analyses of all new projects estimated to cost more than $5,000,000 and shall report the results annually to Congress at the time of the submission of the President's budget request. In developing cost accounting and reporting standards for carrying out this section, the Chief Financial Officer shall, to the extent practicable and consistent with other laws, solicit the advice of expertise outside of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

SEC. 307. GLOBAL CHANGE DATA AND INFORMATION SYSTEM.

Title I of the Global Change Research Act of 1990 (15 U.S.C. 2931 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 109. GLOBAL CHANGE DATA AND INFORMATION SYSTEM.

"(a) The National Aeronautics and Space Administration, in coordination with other agencies that belong to the Committee on Earth and Environmental Sciences, shall establish the requirements and architecture for design and develop a Global Change Data and Information System that shall serve as the system to process, archive, and distribute data generated by the Global Change Research Program.

"(b) The National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall design the Global Change Data and Information System—

"(1) so that other Federal agencies may connect data centers operated by such agencies to such System; and

"(2) so as to minimize, to the extent practicable, the cost of connecting such data centers.

"(c) Each agency involved in the Global Change Research Program shall retain the responsibility to establish and operate Global Change Data and Information System data centers to process, archive, and distribute data generated by such agency's programs. Agencies may agree to assume the responsibility for processing, archiving, or distributing data generated by other agencies.".

SEC. 308. ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED DATA FOR GLOBAL CHANGE RESEARCH.

The Committee on Earth and Environmental Sciences shall develop and submit to the Congress within one year after the date of enactment of this Act a plan for providing access to data from classified archives and systems for global change research. The plan shall—

(1) to the extent consistent with classification restrictions, identify what data from classified archives and systems may be valuable and available for global change research;

(2) determine whether the Global Change Data and Information System or other means should be used to provide access to such data for the scientific community; and

(3) identify what agencies should be responsible for particular parts of such classified data and any data centers needed to process, archive, and distribute such data.

SEC. 309. ORBITAL DEBRIS.

The Office of Science and Technology Policy, in coordination with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Department of Defense, the Department of State, and other agencies as appropriate, shall submit a plan to Congress within one year after the date of enactment of this Act for the control of orbital debris. The plan shall include proposed launch vehicle and spacecraft design standards and operational procedures to minimize the creation of new debris. The plan shall propose a schedule for the incorporation of the standards into all United States civil, military, and commercial space activities. Finally, the plan shall include a schedule for the development of an international agreement on the control of orbital debris.

SEC. 310. NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ACT OF 1958 AMENDMENTS.

(a) POLICY AND PURPOSE.—Section 102 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (42 U.S.C. 2451) is amended—

(1) by striking subsections (e) and (f) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(e) The Congress declares that the general welfare of the United States requires that the unique competence in scientific and engineering systems of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration also be directed toward supporting the private sector development of advanced space technologies which enhance economic growth, competitiveness, and productivity.";

(2) by redesignating subsections (g) and (h) as subsections (f) and (g), respectively; and

(3) in subsection (g), as so redesignated, by striking "(f), and (g)" and inserting in lieu thereof "and (f)".

(b) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Section 206(a) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (42 U.S.C. 2476(a)) is amended by striking "calendar" and inserting in lieu thereof "fiscal".

SEC. 311. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF UNITED STATES AND FOREIGN EXPENDABLE SPACE LAUNCH SYSTEMS.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall conduct a comprehensive study of the differences between existing United States and foreign expendable space launch vehicles. This study shall determine specific differences in the design, manufacture, processing, and overall management and infrastructure of current United States and foreign expendable space launch vehicles. The study shall also determine the approximate effect of these differences on the relative cost, reliability, and operational efficiency of such space launch systems. This study shall be conducted in consultation with the Department of Defense and, as appropriate, other Federal agencies, United States industries, and academic institutions. The results of this study shall be submitted to the Congress no later than October 1, 1994.

SEC. 312. UNIVERSITY INNOVATIVE RESEARCH PROGRAM STUDY.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) universities offer a significant resource for the conduct of innovative scientific and technological research to advance the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's mission;

(2) the National Aeronautics and Space Administration should act to broaden the foundation of its research base by increasing the direct involvement of university research laboratories in the development of technology for space science;

(3) the National Aeronautics and Space Administration should commit to strengthening university research programs in technology beyond contracting with universities for services in support of specific programs; and

(4) the National Aeronautics and Space Administration should develop mechanisms to foster innovative technological research at universities that do not participate in the University Space Engineering Research Centers.

(b) STUDY.—The Administrator shall undertake a study of the feasibility and potential implementation of a University Innovative Research Program which—

(1) promotes technological innovation in the United States by using the Nation's universities to help meet the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's research and development needs, by stimulating technology transfer between universities and industry, and by encouraging participation by minority and disadvantaged persons in technological innovation;

(2) is modeled on the Small Business Innovation Research Program;

(3) avoids duplication of existing National Aeronautics and Space Administration programs with the universities; and

(4) derives funding from the Space Research and Technology program.

(c) COMPLETION.—The study required by subsection (b) shall be completed and its results submitted to the Congress within one year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) ADVICE.—In carrying out the study required by subsection (b), the Administrator shall seek the advice of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Advisory Council, the National Research Council's Aeronautics and Space Engineering Board and Space Studies Board, and other organizations as appropriate.

SEC. 313. GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall give consideration to geographical distribution of its research and development funds whenever feasible.

SEC. 314. CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—The Administrator shall require that all cost-type research and development contracts entered into by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the acquisition of articles or services shall incorporate a provision which holds the contractor liable, in accordance with subsection (c) of this section, for failure to comply with the requirements of the contract.

(b) LIABILITIES.—A provision described in subsection (a) shall, in the event of such a failure, hold the contractor liable for the lesser of—

(1) 50 percent of the cost of rectifying such failure; or

(2) 10 percent of the contract value at the time of such failure.

(c) EXCEPTIONS.—Liability under subsection (b) shall not be imposed if—

(1) the failure occurred despite the best efforts of the contractor and could not have been reasonably predicted at the time the contract was awarded; or

(2) the failure occurred notwithstanding the fact that the contractor had adopted, and its employees were following, generally accepted industrial practices in carrying out the contract requirements.

(d) PROHIBITION.—The cost of insurance to cover potential liabilities described in subsection (b) shall not be an allowable cost under a contract described in subsection (a).

SEC. 315. LAND CONVEYANCE.

The Administrator may accept the conveyance to the United States of certain parcels of land from the cities of Cleveland and Brook Park, Ohio, for the purpose of establishing a Visitor Center for the Lewis Research Center.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALKER: Page 48, after line 10, insert the following new section:

SEC. 316. PROCUREMENT.

(a) PROCUREMENT DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall establish within the Office of Advanced Concepts and Technology a program of expedited technology procurement for the purpose of demonstrating how innovative technology concepts can rapidly be brought to bear upon space missions of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

(2) PROCEDURES AND EVALUATION.—The Administrator shall establish procedures for actively seeking from nongovernment persons innovative technology concepts relating to the provision of space hardware, technology, or services to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and for the evaluation of such concepts by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's Advisory Council against mission requirements.

(3) REQUIREMENT.—At least 10 percent of amounts authorized to be appropriated under section 101(b)(8) for each fiscal year shall be used for innovative technology procurements that are determined under paragraph (2) of this subsection to meet mission requirements.

(4) SPECIAL AUTHORITY.—In order to carry out this subsection the Administrator shall recruit and hire for limited term appointments persons from the nongovernmental sector with special expertise and experience related to the innovative technology concepts with respect to which procurements are made under this subsection.

(b) SUNSET.—This section shall cease to be effective 10 years after the date of its enactment.

Mr. WALKER (during the reading). Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous

consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, I do want to explain this amendment a little bit, because I do think it is important to make a little bit of legislative history.

Mr. BROWN of California. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Madam Chairman, in an effort to encourage the gentleman to be brief with his explanation, let me indicate that we are more than happy to accept the amendment.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, I shall be brief.

Let me indicate here just exactly what this is designed to do. It is designed to elicit from the private sector some innovative concepts which shall be applied to the missions of NASA. All too often NASA relies on its own in-house expertise to design space transportation, infrastructure, and payloads, without giving due consideration to concepts that have been developed in the private sector.

Commonly referred to as the not-invented-here syndrome, NASA has in the past been unreceptive to new solutions for the fulfillment of mission requirements. My amendment would require NASA to survey the private sector see what new technology may be available from outside the government to accomplish the agency's goals. If these concepts, when measured against mission requirements by the NASA Advisory Council, are found to be feasible, the Administrator shall be required to procure up to 10 percent of the commercial programs requirements from new technologies.

□ 1100

But, perhaps more importantly, the amendment provides the Administrator with the tools to overcome the NASA culture which may drown innovative ideas before they are translated from drawing board to prototype.

In short, Madam Chairman, through this amendment I am trying to create the skunk works incentiveness that has been evidenced in abundance by small businesses throughout this country. It has been uniquely valuable as an American asset.

So I think that this will give us a chance to do some innovating at NASA that has not been very obvious in recent months, and the Administrator and I have talked about this. This is a concept that he personally is excited about, and I am pleased that the gentleman from California is willing to accept the amendment. I think it would help move us forward.

Mr. BROWN of California. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BROWN of California. Madam Chairman, since the gentleman has made such a cogent explanation of the amendment, let me just add that this is a technique that is already used in other agencies such as the Department of Defense and intellegence agencies and others. It seems to work well. It does cut through the bureaucratic delays frequently, and I know that the administration and the NASA Administrator are both eager to improve the workings of NASA through expedited procedures of this sort. And the gentleman's amendment will undoubtedly help that.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALKER: Page 38, after line 22, insert the following new subsections:

(b) FUNCTIONS.—The Office of Space Commerce shall be the principal unit for the coordination of space-related issues, programs, and initiatives within the Department of Commerce. The Office's responsibilities shall include—

(1) promoting private sector investment in space activities by collecting, analyzing, and disseminating information on space markets, and conducting workshops and seminars to increase awareness of commercial space opportunities;

(2) assisting commercial space companies in their efforts to do business with the United States Government, and acting as an industry advocate within the executive branch to ensure that the Federal Government meets its space-related requirement, to the fullest extent feasible, with commercially available space goods and services;

(3) ensuring that the United States Government does not compete with the private sector in the provision of space hardware and services otherwise available from the private sector;

(4) promoting the export of space-related goods and services;

(5) representing the Department of Commerce in the development of United States policies and in negotiations with foreign countries to ensure free and fair trade internationally in the area of space commerce;

(6) seeking the removal of legal, policy, and institutional impediments to space commerce; and

(7) supporting the private sector's role in the commercial development of Landsat remote sensing data distribution.

(c) REPORT.—The Office of Space Commerce shall, within 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, submit a report to the President and the Congress containing recommendations for procuring space infrastructure, space launch and launch support facilities, and payloads using proof of concept methods and unsolicited proposals. In preparing such report, the Office of Space Commerce shall consult with appropriate persons in the private sector.

Page 38, line 23, redesignate subsection (b) as subsection (d).

Mr. WALKER (during the reading). Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, this amendment merely further clarifies the duties and responsibilities of the Office of Space Commerce. It is a part of my continuing effort to enhance commercial space opportunities for the United States.

In that regard, on Friday I introduced the omnibus commercial space bill, and this amendment is a part of that continuing effort.

I would like to thank Chairman BROWN, Chairman HALL, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER for continuing to support me in these endeavors, and this amendment will move us in that direction.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF MICHIGAN

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Page 48, after line 10, insert the following new section:

SEC. 316. REMOTE SENSING FOR AGRICULTURAL AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) the use of remote sensing data is potentially a valuable resource to anticipate potential food, feed, and fiber shortages or excesses, and provide this information to the agricultural community in time to assist farmers with planning decisions;

(2) remote sensing data can be useful to predict impending famine problems and forest infestations in time to allow remedial action;

(3) remote sensing data can inform the agricultural community as to the condition of crops and the land which sustains those crops;

(4) remote sensing data can be useful to allow farmers to apply pesticides, nutrients, and water, among other inputs, to farmlands in the exact amounts necessary to maximize crop yield, thereby reducing agricultural costs and minimizing potential harm to the environment;

(5) remote sensing data can be valuable, when received on a timely basis, in determining the needs of additional plantings of a particular crop or a substitute crop; and

(6) the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, using the expertise of the Earth Observations Commercialization Applications Program, and the Department of Agriculture should work in tandem to aid farmers to obtain data conducive to sound agricultural management and greater crop yields.

(b) INFORMATION DEVELOPMENT.—The Secretary of Agriculture and the Administrator

of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, maximizing private funding and involvement, shall provide farmers and other interested persons with timely information, through remote sensing, on crop conditions, fertilization and irrigation needs, pest infiltration, soil conditions, projected food, feed, and fiber production and any other information available through remote sensing.

(c) ENHANCED REMOTE SENSING PROGRAM.

(1) The Secretary of Agriculture and the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall jointly evaluate the need for a radar imaging platform that could enhance U.S. remote sensing capability by providing information and data relating to agricultural resources, and which may have other commercial and research applications.

(2) In the event there is a finding of need for a platform as set forth in paragraph (1), the Secretary of Agriculture and the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall jointly develop a proposal, which maximizes private funding and involvement in the launch and operation of such platform, and in the management and dissemination of the data from such platform. The Secretary and the Administrator shall jointly submit the proposal, within 30 days of its development, to the House Committee on Agriculture, the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, the House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

(d) TRAINING.—The Secretary of Agriculture and the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall jointly develop a proposal to inform farmers and other prospective users concerning the use and availability of remote sensing data.

(e) SUNSET.—The provisions of this section shall expire 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan (during the reading). Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Madam Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to H.R. 2200, the NASA authorization bill. This amendment directs NASA and the Department of Agriculture to work together with private industry to make better use of remote sensing data for American agriculture.

Remote sensing satellites—by taking photographic and radar images of the Earth from space—can provide important information to American agriculture. With this information, we can:

Anticipate potential food, feed, and fiber shortages and gluts.

Predict impending famines and forest infestations in time to mitigate or prevent them.

Provide information on the condition of crops and cropland.

Assist farmers in the proper application of pesticides, nutrients, water, and other inputs to maximize crop yield.

Help farmers decide what kinds of crops to plant based on predicted acres and yield in southern climates and other countries; and

Improve the administration of agricultural policy.

Today, the United States has two remote sensing satellites flying under the Landsat Program. The data produced by these satellites and other remote sensing might greatly improve the operation of farms and farm programs. But we are not using this technology as well as we might.

The amendment I offer to H.R. 2200 directs NASA and the Department of Agriculture to work together, and with the private sector, to find ways to improve the use of remote sensing technology in American agriculture. Those agencies are then directed to report their findings back to Congress.

I am delighted by the broad bipartisan support I have seen in this body to expand and improve the use of remote sensing technology. I thank the chairman and ranking member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee and the chairman and ranking member of the Agriculture Committee for their support of this amendment.

This amendment helps bring American agriculture into the 21st century. We lead the world in space technology: Let us take advantage of that know-how. I ask the House to pass this amendment to H.R. 2200.

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for working with us. We did have some language to work out to make certain that the amendment would do what the gentleman wanted to do, and would satisfy some other ongoing concerns. The gentleman worked with us very cooperatively on that, and I am very pleased to accept the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of California. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from California, chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Mr. BROWN of California. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to compliment him on his amendment.

We have been interested in this subject matter of this amendment for a number of years, hoping that we could make additional progress in this area. I think the gentleman's amendment is constructive, and it will assist us in moving forward, and on our side we are glad to accept it.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

Mr. TRAFICANT. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT: Page 48, after line 10, insert the following new section:

SEC. 316. ADDITIONAL NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION FACILITIES.

(a) SELECTION IN DEPRESSED COMMUNITIES.—When consistent with the goals of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and cost-effective, the Administrator shall select sites in depressed communities for new programs or functions of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, unless those new programs or functions are so closely related to programs or functions carried out at an existing facility as to require being carried out at that existing facility.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section, the term "depressed communities" means rural and urban communities that are relatively depressed, in terms of age of housing, extent of poverty, growth of per capita income, extent of unemployment, job lag, or surplus labor.

Mr. TRAFICANT (during the reading). Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Madam Chairman, my first amendment deals with the fact that NASA has on many occasions established new programs. One of the problems I think we have experienced in looking at the NASA program is NASA is not as widespread as the Pentagon is and does not enjoy as much total support from all of the different regions of America. There are many of us who believe that is very important and critical to NASA's future.

Second of all, there are many communities that do need some help with creating a few jobs. The amendment says where it is cost-effective, NASA shall or will create new programs that entail new jobs where it does not necessarily have to be located in existing facilities, and where it is cost-effective and will meet the goals of NASA, and NASA shall consider placing these programs and these jobs in parts of America that are depressed, that need a helping hand.

That will do two things. No. 1, it is going to help those communities who are paying taxes to try and keep our space program and our NASA program alive, and second of all, it is going to give NASA the type of broad-based people support throughout America when it is needed for some of the critical votes on some of the critical initiatives they have.

Mr. BROWN of California. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

[Mr. BROWN], chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Mr. BROWN of California. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and want to express my appreciation to him for the cooperation he has shown in working out an acceptable draft of this amendment.

The gentleman, of course, has shown over a long period of time a very deep concern for the welfare of the depressed communities of this country, and particularly those in his own State of Ohio. And we want to assist in every way we can to support this kind of a concept, as long as it does not endanger the central mission of NASA. We think the amendment in its present form is constructive. We commend the gentleman for it, and we are willing to accept it on our side.

Mr. TRAFICANT. I appreciate the support of the chairman. I would like to say that the language in this amendment is not inflexible. The Administrator is only required to expand to new sites when it is cost-effective and within the scope of NASA, and meeting much of the criteria that have been articulated by our chairman. So I appreciate his support and the committee's support in addressing this issue.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

Mr. TRAFICANT. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT: Page 48, after line 10, insert the following new section:

SEC. 316. RECIPROCITY.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—Except as provided in subsection (b), no contract or subcontract may be made with funds authorized under this Act to a company organized under the laws of a foreign country unless the Administrator finds that such country affords comparable opportunities to companies organized under the laws of the United States.

(b) EXCEPTION.—(1) The Administrator may waive the rule stated under subsection (a) if the products or services required are not reasonably available from companies organized under the laws of the United States. Any such waiver shall be reported to the Congress.

(2) Subsection (a) shall not apply to the extent that to do so would violate the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade or any other international agreement to which the United States is a party.

Mr. TRAFICANT (during the reading). Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Madam Chairman, I would like to say that this is an amendment that deals with reciprocity, and it basically states that no contract or subcontract may be made with funds authorized under this act to a company organized under the laws of a foreign country unless the Administrator finds that such country affords comparable opportunities to companies organized under the laws of America.

It does not violate our international agreements. It does not violate any stipulation of law, nor GATT. And I believe it is consistent with the goals, and it still provides for flexibility, for the judgment of the Administrator who would be encompassing the policies of our administration and our laws.

Mr. BROWN of California. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman again for yielding. We commend him again for the sensitivity and flexibility he has shown in working out the language of this amendment so that it does comport with national policy. it protects jobs in the United States, which is a central concern, but it does so in a way that does not infringe upon other obligations, and we are happy to accept it.

Mr. TRAFICANT. I appreciate that. Without the chairman's help we would not have the opportunity to bring this amendment. And I appreciate the support of our vice chairman on the issue.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Madam Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio has revised this amendment from the time that it was in committee, and I appreciate the work that has been done on this. It alleviates some of the concerns that I had about the amendment.

But let me say that I think that we need to be careful when we wander into this area. A couple of months ago we had a competitiveness bill on the floor that I was not very excited about, that I thought was a pretty lousy piece of legislation.

□ 1110

But we passed an amendment to that competitiveness bill similar to this one, not the same, but similar and similar kind of language that has caused the industry coalition that previously backed the bill to absolutely abandon the entire piece of legislation. I do not want to put something in this bill that would do that.

I do not believe this amendment drafted in its current form will do that because it says that nothing done could be a violation of the GATT agreements.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. TRAFICANT. I would like to say, Madam Chairman, that the improvement in the language basically came from some of the gentleman's ideas.

Mr. WALKER. Right.

Mr. TRAFICANT. I think the ideas of the gentleman from Pennsylvania have been correct, right on target. I think they have improved this.

I do not think we will experience the same type of problems that we did in the competitiveness bill.

I want to thank the gentleman for that.

I want to establish legislative history here that there is no intent to do anything outside the scope of any perceived law, as well as law that exists.

So I thank the gentleman for what he has done. I think that safeguards this and makes it a lot better amendment.

Mr. WALKER. Well, Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman. I appreciate his working with us to try to clean it up.

I will tell the gentleman that we cannot correct this in the amendment, but the one remaining concern I have is the fact that this could potentially block NASA from contracting to obtain the most cost-effective procurements along the way. In my view, that is a danger here.

Because the Buy America amendment is already in effect and it applies, I am not certain that this is totally necessary; but the gentleman has done a good job of cleaning up the language so that we do not have a problem with it interfering in commerce.

I appreciate the gentleman's willingness to work with us. I am not going to oppose the amendment, but I use this time only to express some degree of caution about the direction in which we are proceeding.

With that, Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COX

Mr. COX. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COX: Page 48, after line 10, insert the following new section:

SEC. 316. HELIUM PURCHASES.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration may purchase helium from private sector sources.

Mr. COX. Madam Chairman, the amendment I offer today will end the requirement that NASA buy its helium from a Government-run monopoly, the national helium reserve. It will allow NASA to buy helium from any source, public or private. By allowing private helium producers to bid on NASA contracts, and letting NASA purchase helium at the best price and terms, Congress will go a long way toward bringing the forces of competition and free enterprise to one of the Federal Government's most notoriously wasteful programs: the national helium reserve.

The helium program was established as a national security measure in 1925, to ensure that America could field a fleet of blimps in time of war.

At the time, there was no private source of helium; but today, private firms account for 90 percent of the Nation's helium sales—over $300 million.

And blimps have long since been replaced by satellites for aerial surveillance.

The national helium reserve is a Federal program whose time has come and gone. It is the worst kind of Governmental anachronism: a program bereft of any identifiable mission, a program that private industry could do more effectively, and a program that is $1.4 billion in debt—and going further into debt each year. In his book "Parliament of Whores," P.J. O'Rourke described the U.S. Government's helium program as "amazingly stupid, even by government standards."

You may already know that the Federal helium program is anachronistic, or that it loses $120 million each year. You may not have known that the national helium reserve's high overhead and inefficient production are also protected from private sector competition by a Government monopoly. Under the Helium Act of 1960, NASA and other Federal agencies are required to purchase their helium from the national helium reserve. As a result of its insulation from competition, the Government-run helium operation costs much more to run than its free-market competitors. But its inefficiency is protected by law, so that it takes 300 Government workers to do the job that perhaps 100 could do in private industry. That is why the helium reserve is losing so much money. It can't even keep up with its interest payments. This year, it will go $120 million deeper into debt.

While a Government-protected monopoly for helium producers may have been an appropriate policy in 1960, when there were no domestic suppliers of helium, it is clearly inappropriate today. This year, private industry will account for more than 90 percent of the nation's helium sales—over $300 million. America's private industry is fully capable of meeting the Federal Government's helium needs. In fact, American industry today provides over 90 percent of the entire world's needs. Preventing them from selling to NASA is—well—downright un-American. It is an affront to the free enterprise system. It is a hoary example of socialism, of State-run industry, at a time when the whole world has rejected socialism as a discredited and wasteful embarrassment.

The time for a Government-owned helium industry—let alone one with a monopoly—has come and gone. That is why T.S. Ary, former director of the Bureau of Mines—which operates the national helium reserve—wrote last year: "The government should not be competing with the private sector in the helium business or in any area where the private sector is capable of satisfying the country's needs."

This view is backed up both by private industry, and the Department of the Interior.

Listen to the testimony of Carl Johnson, Chairman of the Helium Advisory Council, at a Natural Resources Subcommittee hearing on the national helium reserve earlier this year.

He said:

> The private helium industry is prepared to meet all of the U.S. demand for helium, including the demand from the U.S. government agencies. With the private helium industry now fully capable of satisfying the U.S. demand for helium, the Helium Advisory Council believes it is now appropriate for the Bureau of Mines to withdraw from [its] helium production and marketing activities, [and] to discontinue its competition with the private sector.

Likewise, getting the Federal Government out of the helium business has been specifically endorsed by the Department of Interior for years. In a 1989 letter to the Speaker of the House, the Secretary of the Interior stated: "It is now time for the Federal Government to * * * allow the private sector to provide helium for both the Federal and [the] private sectors."

Since then, the Department of the Interior has often repeated its support for allowing Federal agencies the freedom of choice to buy helium from private sources.

Of all Federal agencies, NASA is by far the largest purchaser of helium. During fiscal 1992, NASA purchased 131 million cubic feet of helium from the Government-owned helium monopoly. According to the Congressional Research Service, the Federal Government's helium monopoly currently charges NASA $55 per 1,000 cubic feet of helium. By contrast, private helium producers charge as little as $45 per 1,000 cubic feet. That means NASA is forced to pay over 20 percent higher prices for helium, because of this Government monopoly. If we end the Government monopoly, we save NASA $6.5 million over the next 5 years.

And if all Federal agencies that use helium—not just NASA—are allowed to accept competitive bids, the Federal Government will save at least $20 million over 5 years.

We should also keep in mind that these figures are a conservative estimate of the potential savings for taxpayers. That's because once the national helium reserve is subjected to the real world forces of competition, it will be forced to trim its own waste and efficiency. Then and only then, Madam Chairman, can we expect this Government-run dinosaur to become sufficiently profitable to repay its own debt.

Madam Chairman, ending the Government monopoly on sales to NASA is endorsed not only by the Helium Advisory Council and the Department of the Interior, but also by the National Taxpayers Union; the Heritage Foundation; Citizens Against Government Waste; the Compressed Gas Association; and the workers and employees at virtually every private helium firm in America.

Let us pop the bubble on some of the most blimped-out and downright silly waste in Government. It is time for the Government-run helium monopoly to float back to the private sector. Let us begin that process today by adopting the Cox-Frank amendment.

Mr. SARPALIUS. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Cox amendment.

Madam Chairman, there is another side of this story. Let me say that we are not here to debate the tremendous job that the helium operation does, in my opinion, for this country, but we are here to debate the Cox amendment which is requesting that NASA purchase its helium from the private sector.

I might add that the helium operation that this country has is a model. For an example, there was an article that came out in the Washington Post on June 29, 1993, which states that the national helium reserve is a rare good Federal program and that the helium field operates well in a general manner and this is a Federal program that does work.

□ 1120

What the gentleman told my colleagues, my friend from California, is a little misleading. Back in the 1960's, when the Federal Government purchased the helium, they placed that helium in reserves up in Amarillo, TX, and in other areas across the country. But during that period of time the Bureau of Mines set an interest rate that they would pay back to the U.S. Treasury. The Federal Government never appropriated funds to help pay back that interest rate. During that period of time interest rates would go up to 18 percent and drop down to some of the lower rates of interest that we are witnessing today.

Well, over that period of time, Madam Chairman, we have now seen a billion dollars' worth of interest that is owed to the Federal Government. It is basically one agency owing another agency interest payments. GAO studied this problem, and their recommendation back to Congress was that Congress should forgive the billion-dollar-interest note. If we were able to do that, we would see the helium operation, in a sense, giving back to the Federal Government anywhere from $10 to $11 million a year. In the current program that we now have, Madam Chairman, we appropriate about $23 million from the U.S. Treasury to different Federal agencies, basically

through the Bureau of Mines, and that money is then used in different Federal agencies, of which NASA is a big user of the helium that we produce in this country. But we return back to the U.S. Treasury $13 million.

Now the reason that the gentleman from California [Mr. COX], my friend, is supporting us, the private sector selling helium to NASA, is because he claims that it can be at a cheaper price than what the Federal Government offers. Well, the reason the Federal Government's helium prices are higher than the private sector is because President Bush chose to raise the price of helium when, in all honesty, the answer is for the Federal Government to lower the price of helium. We can, indeed, sell helium cheaper than the private sector can. This is a resource that the taxpayers own. We paid $750 million for this resource. It is now valued at over a billion dollars.

But the debate here today is not what to do with the helium reserves, Madam Chairman. The debate today is whether or not NASA should purchase our helium from the private sector. I might add that the gentleman from California's amendment is in direct conflict with the Helium Act in itself. His amendment really has no impact at all on NASA purchasing their helium from the Federal Government because his amendment does not address the Helium Act.

Madam Chairman, I would strongly encourage my colleagues to vote "no" against the Cox amendment.

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

Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. COX], and I do so for a number of reasons. The gentleman from California is correct in that in the bookkeeping process the amount of helium which is purchased from the helium reserve by NASA does, in fact, show up as a cost above what could probably be purchased in the open market. In a conversation this morning with the director of the helium reserve in Amarillo, TX, I asked him why would they not be willing to sell at a reduced rate, and he said that he would love to be able to, that in fact they could reduce the price probably $20 per thousand cubic feet, and be happy to sell that to NASA.

Now what would happen if, in fact, that occurred? There would be an outcry by the private sector that the Government was undercutting what the marketplace has established that would be a fair price for helium. It would, in fact, tremendously undercut the price that it is being sold at today on the private market for a thousand cubic feet by the private sector, which is about $45 to $50 per thousand cubic feet. They, of course, cannot do that. That would, in fact, cause a tremendous outcry by the private producers of helium.

What the effect could be in this, Madam Chairman, in the fact that there is some, and I will take the figures of the gentleman from California, $6½ million over 5 years, and point out, as was reiterated by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SARPALIUS] last year, the helium reserve returned to the Federal Government $13 million. The previous year it was $10 million, and the year before that, something over $9 million. That is per year. Now it is coming back into the Federal Government. It may be somewhat in that it is allocated differently. It may be that it goes into a different pot. But, if my colleagues consider the total cost of that program, which absolutely I remind my colleagues has no appropriation each year to run the helium reserve, all runs totally within itself, and the profits which were made again last year, $13 million, went back to the Federal Government.

Now what I might suggest that we could accomplish, the goal that would not cause the helium reserve to compete on an unfair basis with private sector and at the same time not cause NASA to have to increase their cost in buying helium from the reserve, would be that we give credit to NASA and any other Federal agency. Obviously we cannot do that under this bill, but it will be something, I think, we should propose to do, that we give credit to that agency that is buying helium from the reserve in the amount in excess that it would cost from the private sector. If we put it on a totally open-bid basis, then I would suggest that the only fair thing to do is to allow the National Helium Reserve, located in Amarillo, TX, to be able to compete and bid whatever they wish. But I will remind my colleagues that if, in fact, that happens, there will be an outcry from the private sector that says that the Federal Government is unfairly competing with them.

So, Madam Chairman, in order to accomplish the goal, if the gentleman from California [Mr. COX] is interested in reducing the cost to NASA, let us take that excess well over what it costs additional to NASA, return it back to NASA in terms of a credit. When that reserve pays back at the end of the year, it is excess that is sold.

Madam Chairman, this amendment, in fact, would require further legislative action on the 1960 Helium Act in order to truly allow that to happen to where there could be in a bidding basis from private sectors as well as from the helium reserve the amount of helium which is purchased by NASA which has been over the years, NASA has said, has been an extremely good supplier, have not wanted to make a change, and I think we could accommodate any concerns that might be had by Members of Congress that, in fact, there is some excess paid by the Federal Government by taking the more than excess amount of moneys returned to the Federal Government, giving those agencies credit. Thereby we do not allow the helium reserve to compete with the private sector, we do not disrupt the private sector, and we continue with the fair and the readily available supply of helium to the NASA program.

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

Madam Chairman, first of all, I would like to say to my colleague on the Democratic side from Texas and my colleague from Texas on the Republican side that this, the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. COX], does not require NASA to buy their helium from private industries. It just says they can, and I think that is a big difference. If they feel that the helium reserve is the proper place to buy it at a competitive price, NASA can continue to buy it from the helium reserve. On the other hand, if they find that the cost from private industry is substantially less or less, they can buy it from private. Right now they are prohibited, and I think my colleagues should understand. NASA cannot go out to the private industry and buy helium even if it costs a lot less. They are required under the law.

Now back in the 1920's, Madam Chairman, when the helium reserve was created, probably it had a good purpose. There were no domestic suppliers of helium, and the Government felt that they needed helium for the national security, and even up until the 1960's the military still had blimps and other devices using helium and needed it for the national security. Now there are plenty of suppliers of helium out in the industries that can provide NASA with enough, and the rest of the Government with enough, helium for all the demands, and it probably far exceeds it. In fact, helium production in this country is one of the industries that exports a lot of helium throughout the world and certainly can supply our domestic needs. But the fact is that they are precluded, the Government, from buying from these domestic companies.

□ 1130

There are times when albatrosses have to be cut loose, and in this particular case, as far as the helium reserve is concerned, I know the gentleman from California [Mr. COX] has been a champion in fighting this and has a bill, H.R. 1552, that would abolish the reserve. Right now we cannot abolish the reserve, but we can certainly give NASA the opportunity to buy from private industry at a cheaper price.

The gentleman from Texas has recommended that there be some amendments to the Helium Reserve Act to

allow credits, and so forth, to bring the price down to NASA, to the same price they may be paying on the private market. That is fine and good. We encourage them to do that, and that may be a good solution. But that is not the solution that is in front of us today.

I commend my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. COX], for bringing this amendment to us. It is a good, strong amendment. It will save NASA millions of dollars a year. Until the members of the committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBEST] and others, are able to amend the Helium Act to save the taxpayer dollars, I think we as Members of Congress should do the responsible thing. We should amend this NASA authorization to allow—and I say again that the word is "allow"—allow, not require, NASA to buy from private suppliers of helium to save dollars that we so desperately need to address the deficit in this country.

Mrs. FOWLER. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Madam Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the amendment offered by the gentlemen from California and Massachusetts.

I first learned about the issue of the Federal Government's helium reserves before I became a Member of this body. It came to my attention during my campaign last year when I was looking for a good example of government waste to use when I talked about the need for fiscal responsibility in Washington.

When I came across the 64-year-old National Helium Reserve Program, I stopped looking.

The helium program became the centerpiece of my speeches about government waste. It was a program that was outdated, unneeded, and was losing money. It was also the perfect example of where the Government was in a business that the private sector could do much cheaper.

I am a cosponsor of a bill by the gentleman from California that will address the issues of outdated and unneeded, it is a bill to repeal the Helium Act all together.

In the meantime, I am pleased to rise in support of this amendment which will immediately begin to address the issue of public versus private sector. If NASA can buy helium from the private sector cheaper than from the U.S. Government, then we should not stand in their way.

Last year alone, it cost NASA an extra $1.3 million to buy helium from the Government instead of the private sector.

As many of us know, this kind of waste and inefficiency is not limited to NASA and the helium program.

That is why I am a cosponsor of H.R. 163, the Freedom from Government Competition Act. This bill would free the entire Federal Government to procure goods and services from the private sector where they are often cheaper, more efficient and where increased business will create private sector jobs.

As I work with Mr. DUNCAN for passage of that important bill, and as I work with Mr. COX for total repeal of the Helium Act, I urge my colleagues, in the meantime, to support this amendment.

Mr. SARPALIUS. Madam Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. FOWLER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SARPALIUS. Madam Chairman, the gentlewoman said in her statement that we returned $1.3 million, or that they could buy it cheaper than that from the private sector. Is the gentlewoman aware that we returned $13 million back to the U.S. Treasury?

Mr. COX. Madam Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. FOWLER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COX. Madam Chairman, in fact the gentleman from Texas, in claiming that the national helium reserve contributes money to the Treasury, conveniently ignores a few facts.

First of all, $6 million of the amount that the gentleman claims is contributed on behalf of the reserve to the Treasury comprises royalty payments from companies like Exxon, not earnings from the national helium reserve. Second, even more conveniently, the gentleman has ignored the fact that the helium reserve is deeply in debt. It borrowed $250 million from the Federal Government, which by law is supposed to be repaid by 1995.

As the gentleman knows, the helium reserve has no intention of paying that money back, or even the interest, and we know that this year the helium reserve defaulted in full on $120 million of its interest due this year.

Mr. SARPALIUS. Madam Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. FOWLER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SARPALIUS. Madam President, is the gentleman aware that he is talking about one agency versus another agency? It is like you yourself transferring money from a checking account to a savings account. It is all within your own control.

Mr. COX. Madam Chairman, reclaiming my time, we are talking about $252 million of taxpayer money advanced to the national helium reserve in the form of a loan which by law is supposed to be repaid by 1995. The interest on that debt runs to $120 million a year, and the reserve cannot pay it because it cannot cover its interest costs from its operations.

Mr. SARPALIUS. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would point out that the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER] has the time.

Mrs. FOWLER. Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment.

I agree with those who suggested that the ultimate goal should be to abolish the helium reserve altogether. I do not believe that anyone has shown that the national security of the United States will be one whit endangered by its abolition. This is a relevant part of that because it is obvious that if we were to bring a bill to the floor abolishing the helium reserve at a time when it was the sole supplier to NASA and NASA could not even talk to anybody else about alternative supplies, we would be told that we could not abolish the helium reserve because it was the sole supplier to NASA.

So it is a great example of bootstrapping. Bootstrapping is, of course, what lawyers say when you lift yourself by your own bootstraps. A helium-powered bootstrapping obviously has a great deal more ability for people to go up, and so we are into helium bootstrapping here.

On the one hand, we say we keep a helium reserve for which there is no real purpose, but on the other hand, we say that NASA has to buy the helium from the helium reserve when there is cheaper helium available elsewhere, and then we argue further why we have to have such a helium reserve. We create the need.

This bill is a first step toward that rational effort. Now we are told this does not cost any money because after all, this is an intragovernmental transfer. That is true if the helium has no value. In the economic sense we would be talking purely about an accounting transaction if the helium and the helium reserve of the Federal Government having been depleted here was in fact of no value. But if in fact that helium is worth something, as I assume it is, although I will confess as someone who is not scientifically adept that the notion that something you cannot see, touch, or feel is really all that valuable sometimes is hard for me to focus on, although I take it from my intellectual betters in that area that the helium is a valuable commodity, therefore, the question is, what is the appropriate pricing? Are we in fact pricing this appropriately or not?

If NASA were able to buy it more cheaply, that would mean that the helium that we have as a Federal asset, because it is in fact an asset because it is of real value, would be available for other purposes if and when we decide to abolish the reserves.

Finally, as has been pointed out, this is simply permissive to NASA. If NASA decides that buying continuously from this reserve is the best way to go, nothing in this amendment stops it. But at

least NASA would have the responsibility to make some alternative arrangements and ask some alternative questions. At least NASA would be able to talk about whether there were alternatives, so when we were able to bring a bill forward to abolish this unnecessary reserve, we would not be faced with the argument that doing it would cripple NASA, which would be left helium-less.

Madam Chairman, I hope the amendment is adopted.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, I would say to the gentleman that a nonscientific way to value the helium is to point out that it helps the guy in the movies to do the Donald Duck voice.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Chairman, in the interest of comity, I am not going to comment on that one at all.

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

Madam Chairman, this is a wonderful case study of what a tangled web we weave when first we get the Government involved in what should be a private enterprise.

There was arguably a case in 1960 that the Federal Government should get involved in helium production and helium reserves because it was believed that all the reserves of helium had already been discovered and they had to be husbanded. As we now know, there are far more reserves than were identified at that time.

The free-market sources of helium have prospered and have multiplied, and we simply do not need the Federal Government in the picture anymore.

The most direct way to deal with the problem, of course, is to sell the helium reserves, and for that reason I am cosponsoring along with many other Members H.R. 1552, which was introduced by the gentleman from California [Mr. COX], which would simply sell the helium reserves in a way that would not disrupt the private marketplace. But because that legislation is not before us and has not been released by committee, we have to deal with the problem the way we find it. I think a commonsense way of dealing with this problem is simply to have NASA and other Federal agencies buy from private sources when the public sources are overpriced. It makes a lot of sense to do that.

□ 1140

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBEST] proposed that we return the excess of what the taxpayers are paying to NASA as a credit. This just tangles the web still further, I believe, because it creates a Rube Goldberg approach to solve a problem that could easily be dealt with simply by eliminating its cause. That is, the unnecessary involvement of Government in the supply of a commodity which is no longer necessary for national security, which is available in great abundance, and which the free market has proved itself more than capable of supplying.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Cox amendment. It is not easy for me to rise in opposition to any amendment that the gentleman from California [Mr. COX] has, because the gentleman is usually so right on every issue.

This time I respectfully differ with the gentleman from California [Mr. COX]. I am not going to talk about transferring bank accounts or intergovernmental exchanges or anything. Let me just talk about how this amendment would affect those that have to live with this amendment, have to handle this amendment, and have to represent this Government using the facilities at hand.

The national helium reserve has been good for the Nation. I think almost anyone would tell us that. It has been good for the Nation's space program. NASA tells us that.

I respectfully say to the gentleman that while this really does not do anything, does not really mandate anything, it simply is a step in the wrong direction at this time. It may not be a step in the wrong direction from here on.

As has been reported, the national helium reserve is an example of a Government program that works. While we have so many that do not work, why set aside one that works?

We should not thoughtlessly walk away from such a program. Before we would unravel the current arrangement, I think we need to be very sure of what the implications are of what is being proposed in the Cox amendment. We do not go to rhetoric on one side or the other as to what that is, we go to those who are affected by it.

In testimony before the Energy and Mineral Resources Subcommittee this spring, on May 20, 1993, Mr. James Dufas, the Director of the Resources Community and Economic Development Division of the Government Accounting Office, made the following important point:

> If holding the federal helium inventory occurs at the same time that federal purchases of helium are shifted from the Bureau of Mines to private industry, the total cost of supplying helium to the U.S. economy increases because of the need for private investment in helium production capacity.

Thus, the amendment, while well meaning, could wind up hurting the U.S. economy, instead of helping it.

I go to the GAO, who said in testimony before Congress, "How to meet federal needs for helium is a public policy decision that should consider many issues."

The GAO and the Mineral Resources study on meeting the needs for helium has pointed that out to us in a release that was released I believe May 20, 1993.

From the U.S. Department of the Interior, once again quoting from those who have to deal with this, from the acting director, he states,

> In response to program inquiries from the Congress, this program is currently being reviewed and various options impacting the future of the program are being considered. Some of these options would affect the employees within the organization. In summary, the program does not receive any appropriations, but must exist on revenue generated from the sale of helium and services.

Madam Chairman, helium is too important to the U.S. economy for us to act I think without thinking through this issue and understanding the implications of what we might be doing.

Finally, as chairman of the Space Committee and having held hearings with NASA, just recently NASA, in a NASA study, stated if NASA was forced to obtain its helium from private industry, it would cost NASA $6 million for equipment to change that helium to a form that NASA can use.

Madam Chairman, I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment.

Mr. CASTLE. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Madam Chairman, when I was campaigning for this office last year I read a lot of different books and circulations that were sent to my office concerning pork barrel projects and unnecessary expenditures by the Federal Government. Generally the helium sales and the helium reserve were one of those that made practically every list I can recall.

I have listened to the arguments today. Some individuals have made some very cogent points concerning the need for helium. I have no doubt that back whenever it was, in 1960 or before, when this particular structure was created with the requirement that NASA purchase its helium from it, there was a need for this. In fact, my research would show indeed there was some question about the whole future of production of helium in the United States of America.

But it is 1993, and the time has come I believe for a change. The concept of requiring that helium be purchased by NASA when there is a private market is outmoded, it is unnecessary, and it is extraordinarily expensive.

I have heard some of the discussions here about the intergovernmental transfer of dollars in terms of what it means. But the bottom line is that the private sector can do it less expensively than can the Federal Government. That is a litmus test that we need to start applying in the Congress of the United States of America, and it applies here because it would ultimately be less expensive if we went to

the private sector to purchase the helium which is necessary.

Madam Chairman, NASA needs help. We know that. They lobbied hard for certain things on this floor in the last 2 or 3 weeks. But this is not one on which I have heard much from them, and I have to assume that they understand perhaps the next step after doing away with the requirement should be to do away with the helium reserve in general.

It is for all these reasons I rise to support the Cox-Frank amendment. Not only because of what it represents in itself, but because of what it represents with respect to white elephants and projects of the U.S. Government which are no longer necessary and which we would be better served without at a lesser cost to the taxpayers of the country.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Madam Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the amendment offered by Mr. COX and Mr. FRANK to end the practice of forcing the Federal Government to buy helium from the national helium reserve.

It is important to underscore the fact that adopting this amendment would allow NASA to seek the most cost-effective source of helium and buy from that source. Hardly a radical proposal.

This idea seems so sensible that it is incredible we have to pass an amendment to do it—but then again, given the lack of fiscal responsibility in the Congress, I guess it is not surprising.

However, there is some evidence that Congress is beginning to understand the importance of terminating unnecessary programs. Last week we put the final nail in the coffin of the advanced solid rocket motor. Today we have the opportunity to take the first step toward shutting down the wasteful Federal helium program for good.

Madam Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Cox-Frank amendment.

Mr. BROWN of California. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Madam Chairman, this gentleman is interested in bringing this debate to a close as quickly as possible. I think we have probably had a good discussion on this issue and are ready to bring it to a vote. I personally am in agreement with the principle that the gentleman from California [Mr. COX] is expounding here, although I think that his amendment only sends a signal, as we sometimes say, and actually does not accomplish what the gentleman would like to accomplish.

I am not going to belabor this point particularly. I hope that we are ready to come to a vote on this.

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

Mr. BROWN of California. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, maybe we should ascertain how many speakers we do have. I would be agreeable to some sort of time limitation. Would the author of the amendment be agreeable to putting some kind of time limit on this?

Mr. COX. Madam Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I am very appreciative of the indulgence of the chairman. I think we only have a few people who have asked to speak.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, I was going to speak a minute or two myself.

Mr. BROWN of California. I know of on one else on our side who wishes to speak on this.

□ 1150

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

I will be brief, too. I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment. It is clear that one of the largest purchasers of helium is NASA. And if this amendment accomplishes two things, it will have done an important service.

No. 1, it will force NASA to begin to look toward private suppliers for some of its needs. That has all too often not been the case with NASA. It has been one of the complaints some of us have had over the years, that NASA has been too much insular in its policies with regard to some of these programs.

Second, in this particular case, I do believe that it is a step toward reform of the helium program and would allow the private suppliers to begin to fulfill this need and, apparently, at a cost that is much less than what the Government is providing this resource.

I think that the amendment may help us move in that direction. Therefore, it deserves the support of the Committee.

Mr. BROWN of California. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Madam Chairman, as I indicated, I think the amendment, if adopted, would send a signal. But it is not mandatory and, as the gentleman knows, there are other agencies which also buy helium from the stockpile. They would not be affected by this.

On the good side, I think the administration, through the Vice President's Task Force on Improving or Reinventing Government, is looking in the same direction as the gentleman from California [Mr. COX], toward some modifications or perhaps elimination of the helium program.

To do that, however, would require changing another act, the Helium Act, which is not reached by this.

My guess is, if we pass this amendment, that it would probably still be reviewed by OMB. And OMB would, in order to maintain consistency, probably say to NASA, keep doing what we require Defense and other agencies to do.

I am concerned because of that, that the fact that this might confuse the situation, but as I have indicated, I would be willing to endorse the legislation of the gentleman from California [Mr. COX] and hope that that would assist us.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman. I agree that this does not completely solve the problems that have been mentioned here with the helium program. But it is also clear that in the business of cutting back the NASA budget, which this House has endorsed in a couple of amendments and which the Administrator, in fact, is trying to do, in trying to find places to save money, this is certainly one area where it appears as though some savings may be possible to obtain a resource that NASA badly needs.

So, therefore, if this does give him some latitude to do that by law, it seems to me we have accomplished something worthwhile.

Mr. BROWN of California. Madam Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, if I had known that we were going to have this thorough and extensive a discussion of the helium program, I would have invited our colleagues on the Committee on Natural Resources, which has jurisdiction over this program, to attend so that they might get the benefit of it.

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Chairman, I just wanted to jump in here. I guess I am already plowing ground that has already been plowed. I want to say that when we cut a program, there is always folks who say we need it because of this, because of that.

One of the things that I am experiencing as a freshman who came up here to try to address the debt is that everything seems to have a sacred cow status when it comes time to cut it. But we have got a $4 trillion debt.

We are passing a controversial tax increase. And if it passes, based on the White House projections, there will still be a deficit each year. And there will still be another trillion dollars added to the debt.

The interest on that is already 18 percent of our annual budget, and we have got to do something.

Here we have, I think, a rare opportunity to work as a bipartisan group and support the Cox-Frank amendment and have the Democrats and Republicans working together to reduce this spending.

So as long as private suppliers can do it and NASA is already working well with a number of private suppliers, I think that we should go ahead and do

it. It is never easy to cut, but it is certainly not easy to pay 18 percent of our national budget on the interest on the debt. I support the amendment.

Mr. ARMEY. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. Madam Chairman, let me just say very quickly, I rise in support of this amendment. I know that the gentleman from California [Mr. COX] has given us a brief truck driver's history of the helium program, begun in 1925 and revised periodically over the years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WALKER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. ARMEY. Madam Chairman, this program makes clear the adage, "The closest thing to eternal life is a government program."

Years and years and years after there is a need for a program, new legislation, new reauthorization, new dimensions to the program, new configurations of the program will be made to keep the program alive. Why? Because it is alive.

I think there is a time when we just have to say no, no more. This is a program that years and years ago outlived its usefulness.

We have got to demonstrate our ability to stand for change, to reinvent the government and to take those programs for which there is not one scintilla of reasonable justification today and eliminate those programs.

If we cannot eliminate the old, the outdated, the passe, we cannot create the new.

In a world of scarce resources, we must ration resources away from what is no longer needed, if we can possibly have them available for what is needed.

If we are going to move forward, we have got to be able to kill programs of this type, of this nature, of this lack of sense in a modern world.

My children have always been excited to see the Goodyear blimp. I have always been amazed at the degree to which their excitement arouses when they see the Goodyear blimp. Why? Because, Members, it is the only blimp in the air.

We do not need a national program of helium reserves where there are no blimps in the air. It is time to kill this program. Let us do it now.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. COX].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. COX. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 319, noes 109, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 380]

AYES—319

Ackerman
Allard
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Bacchus (FL)
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barca (WI)
Barcia (MI)
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett (MD)
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blackwell
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Borski
Brewster
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bunning
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Byrne
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr (MI)
Castle
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Danner
Darden
de Lugo (VI)
Deal
DeLauro
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Emerson
English (AZ)
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrich
Glickman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Huffington
Hughes
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Inslee
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, Sam
Johnston (FL)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kreidler
Kyl
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Leach
Levin
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Meyers (KS)
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Minge
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Norton (DC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Orton
Oxley
Pallone
Parker
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Ramstad
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Royce
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Strickland
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Sundquist
Swett
Synar
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torricelli
Underwood (GU)
Unsoeld
Upton
Vento
Visclosky
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Whitten
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—109

Abercrombie
Andrews (TX)
Barton (TX)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bevill
Bishop
Bonior
Boucher
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Cramer
de la Garza
DeFazio
Dellums
Deutsch
Dingell
Dixon
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English (OK)
Faleomavaega (AS)
Farr (CA)
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Ford (MI)
Gephardt
Geren
Gilman
Gonzalez
Green
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hilliard
Hochbrueckner
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Kennedy
Kopetski
Laughlin
Lehman
Lewis (GA)
Mann
Manton
McKinney
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Mollohan
Moran
Nadler
Ortiz
Owens
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Pickett
Pickle
Rahall
Reynolds
Richardson
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sarpalius
Scott
Serrano
Skeen
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Swift
Tanner
Tejeda
Thompson (MI)
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Valentine
Velazquez
Volkmer
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Williams
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—11

Bryant
Derrick
Henry
Lazio
McCloskey
McDade
Moakley
Packard
Rangel
Washington
Wilson

□ 1228

Messrs. WHEAT, GILMAN, RICHARDSON, JEFFERSON, MFUME, MORAN, and FAZIO changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. KLEIN, BARLOW, TAYLOR of Mississippi, SCHUMER, and BLACKWELL, and Ms. FURSE changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BECERRA

Mr. BECERRA. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BECERRA: Page 48, after line 10, nsert the following new section:

SEC. 316. DIVERSITY FACTORS IN PROCUREMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall ensure, to the fullest extent possible, that at least 8 percent of the funding made available

to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for each fiscal year is made available for contracts with—

(1) socially and economically disadvantaged small business concerns;

(2) business concerns or other organizations that are at least 51 percent owned or controlled by women;

(3) historically Black colleges and universities, and

(4) colleges and universities having a student body in which more than 20 percent of the students are Hispanic Americans, and other Minority Institutions.

(b) WAIVER OF COMPETITIVE PROCEDURES.—To the extent necessary to carry out subsection (a), the Administrator may enter into contracts using less than full and open competitive procedures, but shall pay a price not exceeding fair market cost by more than 10 percent in payment per contract to contractors or subcontracts desribed in subsection (a).

(c) REGULATIONS.—The Administrator shall issue such regulations as are necessary to carry out this section, including—

(1) guidelines for contracting officers of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for carrying out subsection (b);

(2) to the extent practicable, provision for notice, before solicitation for procurements, that specific procurements have been designated for satisfying the requirement of subsection (a); and

(3) procedures for implementing this section that do not alter the procurement process under section 8(a) of the Small Business Act.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

(1) the term "historically Black colleges and universities" has the meaning given the term "part B institution" in section 322(2) of the Higher Education Act of 1965;

(2) the term "other Minority Institution" has the meaning given the term "eligible institution" in section 312(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965; and

(3) the term "socially economically disadvantaged small business concerns" has the meaning given such term in section 8(a)(4)(A) of the Small Business Act.

Mr. BECERRA (during the reading). Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1230

Mr. BECERRA. Madam Chairman, the amendment before us calls on NASA to ensure, to the fullest extent possible, that at least 8 percent of all contracts be awarded to socially and economically disadvantaged businesses, including women-owned businesses.

It is an effort to ensure that businesses owned by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals, including women, have a genuine opportunity to compete for NASA contracts.

This is not a new issue. Similar language has been adopted with bipartisan support in the past on other authorization bills—Department of Defense and National Energy Act of last year, for example.

In fact, the National Energy Act passed 363 to 60 last year.

NASA has been operating a very successful Socially Disadvantaged Business Program for the past 2 years. And they are doing an admirable job in making progress toward reaching the 8-percent goal.

However, the SDB Program was never officially authorized in an authorization bill, but rather in past appropriations bills. This amendment makes the NASA SDB Program official.

Congress has consistently expressed its desire to give minority-owned firms an opportunity to compete for and receive a fair share of Government contracts. My amendment is simply a continuation of this policy.

What we are doing is nothing less than encouraging the development of small and disadvantaged businesses—an appropriate effort in these hard economic times. It is fair and responsible.

Rebuttal points: This is not a set-aside, just a goal; this language was never adopted in a NASA authorization bill, only appropriations bills in the past. That is the reason for doing it here.

Let me make sure I point out again to the Members: This is not a quota. This is not a mandate. This calls upon NASA to the fullest extent possible within NASA to make an effort to provide opportunities for minorities and socially, economically disadvantaged business concerns to compete for NASA on contracts.

I would urge Members to vote for this amendment.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Madam Chairman, in my view what is proposed in this amendment is bad public policy. The gentleman says that this is not a quota. It certainly is quota-based, and I have problems with it.

The thing that the gentleman says which is absolutely correct is that the problem is that it is already public policy. It is what we are doing. It has been decided as a part of appropriation bills to do this and we are already engaged in these programs.

The real question before us today is whether or not the authorizing committee is going to take some control of this policy by including it within the authorization so that at the very least we have some oversight and some ability to deal with it.

The gentleman has been very forthcoming and helpful in modifying some of the language that we did have concerns about that went beyond public policy. His statement is now precisely what is public policy in the appropriation bills and simply is putting the authorizing committee in the position of being able to watch over this public policy.

I say again, this is not a wise thing to be doing in terms of public policy. Too often, I am afraid, what happens is that we take agencies such as NASA and we make their mission into a social policy mission, rather than the appropriate mission of the agency. I am concerned about that and I am concerned about the amendment in that regard.

But the bottom line is that it will not change public policy to defeat this amendment in any way. The public policy will remain. The only thing that will be lost is the ability of the authorizing committee to do something to watch to make certain that that public policy is implemented in a proper and appropriate way.

Mr. BROWN of California. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I am happy to yield to the committee chairman.

Mr. BROWN of California. Madam Chairman, I want to compliment both the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] and the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA] for making an honest effort to reach a meeting of the minds and reaching a meeting of the minds on this issue.

I think this is the way we should approach legislation. I think both gentlemen have set an excellent example, and I am happy to support the language that has been reached.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

Madam Chairman, I appreciate that the majority of this Chamber has never really understood what it means to be denied opportunities on the basis of their skin color. I appreciate that some in this body find it difficult to conceive of the additional burdens race and gender place on individuals who desire to compete on an even playing field. That is why I would like to explain a few of the realities that this amendment is trying to address.

Most people in this Chamber, if pressed, will admit that they prefer to deal with people they know personally or types of people they know through experience. It's a matter of comfort levels. I think we all accept that commonalities of shared experiences—be they through education, social circles, geographic location, military service, whatever—form the foundation for the grounds on which business relationships, indeed all relationships, are built. Historically, African-Americans, Hispanics and women have been excluded from many of these experiences and thus disadvantaged in accessing the opportunities which arise from these relationships. This amendment is very straightforward; it just says that 8 percent of contract awards be made to these individuals. There is no injustice here, no one is being deprived of anything.

It is almost embarrassing that this amendment is controversial. My constituents pay 100 percent of their tax dollars. But what do they get back? Eight percent of the opportunities. Are there people in this body who will deny the 12 percent of the U.S. population that is African-American, the 9 percent of the population that is Hispanic and the 7 percent of the

population that is Asian-American 8 percent of NASA contracts? And then go further to call them quotas?

According to the U.S. Commission on Minority Business Development's report to Congress on historically underutilized businesses, less than 4 percent of all Federal prime contracts and less than 4 percent of Federal prime subcontracts went to small disadvantaged businesses. Not just NASA, but all Federal procurement.

What message does that send to the small disadvantaged business owner? What message sent to the children of that small disadvantaged business owner? These are the children who don't understand why they have to study math or physics or go to college when they see they have got to work everyday and pay their taxes and receive nothing back because they don't have the advantages of the relationships I described earlier. What message is being sent when people in this body say to some groups that getting even less than a proportionate share of the pie is unfair because it is going to deprive another group of what they have felt entitled to by birth?

Eight percent is a ridiculously low figure as a goal for all black-, hispanic-, and women-owned businesses. But it is the language which has become standard throughout numerous Federal programs. Similar language is included in the fiscal year 1993 Defense Department appropriations bill, earlier VA/HUD appropriations bills and energy and water appropriations bills. This amendment would only place the language in the authorizing bill where it belongs. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment and strike a small victory for equality and opportunity.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KLUG

Mr. KLUG. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KLUG: Page 4, lines 1 through 4, strike "the cancellation" and all that follows through "Space Administration" and insert in lieu thereof "consistent with paragraphs (1) through (6), because the aluminum lithium external tank replaces the lift capability enhancement of the Advanced Solid Rocket Motor, and because of severe budgetary constraints and the need to reduce the Federal deficit, the cancellation of the Advanced Solid Rocket Motor program is necessary, and such cancellation will result in a reduction of expenditures by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration over 5 years of $75,000,000, which is".

Mr. KLUG (during the reading). Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Because of a previous order, the gentleman's amendment is now in order.

Mr. KLUG. Madam Chairman, this is a fairly simple amendment and I will not take long.

What it does is amplify the findings that the committee reported out indicating that it was the committee's recommendation that the ASRM Program be terminated.

The new language in these findings does two things. First, it amplifies the fact that those of us in the House think that the program should be terminated because of the issue of deficit reduction; and second, there is also language in the expanded findings indicating that the program no longer can be justified in terms of its original mission.

This language I think is consistent with what the committee tried to do. It also reflects two recent votes in the House, one in the authorization bill, an amendment cosponsored and fought for by my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER], and then another amendment during the appropriations process that I and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. RAMSTAD], the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] and the gentlewoman from Utah [Ms. SHEPHERD] and a number of other people fought for.

So I hope what we can do with these expanded findings is simply again to send a strong message to the conferees and send a strong message to the folks in the other House that as this legislation moves forward, that we achieve what we hoped for a number of years, which is to terminate a program that can no longer be justified from either a fiscal standpoint or can no longer be justified from a scientific standpoint.

Mr. BROWN of California. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I will be very brief. I want to thank the gentleman for his cooperation with the committee in drafting the language of his amendment. We find it satisfactory.

It will complement the language that the committee has already drafted in its report, and we are willing to accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LANCASTER. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Madam Chairman, I would like at this point to enter into a colloquy with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, if he would consent.

Mr. BROWN of California. Madam Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I certainly will.

Mr. LANCASTER. Several weeks ago, Madam Chairman, I came across an article that detailed some of the less than stellar procurement and financial practices of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration [NASA]. The article reported that NASA has the authority to award—and in some cases already has awarded—huge bonuses to contractors whose projects are grossly over budget. As an example, the article cited the 17-ton satellite project known as the Gamma Ray Observatory. Although the cost to construct and operate the project came in at 15 percent—or $40 million more than promised, NASA rewarded the contractor with a $5 million bonus.

Madam Chairman, this is precisely the sort of wasteful and extravagant spending that cannot be justified as we ask U.S. citizens and voters to incur personal sacrifices to help reduce the mounting Federal deficit.

Since NASA spends over 90 percent of its budgets on contracts, I wonder if Chairman BROWN would please explain what measures are in place to ensure that NASA's contract administration practices follow a more financially prudent course? It is my understanding that last year's NASA authorization bill contained a contract reform provision and that the current bill includes even stronger measures to improve contract management and contractor accountability. Could the gentleman explain these initiatives in some detail?

Mr. BROWN of California. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANCASTER. I will indeed, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BROWN of California. Madam Chairman, let me first say that I applaud the work the gentleman from North Carolina is doing and for his concern and interest in the procurement efforts underway at NASA. As the gentleman stated, Congress passed the NASA Authorization Act (Public Law 102-588) last year which required the Agency to assess approaches that would result in greater contractor accountability.

As a result, NASA published a rule in the Federal Register on April 14, 1993, which applies positive and negative incentives to cost-plus award fee contracts. To summarize, this rule appropriately awards contractors that meet and exceed expectations under the contract and penalizes those that do not. We anticipate that this rule will become final in the next several weeks and that subsequent NASA cost-plus award fee contracts will be negotiated to reflect these incentives.

In addition, H.R. 2200 contains a provision authored by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. ESHOO] which further distributes high risk in research and development contracts by levying penalties against contractors for failure to perform under the contract.

Mr. LANCASTER. Madam Chairman, I understand the gentleman's committee is concerned about abuses in NASA's contracting policies and is planning to exercise close oversight of the Agency's practices. Could the gentleman elaborate more fully on these oversight intentions?

Mr. BROWN of California. Madam Chairman, if the gentleman will yield

further, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology exercised a great deal of oversight in the 102d Congress and plans to continue to exercise close oversight in the 103d Congress.

□ 1240

During the past few years, Madam Chairman, we have held numerous hearings on NASA's contract management and contractor accountability and have followed closely the status of rulemaking on procurement initiatives. With flat or decling budgets, the committee believes that NASA must use taxpayers' dollars wisely in procuring products and services for the Agency.

The committee is approaching procurement reform at NASA in tandem with efforts to reform financial management and budget practices. To this end, the committee is supportive of several initiatives such as independent cost analyses of new NASA programs and the appointment of a chief financial officer to address cross-cutting reform efforts.

Mr. LANCASTER. Madam Chairman, is it the judgment of the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] that the measures contained in this bill, and the strict oversight by his committee, will lead to significant improvements in NASA's contracting policies in general, and with respect to unjustified performance bonuses to contractors in particular?

Mr. BROWN of California. Madam Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, again I believe that the committee and NASA are working closely and cooperatively to change past procurement practices. In addition, we have closely consulted with other interested Members and committees of jurisdiction. Not only do the committee and Congress need to ensure that contractors bear appropriate risks and costs in high-risk research and development contracts, but also that NASA plans and manages its cost-plus awarded fee contracts effectively.

I am encouraged by the progress NASA has made in procurement practices over the course of the past several months, and we expect to see even more of these changes in the near future. With rules governing the procedures to include positive and negative award fees and continued committee oversight in procurement, financial management, and budget reforms, I believe the results to NASA and to the taxpayer will be higher quality products which are on time and within original cost estimates.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title III?

If not, the Clerk will designate title IV.

The text of title IV is as follows:

TITLE IV—AERONAUTICS RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

SEC. 401. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) the aerospace industry makes a major contribution to the economy of the United States, accounting for the largest positive trade balance of any United States industry (more than $28,000,000,000 in 1992), and providing over 1,000,000 high-value jobs;

(2) the international market share of the United States aerospace industry has steadily eroded due to competition from foreign consortia that receive substantial direct subsidies from their governments;

(3) the United States aerospace industry is further negatively impacted by reduced investment in national defense;

(4) the continued competitiveness of the United States aerospace industry can be significantly aided by an enhanced Federal investment in technology base research and development in aeronautics;

(5) maintaining state-of-the-art experimental facilities is a key element of Federal investment in aeronautics research and development;

(6) the long-term contribution of advances in aeronautics to the economy and society will rely on a continued commitment to pioneering research and development such as the National Aero-Space Plane;

(7) the National Aero-Space Plane program should explore the possibility of collaboration with other nations for opportunities that would offer unique programmatic benefits without compromising the strategic advantage to the United States; and

(8) cost sharing for facilities use is a highly desirable objective given the deficit reduction goals of the President and the Congress.

SEC. 402. DEFINITION.

For purposes of this title, the term "independent organization" means an organization that does not receive significant funding or support from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, other than under sections 403, 404, and 406.

SEC. 403. INDEPENDENT PERFORMANCE REVIEW.

(a) PLAN.—The Administrator shall provide for the development of a plan establishing criteria, procedures, and milestones for the evaluation, by an independent organization, of advances made in fundamental aeronautics research and development and the progress made by the aeronautics programs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in achieving their goals. Such plan shall be developed by an independent organization in consultation with the Administrator. The plan shall also describe criteria and procedures for terminating National Aeronautics and Space Administration programs that are not making acceptable progress toward their goals. The Administrator shall submit a report describing such plan to the Congress within 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) ANNUAL REPORT.—Beginning in the first year after submission of the plan under subsection (a), at the time of the President's annual budget request to Congress, the Administrator shall submit to the Congress an annual report on the results of an evaluation, conducted by an independent organization, of the progress made by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in advancing aeronautics and achieving the goals of aeronautics programs. Such evaluation shall be conducted using the criteria, procedures, and milestones established under the plan required by subsection (a).

SEC. 404. TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER REVIEW.

(a) PLAN.—The Administrator shall provide for the development of a plan establishing criteria and procedures for the evaluation, by an independent organization, of the effectiveness of technology transfer from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's aeronautics programs to industry and other public organizations. Such plan shall be developed by an independent organization in consultation with the Administrator. The plan shall include clear, quantitative measures of the success of such technology transfer activities. The Administrator shall submit a report describing such plan to the Congress within 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) ANNUAL REPORT.—Beginning in the first year after submission of the plan under subsection (a), at the time of the President's annual budget request to Congress, the Administrator shall submit to the Congress an annual report on the results of an evaluation, conducted by an independent organization, of the effectiveness of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's technology transfer programs. Such evaluation shall be conducted using the criteria and procedures established under the plan required by subsection (a).

SEC. 405. FACILITIES COST SHARING.

The Administrator, in conjunction with other ongoing activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration such as the Aerospace Facilities Plan, shall study existing and potential cost sharing provisions between the Federal Government and industry as they relate to the use of wind tunnels and related test facilities to ensure that cost sharing is employed to the fullest reasonable extent. The Administrator shall submit to the Congress the results of such study concurrent with the completion of the Aerospace Facilities Plan, or one year after the date of enactment of this Act, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 406. JOINT AERONAUTICAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Administrator and the heads of other appropriate Federal agencies shall jointly establish a program for the purpose of conducting research on aeronautical technologies that enhance United States competitiveness. Such program shall include—

(1) research on next-generation wind tunnel and advanced wind tunnel instrumentation technology;

(2) research on advanced engine materials, engine concepts, and testing of propulsion systems or components of the high-speed civil transport research program;

(3) advanced general aviation research;

(4) advanced rotorcraft research; and

(5) advanced hypersonic aeronautical research.

(b) CONTRACTS AND GRANTS.—Contracts and grants entered into under the program established under subsection (a) shall be administered using procedures developed jointly by the Administrator and the heads of the other Federal agencies involved in the program. These procedures should include an integrated acquisition policy for contract and grant requirements and for technical data rights that are not an impediment to joint programs among the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the other Federal agencies involved in the program, and industry.

(c) ELEMENTS OF PROGRAM.—The program established under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) selected programs that jointly enhance public and private aeronautical technology development;

(2) an opportunity for private contractors to be involved in such technology research and development; and

(3) the transfer of Government-developed technologies to the private sector to promote economic strength and competitiveness.

SEC. 407. NATIONAL AERO-SPACE PLANE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) hypersonic flight will be critical to the continued contribution of aeronautics to the economic and strategic interests of the United States in the early twenty-first century;

(2) the data obtained through rocket-based hypersonic flight experiments will not, by themselves, reduce risk sufficiently to allow the development of a single-stage-to-orbit, air-breathing plane; and

(3) a single-stage hypersonic research plane is critical to the successful exploration of the hypersonic flight regime and the timely realization of a single-stage-to-orbit, air-breathing plane.

(b) HYPERSONIC RESEARCH PLANE ASSESSMENT.—The Administrator shall conduct a study, through an independent organization, of strategies that would optimize the next phase of the National Aero-Space Plane program by integrating with the rocket-based hypersonic flight experiments the development, in the shortest possible time frame, of a single-stage hypersonic research plane capable of speeds in the Mach 10 to Mach 15 range or greater, with the objective of providing data that would accelerate the ultimate development of a single-stage-to-orbit, air-breathing plane. The Administrator shall report the results of the study to Congress no later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to title VI?

Are there further amendments to the bill?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. CAMP. Madam Chairman, the Consortium for the International Earth Science Information Network has undergone the scrutiny of an authorizing committee, having been authorized this year by the Science, Space, and Technology Committee. It has and is undergoing the scrutiny of the House of Representatives and funding has been appropriated. It has been approved by a President and submitted in his budget.

Like all spending programs, CIESIN as it is commonly referred to, must undergo a test—a test to determine whether or not it is in the national interest.

CIESIN is gaining recognition and respect of governments around the world. It is a 21st century library of global scientific environmental data. It is an information link between scientists around the world working to meet challenges in research, policy, education, health, and the world economy.

CIESIN is just beginning to get its start and I believe must continue to justify its existence in the future. Like every Government program, we must watch CIESIN carefully to see how taxpayers dollars are spent. That is only fair and right.

Madam Chairman, CIESIN should be debated on the floor of this House as we are doing today. And in the end, CIESIN deserves our support.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. CARDIN] having assumed the chair, Mrs. UNSOELD, 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. 2200) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, space flight, control, and data communications, construction of facilities, research and program management, and inspector general, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 193, she reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded by any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole?

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I demand separate votes on the so-called Calvert-Hall amendment, the so-called Sensenbrenner amendment, and the so-called Cox amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendments?

If not, the Clerk will report the first amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: Page 4, after line 9, insert the following new section:

SEC. 100. TOTAL AUTHORIZATION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this subtitle, the total amount authorized to be appropriated under sections 101(b), 102, 103, 104, and 105 of fiscal year 1994 shall not exceed $12,889,000,000. Each amount stated in such sections shall be reduced proportionately as necessary to meet the requirement of this section.

Mr. GOSS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

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

Mr. GOSS. 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.

Pursuant to rule XV, the Chair announces that the next two votes, if ordered, will be limited to 5 minutes.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 416, nays 6, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 381]

YEAS—416

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blackwell
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Buyer
Byrne
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings
Hayes
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Huffington
Hughes
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Inslee
Istook
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kreidler
Kyl
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McKinney
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn

Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Ridge
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Synar
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Waters
Waxman
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—6

Bacchus (FL)
Browder
Collins (MI)
Cramer
Hilliard
Watt

NOT VOTING—12

Burton
Derrick
Henry
Lazio
Martinez
McCloskey
McDade
Moakley
Packard
Torkildsen
Washington
Wilson

□ 1305

Mr. BACCHUS of Florida changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. QUILLEN, HORN, KOPETSKI, ROTH, ABERCROMBIE, and CONYERS changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARDIN). The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been requested.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: page 11, lines 1 and 2, strike "and $35,000,000 for fiscal year 1995".

Page 11, lines 4 through 8, strike "and transferring the production" and all that follows through "Yellow Creek, Mississippi".

Page 11, line 25, insert "No Federal funds may be obligated for the continuation of the Advanced Solid Rocket Motor program, except as necessary to terminate such program." after "on the Space Shuttle.".

Page 14, lines 22 and 23, strike paragraph (24).

Page 14, line 24, through page 16, line 9, redesignate paragraphs (25) through (39) as paragraphs (24) through (38), respectively.

Page 16, line 11, strike "(39)" and insert in lieu thereof "(38)".

Mr. GOSS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This vote will be limited to 5 minutes.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 303, noes 111, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 382]

AYES—303

Allard
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barca
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bateman
Beilenson
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Brooks
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Byrne
Camp
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chapman
Clayton
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Danner
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fingerhut
Fish
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Inslee
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kreidler
Kyl
LaFalce
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Levy
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Meyers
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Molinari
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Neal (NC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Orton
Oxley
Pallone
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Ridge
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Swett
Synar
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thurman
Torkildsen
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Weldon
Wheat
Williams
Wise
Wolf
Wyden
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zimmer

NOES—111

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Bacchus (FL)
Bachus (AL)
Barlow
Barton
Becerra
Berman
Bevill
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blackwell
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Callahan
Calvert
Carr
Clay
Clement
Collins (IL)
Cooper
Coppersmith
Cramer
Darden
DeLay
Dellums
Dixon
Edwards (CA)
Engel
Everett
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Furse
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilman
Gingrich
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hayes
Hilliard
Hochbrueckner
Hoyer
Hughes
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kennedy
Klein
Kopetski
Lambert
Laughlin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Manton
McCloskey
McDermott
McKinney
Meek
Menendez
Mica
Mineta
Montgomery
Natcher
Owens
Parker
Payne (NJ)
Peterson (FL)
Pickle
Pomeroy
Quillen
Rangel
Reynolds
Roemer
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Scott
Serrano
Skaggs
Skeen
Stokes
Sundquist
Swift
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Thompson
Thornton
Torres
Towns
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Whitten
Woolsey
Wynn

NOT VOTING—20

Cantwell
Derrick
Harman
Henry
Hoke
Jefferson
Lazio
Martinez
McDade
Mfume
Moakley
Mollohan
Neal (MA)
Ortiz
Packard
Royce
Torricelli
Washington
Wilson
Zeliff

□ 1313

Messrs. BERMAN, LEWIS of California, and THORNTON changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARDIN). The Clerk will report the last amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: Page 48, after line 10, insert the following new section:

SEC. 316. HELIUM PURCHASES.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration may purchase helium from private sector sources.

Mr. GOSS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. According to the previous notice, this vote will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 326, noes 98, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 383]

AYES—326

Ackerman
Allard
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Bacchus (FL)
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blackwell
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Borski
Brewster
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Byrne
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeLauro
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Emerson
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrich
Glickman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Herger
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Huffington
Hughes
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Inslee
Istook
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kreidler
Kyl
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Leach
Levin
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Minge
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nussle
Obey
Olver
Orton
Oxley
Pallone
Parker
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Ramstad
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Ridge
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Royce
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Strickland
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Sundquist
Swett
Synar
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torricelli
Unsoeld
Upton
Vento
Visclosky
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Wheat
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—98

Abercrombie
Andrews (TX)
Barton
Becerra
Beilenson
Bevill
Bishop
Bonior
Boucher
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Bryant
Clay
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Combest
Cramer
DeFazio
Dellums
Deutsch
Dingell
Dixon
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Gephardt
Geren
Gilman
Gonzalez
Green
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hilliard
Hochbrueckner
Johnson, E. B.
Kopetski
Laughlin
Lehman
Lewis (GA)
Mann
Manton
McKinney
Meek
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Mollohan
Moran
Nadler
Oberstar
Ortiz
Owens
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Pickett
Pickle
Rahall
Reynolds
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sarpalius
Scott
Serrano
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Swift
Tanner
Tejeda
Thompson
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Valentine
Velazquez
Volkmer
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Whitten
Williams
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—10

Derrick
Hefner
Henry
Lazio
McDade
Moakley
Packard
Rangel
Washington
Wilson

□ 1323

Messrs. LEHMAN, OBERSTAR, ORTIZ, and TORRES changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. CARDIN]. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. WALKER. I am, in its present form, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WALKER moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2200 to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology with instructions to report the bill back to the House forthwith with an amendment as follows:

Page 2, after line 21, insert the following new paragraph:

(3) the Administrator should explore ways of encouraging voluntary retirements by National Aeronautics and Space Administration personnel in order to facilitate any restructuring associated with the redesign of the space station;

Redesignate subsequent paragraphs accordingly.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I think we can dispose of this fairly quickly because I think there is general agreement on the motion.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that in order to restructure and redesign the space station there is going to have to be some change in personnel policies at NASA. This is simply an instruction to the NASA Administrator to assure that as they look towards changes in personnel that one of the things that they would do is to look at early retirement and voluntary retirements from NASA as a way of bringing about any kind of personnel reductions.

It seems to me that this is in line with what the Administrator wants to do. And I think we have agreement that this is a reasonable addition to the bill and can be approved.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me say that I rise in support of the gentleman's motion to recommit with instructions. I think he has indicated the urgency of NASA being able

to take action which would facilitate a restructuring of the organization.

The administration, the executive branch is supportive of this also.

We have introduced today a bill that will be jointly referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology that will facilitate this. This finding is merely to lay a groundwork to allow this action to go forward. I support the gentleman's motion.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman, and I do want to reiterate that point, that this is very much in line with the administration policy, which is attempting to be advanced on a fast track, and so this is something that the administration would thoroughly support.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was agreed to.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the instructions of the House, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology reports back the bill, H.R. 2200, with an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: Page 2, after line 21, insert the following new paragraph:

(3) the Administrator should explore ways of encouraging voluntary retirements by National Aeronautics and Space Administration personnel in order to facilitate any restructuring associated with the redesign of the space station;

Redesignate subsequent paragraphs accordingly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BROWN of California. 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 material, on H.R. 2200, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

SUBMISSION OF LETTER FROM CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS RELATIVE TO PROCUREMENT PROVISION ON H.R. 2200, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 1994 AND 1995

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD a letter from the Committee on Government Operations relating to a procurement provision within that committee's jurisdiction, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 8, 1993.

Hon. GEORGE E. BROWN, Jr.,
Chairman, Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I received your letter of June 8, 1993, asking that the Committee on Government Operations not seek a sequential referral of H.R. 2200 if the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology adopts an amendment to hold contractors liable for failure to perform under requirements of a NASA cost-type research and development contract.

I appreciate your inquiry and understand that this amendment would apply only to NASA. While the Committee on Government Operations would normally request sequential referral of all Federal procurement actions taken by the House of Representatives, we will not seek a sequential referral to H.R. 2200 if the subject amendment is adopted in your markup.

I look forward to your continued support of the Committee on Government Operations' efforts in Federal reform.

Sincerely,

JOHN CONYERS, Jr.,
Chairman.

□ 1330

KUDOS ALL AROUND

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that we finished this bill—and many thought we never would—and I want to think the leadership for allowing us the opportunity to, over the past 6 weeks, take up time in the intermissions between other legislation.

We are very grateful to them.

I also want to thank all the Members who contributed so much to perfecting this bill through their well-honed amendments. We are grateful to them also.

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

Mr. BROWN of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the leadership we accept the very kind remarks of the gentleman from California.

MARITIME ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1994

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 230 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 230

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. 1964) to authorize appropriations for the Maritime Administration for fiscal year 1994, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries now printed in the bill. Each section of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. Points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute for failure to comply with clause 5(a) of rule XXI are waived. It shall be in order at any time to consider the amendments en bloc printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries or a designee. The amendments en bloc shall be considered as read and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. Points of order against the amendments en bloc for failure to comply with clause 7 of rule XVI are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARDIN). The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], 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, this is a bipartisan rule for the consideration of a bipartisan bill, and I want to begin by commending the leadership of the Merchant Marine Committee—on both sides of the aisle—for their hard work.

I would like to focus my remarks, however, on one issue we will be debating today—an issue which gets at the very heart of the U.S. merchant marine.

As many of my colleagues are aware, the U.S. flag merchant marine has been in a state of decline for many years.

Our companies cannot compete with subsidized foreign interests. We have not been able to modernize, and most important, we have been loosing jobs—good jobs.

The U.S. merchant marine is crucial for our international trade, for our military security, and for American jobs. And we cannot let this downward trend continue.

The solution is clear—we need a comprehensive reform of our maritime laws—to make our companies competitive and profitable and to create and retain American jobs.

The good news is that the Merchant Marine Committee here in the House, as well as the administration, are hard at work on just such a reform.

But they need time to do their work.

That is why many of us have been very troubled by several recent events. Two of the largest liner carriers in the U.S. flag fleet now say they want to transfer many of their vessels to a foreign flag.

These companies are afraid that if we do not act fast on a reform bill, they will not be able to compete in the international market.

We need to restore confidence of the shipping industry that we can get these reforms passed.

We need to make sure that U.S. companies can compete internationally.

These firms should want to continue to operate under the U.S. flag. And a comprehensive maritime reform will do just that.

But we need time to work out that reform—we cannot begin to lose U.S. vessels, and American jobs—while that reform is completed.

When this bill is considered today, The chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries intends to offer an amendment to give us time to pass that reform.

His amendment would require the administration to hold off for 1 year, any reflagging decision, while we consider and pass a reform bill.

Mr. Speaker, it is a reasonable and fair approach.

We cannot afford to lose these ships to foreign flags.

We cannot afford the costs to our national security, our international trade, or to our economy.

And we cannot afford to lose American jobs just because we have not had time to work out a reform we all agree is necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this amendment, and I support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 230 is an open rule for consideration of H.R. 1964, the Maritime Administration Authorization Act for fiscal year 1994.

The rule makes in order the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and waives clause 5(a) of rule 21 against the committee substitute.

The rule also makes in order en bloc amendments printed in the Rules Committee report and waives clause 7 of rule 16 against the amendments.

Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, this is a simple, open rule for consideration of the bill, and I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the amendment, and I support the bill. I urge my colleagues to not only support the amendment and the bill but urge the administration and committees of relevance, in the House and in the other body, to get on with what is necessary, that which should have been done a long time ago and now is imperative in order for us to retain these jobs, to maintain our American security on our sealanes around the world, and to make sure that this great industry does not fall the way of recent vessel flaggings in this country.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] has ably explained the provisions of the bill, and I could not agree with him more that we need a refurbishing of our merchant marine capabilities in the legislation here before the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I served aboard an aircraft carrier during World War II, and back then we had over 4,000 American bottoms in our fleet, and now we are down to less than 400. I do not know how or why, but since World War II the administrations have let the merchant marine fleet go down the drain, and we must do something to rebuild it for the benefit of this country because in a time of crisis it is absolutely necessary that they be prepared to support our efforts on the waters of the world, wherever we need to deliver the goods to supply our troops.

□ 1340

In the 30-some years that I have been here, we have been hammering away to do something for the merchant marine, but it is unfortunate indeed that we have not done anything.

I am glad to see the amendment being offered to this legislation that within a year there will be a proposal brought to the floor of the House to revise our maritime policy, reestablish American bottoms, American flags, and the fleet that we so badly need. The committee now is dedicated to do that.

I feel with that dedication and with the leadership of this Congress and our plea with the present administration that we are going to accomplish our goal.

I think we should increase our cargo preference requirements. I think we should do the things that are necessary to implement now the revision status that we all have in mind.

At the conclusion of my statement, Mr. Speaker, I will submit a comparative chart of open versus restrictive rules for the 95th through the 103d Congresses, and a separate chart of open versus restrictive rules for the 103d Congress.

This is an open rule, Mr. Speaker. I know of no objection to it.

I want to do everything that I can to help our merchant marine industry. I pledge to do that and my dedication is to carry that out and follow through.

I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] for his remarks. He is right on target.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following charts:

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES: 95TH–103D CONG.

Congress (years)	Total rules granted [1]	Open rules [2]		Restrictive rules [3]	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
95th (1977–78)	211	179	85	32	15
96th (1979–80)	214	161	75	53	25
97th (1981–82)	120	90	75	30	25
98th (1983–84)	155	105	68	50	32
99th (1985–86)	115	65	57	50	43
100th (1987–88)	123	66	54	57	46
101st (1989–90)	104	47	45	57	55
102d (1991–92)	109	37	34	72	66
103d (1993–94)	31	9	29	22	71

[1] Total rules counted are all order of business resolutions reported from the Rules Committee which provide for the initial consideration of legislation, except rules on appropriations bills which only waive points of order. Original jurisdiction measures reported as privileged are also not counted.

[2] Open rules are those which permit any Member to offer any germane amendment to a measure so long as it is otherwise in compliance with the rules of the House. The parenthetical percentages are open rules as a percent of total rules granted.

[3] Restrictive rules are those which limit the number of amendments which can be offered, and include so-called modified open and modified closed rules, as well as completely closed rules, and rules providing for consideration in the House as opposed to the Committee of the Whole. The parenthetical percentages are restrictive rules as a percent of total rules granted.

Sources: "Rules Committee Calendars & Surveys of Activities," 95th–102d Cong.; "Notices of Action Taken," Committee on Rules, 103d Cong., through July 29, 1993.

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES: 103D CONGRESS

Rule number, date reported	Rule type	Bill number and subject	Amendments submitted	Amendments allowed	Disposition of rule and date
H. Res. 58, Feb. 2, 1993	MC	H.R. 1: Family and medical leave	30 (D–5; R–25)	3 (D–0; R–3)	PQ: 246–176. A: 259–164. Feb. 3, 1993.
H. Res. 59, Feb. 3, 1993	MC	H.R. 2: National Voter Registration Act	19 (D–1; R–18)	1 (D–0; R–1)	PQ: 248–171. A: 249–170. Feb. 4, 1993.

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES: 103D CONGRESS—Continued

Rule number, date reported	Rule type	Bill number and subject	Amendments submitted	Amendments allowed	Disposition of rule and date
H. Res. 103, Feb. 23, 1993	C	H.R. 920: Unemployment compensation	7 (D–2; R–5)	0 (D–0; R–0)	PQ: 243–172. A: 237–178. Feb. 24, 1993.
H. Res. 106, Mar. 2, 1993	MC	H.R. 20: Hatch Act amendments	9 (D–1; R–8)	3 (D–0; R–3)	PQ: 248–166. A: 249–163. Mar. 3, 1993.
H. Res. 119, Mar. 9, 1993	MC	H.R. 4: NIH Revitalization Act of 1993	13 (D–4; R–9)	8 (D–3; R–5)	PQ: 247–170. A: 248–170. Mar. 10, 1993.
H. Res. 132, Mar. 17, 1993	MC	H.R. 1335: Emergency supplemental appropriations	37 (D–8; R–29)	1 (not submitted) (D–1; R–0)	A: 240–185. Mar. 18, 1993.
H. Res. 133, Mar. 17, 1993	MC	H. Con. Res. 64: Budget resolution	14 (D–2; R–12)	4 (1–D not submitted) (D–2; R–2)	PQ: 250–172. A: 251–172. Mar. 18, 1993.
H. Res. 138, Mar. 23, 1993	MC	H.R. 670: Family planning amendments	20 (D–8; R–12)	9 (D–4; R–5)	PQ: 252–164. A: 247–169. Mar. 24, 1993.
H. Res. 147, Mar. 31, 1993	C	H.R. 1430: Increase public debt limit	6 (D–1; R–5)	0 (D–0; R–0)	PQ: 244–168. A: 242–170. Apr. 1, 1993.
H. Res. 149, Apr. 1, 1993	MC	H.R. 1578: Expedited Rescission Act of 1993	8 (D–1; R–7)	3 (D–1; R–2)	A: 212–208. Apr. 28, 1993.
H. Res. 164, May 4, 1993	O	H.R. 820: National Competitiveness Act	NA	NA	A: Voice vote. May 5, 1993.
H. Res. 171, May 18, 1993	O	H.R. 873: Gallatin Range Act of 1993	NA	NA	A: Voice vote. May 20, 1993.
H. Res. 172, May 18, 1993	O	H.R. 1159: Passenger Vessel Safety Act	NA	NA	A: 308–0. May 24, 1993.
H. Res. 173, May 18, 1993	MC	S.J. Res. 45: U.S. Forces in Somalia	6 (D–1; R–5)	6 (D–1; R–5)	A: Voice vote. May 20, 1993.
H. Res. 183, May 25, 1993	O	H.R. 2244: 2d supplemental appropriations	NA	NA	A: 251–174. May 26, 1993.
H. Res. 186, May 27, 1993	MC	H.R. 2264: Omnibus budget reconciliation	51 (D–19; R–32)	8 (D–7; R–1)	PQ: 252–178. A: 236–194. May 27, 1993.
H. Res. 192, June 9, 1993	MC	H.R. 2348: Legislative branch appropriations	50 (D–6; R–44)	6 (D–3; R–3)	PQ: 240–177. A: 226–185. June 10, 1993.
H. Res. 193, June 10, 1993	O	H.R. 2200: NASA authorization	NA	NA	A: Voice vote. June 14, 1993.
H. Res. 195, June 14, 1993	MC	H.R. 5: Striker replacement	7 (D–4; R–3)	2 (D–1; R–1)	A: 244–176. June 15, 1993.
H. Res. 197, June 15, 1993	MO	H.R. 2333: State Department, H.R. 2404: Foreign aid	53 (D–20; R–33)	27 (D–12; R–15)	A: 294–129. June 16, 1993.
H. Res. 199, June 16, 1993	C	H.R. 1876: Ext. of "Fast Track"	NA	NA	A: Voice vote. June 22, 1993.
H. Res. 200, June 16, 1993	MC	H.R. 2295: Foreign operations appropriations	33 (D–11; R–22)	5 (D–1; R–4)	A: 263–160. June 17, 1993.
H. Res. 201, June 17, 1993	O	H.R. 2403: Treasury-postal appropriations	NA	NA	A: Voice vote. June 17, 1993.
H. Res. 203, June 22, 1993	MO	H.R. 2445: Energy and water appropriations	NA	NA	A: Voice vote. June 23, 1993.
H. Res. 206, June 23, 1993	O	H.R. 2150: Coast Guard authorization	NA	NA	
H. Res. 217, July 14, 1993	MO	H.R. 2010: National Service Trust Act	NA	NA	A: 261–164. July 21, 1993.
H. Res. 218, July 20, 1993	O	H.R. 2530: BLM authorization, fiscal year 1994–95	NA	NA	
H. Res. 220, July 21, 1993	MC	H.R. 2667: Disaster assistance supplemental	14 (D–8; R–6)	2 (D–2; R–0)	PQ: 245–178. P: 205–216. July 22, 1993.
H. Res. 226, July 23, 1993	MC	H.R. 2667: Disaster assistance supplemental	15 (D–8; R–7)	2 (D–2; R–0)	A: 224–205. July 27, 1993.
H. Res. 229, July 28, 1993	MO	H.R. 2330: Intelligence Authorization Act, fiscal year 1994	NA	NA	
H. Res. 230, July 28, 1993	O	H.R. 1964: Maritime Administration authorization	NA	NA	

Note.—Code: C—Closed; MC—Modified closed; MO—Modified open; O—Open; D—Democrat; R—Republican; PQ: Previous question; A—Adopted; F—Failed.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am anxious to get on to the full debate in the Committee of the Whole and pass this bill.

Again I would repeat as a courteous admonition to this administration to take this seriously. This is a priority for a lot of us in this Congress. It is a priority that needs to be moved up to the front burner. We do not need inaction. We need people to take this issue seriously for the sake of the jobs in this country, this industry, and our own national security.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill and the amendment that will be offered by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

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

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 230 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. 1964.

The Chair designates the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAHALL] as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole and requests the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. DARDEN, to assume the chair temporarily.

□ 1343

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. 1964) to authorize appropriations for the Maritime Administration for fiscal year 1994, and for other purposes, with Mr. DARDEN, Chairman pro tempore, in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Under the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FIELDS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1964 is the Maritime Administration Authorization Act for fiscal year 1994. The bill authorizes $621 million for the programs within the Maritime Administration, an agency responsible for the promotion, development, and maintenance of the U.S. merchant marine. The Clinton administration supports House passage of H.R. 1964.

Mr. Chairman, the U.S. merchant marine is at a critical juncture. Unless we reform our national maritme policies, our ships will seek refuge under a foreign registry, we will lose the ability to build ships, and the U.S. merchant marine will be a fond memory of the past.

To revitalize our maritime community, the leadership of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. BATEMAN, and I have developed a package of maritime reform initiatives. These include two measures already reported from committee: H.R. 2152, the Merchant Marine Investment Act of 1993, and H.R. 2547, the National Shipbuilding and Conversion Act of 1993. These bills promote commercial shipbuilding in U.S. shipyards. In addition, we have worked very closely with the Committee on Armed Services and portions of our shipbuilding bill were included in this year's Defense Authorization Act. I am especially grateful to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. DELLUMS, for his recognition of the importance of domestic shipbuilding to our national security.

The third component of our maritime reform initiative, H.R. 2151, the Maritime Security and Competitiveness Act of 1993, was just reported this morning from the Merchant Marine Subcommittee. H.R. 2151 establishes a new financial assistance program which, when funded, should keep the U.S. merchant marine fleet under the U.S. flag. To give the Congress time to enact this reform measure. Mr. LIPINSKI and I will shortly offer an amendment to H.R. 1964 that will place a 1-year moratorium on the Secretary of Transportation's authority to approve the pending request of some U.S. companies to transfer 20 U.S.-flag vessels to foreign registry.

Although less dramatic than its companions, H.R. 1964 authorizes MarAd to maintain the vessels in the Ready Reserve Force in a state of readiness and to fund the title XI loan guarantee program. H.R. 1964 also secures funds for the Massachusetts Center for Marine Environmental Protection at the Massachusetts Maritime Academy.

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to join my colleagues from the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, Chairman STUDDS, Mercant Marine Subcommittee Chairman LIPINSKI, and Mr. BATEMAN, in supporting H.R. 1964, the authorization bill for the Marine Administration [MarAd] for fiscal year 1994.

This bill authorizes $621,493,000 for MarAd. The administration's request

was $620,951,000. It reallocates some funding originally proposed for the acquisition of additional vessels for the Ready Reserve Force [RRF], to the maintenance account for those vessels. If we have to accept limited funding for MarAd, it is more appropriate to assure that we properly maintain the existing RRF vessels rather than acquiring additional ships for this reserve fleet.

H.R. 1964 also authorizes $50 million for new vessel construction under the title XI Loan Guarantee Program, as well as $4 million for administrative expenses under this program. Based on this budget calculations, this $50 million in guarantees could result in the construction of about $1 billion worth of commercial vessels in U.S. shipyards. Also, I want to point out to my colleagues that this $54 million for guarantees is taken from within the administration's original overall budget by shifting funds from the RRF acquisition account, so it does not increase the total budget.

I am particularly pleased that this legislation includes a provision based on my earlier bill, H.R. 1780, providing for the reimbursement of the young men and women graduating from our State maritime academies who are now required to pay the Coast Guard for their entry level merchant marine licenses. I strongly believe that this is an unfair burden placed on these cadets.

Our committee has done an excellent job in crafting a bill that reflects the collective desire to adequately fund MarAd, while at the same time, acknowledging that there are a number of statutory modifications needed to make the Agency's programs work even better.

Our committee requested, and obtained, an open rule for H.R. 1964. We wanted to be sure that Members had an opportunity to offer amendments to the legislation. At the appropriate time, Chairman STUDDS will offer an amendment that deserves the support of the Members of this House.

H.R. 1964 is a fiscally sound bill and I urge my colleagues to pass this bill to fund MarAd's programs and to revise a number of their statutory authorities.

□ 1350

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIPINSKI].

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1964, as amended, authorizes an appropriation of $621,251,000, the amount requested by the Clinton administration, with an additional $300,000 to reimburse State maritime academy students for Coast Guard licensing fees.

The bill funds maritime education and training as well as the operating differential subsidy program and MarAd's operations at levels consistent with the President's request.

The only major change made by the committee was in the Ready Reserve Program [RRF]. Severe underfunding of the RRF maintenance and operations account has led to a shift in funding from the acquisitions account to the maintenance account. It seems only logical to maintain the vessels we own before purchasing more foreign vessels.

H.R. 1964 also shifts requested funds from RRF acquisitions to the title 11 Loan Guarantee Program to help start the much-needed revitalization of the U.S. maritime industry.

Chairman STUDDS and I will be offering a noncontroversial amendment regarding documentation of a number of small vessels. These are annual and noncontroversial requests that satisfy the concerns of a number of our fellow members.

And as Chairman STUDDS has already stated, we will also be offering an amendment to place a 1-year moratorium on the Secretary of Transportation's authority to approve the transfer of U.S.-flag vessels to foreign registry.

It is vital that at a time when we are trying to preserve our maritime industry that we retain our merchant fleet.

We are at a critical juncture. I strongly urge my colleagues to support the reflagging amendment and pass H.R. 1964.

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN], the ranking minority member on the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine.

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FIELDS] for yielding this time to me, and I will not spend the committee's time dealing with the substantive provisions that are in the bill before us because those who have preceded me have adequately done that. I will say that I am proud to have been associated in the constructing of this legislation and to have been one of the original cosponsors of it. It does address aspects of the problems confronting our very troubled maritime community, and certainly I echo the sentiments of all those who have preceded me as to the urgency of our doing something to revitalize all aspects of that community. For the American-flag carriers, the maritime laborers who work on those vessels, and for the American shipbuilding industry, all of which are sorely pressed and distressed in this era, it is, in my opinion, a very, very shameful thing that this Nation, which can only be a strong nation as long as it remains a maritime power, has for so long neglected its merchant marine and its maritime resources.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIPINSKI], the chairman of the subcommittee, and my ranking member of the full committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FIELDS], for what they have done in connection with this bill, and I most especially thank the chairman and the subcommittee chairman for the very open, very cooperative manner in which they have dealt with, not only this legislation, but the other legislation affecting our maritime industry in this session of Congress. This spirit of openness and cooperation has never been better than I have experienced in working with them in these endeavors this year.

I do want to take the remainder of my time, however, to make reference to, I think, an unfortunate aspect of what is occurring to us today, and I want to do that while making it clear that it is not so much in the context of any substantive objection to any of the amendments which are being offered en bloc today. But I do have very definite concerns as to the manner in which one of those amendments comes to us, whether en bloc or otherwise.

Mr. Chairman, I have reference to the amendment that puts the moratorium on reflagging of present American-flagged vessels. Again, Mr. Chairman, substantively I am not objecting to that. It may be something critically necessary. What I do object to is being put in the position of coming to the floor today, having learned only yesterday or the evening before that such as amendment was being offered, it not having come through the channels of either the subcommittee or the full committee, but from forces or persons external to our committee.

Mr. Chairman, our committee is a very dedicated committee. It has the greatest degree of expertise on issues and problems that we are dealing with, and I think very clearly that we in the Congress, or the Congress in general, would be better served had this committee had some input in the dealing with that amendment.

The amendment that I have reference to, Mr. Chairman, says that American-flag carriers who had announced their intentions to reflag will not be able to do so until December 1994. It may be essential that this be done. I would remind my colleagues in the House that, under present law, they cannot do it without the approval of the Maritime Administration, and there is a process by which discretion could have been exercised as to whether they were permitted to do it, or not permitted to do it, or to what extent they were permitted to do it. Whether it is necessary to go further and actually legislate a moratorium is the very thing that we should have had hearings upon.

Mr. Chairman, as good as this may be for everybody else, we cannot be so insensitive that we do to certain American companies things which may have millions of dollars of implications upon

them with little notice on their part of what we are about to do or an opportunity to be heard as to what exemplifications for them were, and, as much as I want to extend opportunities for American maritime labor, and as much as I appreciate the national-security implications of an adequate pool of maritime labor, it will not serve us well in the long run, them or any other aspect of our merchant marine, if it is done at the price of bankrupting the few remaining American flag carriers. Our committee was the forum for these things to have been discussed, to have been worked out, and, in fairness, to have given everyone concerned an opportunity to be heard, and I do state my concerns to the fact that this is not done.

Mr. Chairman, I ask no Member of this House to defeat the en bloc amendment which includes the one to which I made reference, but I do feel that it would be derelict on my part as the ranking member of the subcommittee and a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries not to indicate my sincere concern that the committee has not played its role in this very important aspect of this legislation that it is more than capable of playing, and I hope that we will have no such instances in the future.

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

Mr. Chairman, if I may respond briefly to the remarks just made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN], I want to, first of all, thank him for the graciousness of tone with which he made his observations, and I say to him that to a large degree I share his regret at the speed with which we felt compelled to do that.

Let me point out a couple of dates to the gentleman, if I may. The committee marked this bill up on May 26. A little over a month later, on June 29, the first applications for reflagging were filed. At that point, Mr. Chairman, the bill was already out of committee, and, if we were to use this as a vehicle, there was no opportunity to do it at the committee stage.

The gentleman is absolutely correct, in my judgment, that under almost all circumstances that is the way we ought to proceed legislatively around here, and I will say to the gentleman that there was no effort whatsoever to sneak up on anyone. I did not decide in my own mind that we should probably go ahead and do this until a couple of days ago. The timing is such that, as I said, if we were to do it, we really had no other choice.

But I do want to say to the gentleman that I think we make a great deal of sense and reiterate to him what I have said so many times before, and also to the ranking member from Texas, my appreciation for all of the spirit with which this enterprise has been undertaken by all of us. This remains, as we have said so many times, I think the most collegial and the most bipartisan of all the committees of the House. We are now wrestling with a matter of immense consequence, not just for Members of coastal communities, as sometimes we do, but things which speak to the national security of this country, and I know the gentleman also serves on the Committee on Armed Services, and I also want to thank him for the extraordinary work he has done there in facilitating the most unusual degree of cooperation between these two committees on this matter.

□ 1400

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I want to make it very clear that the exceptions that I have taken do not relate to the chairman of the full committee. I would suggest, however, that it was not critically important that this particular amendment be offered en bloc to this bill, in view of the fact that this very morning we were in subcommittee reporting out a bill which would have been an equally available vehicle, I believe, for this amendment, and which would at full committee when we mark up that bill next week have been a vehicle for it.

Again, it is not something that I am offended in any degree that the chairman of the subcommittee has done anything to avoid that committee being able to work its will or to be advised or to be participating. But there is something wrong with the legislative process where this happens, and I would hope that those who have brought us here to this in this instance would not repeat it in the future.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the observations of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN].

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1964, the Maritime Administration Authorization Act. This legislation has strong bipartisan support in the Merchant Marine Committee, thanks to the hard work of Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BATEMAN, Chairman STUDDS, and Mr. FIELDS.

In particular, I would like to compliment Chairman STUDDS and the ranking minority member, Mr. FIELDS, for their commitment to the critical issue of maritime reform in this country. It has been my pleasure to sit on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and work in a truly bipartisan manner and get things done.

I rise in support of the Studds amendment that is being offered today. I am aware that this is a sensitive issue. However, it should be noted that we are in a national crisis in regards to our maritime industry. This amendment would afford Congress and the President the needed time to come out with a comprehensive program on maritime reform.

I must stress that this is a critical issue to the United States. If our shipbuilding and industrial base is to be maintained, we are going to have to recapture a share of the commercial shipbuilding and repair market.

Mr. Chairman, I am confident that our ship yards can be competitive once again. This amendment would allow the consideration of changes in maritime policy in an atmosphere where all parties must work together for a positive change.

At a time when commercial shipbuilding is booming, when there are over 200 ships on order or under construction worldwide, to my knowledge there are no commercial tankers currently being built here.

Mr. Chairman, I look forward to continue working diligently with you and the other members on the committee to see that the goal of a new and comprehensive maritime reform be accomplished in the very near future. I urge my colleagues to support the Studds amendment.

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

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE].

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise also as a member of the Committee on Armed Services and as an exmember of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in strong support of these initiatives. I want to follow up just a moment on Chairman STUDDS' observations with respect to the cooperation between the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and the Committee on Armed Services.

I was privileged to be in attendance and participate during the lengthy markup of the Armed Services bill under Chairman DELLUMS, and I want to indicate to all Members that the strong sense of cooperation that has been indicated, both by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS], the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN], and others, indicates that that strong sense of bipartisan cooperation is also made manifest in these two committees.

Mr. Chairman, some Members may recall that at one point as the cold war drew to a close, and subsequent to my membership on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, that I indicated during the last chairman's tenure, who now, of course, is the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Aspin, that what was vital and necessary to the interests of the United States, and indeed to peace loving people throughout the world, was that we redefine the term national security, that we redefine it

in post-cold war terms. And I am very happy to indicate to the membership and to the American people that under the leadership of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] and the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], and with the full bipartisan cooperation that I have indicated on both committees, that we are turning the corner on redefining the very nature of the phrase national security. Fundamental and elemental in this process is refurbishing, in fact revitalizing, the American merchant marine.

Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to say that in our Armed Services markup, and I am sure Chairman DELLUMS will agree and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] will acknowledge, that we were able to carefully craft an approach that will carry forward this notion of redefining national security; that the American merchant marine will be the beneficiary; that working men and women in shipbuilding, working men and women on the sea, working men and women throughout the country that are looking for our economy to make a good comeback, to achieve a new prosperity and a new sense of security in the best sense of that word as we convert from the cold war psychology and from the cold war technology into a psychology-technology, and indeed an economy, that will truly be converted into one of social utility and advancement for all people.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to be working with Chairman STUDDS, with Chairman DELLUMS, and with our Republican and Democratic members on both committees to see this accomplished.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, I echo everything that the distinguished gentleman just had to say about our colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, to whom I now yield 3 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the legislation before us and associate myself with the remarks of several of my distinguished colleagues from California, Virginia, and others, and also to compliment the distinguished gentleman, the Chair of the committee. I have enjoyed working very closely and cooperatively with the gentleman.

Just the other day in action of the full Committee on Armed Services we ratified a program that would allow the Committee on Armed Services to place some $200 million on the table for the purpose of loan guarantees. When you put that together with the business of this committee, we have taken a long journey to answer some very important questions that America needs to answer: Is this a maritime nation? I believe the answer to that is yes. Do we need to maintain the integrity of the industrial base that allows us to continue to manifest the competency to build commercial ships? The answer to that is yes.

Mr. Chairman, it appeared where we are downsizing our military budgets, and the days of the 600-ship Navy is over and we are coming closer to a 300-ship Navy, the question is how do we then convert. And I think in this program in a very classic way is a very significant economic conversion effort.

□ 1410

The hope of this gentleman and, I am sure, my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts was that at the end of the day, let the RECORD show that these two committees came together and placed a program on the table that challenges the leadership of this Nation to come to grips with the need for the development of a comprehensive maritime policy. What we have attempted to do in our markup is to say that at a critical juncture in the history of this country, as we address this particular problem, we stepped up to the plate. We used several hundred million dollars in order to generate an important discussion and an important policy formulation.

In conclusion, let me, again, say that I am very proud and very pleased to rise in support of the legislation, to work with my distinguished colleagues on the Committee on Armed Services, as we stepped up and placed an important element in this whole fabric and to finally, again, thank my distinguished colleague for his generosity and his cooperation, because I think what we do here today and what the Committee on Armed Services has done and what we will do in the next several days when we authorize the DOD budget for fiscal 1994 will be historic for this Nation.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I notice that in the bill there is approximately $240 million set aside for operating differential subsidies. Although the money is not appropriated, it is authorized and subject to appropriation.

We are, therefore, giving our blessing to it. I have some concerns that in years past we have allowed foreign built but U.S.-flag vessels to get this money.

As the gentleman knows, there is a move afoot in town by some of the vessel owners to continue this practice, to actually add to the practice by procuring additional foreign built but U.S.-flag vessels for the operating differential subsidy.

In legislation pending before the committee, 2151, to be exact, we hope to address this, and that although I feel like the committee has made some mistakes in the past, we cannot change the past, but that no further funds would be allocated for operating differential subsidies for vessels that have not yet been constructed or that have not yet gotten the subsidy.

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

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I would hope that that is the intent of the committee, as this language moves to the Senate, and will be the position of this committee when this bill goes to conference.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, so far as I know, that is the position of this committee on both sides.

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

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that the funds authorized in this bill cannot, would not be used for any subsidization of any foreign built vessel. There are such proposals, which would permit that in other legislation that is moving forward, but not in this bill. That is my understanding.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for his clarification.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, and each section is considered as read.

It shall be in order at any time to consider the amendments en bloc printed in House Report 103-196 if offered by the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries or a designee. The amendments en bloc shall be considered as read and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

The Clerk will designate section 1.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text by the rule be printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 1964

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 "Maritime Administration Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994".

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATIONS FOR MARITIME ADMINISTRATION.

(a) AUTHORIZATIONS.—In fiscal year 1994, the following amounts are authorized to be appropriated for the Maritime Administration (Department of Transportation):

(1) Any amounts necessary to liquidate obligations under operating-differential subsidy contracts for the fiscal year 1994 portion of the total contract authority.

(2) $41,013,000 for expenses related to manpower, education, and training, including—

(A) $28,877,000 for maritime training at the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, New York;

(B) $10,344,000 for assistance to the State maritime academies (including for reimbursement of fuel costs associated with the operation of training vessels), of which $1,200,000 may be used for training simulators for the State maritime academies; and

(C) $1,792,000 for manpower and additional training.

(3) $30,713,000 for operating programs, including—

(A) $19,989,000 for general administration;

(B) $8,983,000 for development and use of water transportation systems; and

(C) $1,741,000 for research, technology, and analysis.

(4) $254,355,000 for expenses related to national security support capabilities, including—

(A) $6,937,000 for the National Defense Reserve Fleet;

(B) $1,418,000 for emergency planning and operations; and

(C) $246,000,000 for the Ready Reserve Force, including—

(i) $242,000,000 for maintenance and operations programs in support of the Ready Reserve Force; and

(ii) $4,000,000 for Ready Reserve Force facilities.

(5) $4,000,000 to pay administrative costs related to new loan guarantee commitments under title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 App. U.S.C. 1271 et seq.), relating to Federal ship mortgage insurance.

(6) $50,000,000 for costs (as that term is defined in section 502 of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 661a)) of new loan guarantee commitments under title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 App. U.S.C. 1271 et seq.).

(7) $242,000 for assistance to the Massachusetts Center for Marine Environmental Protection located at the Massachusetts Maritime Academy.

(b) USE OF PROCEEDS OF SALES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Transportation may use proceeds derived from the sale or disposal of National Defense Reserve Fleet vessels that are currently collected and retained by the Maritime Administration for facility and ship maintenance, modernization and repair, acquisition of equipment, training simulators, and fuel costs necessary to maintain training at the United States Merchant Marine Academy and the State maritime academies.

SEC. 3. NATIONAL SHIPBUILDING ENHANCEMENT INSTITUTES.

(a) DESIGNATION BY SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION.—The Secretary of Transportation may designate National Shipbuilding Enhancement Institutes.

(b) ACTIVITIES.—Activities undertaken by such an Institute may include—

(1) vessel construction and repair technology development with an emphasis on improving the productivity of United States shipyards through innovative design, engineering, or operations;

(2) enhancing the international competitiveness of domestic shipyards in ship construction and repair;

(3) documenting and forecasting international and domestic trends in ship construction and repair;

(4) fostering innovations in the domestic shipbuilding marketing system; and

(5) providing technical support on shipbuilding practices.

(c) SUBMISSION OF APPLICATIONS.—An institution seeking designation as a National Shipbuilding Enhancement Institute shall submit an application under regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

(d) DESIGNATION CRITERIA.—The Secretary shall designate an Institute under this section on the basis of the following criteria:

(1) The research and extension resources available to the designee for carrying out the activities specified in subsection (b).

(2) The existence of an established program of the designee encompassing research, education, and training directed to enhancing shipbuilding industries.

(3) The ability of the designee to assemble and evaluate pertinent information from national and international sources and to disseminate results of shipbuilding industry research and educational programs.

(4) The qualification of the designee as a nonprofit institution of maritime or higher education.

(e) GRANTS.—The Secretary may make an award, on a matching basis, to any institute designated under subsection (a), from amounts appropriated.

SEC. 4. REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN FEES BY STATE MARITIME ACADEMIES.

(a) CONDITION OF ASSISTANCE.—Section 1304(d) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 App. U.S.C. 1295c(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(3)(A) Subject to subparagraph (B), an agreement under this subsection shall require a State maritime academy to reimburse each qualified individual for any fee or charge for which the individual is liable to the United States for—

"(i) the issuance of an entry level license under chapter 71 of title 46, United States Code;

"(ii) the first issuance of a merchant mariner's document under chapter 73 of that title;

"(iii) an evaluation or examination for such a license or merchant mariner's document conducted before the end of the period described in subparagraph (D)(ii); or

"(iv) an application for such a license, merchant mariner's document, evaluation, or examination.

"(B) A State maritime academy shall reimburse qualified individuals under subparagraph (A) to the extent amounts are available under subparagraph (C).

"(C) In addition to annual payments under paragraph (1)(A) and subject to the availability of appropriations, the Secretary shall annually pay to each State maritime academy that enters into an agreement under paragraph (1) amounts to reimburse qualified individuals under subparagraph (A).

"(D) In this paragraph, the term 'qualified individual' means an individual who—

"(i) is attending or is a graduate of a State maritime academy;

"(ii) fulfills the requirements for a license or merchant mariner's document described in subparagraph (A) not later than three months after the date the individual graduates from a State maritime academy; and

"(iii) is liable for a fee or charge described in subparagraph (A).".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) is effective October 1, 1993.

(c) AMENDMENT OF EXISTING AGREEMENTS.—As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall amend agreements under section 1304(d) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 App. U.S.C. 1295c(d)) pursuant to the amendment made by subsection (a).

(d) ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED.—In addition to amounts authorized to be appropriated for assistance to State maritime academies, there is authorized to be appropriated $300,000 for fiscal year 1994 to reimburse qualified individuals pursuant to the amendment made by subsection (a).

SEC. 5. NATIONAL MARITIME ENHANCEMENT INSTITUTES.

Section 8(e) of the Act of October 13, 1989 (46 App. U.S.C. 1121–2(e)), is amended to read as follows:

"(e) The Secretary may make awards on an equal or partial matching basis to an Institute designated under subsection (a) from amounts appropriated.".

SEC. 6. TERMINATION OF CONDITION FOR STATE MARITIME ACADEMY ASSISTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1304(f)(1) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 App. U.S.C. 1295c(f)(1)) is amended to read as if section 3 of the Act of October 13, 1989 (Public Law 101–115; 103 Stat. 692), had not been enacted.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be effective October 13, 1989.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 3 of the Act of October 13, 1989 (Public Law 101–115; 103 Stat. 692), is repealed.

(2) Section 706 of the Federal Maritime Commission Authorization Act of 1990 (46 App. U.S.C. 1295c note) is repealed.

SEC. 7. MAINTENANCE CONTRACTS FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE RESERVE FLEET VESSELS.

The Secretary of Transportation may enter into a contract for the maintenance of the National Defense Reserve Fleet, including the Ready Reserve Force, only for—

(1) the repair, activation, operation, berthing, towing, or lay-up of a vessel;

(2) a vessel used by a State maritime academy; or

(3) obtaining maintenance technical services when—

(A) the technical expertise required for that service is beyond the capabilities of the Fleet staff or when the Fleet has insufficient personnel resources to adequately maintain the Fleet; and

(B) the contract does not result in reducing employment at the Fleet site.

SEC. 8. MAINTENANCE OF READY RESERVE FORCE VESSELS IN REDUCED OPERATING STATUS.

The Secretary shall, during fiscal year 1994, maintain in a reduced operating status—

(1) at least 29 vessels in the Ready Reserve Force component of the National Defense Reserve Fleet, or

(2) a lesser number of those vessels that the Secretary determines to be practicable based on the appropriations available for that fiscal year for maintenance of vessels in that Force.

SEC. 9. VESSEL REPAIR AND MAINTENANCE PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Transportation shall conduct a pilot program to evaluate the feasibility of using long-term contracts for the maintenance and repair of outported vessels in the Ready Reserve Force to enhance the readiness of those vessels. Under the pilot program, the Secretary, subject to the availability of appropriations and within 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, shall award 9 contracts for this purpose.

(b) USE OF VARIOUS CONTRACTING ARRANGEMENTS.—In conducting a pilot program under this section, the Secretary of Transportation shall use contracting arrangements similar to those used by the Department of Defense for procuring maintenance and repair of its vessels.

(c) CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS.—Each contract with a shipyard under this section shall—

(1) subject to subsection (d), provide for the procurement from the shipyard of all repair and maintenance (including activation, deactivation, and drydocking) for one vessel in the Ready Reserve Force that is outported in the geographical vicinity of the shipyard; and

(2) be effective for 3 years.

(d) LIMITATION ON WORK UNDER CONTRACTS.—A contract under this section may not provide for the procurement of operation or manning for a vessel that may be procured under another contract for the vessel to which section 11(d)(2) of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 (50 App. U.S.C. 1744(d)(2)) applies.

(e) GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION.—The Secretary shall seek to award contracts under this section to shipyards that are distributed throughout the United States.

(f) REPORTS.—The Secretary shall submit to the Congress—

(1) an interim report on the effectiveness of each contract under this section in providing for economic and efficient repair and maintenance of the vessel covered by the contract, by not later than 20 months after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) a final report on that effectiveness, by not later than 6 months after the termination of all contracts awarded pursuant to this section.

SEC. 10. GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF READY RESERVE FORCE VESSELS.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall submit a report to the Congress which describes where vessels in the Ready Reserve Force will be located in fiscal year 1994.

(b) CONSIDERATION OF PORTS IN LOCATING VESSELS.—In selecting locations where Ready Reserve Force vessels will be outported, the Secretary of Transportation shall consider ports that have historically been involved in outporting of those vessels.

SEC. 11. MARITIME POLICY REPORT.

(a) REPORT.—The Secretary of Transportation shall transmit to the Congress a report setting forth the Department of Transportation's policies for the 5-year period beginning October 1, 1993, with respect to—

(1) fostering and maintaining a United States merchant marine capable of meeting economic and national security requirements;

(2) improving the vitality and competitiveness of the United States merchant marine and the maritime industrial base, including ship repairers, shipbuilders, ship manning, ship operators, and ship suppliers;

(3) reversing the precipitous decrease in the number of ships in the United States-flag fleet and the Nation's shipyard and repair capability;

(4) stabilizing and eventually increasing the number of mariners available to crew United States merchant vessels;

(5) achieving adequate manning of merchant vessels for national security needs during a mobilization;

(6) ensuring that sufficient civil maritime resources will be available to meet defense deployment and essential economic requirements in support of our national security strategy;

(7) ensuring that the United States maintains the capability to respond unilaterally to security threats in geographic areas not covered by alliance commitments and otherwise meets sealift requirements in the event of crisis or war;

(8) ensuring that international agreements and practices do not place United States maritime industries at an unfair competitive disadvantage in world markets;

(9) ensuring that Federal agencies promote, through efficient application of laws and regulations, the readiness of the United States merchant marine and supporting industries; and

(10) any other relevant maritime policies.

(b) DATE OF TRANSMITTAL.—The report required under subsection (a) shall be transmitted along with the President's budget submission, pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, for fiscal year 1995.

SEC. 12. PILOT PROGRAM ON SEALIFT TRAINING.

The Secretary of Transportation shall establish a 2-year pilot program for Sealift Training at the Massachusetts Maritime Academy.

SEC. 13. SPECIAL RULE FOR VESSEL CONSTRUCTION GUARANTEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any provision of title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 App. U.S.C. 1271 et seq.), in guaranteeing an obligation under that title with amounts appropriated for fiscal year 1994, the Secretary of Transportation shall guarantee an amount of principal or interest (or both) that is equal to 87½ percent of the actual cost or depreciated actual cost (as those terms are defined in that title) of the vessel or facility that is used as security for the guarantee.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to the guarantee of an obligation if the Secretary determines that—

(1) special economic circumstances exist; and

(2) there is good cause for guaranteeing a lesser percentage of principal or interest (or both) authorized by that title.

EN BLOC AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. STUDDS

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, I offer en bloc amendments authorized by the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the en bloc amendments.

The text of the en bloc amendments is as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. STUDDS:

On page 15, line 14, add the following new sections:

SEC. 14. WAIVERS FOR CERTAIN VESSELS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 12106, 12107, and 12018 of title 46, United States Code, and section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920 (46 App. U.S.C. 883), the Secretary of Transportation may issue a certificate of documentation for the following vessels:

(1) AFTERSAIL, (United States official number 689427).

(2) ALEXANDRIA (United States official number 586490).

(3) ARIEL (United States official number 954762).

(4) BRANDARIS (Rhode Island registration number 2848N; former United States official number 263174).

(5) COMPASS ROSE (United States official number 695865).

(6) DIXIE (United States official number 513159).

(7) GYPSY COWBOY (United States official number 550771).

(8) IMPATIENT LADY (United States official number 553952).

(9) ISLAND GIRL (United States official number 674840).

(10) MARINER (United States official number 285452).

(11) MOONSHIRE (United States official number 974226).

(12) MYSTIQUE (United States official number 921194).

(13) NORTHERN LIGHT (United States official number 237510).

(14) PLAY PRETTY (United States Official number 975346).

(15) PRINCE OF TIDES II (United States official number 903858).

(16) SHILOH (United States official number 902675).

(17) SWELL DANCER (United States official number 622046).

(18) TESSA (United States official number 675130).

(19) TOP DUCK (United States official number 990973).

SEC. 15. PROHIBITION ON TRANSFER.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Transportation may not approve the transfer of a United States-documented oceangoing merchant vessel that is of 3,000 gross tons or more (or that type of a vessel the last documentation of which was under the laws of the United States) to a foreign registry under section 9(c) of the Shipping Act, 1916 (46 App. U.S.C. 808) through December 31, 1994.

SEC. 16. AMENDMENTS RELATING TO COAST GUARD MARITIME ACADEMY RESERVE TRAINING PROGRAM

(A) NAVAL RESERVE STATUS.—Section 1304(g)(2) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 App. U.S.C. 1304(g)(2)) is amended by inserting before the period the following: ", unless the individual participates in the Coast Guard Maritime Academy Reserve Training Program".

(b) RESERVE SERVICE OBLIGATION.—Section 1304(g)(3)(D) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 App. U.S.C. 1304(g)(3)(D)) is amended by—

(1) inserting "(i)" after "commissioned officer";

(2) inserting "(except as provided in clause (ii))" after "the United States Coast Guard Reserve"; and

(3) inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: "; or (ii) in the United States Coast Guard Reserve for such period following that date of graduation as may be established by the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating, in the case of an individual that participates in the Coast Guard Maritime Academy Reserve Training Program;".

(c) PENALTIES FOR FAILURE TO FULFILL INCENTIVE PAYMENT AGREEMENT.—Section 1304(g) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 App. U.S.C. 1304(g)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4) by inserting ", except as provided in paragraph (8)," after "such individual may";

(2) in paragraph (5) by inserting ", except as provided in paragraph (8)," after "such individual may"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(8)(A) Paragraphs (4) and (5) shall not apply to a failure to fulfill a part of an agreement, by an individual who—

"(i) is enlisted in the United States Coast Guard Reserve; and

"(ii) participates in the Coast Guard Maritime Academy Reserve Training Program.

"(B) If the Secretary determines that an individual described in subparagraph (A) has failed to fulfill any part of the agreement (required by paragraph (1)) described in paragraph (3), the individual may be ordered to active duty in the Coast Guard to serve for a period of time determined by the Commandant of the Coast Guard, not to exceed 2 years. In cases of hardship as determined by the Secretary, the Secretary may waive this subparagraph.".

(d) COAST GUARD MARITIME ACADEMY RESERVE TRAINING PROGRAM DEFINED.—Section 1304(g) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 App. U.S.C. 1304(g)), as amended by this section, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"(9) In this subsection, the term 'Coast Guard Maritime Academy Reserve Training

Program' means that program established by the Commandant of the Coast Guard, as in effect on the date of the enactment of the Maritime Administration Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994.".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the amendments en bloc are not subject to a demand for a division of the question.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendments en bloc.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment adds three new sections to the bill.

The first section of the amendment adds the provisions of 18 separate bills granting waivers of the Jones Act to 19 individual vessels. The Jones Act, section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920, provides that only vessels built in the United States, documented under the laws of the United States, and owned by a citizen of the United States may transport merchandise in the coastwise trade of the United States.

In the past, Congress has approved special legislation granting coastwise trading or fishing privileges when the vessel owner proved extenuating circumstances, such as severe financial hardship or lack of adequate documentation, or when the vessel or its operation was unique.

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has investigated each vessel covered by the amendment and found compelling reasons to grant a waiver.

The amendment also contains technical amendments to the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to enable the Coast Guard to recruit graduates from State maritime academies. The amendment simply clarifies existing law to eliminate conflicting obligations in reserve training programs. It is supported by the Coast Guard, MarAd, and the State maritime academies.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the amendment places a 1-year moratorium on the Secretary of Transportation's authority to approve the transfer of large oceangoing U.S.-flag vessels of over 3,000 gross tons to a foreign registry. Under current practice it can take the Secretary up to six months to process a reflagging request.

The Secretary is currently in receipt of 20 reflagging applications. This represents over 15 percent of the total international fleet of U.S. liner vessels. The reason for the flood of applications is that we have outdated maritime laws and programs. The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee is working feverishly with the Senate and the administration to enact a comprehensive maritime reform program. We have already reported two-thirds of the program and expect the third piece to clear the committee before the August recess.

But, we need time. If our ships are allowed to go foreign, we will never get them back. This amendment simply gives us an opportunity to enact our program, and ensure the continuation of the U.S.-flag fleet.

Let me add, Mr. Chairman, that as this bill progresses through the legislative process, we will keep our minds open on this issue. Should the President or Secretary Pēna come forward with alternatives or improvements to this amendment, we will certainly consider them.

Mr. Chairman, the members of this committee on both sides of the aisle, in cooperation, in some instances, with the Committee on Armed Services on both sides of the aisle, are working as hard as we can and as fast as we can to come up with a comprehensive proposal for maritime reform for this country, both with regard to the ability of the United States to retain a U.S. flag merchant marine and with regard to the ability of the United States to build those vessels.

Very simply, Mr. Chairman, we have a decision before this country, which will be decided whether or not we act because inaction will constitute decision in and of itself. Certainly, before the end of this Congress or by the end of this Congress, at the end of next year, we will know whether or not this country will continue to have a U.S.-flag merchant marine on the high seas and whether or not we will continue to retain any significant shipbuilding capacity to produce such a U.S.-flag merchant marine.

That decision, Mr. Chairman, is of enormous consequence to this country. It is a decision which speaks directly to our national security, and it is a decision which means thousands and thousands of jobs, both oceangoing jobs and shipbuilding jobs and related trades.

It is a decision of sufficient importance, Mr. Chairman, to be made by the President of the United States. And it is entirely appropriate, as I understand it, that as we conduct this debate there is on the desk of the President a set of options which comprise essentially that decision.

We are all here today, and I know that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will echo this as some already have done, to urge the President to take affirmative action of real significance to answer this question in the affirmative. Yes, this country, for a whole variety of reasons, national security reasons, economic reasons, competitiveness and trade reasons and job reasons, among others, yes, we will retain a U.S.-flag merchant marine as we have for two centuries. And yes, we will retain the capacity to build that.

This amendment or this component of the en bloc amendments, Mr. Chairman, is necessitated, as I said, by the pending application of two of our major liner companies to reflag to a foreign registry.

Once we have lost those vessels, if we do, we will never get them back. And this question will have been answered.

I think I speak for most of my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, when I say that it is unthinkable, at least in my judgment, that the world's only remaining superpower could find itself without any significant merchant fleet and without the capacity to build one. That is almost a contradiction in terms.

We would find ourselves in the preposterous situation of being relying increasingly on foreign sources of energy brought to our shores on foreign-owned and foreign-flagged vessels. Whatever that is, meaningful sense of the word.

□ 1420

This component of the en bloc amendments is offered to buy all of us time, the President, the Secretary of Transportation, and this Congress, to make this most fundamental of decisions.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, it is not offered with any ill will of any kind toward any of the companies concerned. I know they are not at all happy about this procedure. They join us in their preference to continue to fly the American Flag. All of us, the corporations in question, the men and women who work for them, and the requirements and security and otherwise of this country are best served by the ability of these companies to continue to fly our flag. They want to do that, we want them to do that, and our interest, in my judgment, requires that they do that.

I recognize that if we are unable for the duration of the life of this Congress, if we are unable to come up and enact into law significant reform, both with respect to operating vessels and building vessels, that from the business perspective of the companies involved, those who have announced their desire to reflag, we all understand their situation.

Absent significant change in U.S. law, absent meaningful maritime reform, those companies from their own perspective, as they have all said to us, would have no choice but to go foreign. Mr. Chairman, sadly, if that were to be the case, I frankly do not know how we could make a compelling argument that they ought not to do it, because we would have been given our chance, and we would not have risen to the occasion.

This is a matter of enormous consequence, and I want to just add, once again, in paying my own personal tribute to the distinguished ranking member, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FIELDS], the ranking member of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN], the chairman of the subcommittee, and also the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] and his colleagues on the Committee on Armed Services.

I do not know, but I suspect it is highly unusual for this degree of both bipartisan and multicommittee cooperation on a matter of this consequence. Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to address the en bloc amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS], the honorable chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. Chairman, I have no objections to any of the special documentation provisions concerning private vessels, and I also support that part of this amendment dealing with the Coast Guard Reserve Program conducted at the State maritime academies.

I do want to speak for a moment on the provision in this amendment that would prohibit the Secretary of Transportation from approving a request to transfer U.S.-flag merchant vessels to foreign registry until after December 31, 1994.

In the best of worlds, I would not agree with this provision, first, on procedure. I agree with what my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN], said earlier in debate on that particular point.

Second, I do not believe it is appropriate for Congress to mandate this kind of prohibition related to private property rights, again, if we were dealing in a perfect world.

However, Mr. Chairman, we are not in the best of worlds at this particular moment. Indeed, the American maritime industry is on the verge of a total collapse. We are at a precipitous moment. I think we have to take this dramatic action in order to obtain dramatic results.

Two hundred years of American history have proven to us that an American-flag merchant marine is a critical element of our national defense. The national security sealift policy specifically recognizes the need for the United States to be able to respond to security threats with U.S.-owned sealift. In order to run those ships, we must have a well-trained force of merchant seamen.

Our experiences in Operation Desert Shield and Desert Storm confirmed just how critical American ships and American crews are. In this most recent conflict, we had to rely on foreign-flag ships, and repeating the experience we had in Vietnam, we ran into problems. In one case, the crew of a German-registered ship, *Eagle Nova*, refused to fulfill its contract to transport military cargo through the Persian Gulf. Fortunately, we had American ships to turn to. In addition, when we broke out the ships of the Ready Reserve Force, we had difficulty in finding trained seamen to run those ships.

We now find ourselves in a peacetime crisis. There are only 168 military-useful dry cargo vessels in the U.S. fleet and, based on current trends, by the year 2005, there will only be 35. Furthermore, the existing base of trained seamen is declining. The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has been working diligently to turn this trend around. The Subcommittee on Merchant Marine has had several hearings and just this morning, we marked up a major piece of maritime reform legislation. Next week, the full committee will act.

This amendment is necessitated by the fact that two U.S.-flag container ship operators have just applied for permission from the Government to reflag 20 of these ships. They have taken this drastic measure because they cannot compete in international trade without Federal assistance, and they are fearful that maritime reform legislation will not be enacted in time to do them any good.

Acceptance of this amendment will keep these 20 vessels under the American flag until Congress has had an opportunity to craft a new subsidy program. As I indicated earlier, this approach would not have been my preference. However, I have been assured by Chairman STUDDS that this will be a one-time moratorium and there will be no extension of this prohibition. I believe that by approving this amendment, this House will be sending a signal to the administration, the vessel owners, the maritime labor unions, and the American shipyards that we have reached a critical point and we must act immediately on maritime reform legislation.

I understand that some Members may be concerned with this legislation, but I can only assure them that we are taking this step under the most severe circumstances. I urge my colleagues to join me and the other Members of this House who are desperately trying to save the American merchant marine in supporting this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to publicly compliment the way our chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS], conducts himself; the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIPINSKI], the chairman of the Merchant Marine Subcommittee; my colleague and good friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN]; because truly this is a bipartisan effort, working under severe and difficult circumstances to do the right thing, not only for our domestic merchant marine, but also, Mr. Chairman, trying to work for the best interests of this country.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GEJDENSON TO THE EN BLOC AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. STUDDS

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the en bloc amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GEJDENSON to the en bloc amendments offered by Mr. STUDDS: On the first page of the amendments, in the matter proposed to be added as section 14(a), insert after paragraph (6) the following (and redesignated the subsequent paragraphs accordingly):

(7) GRAY (Connecticut State vessel number CT5944AJ).

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, with the incredible speed and efficiency that the committee has acted under the leadership of the chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS], and with the cooperation of his minority members, we ran into a time problem in adding this vessel, built in the 1920's.

It is a vessel that will be used, it is a tall ship that will be used for the Outward Bound Program. I think both minority and majority staff have reviewed it.

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

Mr. GEJDENSON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is absolutely correct. We have no objection whatsoever to this amendment.

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEJDENSON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the minority has examined this. We have no problems with it, and I urge its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON] to the en bloc amendments offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS].

The amendment to the en bloc amendments was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS TO THE EN BLOC AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. STUDDS, AS AMENDED

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the en bloc amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEARNS to the en bloc amendment offered by Mr. STUDDS: On the first page of the amendments, in the matter proposed to be added as section 14(a), insert after paragraph (9) the following (and redesignated the subsequent paragraphs accordingly):

(10) LAURISA (United States official number 924052).

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment adds a 20th vessel, *Laurisa*, to the en bloc amendments offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS]. This vessel was once transferred to a British Virgin Island corporation, therefore representing a chain of title problems.

I have spoken to the chairman and the ranking Republican member of the committee, and they have agreed to accept my amendment.

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEARNS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the minority has had a chance to review the amendment. We think the amendment is a good amendment. We support it, and have no problems with it.

Mr. STEARNS. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. STEARNS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, likewise, we support the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] to the en bloc amendments offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS], as amended.

The amendment to the en bloc amendments, as amended, was agreed to.

□ 1430

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT TO THE EN BLOC AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. STUDDS

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the en bloc amendments, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT to the en bloc amendments offered by Mr. STUDDS, as amended: At the end of the amendment add the following new sections:

SEC. . COMPLIANCE WITH BUY AMERICAN ACT

No funds appropriated pursuant to this Act may be expended by an entity unless the entity agrees that in expending the assistance the entity will comply with sections 2 through 4 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a-10c, popularly known as the "Buy American Act").

SEC. . SENSE OF CONGRESS; REQUIREMENT REGARDING NOTICE

(a) PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—In the case of any equipment or products that may be authorized to be purchased with financial assistance provided under this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that entities receiving such assistance should, in expending the assistance, purchase only American-made equipment and products.

(b) NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE.—In providing financial assistance under this Act, the head of each Federal agency shall provide to each recipient of the assistance a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

SEC. . PROHIBITION OF CONTRACTS

If it has been finally determined by a court or Federal agency that any person intentionally affixed a label bearing a "Made in America" inscription, or any inscription with the same meaning, to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that is not made in the United States, such person shall be ineligible to receive any contract or subcontract made with funds provided pursuant to this Act, pursuant to the debarment, suspension, and ineligibility procedures described in section 9.400 through 9.409 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations.

Mr. TRAFICANT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, this is the Buy American amendment that states that the procurement under the bill shall comply with the Buy American Act, and also a notice be given to anyone who would receive funds under it. It is the intent of Congress, wherever possible, that anybody receiving funds prioritize the purchase of American-made goods and products. And finally, it says if there is in fact a firm, that under the Buy American Act has a contract, and affixes a false label, they would have to come before the committee and would be deprived from doing any further business only for this particular year of this bill. So it gives the committee the right to review those cases and avoid fraudulent labeling.

That is in essence the amendment.

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

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

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, I just want to ask the gentleman, and I think I know the answer, am I correct that the gentleman's amendment does not add to requirements which essentially exist under existing law?

Mr. TRAFICANT. No, they do not, and they do deal with issues that we have dealt with. And if there is not a domestic product available, then certainly the right to purchase a foreign product is still allowed.

Mr. STUDDS. I thank the gentleman. We are delighted to accept the amendment.

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

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, is this the amendment that the gentleman normally offers to most legislation?

Mr. TRAFICANT. This is the same legislation that the gentleman has supported in the past, and I have appreciated that support, and would hope that the gentleman would support me again. But it is in essence the very same thing. It is a standard Buy American amendment that has been offered on other legislation.

Mr. FIELDS. We think the gentleman makes a genuine point and have no objection to his amendment.

Mr. TRAFICANT. I appreciate that.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of both H.R. 1964 and the en bloc amendments offered by Chairman STUDDS, and I want to commend him, along with Subcommittee Chairman LIPINSKI and my colleagues, Messrs. FIELDS and BATEMAN, the ranking Republican members on the full committee and the subcommittee, respectively, for their outstanding work on the Maritime Administration authorization bill and the legislative agenda they have offered and are working on to help revitalize the merchant marine and shipbuilding industries.

Mr. Chairman, clearly, the language placing a 1 year moratorium on the Maritime Administration's processing of registry transfer applications filed by Sea-Land Service, Inc., and American President Line, Ltd., two of our Nation's largest liner operators, has generated much discussion within the industry.

For more than 45 years, I have championed the causes of our maritime industries and repeatedly have warned of the dire consequences to our fleet and industries if we did not initiate major reforms.

My warnings, and those of others, were supported by the findings and recommendations of the President's Commission on Merchant Marine and Defense, which issued its series of reports beginning in 1987. Unfortunately, as evidence by the fact that both the U.S. merchant marine and shipbuilding industries now are on the perilous edge of extinction, no one has been listening or willing to act—at least, up to now. At long last, the members of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, through the committee leaders are well aware that the 11th hour has arrived for both the merchant marine and the shipbuilding industries.

The provision freezing the Sea-Land and APL reflagging applications will give our committee and the Congress, working in close cooperation with the administration, as well as maritime labor and the operators, the opportunity to finalize legislative remedies which addresses the myriad complex issues that confront these industries so critical to our military and economic security.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote "aye" for the en bloc amendment offered by my good friend and colleague, Mr. STUDDS.

Mr. MACHTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this amendment offered by Mr. STUDDS, my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts and the chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

Included in this amendment, which seeks to waive various maritime statutes in order to allow vessels to participate in coastwide trade, and three beautiful and historic sailing vessels currently anchored in the waters of my home State of Rhode Island.

I would like to take just a moment to briefly share the history of these ships.

The first boat, *Brandaris*, was built in Amsterdam in 1938, and was immediately under threat of German capture and seizure during World War II. For safe keeping, this vessel went into hiding off the coast of England. She was eventually called on for service in Operation Domino, and served with distinction in

the evacuation of Dunkirk. Since coming to America, she has been restored and has participated in numerous town celebrations and waterfront festivities. Currently, she is a dockside attraction in Wickford, RI.

The second boat, *Mariner*, has a history of service to this country. *Mariner* was donated to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy in 1958. From then until 1964, *Mariner* was used rigorously to train new cadets. In 1968, the boat was largely destroyed in a storm, and subsequently had extensive rebuilding work performed by the Derector Shipyard in New York. She is currently a recreational sailing vessel anchored in Newport.

Northern Light, the third vessel, has served her country honorably as well.

Northern Light was used during the America's Cup trials in 1958 to help train the eventual cup defender, *Columbia*, against the British challenger, *Septre*.

She continued as an America's Cup trial horse during the 1960's and deserves credit for America's domination of the event for so many years.

In the 1970's, after sailing in the Great Lakes for a number of years. *Northern Light* fell into disrepair and sank at a dock in Holland, MI. The current owner raised this vessel, restored her, and in the spring of 1986, sailed her to New York to participate in the Statue of Liberty rededication ceremonies. She now is part of a growing fleet of restored 12-meter yachts which adorn Newport Harbor.

I am proud to have each of these two yachts moored in Newport, RI, a town which has a long tradition of maritime activity, and is affectionately known as the sailing capital of the world.

Mr. Chairman, passing this amendment will allow thousands of people to enjoy these vessels, and become part of their rich and distinguished history.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and allow these boats to be used in coastwide trade.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] to the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS], as amended.

The amendment to the amendments en bloc, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS], as amended.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 388, noes 41, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 384]

AYES—388

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentley
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blackwell
Blute
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Buyer
Byrne
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crapo
Cunningham
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
de Lugo (VI)
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Dornan
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Faleomavaega (AS)
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gekas
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings
Hayes
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hughes
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Inglis
Inslee
Istook
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Knollenberg
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McKinney
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Norton (DC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Ridge
Roemer
Rogers
Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Synar
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Underwood (GU)
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weldon
Wheat
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff

NOES—41

Allard
Archer
Armey
Barrett (NE)
Barton
Bereuter
Bliley
Boehner
Bonilla
Burton
Collins (GA)
Combest
Crane
DeLay
Doolittle
Dreier
Gingrich
Gunderson
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Huffington
Hyde
Inhofe
Jacobs
Johnson, Sam
Kingston
Klug
Kolbe
Kyl
Manzullo
Paxon
Penny
Petri
Porter
Ramstad
Roberts
Rohrabacher
Royce
Sensenbrenner
Stump
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—10

Derrick
Ford (TN)
Gephardt
Henry
Lazio
McDade
Moakley
Packard
Washington
Whitten

□ 1452

Messrs. ROBERTS, PORTER, HYDE, GINGRICH, PENNY, KYL, and PETRI, changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. GREENWOOD changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the en bloc amendments, as amended, were agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise simply to advise Members that so far as we know there are no further amendments to the bill.

It is my understanding that when the Committee rises there will be a request for a separate vote in the House on the amendment just adopted.

I would also advise Members that in consultation with the ranking minority member, it is not the intention of anyone responsible for this bill to request a vote on final passage; so that if we are all well behaved, there will be one more vote and that is a separate vote in the House.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY) having assumed the chair, Mr. RAHALL, 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. 1964) to authorize appropriations for the Maritime Administration for fiscal year 1994, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 230, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on the amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the so-called Studds amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments: On page 15, line 14, add the following new sections:

SEC. 14. WAIVERS FOR CERTAIN VESSELS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding sections 12106, 12107, and 12018 of title 46, United States Code, and section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920 (46 App. U.S.C. 883), the Secretary of Transportation may issue a certificate of documentation for the following vessels:

(1) AFTERSAIL (United States official number 689427).

(2) ALEXANDRIA (United States official number 586490).

(3) ARIEL (United States official number 954762).

(4) BRANDARIS (Rhode Island registration number 2848N; former United States official number 263174).

(5) COMPASS ROSE (United States official number 695865).

(6) DIXIE (United States official number 513159).

(7) GRAY (Connecticut State Vessel number CT 5944AJ).

(8) GYPSY COWBOY (United States official number 550771).

(9) IMPATIENT LADY (United States official number 553952).

(10) ISLAND GIRL (United States official number 674840).

(11) LAURISA (United States official number 924052).

(12) MARINER (United States official number 285452).

(13) MOONSHINE (United States official number 974226).

(14) MYSTIQUE (United States official number 921194).

(15) NORTHERN LIGHT (United States official number 237510).

(16) PLAY PRETTY (United States official number 975346).

(17) PRINCE OF TIDES II (United States official number 903858).

(18) SHILOH (United States official number 902675).

(19) SWELL DANCER (United States official number 622046).

(20) TESSA (United States official number 675130).

(21) TOP DUCK (United States official number 990973).

SEC. 15. PROHIBITION ON TRANSFER.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Transportation may not approve the transfer of a United States-documented oceangoing merchant vessel that is of 3,000 gross tons or more (or that type of a vessel the last documentation of which was under the laws of the United States) to a foreign registry under section 9(c) of the Shipping Act, 1916 (46 App. U.S.C. 808) through December 31, 1994.

SEC. 16. AMENDMENTS RELATING TO COAST GUARD MARITIME ACADEMY RESERVE TRAINING PROGRAM.

(a) NAVAL RESERVE STATUS.—Section 1304(g)(2) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 App. U.S.C. 1304(g)(2)) is amended by inserting before the period the following: ", unless the individual participates in the Coast Guard Maritime Academy Reserve Training Program."

(b) RESERVE SERVICE OBLIGATION.—Section 1304(g)(3)(D) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 App. U.S.C. 1304(g)(3)(D)) is amended by—

(1) inserting "(i)" after "commissioned officer";

(2) inserting "(except as provided in clause (ii))" after "the United States Coast Guard Reserve"; and

(3) inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: "; or (ii) in the United States Coast Guard Reserve for such period following that date of graduation as may be established by the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating, in the case of an individual that participates in the Coast Guard Maritime Academy Reserve Training Program;".

(c) PENALTIES FOR FAILURE TO FULFILL INCENTIVE PAYMENT AGREEMENT.—Section 1304(g) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 App. U.S.C. 1304(g)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4) by inserting ", except as provided in paragraph (8)," after "such individual may";

(2) in paragraph (5) by inserting ", except as provided in paragraph (8)," after "such individual may"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(8)(A) Paragraphs (4) and (5) shall not apply to a failure to fulfill a part of an agreement, by an individual who—

"(i) is enlisted in the United States Coast Guard Reserve; and

"(ii) participates in the Coast Guard Maritime Academy Reserve Training Program.

"(B) If the Secretary determines that an individual described in subparagraph (A) has failed to fulfill any part of the agreement (required by paragraph (1)) described in paragraph (3), the individual may by ordered to active duty in the Coast Guard to serve for a period of time determined by the Commandant of the Coast Guard, not to exceed 2 years. In cases of hardship as determined by the Secretary, the Secretary may waive this subparagraph.".

(d) COAST GUARD MARITIME ACADEMY RESERVE TRAINING PROGRAM DEFINED.—Section 1304(g) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 App. U.S.C. 1304(g)), as amended by this section, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"(9) In this subsection, the term 'Coast Guard Maritime Academy Reserve Training Program' means that program established by the Commandant of the Coast Guard, as in effect on the date of the enactment of the Maritime Administration Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994.".

At the end of the bill add the following new sections:

SEC. . COMPLIANCE WITH BUY AMERICAN ACT

No funds appropriated pursuant to this Act may be expended by an entity unless the entity agrees that in expending the assistance the entity will comply with sections 2 through 4 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a–10c, popularly known as the "Buy American Act").

SEC. . SENSE OF CONGRESS; REQUIREMENT REGARDING NOTICE

(a) PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—In the case of any equipment or products that may be authorized to be purchased with financial assistance provided under this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that entities receiving such assistance should, in expending the assistance, purchase only American-made equipment and products.

(b) NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE.—In providing financial assistance under this Act, the head of each Federal agency shall provide to each recipient of the assistance a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

SEC. . PROHIBITION OF CONTRACTS.

If it has been finally determined by a court or Federal agency that any person intentionally affixed a label bearing a "Made in America" inscription, or any inscription with the same meaning, to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that is not made in the United States, such person shall be ineligible to receive any contract or subcontract made with funds provided pursuant to this Act, pursuant to the debarment, suspension, and ineligibility procedures described in section 9.400 through 9.409 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations.

Mr. STUDDS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendments.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 382, noes 40, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 385]

AYES—382

Abercrombie	Barcia	Blackwell
Ackerman	Barlow	Blute
Andrews (ME)	Barrett (WI)	Boehlert
Andrews (NJ)	Bartlett	Bonior
Andrews (TX)	Bateman	Borski
Applegate	Becerra	Boucher
Bacchus (FL)	Beilenson	Brewster
Bachus (AL)	Bentley	Brooks
Baesler	Berman	Browder
Baker (CA)	Bevill	Brown (CA)
Baker (LA)	Bilbray	Brown (FL)
Ballenger	Bilirakis	Brown (OH)
Barca	Bishop	Bryant

Bunning
Buyer
Byrne
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crapo
Cunningham
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings
Hayes
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hughes
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Inglis
Inslee
Istook
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Knollenberg
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDermott
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McKinney
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Ridge
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stark
Stearns
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Synar
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff

NOES—40

Allard
Archer
Armey
Barrett (NE)
Barton
Bereuter
Bliley
Boehner
Bonilla
Burton
Combest
Crane
DeLay
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Gingrich
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Huffington
Hyde
Inhofe
Jacobs
Johnson, Sam
Klug
Kolbe
Kyl
Manzullo
Paxon
Penny
Petri
Porter
Ramstad
Roberts
Rohrabacher
Royce
Sensenbrenner
Stenholm
Stump
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—12

Derrick
Ford (TN)
Henry
Lazio
McDade
McHale
Moakley
Packard
Payne (VA)
Spratt
Washington
Williams

□ 1514

Mr. MINGE and Mr. MOORHEAD changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendments were agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY). The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 372, nays 48, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 386]

YEAS—372

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentley
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blackwell
Blute
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Buyer
Byrne
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Cunningham
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hilliard
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Huffington
Hughes
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Inslee
Istook
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lehman
Levin
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Mink
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Ridge
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Sundquist

Swett	Torricelli	Weldon
Swift	Towns	Wheat
Synar	Traficant	Whitten
Talent	Tucker	Williams
Tanner	Unsoeld	Wilson
Tauzin	Upton	Wise
Taylor (MS)	Valentine	Wolf
Taylor (NC)	Velazquez	Woolsey
Tejeda	Vento	Wyden
Thomas (CA)	Visclosky	Wynn
Thomas (WY)	Volkmer	Yates
Thompson	Vucanovich	Young (AK)
Thornton	Walsh	Young (FL)
Thurman	Waters	Zeliff
Torkildsen	Watt	
Torres	Waxman	

NAYS—48

Allard	Doolittle	McMillan
Archer	Dornan	Minge
Armey	Dreier	Moorhead
Ballenger	Duncan	Nussle
Barrett (NE)	Fawell	Paxon
Barton	Gekas	Penny
Bereuter	Hall (TX)	Porter
Bliley	Hancock	Ramstad
Boehner	Hunter	Roberts
Bonilla	Jacobs	Rohrabacher
Burton	Johnson, Sam	Royce
Collins (GA)	Klug	Sensenbrenner
Condit	Knollenberg	Stenholm
Crane	Kyl	Stump
Crapo	Leach	Walker
DeLay	Manzullo	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—14

Derrick	Lazio	Petri
Hastert	McDade	Schenk
Henry	Moakley	Shuster
Hinchey	Morella	Washington
Kennedy	Packard	

□ 1534

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote 386 I was unavoidably detained at a meeting sponsored by the House Republican Task Force on Health Care. Had I been present I would have voted "aye" on rollcall vote 386, final passage of H.R. 1964, a bill to authorize the Maritime Administration for fiscal year 1994.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I returned to my district to be present at the birth of my second child.

Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcalls 380 through 386.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, had I been present for the following rollcall votes, I would have voted yes on rollcall votes numbered 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, and 386.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SOLOMON. 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. 1964, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HILLIARD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

NOTICE OF REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF DEADLINE TO FILE AMENDMENTS ON H.R. 2401, THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1994

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the chairman of the Committee on Rules announced that amendments to the National Defense Authorization Act must be filed with the Committee on Rules by noon this coming Monday. It is my understanding that the text of H.R. 2401, which is the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1994, is not yet available for Members and staff to use for the preparation of those amendments. Therefore, it is unreasonable to expect Members to have their amendments, to such an important bill, filed with the Committee on Rules by the announced deadline of 12 noon on Monday.

Accordingly, the minority members of the Committee on Rules will be requesting an extension of that deadline for filing amendments. We trust that the House will be given timely and adequate notice of such an extension.

Mr. Speaker, I would just say in conclusion that the delay in making a text of this bill available does not in any way reflect on the work performed by the Committee on Armed Services. I understand that they did an outstanding job, and I commend the chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], for his particular efforts on that issue.

As a matter of fact, it has been several other agencies of Government which have been tardy in supplying the committee with the necessary numbers and other data needed in order to put together the final text of the bill. I would hope we would be able to work this out with the Committee on Rules as far as this filing is concerned by sometime tomorrow morning. Mr. Speaker, we will further alert the Members during the day.

MODIFICATION OF APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2264, OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1993

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair announces the following modification in the appointment of conferees on H.R. 2264:

The final panel from the Committee on Ways and Means is also appointed for the consideration of sections 13601–02 and 13604–705 of the House bill.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will notify the Senate of the Change in Conferees.

THE HISTORY OF LARGE TAX INCREASES

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

Mr. HOAGLAND. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, as we so well know, we are borrowing a billion dollars a day to fund the day-to-day operations of Government, and that simply has to stop. We must take courageous action to begin to reduce the deficit. We must move in the direction of no deficit and a balanced budget.

In that context, Mr. Speaker, the critics of this plan say over and over that this is the largest tax increase in history. Nonsense. That simply is not the case.

Mr. Speaker, I will submit a letter to the editor of the Washington Post by Robert S. McIntyre The director of the Citizens for Tax Justice, to be placed in the RECORD. It points out that the tax increase proposed by the Roosevelt administration to fund World War II was 18 times larger than this proposal, that the Truman administration increase to fund the Korean war was 6 times larger. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, Mr. McIntyre, points out that the Dole-Reagan tax increase in 1982 was 25 percent larger than the Clinton proposal.

And Mr. McIntyre's computations were made when the bill contained the Btu tax, which raised about $71 billion, much more revenue than is likely to be included in the final package.

Let me also emphasize that a recent study released by Senator EXON indicates that less than 1 percent of all Nebraskans will experience an income tax increase under this proposal.

[From the Washington Post, May 29, 1993]

EXAGGERATED TAX PACKAGE

For about the zillionth time this year, your paper ["At a Taxing Time, 'The Boss' Is Back," front page, May 27] has called President Clinton's budget program "the largest tax increase in history." That's silly. Obviously, taxes didn't get to their current level without some considerably heftier tax hikes in the past.

By fiscal 1998, when his energy tax is fully phased in, Clinton's tax plan is expected to raise $64 billion annually, or about 0.8 percent of the gross domestic product. How does that compare with other tax increases in the past half-century?

Remember World War II? To help pay for it, federal taxes were increased by a staggering 14.8 percent of the GDP (from fiscal 1940 to 1944). By 1998 standards, that's a tax hike of $1,165 billion a year—18 times as large as Clinton's proposal.

The Korean War required a federal tax increase of 4.6 percent of the GDP. That's $362 billion in 1998 terms—almost six times bigger than the Clinton plan.

The surtax enacted at the end of the Johnson administration to finance the Vietnam War amounted to 2.1 percent of the GDP. That's $165 billion a year in 1998 terms—or 2½ times larger than Clinton's annual tax boost.

In 1982 Ronald Reagan signed Bob Dole's Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act.

Still in effect, that bill will raise an estimated $75 billion in fiscal 1998 ($80 billion if you count the gasoline tax hike also enacted in 1982). At one percent of the GDP, the Reagan-Dole 1982 tax increase is 25 percent bigger than Clinton's proposal.

(I could add that two tax bills enacted in 1983 and 1984—one to rescue Social Security, the other for deficit reduction—will raise about $70 billion in fiscal 1998—again more than Clinton's plan. But maybe it's unfair to combine them.)

So it might be reasonable for your paper to call Clinton's program "the biggest tax increase since Ronald Reagan's first term." Or even "one of the biggest peacetime tax hikes in this century." But the "largest increase in history"? Not even close.—ROBERT S. MCINTYRE.

AN ECONOMIC REPORT FROM THE DELAWARE VALLEY

(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, the drumbeat continues. I continue my series of discussions about the impact of the Clinton tax hikes on real businesses, real jobs, and real people.

Today I have a letter from Steve Markowitz, president of the Business and Association Administrators, located in Collingsdale, PA, in my district. Mr. Markowitz is also a board member of the Small Business Association of the Delaware Valley, which has 5,000 small businesses involved in New Jersey, Delaware, and Pennsylvania. A real, live small businessman, and he hates the Clinton tax plan.

He writes: "Our members need to convey to you the distressed state of the entrepreneurial segment of this country." The cause of this distress? The soak the capitalist mentality of the Clinton administration.

Mr. Markowitz describes the impact of these tax hikes on small businesses in the region: "A service business in Wayne will offset anticipated corporate tax increases by reducing payroll 18 percent * * *. A physician in Montco will be reducing staff * * *. Our own organization has made a decision to have a zero increase in payroll for at least 12 months." This after increasing from 21 to 37 employees in just 19 months.

My friends on the other side of the aisle can comfort themselves with feel-good rhetoric about how the Clinton tax hikes will help small businesses. But actual small business leaders are telling a far different story. Congress has not even finished its work, but the Clinton tax hikes are already costing jobs all across America.

Mr. Speaker, the complete text of the letter to which I referred is as follows:

BUSINESS AND ASSOCIATION ADMINISTRATORS, INC.,
Collingsdale, PA.

Hon. CURT WELDON,
House of Representatives, Cannon House Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WELDON: I am writing to you in my capacity as an officer of this company, and as a Member of the Board of Directors of the Small Business Association of Delaware Valley. You are aware of course that SBADV represents more than 5,000 small businesses in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware.

Our Members, as well as my own company need to convey to you the distressed state of the entrepreneurial segment of this country. That distress has been precipitated by an increasing feeling among my colleagues that the Clinton Administration in its promotion of its tax bill is working counter to its stated objectives of creating more jobs and nurturing an environment conducive to small business startup. Much of the distress is precipitated by the impression that the Administration has no clear, practical agenda for equitable taxation, leading to the belief that a "soak the capitalist" mentality may prevail.

In terms of our Members, let me illustrate some of their real responses to what they believe are unfocused and impractical tax packages. A service business in Wayne will offset anticipated corporate tax increases by reducing payroll 18%. A physician in Montco has informed me that she will be reducing staff in anticipation of decreased patient care—she believes that the BTU tax particularly will create more hardships on her patients who will in turn selectively reduce their expenditures. She also fears that many of her patients will delay seeking the kinds of essential endocrine services she provides.

In our own organization after having increased from 21 to 37 full-time employees in just nineteen months of operation, we have already made the decision to effect zero increase in payroll and new staffing for the next twelve months, and to withhold on two major capital expenditures and a possible acquisition because of the uncertainty created by the Administration's unpredictable revenue producing package.

I urge you to prevail upon your fellow House members to consider the impact that the Administration's tax package will have upon the thousands of American entrepreneurs who are in fact creating the labor force in the 90's. The package is stultifying and guarantees that we will have to survive such impractical measures through staff cuts and lack of expansion. This is certainly not what the Clinton Administration had in mind, or promised the small business community during the campaign.

Thank you for your attention to those matters.

Very truly yours,
STEPHEN MARKOWITZ,
President, Chief Operating Officer.

SUPPORT OF THE CHRISTIAN COALITION

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

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I am not an attack dog, but I am consistent.

I am wearing my deficit reduction dollar bill. I may put a higher denomination there later in the year. I folded it so that it says "In God we trust" at the top. And someone has even sent me a pin to stick it on that says, "I care about the deficit." So I did not go halfway in 1990, because I made a pledge to my constituents not to raise taxes.

I am not doing anything differently now. I did not meet President Bush halfway on that tax increase. I thought it would throw us deeper into the recession than it did. But I notice something else peculiar on the floor. A few Members have taken to the floor with a troubling message.

They are suggesting that people of faith have no right to look at taxes as kind of a moral issue.

I had lunch the other day with Rabbi Daniel Lapin down in a restaurant, and he pointed out that in Genesis, that is in the Torah, that is one of the first five books of the original Testament, it says that any taxation over 20 percent is sinful.

So let members of faith come to the well and put a little moral spin on this, if they want. Nothing wrong with that.

So Mr. Speaker, People of faith have every right to engage in the debate over the tax plan that will soon be considered by this Chamber. Specifically, some Members have attacked the Christian Coalition for sponsoring radio advertisements in their districts opposing the Clinton tax increase.

On May 27, this Chamber passed a tax bill that contains the largest tax increase in American history. Rather then defending their vote, these Members chose to shoot the messenger. A rather classic diversionary tactic. It is understandable because the Clinton tax plan will burden families, kill jobs, and extinguish prosperity. I understand why some are defensive about groups educating their constituents—they are simply embarrassed about their vote for more taxes and more spending. But it's outrageous to suggest that people of faith have no right to participate in the political process. Let's be clear. The Christian Coalition, in no way shape or form, suggested those who voted for the plan were "un-Christian". The radio ads simply pointed out that middle class families with children cannot bear another tax increase.

The Christian Coalition, like the National Council of Churches and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, has every right to participate in the public policy deliberations of our Nation. If it's right for the religious left to get involved, it's right for conservative people of faith.

PRESIDENT CLINTON'S ECONOMIC PLAN RESTORES TAX FAIRNESS

(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, the conference report is ready and it is time to put up or shut up. It is time to stop fooling around. It is time to pass the plan.

Mr. Speaker, the White House has its act together. Yesterday 67 CEO's of the largest corporations endorsed the plan.

The EITC is being discussed today at the White House. Millions of Americans will receive a tax cut under this Clinton plan.

By expanding the EITC, we can make certain that anyone who works full time and has a child at home will be

lifted out of poverty, but by working. And this bill, this initiative, the EITC, is going to be followed by welfare reform.

Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal is reflecting reality. By a comfortable margin, 54 to 32 percent, the American people say the Clinton plan is a step in the right direction; 72 percent of those surveyed say they approve of raising taxes on the wealthy people.

But most importantly, in a trial heat, Americans, by 49 to 40 percent, would support a Democratic Member of Congress who supported the President against a Republican Member who opposed the program.

Mr. Speaker, the rivers are overflowing in the Midwest and misinformation is overflowing in Washington. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle would like to create the impression that the President's economic package will cause untold damage to the country. The fact of the matter is that their response—doing nothing—would be our most dangerous course.

The cornerstones of the President's plan are deficit reduction, making the rich pay their fair share, and job creation.

This plan will return tax fairness to America. Under this plan, people who make the most will pay the most—70 percent of all new taxes will be paid by people who make over $200,000 per year. In fact, there will be no income tax increase for 98.8 percent of all American taxpayers. This plan keeps faith with the middle class. For every $10 in deficit reduction, $5 comes from spending cuts, $4 from taxing those who make over $100,000, and only $1 comes from the rest of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans left the playing field and declined to put forward a responsible economic plan. The President's plan is not only the best plan in town, it's the only game in town.

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 29, 1993]

SUPPORT FOR CLINTON'S ECONOMIC PLAN GROWS DESPITE SOME TAX COMPLAINTS

(By Gerald F. Seib)

WASHINGTON.—Americans are expressing more support for President Clinton's economic plan as it nears a crucial final vote, although they aren't happy with some of its specific taxes.

According to a new Wall Street Journal/NBC News poll, the share of people who say they favor the economic plan has risen in the past month to 43% from 39%. By a like amount, the percentage of those who say they oppose the plan has fallen to 39% from 44%.

By a comfortable margin, 54% to 32%, people say the Clinton plan would represent a step in the right direction. And the survey indicates that many Americans are sour on the conduct of Mr. Clinton's Republican critics.

People also say that in next year's election they would be more inclined to support a Democrat who votes for the Clinton plan than a Republican who votes against it. And, as the White House has always hoped, the element of the plan that the administration is counting on to produce the most revenue, a tax increase on wealthier people, also is easily its most popular element.

The overall message appears to be that, although most people find flaws in the package the Democrats are struggling to complete, they prefer to see it passed rather than have nothing done.

But there also are troubling findings for the White House in the new poll, conducted by Democratic pollster Peter Hart and Republican Robert Teeter. Americans seem afraid that the plan's taxes on businesses could hurt the economy. They also believe that, contrary to what the White House says, the middle class will bear the heaviest share of the tax burden.

DOUBTS ABOUT EFFECT ON RICH

The findings also suggest that, while a White House public relations blitz has succeeded in increasing support for the overall plan, Mr. Clinton still hasn't convinced the public that it hurts mostly the rich and cuts spending enough. "There's still some reconciliation to be accomplished with the American public, both on taxes and spending," say Messrs. Hart and Teeter.

Fifty-six percent agree with the statement that business taxes should not be raised because doing so might hurt job creation, compared with 36% who say business taxes should be raised to assure companies are paying their fair share.

Even some who support the overall Clinton package still seem to fear the ramifications of its tax increases: Overall, 65% of those surveyed say raising taxes now would hurt the economy.

At the same time, a large portion of those surveyed, 78%, say they think middle-income people will pay a bigger share of the new taxes under the Clinton plan than will upper-income people. Many people also seem to think spending could be cut further. Six out of 10 say they would prefer moving toward more spending cuts rather than tax increases or a larger deficit in any legislative compromises to complete the plan.

On perhaps the most controversial tax measure under discussion, it appears that people can be convinced to accept the modest gasoline tax that the Senate included in its version of the economic plan. But they oppose gas taxes significantly beyond that. People split virtually evenly when asked whether they favor or oppose the 4.3 cent-a-gallon increase approved by the Senate. But by a 76% to 22% margin, they oppose a 10 cent-a-gallon gasoline tax increase.

At the same time, though, 72% of those surveyed say they approve of raising taxes on wealthy people. And 8 of 10 say that raising taxes on wealthier people would be very effective or somewhat effective in cutting the deficit.

There's also general support for another tax measure, a plan to tax most Social Security benefits received by couples earning over $40,000 a year. By a 51% to 44% margin, those surveyed approve of that step as part of a plan to reduce the deficit. There's slightly less support for another step to curb an expensive entitlement program: 48% favor a proposal to reduce payments to hospitals and physicians who treat patients under the Medicare and Medicaid programs, while 45% are opposed.

Certainly people expect to feel some pain in the drive to cut the deficit—even more pain, in fact, than they are likely to feel. Eight in 10 think it's likely that they will have to pay "significantly more" for gasoline, utilities and other kinds of energy as a result of the new plan. Yet it appears increasingly likely that there won't be any energy tax in the final economic plan beyond a gasoline tax in the range of four cents a gallon. Some 65% of those surveyed say they think it's likely that small businesses will be forced to lay off workers.

Overall, by a 53% to 38% margin, respondents say they prefer the House version of the Clinton plan, which raises taxes more and cuts social programs less than the Senate version. That's good news for President Clinton, who generally prefers the House version over the Senate version. The differences between the two are being ironed out right now by congressional negotiators.

AVOIDING PAIN

In the end, it appears that, rather than endure too much pain, many people would be willing to accept a plan that doesn't hit Mr. Clinton's goal of cutting the deficit by $500 billion over five years. By a 61% to 33% margin, those in the survey say President Clinton should be willing to accept a deficit reduction of $400 billion rather than $500 billion if necessary to get a plan through Congress. And asked whether they would prefer a major drive to cut the deficit that includes a tax increase, or a minor effort to cut the deficit that doesn't include one, 50% choose a minor effort while 43% pick a major one.

"The American public wants the deficit to be reduced, but they seem more ready to gnaw the bullet than bite the bullet," concludes Mr. Hart.

Whatever problems the survey finds in Mr. Clinton's deficit-cutting efforts, it also clearly shows that Republicans face distinct problems because of their flat opposition to the White House effort. Asked whether Republicans are opposing the president for political reasons or are interested in offering a realistic alternative, 64% say the GOP is acting for political reasons. And a majority of those surveyed, 52%, disapprove of Republicans' declaration that they won't support the effort to pass a plan because it includes tax increases.

ALLOCATION OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order for the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI] on July 29, 1993, be allocated to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST].

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

There was no objection.

ALLOCATION OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the hour allocated to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] on July 29, 1993, be allocated to myself.

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

There was no objection.

RETURN SOUTHERN LEBANON TO LEBANESE

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

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, war ravaged the country of Lebanon from the mid-1970's to the early 1990's. It was a

war played out by neighbors of this country and other kingpins in the region, using this small innocent country as the chessboard. Lebanon took no hostages and invaded no country. Indeed, Lebanon was a hostage itself, with, until recently, too weak an army and too weak a government to protect its own borders.

Beginning this decade, peace started to return, and the Lebanese Government and economy embarked on the rough road to recovery. The army grew in strength and was able to disarm most militias that lived off war. For obvious reasons, that being the continued occupation of Southern Lebanon by surrogates of Israeli forces, the Lebanese Government realized that a resistance force would remain in the south.

Under decades of occupation, resistance forces are not likely nor are they expected to exactly kiss the feet of the occupiers of the land. Some have termed these resistance forces terrorists, and where their actions harm human beings and/or land outside the occupation zone, I would fully agree with this definition. And I absolutely do not agree with the rhetoric and anti-Israeli slogans of these resistance forces. But in an occupation zone, such as we have in Southern Lebanon, soldiers of the occupying force are not trained to expect cookies and ice cream every night before being tucked into bed.

In Northern Israel, yes, such should and must be the case for Israeli citizens, and there is the right to respond to such cross-border attacks. But relative calm existed for Northern Israel prior to recent events, just as such was the case prior to Israel's disastrous invasion of Lebanon in the summer of 1982, which I happened to personally witness while traveling the region and traveling in Lebanon at the time.

The scenario was strikingly similar. Then, as now, there was no increase in attacks in Northern Israel, but only attacks upon soldiers in an occupied zone. To paraphrase the July 28 edition of AIPAC's memorandum, which is in all of our offices, in regard to the chronology of recent events, and I will paraphrase, on July 8, two Israeli soldiers killed and three other soldiers wounded in Southern Lebanon, occupied territory, I remind you. July 9, three Israeli soldiers killed and five soldiers wounded, again in Southern Lebanon, occupied territory, again I remind you. On July 22, an Israeli soldier killed in Southern Lebanon, occupied territory, I again remind you.

So how does Israel retaliate? Much like in the summer of 1982. Tens of civilians—civilians—killed; hundreds wounded. Villages being bombarded to the point of being devastated.

Mr. Speaker, this, coupled with the ongoing deterioration of conditions in other Israeli occupied territories, the West Bank and especially the Gaza Strip, represent a serious matter of fundamental human rights. It is a matter of basic humanitarian concern.

This should place recent events uppermost in our minds and invite thoughtful introspection. Why such cycles of violence? Nobody's hands are clean when it comes to such violence in the Middle East. We all know that. There are more sides to the fighting in this part of the world than there are sides to a rubix cube. Countries who claim to desire peace find it more beneficial and profitable to keep the pot boiling instead. Countries will even arm or help ensure arms are delivered to their publicly acclaimed enemies to keep the flame alive from which they benefit selfishly.

My bottom line, Mr. Speaker, is leave Lebanon alone. All non-Lebanese forces must leave that country. The Lebanese Army is now willing and able to take over Israeli positions in the south. If Israel withdraws from Southern Lebanon, in compliance with UN Resolution 425, then Lebanese authorities are willing to secure peace and security in Lebanon to its southern border, including the disarming of all militias. Thus will all of the children of Southern Lebanon and Northern Israel be able to enjoy cookies and ice cream each night before being tucked into safe beds.

The already faltering peace talks are further jeopardized by recent violence. I sincerely hope that Secretary Christopher on his upcoming visit to the region will not only be able to negotiate a cease-fire to the current fighting, but to get the faltering peace talks back on track.

Violence in Lebanon is hemorrhaging, is destroying, their dream of reestablishing their society and rebuilding their own country, with recognition of all countries' boundaries in the region.

□ 1540

REGARDING RECENT EVENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HILLIARD). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my concern for the way in which recent events in the Middle East are being viewed by too many otherwise thoughtful Americans.

It is hard to comprehend recent statements, reported in the press, suggesting that somehow Syrian President Hafez Assad is now a moderate, a force for peace, and a trustworthy partner in the region. While it is right and desirable to work for Syrian recognition of Israel, and for Syrian steps toward peace, it is wrong and a dangerous mistake for anyone to suggest that Syria is firmly on the road to peace, or can be trusted to be so. The dictator in Damascus should be judged by his actions, not by a few pleasantries made to U.S. diplomats.

Has there been a change in Syria's behavior toward Israel? The answer is, sadly, no. Even now, as rocket attacks, launched from Lebanon, murder innocent civilians in northern Israel, we hear only condemnation of Israel's efforts to defend herself. We hear no recognition of Israel's predicament, no acknowledgment that this country would do the same if terrorists, bent on the destruction of the United States, were firing Katyusha rockets at Buffalo or Detroit, and were being given safe haven by the Government of Canada.

It is Syria which is the dominant military force in Lebanon. It is Syria which controls the Bekaa Valley where the Hezbollah terrorists train. It is hard to believe that Hezbollah's Iranian patrons could supply the terrorists with the level of assistance they are now receiving if Damascus's more than 30,000 troops decided to turn off the tap.

Rather than criticizing Israel, or praising President Assad's supposed new restraint, we should build a Middle East policy based on the facts.

The fact is that Israel is the only true democracy, and the only reliable ally the United States has in the region. Anyone who doubts that Israel is genuinely democratic need only look at the action of the Israeli Supreme Court which just overturned the conviction of accused Nazi war criminal John Demjanjuk. How many countries today have a judiciary so independent, so scrupulous about individual rights, that the most hated defendant in the nation could be ordered released by a court? Certainly not any of Israel's neighbors now receiving high praise as moderates.

Mr. Speaker, the conflicts in the Middle East often seem intractable, even incomprehensible, to Americans. We are an optimistic Nation which always looks hopefully for the best in everyone. But our desire to see peace should not blind us to the continued intransigence of some of Israel's neighbors, nor should it make us denounce our democratic ally for actions taken in self-defense. The problems of the Middle East will not be solved if we don't face them forthrightly.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES IN NAFTA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, in early May, when a bipartisan group of eight Congresswomen went to Mexico to investigate conditions in the Macquiladora program and to speak with Mexican Government officials

about our concerns with the NAFTA agreement, samples of the water and soil around a canal in Matamoras, Mexico, were collected.

This canal flows into the Rio Grande River which flows from there into the United States.

Congresswoman MARCY KAPTUR, who had put together the trip and to whom we owe a great deal for her efforts—I was honored to serve as the bipartisan cochair—was responsible for having the soil and water samples tested.

The release of the report yesterday on the pollution we found in the canal at Matamoras, Mexico, emphasizes several points in my objections to the NAFTA agreement as it now is drafted.

Among them, the canal represents a major water problem for the whole of Mexico. From my years on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, representing a State that shares the responsibility for the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries, we have found that water pollution is the most expensive and complex of all problems to solve.

Since the first Clean Water Act in the early 1970's—this Nation has spent billions of dollars on clean-up, both in facilities and in policing. Additionally, there has been a costly public relations campaign by the U.S. Government and by environmental groups raising the consciousness of Americans to the need for clean water.

And, we still have a long way to go. The conditions we saw in the Brownsville-Matamoras area are at least 50 years behind most of the United States.

If water cleanup is an expensive process, it is also a process calling for determination and a will, not only on the part of the nation's leaders, but on the part of its people. I saw no evidence of that will in the section of Mexico we visited. The banks of this polluted canal are being used as a garbage dump at the same time that the populace uses the water for irrigating table vegetables and fruits, and for the watering of domestic animals and cattle.

In a nation with 25 percent structural unemployment, if the Mexican Government is concerned about the lives of its people and has any desire to convince America and Canada that they will enforce the new, strict environmental laws—then, a Works Project Administration effort—along the lines of the 1930's WPA in this country—would have had the refuse along those canals cleaned up within the year.

Toxic dumping along those canals would have been stopped in the first days that a NAFTA began to be discussed.

If the Government of Mexico makes no effort to showcase these highly exposed areas when the agreement is pending, what chance do we have to make them act once it is a done deal?

Side agreements will not change a mindset. We need action, not promises before we sign on to any agreement with Mexico.

The report stated that the soil and water samples were contaminated with high levels of industrial pollutants such as lead, mercury, benzene and xylene. Some of the concentrations were high enough to be classified as hazardous waste under U.S. environmental law. Most samples also had an extremely coliform and fecal coliform—which means the sewer effluent is running into the canals.

The impact on the food chain of these metals and sewer effluent being ingested by animals suggests that the flesh of any one of these animals will contain traces of these poisonous metals and can contain parasites—all of which can lodge, and/or infect people who eat the meat.

None of these residues or parasites would be discovered in any of the normal inspections that now are carried out at the border by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

If for no other reason—and there are many others—NAFTA as presently written, even with the side agreements, should be defeated.

Let's start all over—and demand that steps to clean up the environment below the United States should begin immediately.

REAFFIRMING STRONG SUPPORT FOR LINE-ITEM VETO

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

Mr. BACCHUS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reaffirm my very strong support for a line-item veto. Once again this session I am a cosponsor of the pure line-item veto. A pure line-item veto would enable the President of the United States to veto a line in an appropriations bill, and then would require a two-thirds vote in order to override that veto. Ideally, that is what I would prefer.

Several weeks ago we had two votes in this House. One was a vote for a pure line-item veto. I was one of a handful of Members of my party who voted for that pure line-item veto. I would like to see it become law.

However, I also voted for the modified line-item veto which would enable an override to occur with only a majority of the votes of the House or the Senate. I think that would be progress, and I would like at least to see some progress toward real reform, and real help to a President who wants to exercise such a veto.

My fervent hope is that the modified line-item veto will become law and will prove to be a useful experiment, and will give us the additional support that we need to make the pure line-item veto law in the future. I applaud President Clinton for his strong support of a pure line-item veto. As a former Governor, he knows that it can be a useful tool for a chief executive to have. And the truth of the matter is that 43 of the 50 States give their Governors the line-item veto.

I saw firsthand how useful a tool a line-item veto can be when I worked for Rubin Askew when he was Governor of Florida years ago. He used the line-item veto skillfully, and well, as did President Clinton when he was Governor of Arkansas.

Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with those of my colleagues who see the line-item veto as some diminishing of the rightful legislative power of the Congress. To the contrary, I see the line-item veto as a way to make the President more accountable as well for the spending that the Congress appropriates. As it is, the President can simply say to the American people, "The Congress appropriates the money. I have nothing to do with it. I am not the one who does it." With the line-item veto, any President could not say that anymore. He too would be accountable, as we are to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I do not see the line-item veto as any panacea, not at all. And I believe that some have exaggerated what it could accomplish.

The line-item veto would not eliminate the Federal budget deficit, but it could save us billions of dollars, and I believe those billions are well worth saving.

Nor is it true that the line-item veto is by any means the only reform we need in order to make ourselves and the President more accountable to the people. We need other reforms as well in the spending process.

I would like to see us have, for example, a sunset law that would abolish automatically those programs that are no longer needed. I helped write and enact such a law in Florida.

I would like to see zero-based budgeting. That would require us to justify every dollar that is spent every year, and not just start with the excess that the agencies want to spend in the new year.

I would like to see us have a capital budgeting scheme that would enable us to focus on the capital investments that we need to make as a nation and, of course, I remain a very strong supporter and a cosponsor of the balanced-budget amendment, because we do not just need to reduce the Federal budget deficit, we need to eliminate it.

But best of all, I believe the line-item veto could help us restore our credibility with the people so that we could begin to confront some of the truly hard choices that must be made to eliminate the budget deficit. If we can just get rid of the Steam Towns, if we could just get rid of some of the pork that seems to creep into appropriation

bills in the dead of night, then may be we could begin to address some of the bigger spending issues that must be addressed in order for us truly to do what we need to do for America.

The line-item veto will help us begin to do it.

□ 1550

REGGIE JACKSON "MR. OCTOBER" INDUCTED INTO BASEBALL'S HALL OF FAME

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HILLIARD). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the remarkable achievements of an individual who inspired a generation of young athletes, entertained millions, and this Sunday, in Cooperstown, NY, will officially achieve baseball immortality by his induction into the Baseball Hall of Fame. I am, of course, talking about "Mr. October," Reggie Jackson.

On rare occasions we are blessed to witness the achievements of public individuals who are welcomed into our lives as though we had know them for years. They become so familiar to us that they are universally known by their first names. Such is the case with Reggie. Destined for baseball greatness, he even had a candy bar named after him. And, as they say, the rest is history.

Reginald Martinez Jackson was born in 1946, in Wyncote, PA. He broke into the majors in 1967, playing for the Kansas City Royals. Over the following 21 seasons Reggie spent time with the A's, the Orioles, the Yankees, and the Angels, being a principal in winning 11 division crowns, and 5 world championships.

Reggie played baseball with the same fire and ambition with which he attacked life, blasting out a place for himself in baseball folklore. The self-proclaimed, "straw that stirred the drink," he was able to, "light the fire" underneath the baseball world.

He won the MVP award in 1973, leading the league with 32 homers and 117 RBI's, while guiding his team to a world series championship. During his long and productive tenure, Reggie amassed 563 career home runs, placing him sixth on the all-time list. At home or on the road, he hit 'em where no one could get 'em. Of all his home runs, 280 were at home and 283 came on the road. What a record! He collected 2,584 hits, drove in 1,702 runs, and belted 11 grand slams. A versatile athlete, he has speed to go along with power, stealing 226 bases and scoring 1,551 runs.

But the stats don't tell it all. Reggie was the consummate superstar, bigger than life, and never disappointing. As Don Baylor once remarked about his friend, "Either he was going to hit one nine miles or he was going to strike out. But even his strikeouts were exciting." Reggie certainly provided baseball fans with a lot of excitement, for he holds the dubious distinction of striking out more often than any man in history, 2,597 times. But unlike the fans of Mudville, we tend to overlook these minor details. We accept that a competitor like Jackson who swings for the fence, is going to miss a few times. But when the team's back was against the wall, when it really counted, there was nobody you'd rather have at the plate then Reggie.

Jackson was the consummate clutch performer, at his very best when the stakes were high and the chips were down. During the post-season Jackson flourished like no one else in the history of baseball. In five World Series, Jackson batted .357, hit 10 home runs, and garnered 24 RBI's. His .755 slugging percentage is the best series performance of all-time.

The most defining moment of Reggie's illustrious carrier occurred on October 18, 1977. I remember the night as if it were only yesterday. It was the seventh and final game of the 1977 World Series, pitting the Los Angeles Dodgers against the New York Yankees. In one of the most amazing sports spectacles of all time, Reggie Jackson hit three home runs on three first pitches off of three different Dodger pitchers. With this performance he single handedly captured the world title for his team. "I must admit," Dodger first baseman Steve Garvey later revealed, "when Reggie hit his third home run, and I was sure that nobody was looking, I applauded in my glove." In fact, that last home run was measured at 450 feet.

However that was not his longest shot. That occurred during the 1971 All-Star Game. Reggie sent a ball out of Tiger Stadium, hitting a light tower high above the park.

This year, in his first year of eligibility, Reggie Jackson was voted into the Hall of Fame, garnering 93.6 percent of the vote. I need not remind my colleagues the satisfaction of achieving such success at the ballot box. This is no small achievement, for it makes Jackson only the 29th player ever elected in his first year of eligibility, and the only one to be elected this year. In fact his vote percentage was the 10th highest in Cooperstown history.

I am told that Jackson had prepared no remarks, and had not spoken to the press about the possibility of election until after the actual voting took place. Apparently he was afraid of jinxing himself. But speaking of the possibility of induction several years ago, Jackson remarked, "I'd like to wait until the room is empty at night and go in once to look at my plaque." Such are the dreams of a man who allowed us to live out our own fantasies by watching him play. The American public was fortunate enough to be allowed to view every aspect of this very public man for over two decades, enjoying the thrills and spills of what he himself proclaimed to be, "* * * just part of the roller coaster ride that is Reggie Jackson."

The sports columnist Thomas Boswell wrote of Jackson, "When it comes to being a true live-big, love-it-all, worth-the-price-of-admission superstar, nobody—absolutely nobody in the game—has replaced Reggie Jackson."

Reflecting upon his long and sometimes controversial career, Reggie mused, "What I've been, through it all, is human." Well for once, Reggie may have understated the facts. I know I speak for all my colleagues when I say, "Congratulations Reggie!"

I insert into the RECORD Reggie's career statistics.

REGGIE JACKSON'S CAREER STATISTICS

Year, team	AB	R	H	HR	RBI	Avg.
Regular season						
1967 KC	118	13	21	1	6	.178
1968 OAK	553	82	138	29	74	.250
1969 OAK	549	123	151	47	118	.275
1970 OAK	426	57	101	23	66	.237
1971 OAK	567	87	157	32	80	.277
1972 OAK	499	72	132	25	75	.265
1973 OAK	539	99	158	32	117	.293
1974 OAK	506	90	146	29	93	.289
1975 OAK	593	91	150	36	104	.253
1976 BAL	498	84	138	27	91	.277
1977 NYY	525	93	150	32	110	.286
1978 NYY	511	82	140	27	97	.274
1979 NYY	465	78	138	29	89	.297
1980 NYY	514	94	154	41	111	.300
1981 NYY	334	33	79	15	54	.237
1982 CAL	530	92	146	39	101	.275
1983 CAL	397	43	77	14	49	.194
1984 CAL	525	67	117	25	81	.223
1985 CAL	460	64	116	27	85	.252
1986 CAL	419	65	101	18	58	.241
1987 OAK	336	42	74	15	43	.220
Totals	9,864	1,551	2,584	563	1,702	.262
Division Championship Series						
1981 NNY	20	4	6	2	4	.300
League Championship Series						
1971 OAK	12	2	4	2	2	.333
1972 OAK	18	1	5	0	2	.278
1973 OAK	21	0	3	0	0	.143
1974 OAK	12	0	2	0	1	.167
1975 OAK	12	1	5	1	3	.417
1977 NYY	16	1	2	0	1	.125
1978 NYY	13	5	6	2	6	.462
1980 NYY	11	1	3	0	0	.273
1981 NYY	4	1	0	0	1	.000
1982 CAL	18	2	2	1	2	.111
1986 CAL	26	2	5	0	2	.192
Totals	163	16	37	6	20	.227
World Series						
1972 OAK[1]	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1973 OAK	29	3	9	1	6	.310
1974 OAK	14	3	4	1	1	.286
1977 NYY	20	10	9	5	8	.450
1978 NYY	23	2	9	2	8	.391
1981 NYY	12	3	4	1	1	.333
Totals	98	21	35	10	24	.357

[1] Injured, did not play.

A TRIBUTE TO CAPT. HAROLD SHAMBLIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an individual who has provided many years of outstanding support and dedication to this Congress. Capt. Harold Shamblin, legislative liaison in the inquiry division in the Office of the Secretary of the Air Force, has been reassigned from the Pentagon to the Air Command and Staff College at Maxwell Air Force Base, AL. The reassignment was made effective July 21. I, and many of my colleagues, have greatly benefitted from his exceptional service in the Air Force's congressional inquiry office and we want to recognize his years of service.

As an action officer, Captain Shamblin's calm and thorough method of handling unique situations and varied constituent concerns, resulted in the successful resolution of more than 2,000 cases each year during a 3-year tour. He was also a seasoned traveler with a number of congressional members and their staffs. He escorted a large delegation to Turkey and throughout Europe, as well as with others to locations within the United States to provide insight into Air Force operations, policy and training.

Mr. Speaker, I want to join with many of my colleagues who have worked with Captain Shamblin over these years in offering congratulations on a job well done. We wish him, his wife Theresa, daughters Claire and Suzanne, and son Robert the best as they move on to a new assignment.

Captain Shamblin is a true professional and a credit to himself and the U.S. Air Force.

POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to enter into the RECORD the real story about what happened several years ago when the Army terminated a research project in my State which involved shooting 700 cats in the head in order to try to learn something about the treatment of battlefield head wounds. The record would be set straight, Mr. Speaker, because the national TV news show "60 Minutes" and its long-time star reporter, Mike Wallace, mangled the truth in a 13-minute story on the subject and in doing so twice told a direct fabrication about me.

The research in question certainly was not something to be seen by the squeamish. The researcher, Dr. Michael Carey, meticulously drilled holes, small holes, in cats' skulls, placed their heads in a vise and shot BB pellets into their brains. Many of the cats were eventually decapitated.

Mike Wallace and "60 Minutes" came in and did a story on this episode, which made Dr. Carey into a hero, but which misrepresented film footage of animal rights activists, ignored reams of evidence in their own files in order to put a false bias into their story and which played fast and loose with the facts and which criticized various Congressmen for trying to save the taxpayers some money for what I believe was arguably useless research.

In the process, Mike Wallace reaffirmed his own self-admitted status as someone who does not tell the truth if the untruth is for the sake of a good story. The stated purpose of the research had some merit. The goal was to find ways to save more of America's brave young soldiers who were victimized by battlefield head wounds. Nobody can quarrel with that. At first glance, the method of research seemed valid, with apparently plenty of controls and anesthesia. But then various folks in my district and outside, including some respected community leaders, asked me to look into allegations that the research was not worthwhile, that it was killing cats perhaps cruelly and perhaps for no reason, that it was not finding out anything of significant value and that it was thus a waste of $2 million in taxpayers' money.

Mr. Speaker, I am no scientist, and thus had no way of knowing for myself whether the research was scientifically valid or not. So I did what I think any conscientious Congressman would do: I asked the General Accounting Office to convene the appropriate medical experts to find out if the project was worthwhile. If it had been determined to be worthwhile, the project could continue. If not, why then, other action could be taken. And I want to stress that I certainly wanted to protect solid and valid research that would save our soldiers.

Anybody that knows anything about my record knows that I am a friend of the soldier, the sailor, the marine, the airman, that I believe very strongly in a strong national defense. And if we really had an experiment that was going to help the soldier, I would be in favor of that research.

□ 1600

Especially since the project was being done by a university just a stone's throw from my own congressional district.

Well, I would save it, of course. But, I would recommend that the project be saved only if it were both humane and worthwhile and if it were a conscientious expenditure of taxpayer dollars.

So that is what I asked the General Accounting Office to find out.

First, the General Accounting Office convened a panel of medical experts on brain wound treatments. The panel had a number of good things to say about portions of Dr. Carey's research, but on the research as a whole, four out of the eight panelists said that they were lukewarm about its value. They were concerned about his methods. All eight panelists criticized him for failing to publish any papers on his research for 6 whole years, an unusually long time. In fact, it appeared that he did not publish anything until the GAO began its investigation.

All eight panelists questioned the inconsistent use of anesthesia and wondered whether that could skew the results of the research.

Because they were unable to tell if the anesthesia would mess up the results, the GAO then convened another panel, this one of veterinary anesthesiologists, to review the anesthesia use.

This second panel concluded that there was a good chance that the inconsistent use of anesthesia threw off the results and possibly invalidated some results.

Furthermore, the good doctor had claimed in the media several times that his biggest breakthrough discovery was that when the brain is injured, breathing stops.

Well, that same finding had first been proven back in 1894, I am told, and that knowledge has been used ever since.

In other words, according to the doctor's own claim, we were spending $2 million to rediscover something that had been known for some 90 years.

So with all this information, the General Accounting Office turned over a thick and complex report to the U.S. Army, and on the basis of their recommendations, the Army decided that it could spend its money better elsewhere. They were not overly critical of the doctor's research, but they felt that this just really was not a good expenditure of taxpayer funds, especially since there were no concrete results coming from this research. So the Army pulled the rest of the funding.

I want to emphasize, the Army pulled the funding. The Army made the decision, a decision which quite frankly made a lot of sense based on the information that was available to them and to the GAO.

Then a year later a "60 Minutes" researcher was making a doctor's visit, and he was sold a bill of goods by his doctor about how some evil animal rights extremists had shut down some vital medical experiments. Armed with this rather one-sided view, "60 Minutes" then set out to create a news feature which brought this viewpoint to light. They thought it would make a good story. They kept on and kept on, doing loads of research into the story and ignoring all the evidence which told them that they might be on the wrong track.

They came to me, and I was very open with the researchers. We shared our files with them. But by the time they called to ask me to go on camera, I could tell that they were hopelessly biased, they were prejudiced, they were going to write the story the way they wanted to interpret it, regardless of the facts and regardless of the circumstances, that they were prejudiced against me and against any efforts to question whether shooting cats in the head for 90-year-old knowledge was

worth spending $2 million of taxpayer funds on.

Mike Wallace and his cohorts, one of whom was apparently very rude to some of my staff, wanted to make it look like everyone who questioned the research was an animal rights extremist, or a dupe of the most extreme faction of the animal rights folks, who would rather first let American soldiers die on the battlefield than do harmless research on a few useless tabby cats.

So because of this interchange, I sent a signed memo to the news show, "60 Minutes." I declined to do a taped interview which they could edit at their own discretion. The memo that I sent them closed with this quotation:

I have always supported using animals in valid research projects. However, the Army decided it had enough information and that further expenditures of taxpayer funds would be unwarranted. I support that decision. I have never been reluctant to make my records available, or to explain any of my actions in a fair and open debate. If you want to provide the opportunity to be on your program live and unedited, I will be more than happy to do so.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to stress that I said I would be on their program live and unedited.

In several subsequent phone calls, Mr. Mike Wallace personally requested that I change my mind and do a taped interview with him, explaining that their format simply did not allow live appearances.

In the course of one phone call, he reconfirmed my belief that the "60 Minutes" story would be biased in favor of Dr. Carey, so I repeated my offer to go on live and unedited.

I also cited a college journalism textbook on journalistic ethics which used case studies of "60 Minutes," CBS News, and Wallace himself as examples of what they called exceedingly shoddy ethics. The book documented the way that the Wallace interviews were cut and reedited in some cases to change the entire meaning of what the interviewee was saying.

Interestingly, Mr. Wallace feigned ignorance of that book on the phone with me. In fact, though, Mr. Wallace had exchanged copious correspondence with the book's author in an effort to change the author's analysis, and he had even dined with the author to discuss the author's charges.

In other words, apparently Mr. Wallace was once again disingenuous.

Well, Mr. Wallace never did accede to my request to go on the air unedited. Half a year later, the producer of the segment told my press guy that the air date for the show would be one of four Sundays—Sundays which just happened to be one of the four Sundays immediately preceding the national congressional election date, and coincidentally, also the Presidential election date.

Mysteriously, though, that segment never aired in those four Sundays, never aired in that last month before the congressional elections, because apparently, perhaps, Mr. Wallace and his crew discovered that I had already been reelected under Louisiana's unique primary rules only weeks earlier.

Well, we do not know why they pulled the show, the segment. We knew that they were going to run it at that time. Perhaps only the Shadow knows for sure why they pulled it.

Anyway, the segment finally did run in January 1993, a full 3 months after it was originally planned to air.

As I feared, the show was entirely one-sided in favor of the research. Interviews with research opponents were butchered in order to embarrass the opponents of the research. Interviews with the General Accounting Office, which organized the analysis which gave such mixed reviews to the cat shooting research, were not used at all.

In fact, there were more than two dozen errors, misrepresentations, or clear instances of bias or shoddy journalist ethics in this story.

Among them was one direct, unambiguous, and inexplicable lie. In direct contradiction to our direct phone communication and the signed memo I had sent him, Mr. Wallace said that "whatever Congressman LIVINGSTON thought at the time about Dr. Carey's research, he declined to tell us about it on camera."

Now, that was part of the segment aired in January of 1993 on "60 Minutes." But as I have demonstrated, I did not decline to go on camera. Instead, I only declined to go on camera under the terms offered by Mike Wallace.

In fact, the whole show was so biased and dishonest that several nationally known columnists have written scathing reviews about it. Howard Rosenberg of the Los Angeles Times used the story of an example of why "60 Minutes" is "one of the shiftiest when it comes to tailoring a story to a particular point of view."

And Colman McCarthy of the Washington Post called it "an example of television journalism at its tawdriest. * * * Inaccurate quoting, shifty use of file footage, unequal time to one side in the dispute, and innuendo marked the program's 13-minute report. * * * As an entertainer, Wallace was boffo that night. As a reporter, he betrayed the rules of his craft."

□ 1610

Again, that coming from Colman McCarthy.

Now, after reviewing the facts, I sent a letter to Wallace and his boss on "60 Minutes," Don Hewitt, demanding an on-air apology, and I quote from that letter. This is me writing them after the first airing of that show:

Of the many offenses against journalistic ethics in your story, the most egregious is the use twice of footage of an animal rights demonstration, as if the demonstration concerned Dr. Carey's research, while the narration described, quote, a brutal confrontation with animal rights activists, unquote. Not only can that demonstration not concern Dr. Carey's research, but I am told there were never any such public demonstrations against Dr. Carey. Yet you used the footage as a means to raise an emotional viewer response against the animal rights folks and anyone else who questioned the use of Dr. Carey's research, and I underline the second paragraph:

This use of footage is directly analogous to the fraudulent use of "fish kill" footage for which NBC News recently was forced to apologize. The similarities are striking: dead fish from a different forest presented as if they were from the forest being featured on the news show, compared to virulent demonstrators from another place and time being presented as if they were demonstrating against the research being featured on the news show. * * *

I go on in another paragraph:

The second correction I demand that you make on the air is of the assertion by Mr. Wallace that "Representative Bob Livingston of Louisiana has been 'had' by these animal rights zealots." Not only was Mr. Wallace's remark a gratuitous insertion of my name into an interview that previously had not involved me at all, but "60 Minutes" knew that it was an erroneous conclusion. You knew, because your researcher . . . had been so informed in a letter from Suzanne Roy of In Defense of Animals.

Well, Mr. Speaker, rather than quote, I will summarize Suzanne Roy's letter. It is said that her group had not worked closely with me or my office, but had worked with two other congressional offices who were strongly opposed to the research, whereas she had suspected that I actually wanted the research to continue. She even noted that her organization had put out a press release against me for my efforts to ensure the protection of Dr. Carey's rights.

Now get this. She is the animal rights person. She is attacking me because I am coming too much to the defense of Dr. Carey, and "60 Minutes" is doing a number on me as if I am a dupe of the animal rights activists. I really think this is an incredible story, so again I quote from my letter:

Indeed, "60 Minutes" was fully aware that I had taken political heat by putting an embargo on that GAO report specifically to give Dr. Carey time to respond to the parts of it which were critical of him. Far from being "had" by animal activists—whose concerns . . . are certainly sincere—I actively resisted involvement with them in order that Dr. Carey would have every opportunity to receive due process by the politically neutral and independent GAO. I shared my files with "60 Minutes" researchers, so they knew all this, but chose to ignore it so that Mike Wallace could put words into the mouth of his interviewee. Despite my efforts on behalf of Dr. Carey, in resistance to the entreaties of other congressmen for a permanent end to all funding of his project, "60 Minutes" painted me as the congressional party solely responsible for stopping Dr. Carey's research,

as a result of pressure from people to whom I had not even spoken.

Well, Mr. Speaker, finally, in my letter to Wallace and Hewitt, I demanded a retraction of their false statement about my refusal to go on camera. Believe it or not, this is where the direct, direct deceit of Mike Wallace began getting even worse than it already had been.

In response to my letter Mike Wallace called me again. He argued that the use of demonstration footage was not deceitful, first because, quote, "we never indicated the footage that you talk about was specifically Dr. Carey's research," and secondly because even if they did have footage, there was indeed a demonstration against Carey's research.

Well, he is wrong on both counts. First, the footage was used while Wallace intoned about, quote, "brutal confrontation with animal rights activists," which certainly would lead 99 viewers out of 100 to think the footage had something to do with what was being discussed. Second, he was apparently wrong about the occurrence of other, non-filmed demonstrations.

Wrong, that is, unless he wants to compare his footage of yelling, angry, threatening demonstrators with one small, dozen-person, Christmas Eve candlelight vigil and Christmas carol singing outside the lab where the doomed cats were being housed, soon to be shot.

Well, let me go on. Then Mike Wallace started to really apologize, perhaps grovel. I call it groveling because subsequent actions prove that he did not mean a word of what he said. What he said was this, and I quote, and this was on the telephone conversation between Wallace and me after the airing of the segment. Wallace said this:

> One way in which you're dead right, and I apologize to you for it and I don't know how the hell it got through, and that's the business of, ah, of not saying "live and unedited"—in other words, that you didn't want to go on camera to tell us. I should have said "except live and unedited" . . . My friend, I apologize to you, I really do. I'm ashamed of myself because you told it to me and how the hell it got through without it, I don't know. It's unfair. Because you were perfectly willing to go on.

Now that was Wallace talking to me, apologizing because of the segment that was aired on "60 Minutes" in January 1993. In that same conversation later on Wallace again said, and I quote:

> I really feel bad about that one thing, 'cause that was just dishonest, of me, and that was stupid of me. * * * Some time you and I will—we're gonna do a piece, and I'm gonna prove to you that ah, the show is straight, and that I'm straight.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I heard that, and I accepted that as an apology, and I grudgingly accepted Mr. Wallace's apology. I took him at this word—at his word that he had been unfair, dishonest, and stupid, and that he was sorry for it, and so I pulled off efforts to bring pressure on Mr. Wallace to reconsider his viewpoints. I just stated, "It's over, we walk away from it, and I'm not going to think about it anymore." It is too bad that he aired it, but I said, "I'll take my lumps. I'm a politicians, and I'll take my lumps."

Then who would believe it? Lo and behold, 4 months later, last Sunday night, on July 25, "60 Minutes" reran the story on Dr. Carey's cat shooting. Wallace took the time to do a new introduction to it, and a new closing to it, so he clearly had the opportunity to correct all the mistakes in the show. At the very least, he could have removed the lie about my refusal to talk about the subject on the air, since he had specifically admitted his statement was dishonest and unfair, and that at some time in the future he would make amends.

□ 1620

Well, Mr. Speaker, I was dumbfounded when I turned on the television and saw that program. He made no corrections. He made no retractions. He used the same bad footage in the same bad way. He repeated the canard about me being hoodwinked by the animal zealots, thus mischaracterizing both me a lot of other good, decent folk who questioned the research. And, most outrageously, Mike Wallace allowed the repetition of the lie that I had refused to go on the air.

Well, the next day, Monday of this week, under pressure from his bosses at CBS, since obviously I made a phone call, Mr. Wallace called up yet again to apologize. And this time he admitted that he, and I quote, "blew it." And he promised that in 2 weeks, on August 8, he would finally make an on-air retraction and apologize for at least that one misstatement, even if he would not apologize for the overall dishonesty of the rest of the whole segment.

Well, Mr. Speaker, let me tell you, after the experiences I have had with Wallace and his crew, I will believe it only when I see it. Then again, even if he does apologize, I know that in his heart he will not really mean it.

How do I know? Well, let me cite a statement that Mike Wallace made, and I quote from the Washington Post on November 30, 1992, 8 or 9 months ago, when in that article he virtually bragged about using dishonesty for what he considered to be more important ends.

This is his quote. He said, "You don't like to baldly lie, but I have," said Mike Wallace. "It really depends on your motive," Wallace said. "Are you doing it for drama, or are you doing it for illumination? Each one has to be weighed separately as to the cost benefit."

That sounds strangely out of some manifesto from Karl Marx. But that is Mike Wallace, the revered commentator from "60 Minutes."

So there you have it, Mr. Speaker, Mike Wallace's own words indicting himself as a liar if he has a self-proclaimed higher motive than the immediate truth. And in light of all of this, not only do I eagerly await for his on-air apology for that one lie, but I request an apology again for all three egregious falsehoods mentioned in my letter to Wallace and Don Hewitt. In fact, I asked for a retraction of the entire dishonest story. And I hope that the American people will not believe Wallace or "60 Minutes" just because they come on the air on Sunday nights and they see them there, because the program has proven itself capable of and has clearly exhibited demonstrable journalistic fraud. And if "Prime Time Live" or some of these other news shows want to do a real expose on an institution that is a pox on the American public, I urge them to look into the inner workings of "60 Minutes" and expose the show for the sham that it is.

Mr. Speaker, I do not come here lightly about this subject. I had hoped that it was behind me when Wallace had apologized to me in March. But when he, after that apology, came on with no explanation, and just came back and repeated the same old dogmatic lie Sunday night, I just could not believe it. And I fully expect that one day Mr. Wallace will find a way to do a real number on me. This may not have been too terribly significant. But I would tell anybody who might see that segment, consider the source, consider the real facts, and judge carefully whether or not you should believe what you see.

EARNED INCOME TAX CREDIT

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, we have a great opportunity to pass a budget that will begin to deal with our outrageous budget deficit and at the same time provide the building blocks for a strong economy with opportunities for those families who have suffered most over the last 12 years.

I am personally disappointed that Members on the other side of the aisle have refused to give the American people a fighting chance for economic growth and change by continuing to be the guardians of gridlock. President Clinton's plan is the only viable option for constructive change. While the Republicans continue to complain about taxes and how when need to cut spending first, the Democrats have actually named over 200 specific cuts. The Democrats are making hard choices for the future of our country. The Republicans, on the other hand, are doing a

lot of talking without specifying anything. Their budget plan currently has over $66 billion in unspecified cuts.

Republican Presidents had 12 years to submit a budget that actually worked to reduce the deficit. They did not. The Republicans in Congress are now continuing the rhetoric of more empty promises about cutting the budget without any viable plan to do so. Let us get serious and get behind the only plan that is real.

With that in mind, I am delighted to speak today about President Clinton's plan to expand the earned income tax credit [EITC]. This tax credit is essential for the working poor and is a key element of the President's plan to return fairness to the Tax Code.

For the past 12 years, Presidents have ignored the needs of the middle class and the working poor and placed the burden of the Federal budget deficit squarely on their shoulders. All this was done while the Federal budget deficit skyrocketed and the rich received tax break after tax break. President Clinton's plan seeks to reverse both of these trickle-down economics trends. His plan is a bold initiative to reduce the Federal budget deficit by what is fair to the middle class and the working poor.

The overwhelming majority of the taxes from his plan fall on the most well-off Americans. The Congressional Budget Office shows that 70 percent of the taxes we raise fall on those making over $200,000. The plan increases tax rates on the top 1 percent, those making over $180,000; a surtax on individual income above $250,000; reduced deductions for country club dues, three-martini lunches, lucrative pensions, and lobbying expenses; and the wasteful taxpayer subsidy of CEO pay over $1 million.

The plan passed by the House also helps the working poor. It expands the earned income tax credit. This tax credit is prowork.

I would like to take just a minute, if I may, to outline some of the features of the earned income tax credit.

The EITC is widely hailed for rewarding work, supporting hard-pressed working families with children, and reducing tax burdens on low-income workers.

The EITC is pro-work. Only those who work can get it; nonworkers do not qualify. Also, the EITC helps low-wage working families make ends meet. And for some parents on public assistance, the EITC can play an important role in making it worthwhile to go to work.

Furthermore, unlike welfare benefits, which fall sharply as earnings rise, EITC benefits increase with each additional dollar earned by the very poor. Consequently, the EITC strengthens the incentive to work for those working little or not at all.

The EITC is pro-family. Only parents who live with their children can get it. Absent parents living apart from their children are not eligible for regular EITC benefits. And unlike welfare—where the eligibility rules are much more restrictive for two-parent than single-parent families—the EITC treats both types of families on an equal basis.

The EITC is the one feature of the Tax Code that helps, and rewards work among, the working poor. This is because the EITC is the one refundable tax credit in the Federal Tax Code. That means if a family's EITC benefit exceeds its income tax liability, the IRS sends the family a check for the difference. Working poor families earn too little to owe Federal income tax, but they still receive the EITC.

□ 1630

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN], who is a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, for a further discussion of this very important feature of the bill that was passed by the House of Representatives and that is a part of the President's basic plan.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, first I want to thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] for taking this time to clarify one of the most important provisions in the President's package, which has not gotten much publicity. As we know, as we listen to the radio and TV accounts and press accounts of the President's economic package, the earned income tax credit can hardly be found in the discussion. Yet it is one of the most important provisions for restoring fairness in our Tax Code.

There are many reasons why we must move forward with an economic package, as recommended by President Clinton. We need to do that in order to reduce the deficit of this country. That is certainly very, very important. We need to do that in order to help small business. There are several provisions in the President's package to help small business create more jobs in our communities. And that is certainly a very important reason to move forward on it.

The balance between spending cuts and new taxes, in order to deal with the deficit, is clearly in the President's package, another reason to move forward. But as the gentleman was bringing out, the fairness issue is another reason why we should consider and pass the President's package, and we should be evaluating the package that the President has submitted and other recommendations that have been made in the area of fairness.

The earned income tax credit provides a refundable tax credit. It is a credit that can be paid in cash to taxpayers of low income.

Let me explain how it works, because I am afraid many people do not really understand how the earned income tax credit works.

There are nearly 14 million people today who benefit from the earned income tax credit. In my State of Maryland, 223,000 families today benefit from the earned income tax credit. And in the State of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST], I might point out that 1.3 million families in Texas benefit from the earned income tax credit. I have West Virginia, too. I will look up that figure and give Members how many people in the State of West Virginia benefit from the program a little bit later on.

But how it works is that for low-income people, they get a credit of a certain percentage of their income, the earned income, up to a certain amount. Under current law, it is about $8,000. So they are entitled to a refund, a positive refund, not really a refund, a check equal to a certain percentage of the income that they earn up to about $8,000.

Then starting at around $12,500, the credit is phased out up to around $23,000 of income.

What President Clinton has recommended is that we dramatically improve that mechanism so that we can tell the American society that if a person works, a person works 40 hours a week, that person should not have to live in poverty. Today, 20 million people in our Nation live in poverty, even though there is a full-time worker in that family. That is unconscionable, and that is what we are aiming at eliminating by dramatically improving the earned income tax credit.

The President is suggesting that we make it sensitive to the size of a family in calculating how much of an earned income tax credit a family will be entitled to. The earned income tax credit is significantly increased and can mean an extra $1,500 for many American families. So it is an effort to say, as the gentleman pointed out, that we are going to reward work. If you work full time, you should not have to live in poverty. And that is really the centerpiece of the fairness issue.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out, if I might, because I am frequently asked in my townhall meetings about how these taxes work and what we are doing to people as far as the taxes being recommended by the President. Rarely is the earned income tax credit ever mentioned.

In fact, in some cases, for working poor, they are actually going to be paying a lot less in taxes and be getting funds back so that hopefully they do not have to live in poverty. But if you go through the taxes that have been recommended, and what I asked my constituents to do is calculate the tax burden themselves. Do not take my word for it, do not take the words of some of the Members that have taken this well or particularly on the other side as to how this tax bill or how this deficit reduction package will personally impact their taxes.

What the President, and what we have passed, will do is to tell all the wealthiest 1 percent of our society that they should pay approximately 70 to 80 percent of the additional taxes. We do that by increasing the income tax rate for those people who have taxable income, if they are individuals, of $115,000 or higher, or for married couples, $140,000 or higher. So if your taxable income is below those limits, there is no additional income tax that you would have to pay under the proposals that passed the House and the Senate.

We tell people who have earned income over $135,000 that we are going to remove the health insurance cap so that you would have to continue to contribute toward Medicare, 1.45 percent of your earned income above $135,000. So once again, if you do not have earned income above $135,000, that would not impact on your tax liability.

And we tell people who receive Social Security, if their Social Security income for an individual is over $32,000 or for a couple, over $40,000, you should pay taxes on that portion of your Social Security benefits that reflect what society, what we have added to what you have already contributed through your withholding by increasing the amount of tax from 50 to 85 percent.

Now, most of my constituents are not going to be impacted by any of those taxes that I have just mentioned. The only tax we have talked about is a gasoline tax that may impact my constituents, most of my constituents. And that is 6 cents, maybe as much as 4 or 6 cents a gallon. How many gallons of gasoline do you use a week? Fifteen, to fill up your tank more than once. That is 90 cents a week.

The reason I mention that is I think we have to talk about the fairness issue here and how the tax changes will impact the fairness of our society.

We have a huge deficit, and we are saying to the wealthiest people in our society that they should pay more.

First, we cut spending. Then we raise taxes, and all of it is used for deficit reduction so that our Nation will be stronger and that we can provide a greater opportunity, particularly in creating more jobs for our young people.

I really appreciate the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] taking the time this evening to point out that the earned income tax credit is a part of this proposal that brings basic fairness to our Tax Code, that says to a working person they should not have to live in poverty.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE].

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for taking this time. I think it is important to point out some of the aspects of the President's economic plan, the deficit reduction plan that the House most likely will be voting on next week.

There has sure been a lot of fire and fury delivered on this floor concerning it. Yet, I think it is time now to get some true understanding of what it is about.

One of the most important provisions in here is the earned income tax credit. I am interested that society requires, as rightly society should, that people work and work for a living. But too often in our society, those who work are not rewarded as they should be.

I have a situation and many times have seen in my own district situations where a husband and wife, two parents, are working. They are doing exactly what society asks. They are working for $4.25 to $5 an hour, both of them. It is not enough combined to raise their family. They are struggling. If they are fortunate, they have health insurance. Probably they do not.

What the earned income tax credit does is to try and say, and what the President's proposal and this package does, which I do not think many people fully appreciate or want to recognize, in some cases, what the President's proposal does is to say that if you work a full 40 hours a week, you are a working family. Then you should not be living in poverty.

I think that is something we can all subscribe to. The earned income tax credit, interestingly enough, has another positive benefit. Because through its provisions, by rewarding working families, these families tend to be lower income. This will put more money into the economy and, particularly, lower income and in many cases rural areas, rural, urban, whatever.

□ 1640

But the important thing is that there will be more money in the economy as well. I wanted to stress something: This is not welfare. This is not welfare, by any means. This only goes to those people and only those who are eligible for it; who are working parents with, obviously, children.

I think it is important, too, because I have heard a lot of bombast on this floor, particularly today, but in the last few days about what our opponents say are 27 tax increases. They never talk about the tax cut. They never talk about the tax cut. They never talk about the fact that for many low- and middle-income persons who will qualify for this EITC, that any possible increase in the gasoline tax, whether it is a nickel or 6 cents a gallon, that that will be offset, so there will not be a tax increase for many of our working poor. I think that is significant.

There are a couple of other things, obviously, that the opponents do not point out in this package. They do not point out, for instance, that 70 to 80 percent of the tax burden will go to the wealthiest, the 1 to 2 percent of the wealthiest in this country. They do not point out, for instance, that income tax will not affect anyone who is a working person making less than $140,000 a year as a joint filer. So if you are below $140,000 a year as a couple, or $115,000 a year as a single person, you are out of this business as far as income tax goes. You will not be affected.

As far as the 6 cents a gallon goes, what they are not pointing out is that, for instance, in just the Btu tax alone, that this is less than what was even being considered there, and that it results in about a $1 a week increase, a $1 a week increase, which is about the price of two cups of coffee per week.

Also, it is a minuscule part, 5 percent, I calculate, of the total economic growth deficit reduction package. Five percent would be in this one area, the proposed gasoline tax. The other 4 percent comes in tax increases on the upper income, and then, of course, half of this total package, 250, are in spending cuts, 200 specific cuts, not the $66 billion of unspecified cuts that our opponents offered.

One other note. This goes somewhat to the EITC, since many EITC recipients, those who qualify for the earned income tax credit, work for small business. We have heard a lot of the bombast on small business around here as well. What they are not pointing out, the opponents, is that 95 percent of small businesses will see no impact whatsoever, no adverse tax impact, because of this legislation; that where there is increased corporate tax, in order to trigger that, you are talking about they have to have over $10 million in profits. That is not Mom and Pop's grocery store, $10 million in profit to trigger any increase in the corporate taxation. The vast majority of subchapter S corporations, and that is the bulk of small businesses, are not affected by this as well.

Once again, getting back to the fact, though, that half of the deficit reduction package, there is at least $1 of deficit reduction for every $1 of tax increases, and there are many in our country who are working that will actually receive favorable tax treatment; a tax cut, in effect, because of the EITC.

More importantly, what they will be able to do is, by the effort that they are making in working, lift themselves out of poverty. I think it is important to get through that this is deficit reduction, but it is also positive development for millions of working families, many thousands of which are in West Virginia, that are doing exactly what society asks, that want the deficit brought down, that are working at least 40-hour-a-week jobs, and that they will benefit from this package, not only because the deficit is down, we all benefit from that, lower interest rates, for instance, ability to finance homes, cars with lower interest rates.

They will benefit that way, but they will also benefit because their work

will truly be recognized, and then that hopefully sets the stage for a national health care plan which recognizes that those who work are to have affordable access to health care.

I appreciate the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] taking this opportunity to set the record straight, to promote the positive aspects of the earned income tax credit, and to say that working Americans do get favorable treatment under this, and to give us a chance to point it out.

I appreciate the gentleman making it possible for me to participate in this special order tonight.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from West Virginia very much because his points have been very well taken. I think it is helpful. People who are listening to this, people who are watching what is going on here today, it is helpful to understand that there are some very critical provisions in the President's plan that go directly to helping lower and middle income taxpayers in this country; that are vital, vital if we are going to provide fairness.

At this point I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PRICE].

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

I, too, want to commend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] for taking out this special order and giving us a chance to discuss with each other and before the American people this critical component of the budget reconciliation package that we will be voting on next week.

The earned income tax credit is one of the most critical components of this package. It is one of the most important things we could do to reform the welfare system in this country, which I think almost everybody thinks is a desirable goal, to reform the welfare system and to reward work, to make work more attractive than staying on welfare.

It is a perverse system that actually makes it pay for people to stay on welfare, and encourages them to do that, as opposed to entering the work force. What this earned income tax credit will do is reward people who want to help themselves.

Any parent who works full time, with this provision, will be lifted out of poverty, not by some kind of government program but by their own hard work, by their own efforts. That is the idea, to help people without creating larger bureaucracies and to strengthen families. That is the essence of what this new, revitalized Democratic Party is all about, and it is right at the heart of this economic plan.

The earned income tax credit is the furthest thing from a handout, Mr. Speaker. Some may describe it as an anti-poverty program, but in reality it is tax relief, tax relief for struggling families who want to become self-sufficient but simply cannot, because the current system actually punishes them for working harder and longer and makes it more profitable for them to stay on welfare.

Because of this earned income tax credit increase, families who make less than $30,000 a year will actually see their taxes go down. In fact, a study by Arthur Andersen, Inc., finds that the family whose annual average income is $25,000 will see their taxes fall by several hundred dollars.

Some have described the budget with overblown rhetoric as a tax plan that is going to tax the American people broadly. Actually, that is very far from the truth. Whatever burden under the energy portion of this budget plan will place on the working poor will be more than offset by what this EITC increase will do for them by way of a tax break.

That reduction in taxes is going to enable these families to save more and to provide more money to meet basic household needs. The Dallas Morning Herald, in an editorial this week, said, and I quote, "The tax credit can make a substantial difference in the lives of the working poor, while reinforcing the work ethic."

That is what family values really mean. The House proposal would give eligible families with at least two children and incomes below $8,000 a 39-cent tax credit on every dollar they earn. That is far superior to simply increasing the minimum wage as a means to move families above the poverty line, since half the working poor are in jobs not covered by the minimum wage and because some 85 percent of minimum wage workers live in nonpoor households. In other words, the fit between the needs of our families all whom the minimum wage affects is not very good, but the fit is perfect in the case of the earned income tax credit. It is a far more targeted, far more sensible way to improve the situation of working families than the minimum wage.

Our colleagues may remember a few years ago, when we were debating the minimum wage bill out here on the House floor. It is useful to look back for a minute to that debate, because of the kinds of things our Republican colleagues were saying at that point. The Republicans have targeted the earned income tax credit in this present bill as wasteful spending. They say it is an investment we do not need to make, even though it will strengthen families and make an important contribution to welfare reform.

For example, the House minority leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], used the earned income tax credit in recent debate as an example of tax-and-spend Democrats. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], the ranking minority member of the House Committee on the Budget, urged his Republican colleagues to cut the earned income tax credit in the reconciliation bill.

In 1993, our Republican colleagues stand united against the earned income tax credit. Oh, how times have changed. Let me take the Members back to that minimum wage debate in 1989. Let me just quote from a few of our Republican colleagues, who at that time were extolling the virtues of the EITC. Of course at that point they did not want to raise the minimum wage, but those of them who felt like they had to have some constructive alternative were singing the praises of the earned income tax credit.

□ 1650

For example, our good friend Mr. PETRI described the minimum wage as a dinosaur. But then he said, "But I think even the dinosaur handlers know that earned income tax credit reform is a better idea."

Mr. FROST. If the gentleman will yield, when was that said?

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. That was said in 1989 in the midst of a debate on this floor on the minimum wage.

Mr. FROST. So if I understand correctly, in 1989 when the Republicans did not want to raise the minimum wage they were for the earned income tax credit?

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. That is right. The earned income tax credit was a better way.

Mr. FROST. The panacea? A better way.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. The better way.

Mr. ARMEY, who is now the Chair of the Republican conference, was another one out here singing the praises of the earned income tax credit. The earned income tax credit, he said, "is a better, more compassionate alternative."

And then our good friend, who is now the mayor of Dallas, Steve Bartlett, a very thoughtful Member, said the earned income tax credit, "should not be a partisan issue. Members on both sides of the aisle say they support an earned income tax credit. They say they support it, but not in this time, not in this bill, not in this way, and not on this day. The fact is the time has come for Congress to begin speaking," Mr. Bartlett said, "for the best interests of low-income heads of households. This is a perfect bill to do it on."

Mr. FROST. If the gentleman will yield further, do we understand that they were against the minimum wage and for the earned income tax then, and now they are against the earned income tax credit? Are they going to be for the minimum wage increase now? I mean where are they?

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. It will be interesting to see. Maybe the tables have turned. On the other hand, maybe they are not for anything.

Mr. FROST. I think that is perhaps more likely.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. You may have seen the article recently in the Wall Street Journal where it said that this Republican cry of no new taxes really seems to mean no new anything.

Mr. FROST. Yes, I did see it. It was a fairly lengthy story.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. After all, the EITC is a tax cut. This means that for families making $30,000 a year or less, the net impact of our budget package is a tax reduction. It is a tax reduction for working families that helps reward their hard work. And those people who in 1989 were talking about the virtues of the earned income tax credit, now they have gotten their wish. It is now a key part of this budget reconciliation bill. And I agree with what Mr. Bartlett said at that time: The time has come to help low- and moderate-income working families make ends meet.

In closing Mr. Speaker, let me recall the very heated race for a seat in the other body that we had in my State of North Carolina last year. The 10-second TV ads for the Republican candidate were out there blaring every day, "Workfare, not welfare. Workfare, not welfare."

Well, this is a chance, if there ever was one, to reform a welfare system that we all know needs fixing, to replace dependence with a reward for an honest day's work, and to guarantee that anybody who works a full-time job in this society is not going to have to leave his or her family in poverty. Goodness knows, that is what welfare reform ought to be about, and that is what this bill is about.

It is the height of hypocrisy to have gotten out here on the floor 4 years ago, praising to the skies the earned income tax credit as the alternative to the minimum wage, and now to be turning around criticizing this tax cut as part of some kind of a tax-and-spend syndrome.

The EITC is a critical piece, Mr. Speaker, of the budget reconciliation bill. It is a proposal that—before we entered the present, overly political, season—was embraced by liberals and conservatives alike. This has not been a partisan issue. This has not been a liberal versus conservative issue. This has been an issue that we could unite on because the earned income tax credit is about values that we share. It is about reforming the welfare system. It is about rewarding work. It is about strengthening families. And it is about tax relief.

That is what this earned income tax credit idea is all about. It is an essential element of this budget reconciliation package, and we simply have to pass it.

I thank the gentleman for the opportunity to share these thoughts with my colleagues here today, because I do not think this earned income tax credit has been interpreted as strongly and persuasively as it might be, and I hope we can do our part to remedy that.

Mr. FROST. I thank the gentleman very much for his excellent remarks.

It always is helpful to look back in time and to see what Members of this House have said in another time and in another context as we bring up a bill that seeks to do things that people said they are for in one context, but when they have the opportunity to actually do it, then they shrink from that. And I thank the gentleman very much for bringing that out.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. The gentleman may have noted that some of the critics are asking: What good is the earned income tax credit if the jobs are not there? And these are the same people who are not willing to vote for the kind of deficit reduction and the kind of economic policies that will create these jobs.

What these critics must know is that if we can enact this economic plan, we are going to create 8 million new jobs in this country. And when you combine those new jobs with this tax reform, we are going to make sure that those jobs enable families to keep body and soul together.

Mr. FROST. I thank the gentleman very much for his time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY], a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mrs. KENNELLY. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for bringing this together at the end of the day.

Mr. Speaker, among the ideas that are fundamental to our idea of ourselves as contributing, responsible members of society, is the idea of work. Work does much more than enable us to provide for ourselves and our families. In some part, it defines who we are. Work gives an individual standing, respect, recognition, and a place in our communities—and often a feeling of self-worth and accomplishment.

It is for this reason that our national debate about how best to reform the welfare system is so important. Welfare, quite simply, cannot be a way of life. To the extent that we allow it to become so, we do a disservice to those very people we most wanted to help; it is blatantly unfair to taxpayers.

Soon, we will take the first steps on the road to welfare reform. Our effort must be to open the way to work for all Americans. But as we start this effort, let us remember that we have now, today, one good working program that helps achieve exactly that goal. That program is the earned income tax credit—the EITC.

The President proposed a substantial expansion in the EITC, an expansion I fully support. The EITC is specially designed to aid low-income working people. It helps people cross one of the most important barriers that stands between them and work, and that is the fact that for far too many Americans, it is entirely possible to work full time, every day, 52 weeks a year, and still remain in poverty.

The EITC aids low-wage workers with children. This is no handout. This is a special tax credit that means that low- and moderate-income workers get to keep more of the money they earn. And, I would add, unlike welfare benefits, EITC benefits increase with every additional dollar earned, offering a real incentive to work for those working little or not at all.

Let me tell you why the EITC is so important, especially now. I come from Connecticut, a State that has been battered by recession. Many have lost jobs. Do we want to say: Just give up, go on welfare, abandon your hopes and dreams? Or do we want to say: We respect what you are doing; we understand how difficult it is; you must remain independent.

What do we want our message to be to older women, divorcees, widows—women who are now facing life alone on dramatically lower incomes? Some of these women are just beginning their careers, trying to get along on entry-level wages. Again, what do we want them to do? Do we want them to give up because the struggle is just too hard, or do we want to ease their transition and offer them the opportunity to become and remain self-sufficient?

The IRS reports that in my State, almost 5 percent of the households filing an income tax return received the EITC. About 78,000 working families with children benefited from the EITC last year.

The expansion proposed by the President means enormous benefits to my State. The Treasury Department estimates that about 84,000 Connecticut working families with children would be eligible for the EITC once the proposal was fully phased in. Most families already eligible for the credit would receive a substantial increase in their EITC payment.

As a result, Connecticut workers would get to keep $36 million in wages they earned. The benefits to the overall State economy would be immense, creating more demand, helping local businesses, and providing a much-needed infusion of funds. This is the kind of bottom-up stimulus that really can brighten the economic picture.

I have been a long-time supporter of the EITC and I fully support this expansion, as should anyone who is serious about encouraging work and improving the economy.

□ 1700

This is the kind of situation that we have before us: The people of the United States say, "Why can't we do something to help everyday working people?" The earned income tax credit

helps everyday working people, your neighbors, my neighbors, people who want to do one thing, want to get up in the morning, go to work and take care of themselves and take care of their children, their families.

We should be able, Mr. Speaker, to come together behind the earned income tax credit to support it and get on with the business of this country, pass the budget, embrace the earned income tax credit because it is a fair credit for the people of this United States.

I thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] for bringing us together so that we can calmly discuss something that would be very important to many people of these United States.

We so often get off the track, lose our way, talk about things that the people say are "beltway politics," and it is true. But tonight the gentleman from Texas brings us together to talk about a program that is simple to administer. It has one line on the tax return; one line. And we had to work to even get that. It is not a separate piece of paper.

You fill it in, you go to work, you do your job, and you do not live below poverty.

I once again thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FROST. I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut for her excellent remarks.

At this point I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. GORDON. I thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] for yielding. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have the opportunity to join you today to talk about this. I think it is a very important subject.

The reason it is important to me is I have hundreds of open meetings all across my congressional district in middle Tennessee, and frequently we will have meetings and maybe 20 people will come, sometimes 100 people will come. But it is important because it gives me a chance to learn more what is on the minds of my constituents, to discuss the issues of the day and to take back here their message.

Frequently I will hear someone come to the meeting and they will tell me about how they work 40 hours or more when they can. Maybe they are making minimum wage or more. Yet they are having a tough time getting by. Particularly a family like this, they see themselves working so hard, and then down the street there will be somebody who is not working, who can be living almost as well, on welfare.

They said, "Why in goodness sake am I working so hard for minimum wage," $4 an hour, $5 an hour, "yet I am not living that well, not as well as somebody that may be living on welfare."

But they want to do that, and they continue to do that because they want to show the right image for their children. They want to show them that if you do work hard, there can be opportunity.

But these folks are having difficulties.

Then you will have someone who will come in and they have got a good job, maybe making $25,000 or $35,000, but they have a child in college or they have other payments, house payments. It is very tough to get by.

Mr. FROST. The gentleman makes a very interesting point. he says $25,000, $30,000. In the gentleman's State and in my State, a lot of people consider that a good wage.

Mr. GORDON. Well, it is a good wage.

Mr. FROST. Middle-class people.

Mr. GORDON. It is a good wage.

Mr. FROST. That may not be a high wage in other States, perhaps on the Atlantic coast, the East Coast someplace; but in Texas or Tennessee a lot of hardworking people are in that category who would like some tax relief.

Mr. GORDON. Sure. Neither of my parents ever made that much money. It is something that they are glad to have. But it is still hard to get by on, particularly if there is a kid in school, a house payment to be made, doctor bills to be paid.

That is why anytime you have a package of deficit reduction, you can always find things you do not like. I want to tell you something about this that I do like, and that is the earned income tax credit. Because finally we are going to start giving people tax money back; we are talking about a tax cut for those families of four making less than $30,000. If the family is larger, you can make even more and still get a tax cut. I think it is time that we recognize that it is difficult to get by when you are raising a family and you need that kind of tax cut.

So, I think it is going to be a good incentive for folks to work hard, to show their kids, "Yes, you can do the right thing and come out better."

So, I think this is a good part of the overall deficit reduction package, something I am pleased about and something that is going to affect a lot of my constituents.

As my friend from Texas said, it will also affect his constituents. The gentleman was showing something to me earlier that indicated that there were 354,000, I believe it was, families or people in Tennessee.

Mr. FROST. That is a families figure.

Mr. GORDON. Families, 354,000 families, that is before this additional tax reduction even takes place.

□ 1710

So gosh, I wish my math was better, but that is probably one out of maybe every four families in Tennessee that is going to be getting a tax cut. I think that is good news for Tennessee. I think it is good news for America. I think it is good news for working Americans.

I am glad we have had a chance to talk about this today, and hopefully we can continue this discussion later.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Texas, for initiating this discussion.

Mr. FROST. Well, I thank the gentleman very much. These are excellent comments.

I think we particularly need to underscore the comment that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORDON] started with, and that is this is a way to get people off welfare. This is to provide an incentive for someone to go out and work, because they will not be able to be better off if they are on welfare. If they go out and work, with this earned income tax credit, then they are going to be doing OK. Maybe not great, but they are going be doing OK and it is to their advantage to work and not just to sit home and take part in our welfare system.

Mr. GORDON. Well, certainly that is one group of folks that will be helped, but in Murphysboro, making $30,000——

Mr. FROST. I was talking about lower income people, of course, lower level.

Mr. GORDON. That is not welfare. That is a good job, and those folks are working hard, too. They deserve to have a break. They deserve to have a chance to get their heads above water and try to move forward.

This tax cut is going to be good for middle-class America, as well as those folks who are trying to get into the middle class.

I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and I appreciate him taking out this special order on the earned income tax credit.

Let me say, we have had so much talk about the budget, and yet the EITC has sort of been left out. It is really a breathtaking reform in the President's proposal. It is not little. It does not just affect a corner of the world. It affects major sections of working America, and it gives people a message that we have not heard in a long time, and that is if you work, you will be better off than if you are on welfare. That message has not been heard, and everyone in America wants to hear it.

The conservative right, the wealthy people want to hear it, the middle class want to hear it, and the poor people themselves want to hear it, because believe me, they would much rather be working than receiving public assistance in almost every case.

And what does the EITC do? It sends out these two loud messages: to the welfare family, get off welfare. You will do better working.

To the working family: Do not slide back. You do better working.

It has an enormous effect. We can talk about job training programs and we can talk about capital gains cuts and we can talk about everything in between in terms of dealing with the major problem in America today, jobs; but I dare say you can put all that in and it will not do as much to help America get to work and stay working as the EITC.

What I would like to say to the gentleman, there are lots of States, every State is a winner under this, but it affects two types of States more than others. One type of State is mine that has a large working low-income population who are struggling, just getting by and hanging on by their fingernails.

In my State of New York, 68,000 new working families, low-income working, will be eligible for the EITC once the plan is phased in, once President Clinton's plan is phased in, and 823,000 working New York families that already benefit from the EITC will get a substantial raise from these changes.

How big a raise? Well, the typical low-income working family in New York will get a yearly EITC increase of about $400.

The State of New York will get $420 million in new EITC benefits a year that is then spent in the stores.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will allow me, when we say $400, that is $400 directly back in someone's pocket.

Mr. SCHUMER. No government bureaucracy.

Mr. FROST. That is $400 more they get to keep. When they figure out their income tax, it is $400 less in income tax they pay than they otherwise would have paid had this not been in law.

Mr. SCHUMER. The gentleman is exactly right.

It is no wonder, by the way, that as the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PRICE] pointed out that conservatives love this program. They say this is a lot better than setting up a big Government bureaucracy to try to help working people and poor people, and they are right.

Mr. FROST. They have loved it in the abstract.

Mr. SCHUMER. Well, they are not voting for it here because maybe it does not mean much.

But finally, Democrats get the message, and what happens?

"Oh, no, we don't want it."

It makes me think twice about the motivation and intention. Once it is here, they are gone.

But for New York, it is $420 million more.

Compared to the gas tax, there is a cry, "Oh, no," about the gas tax. That is about a dollar a week. The working families will net between $300 and $350 per year here under this deficit reduction plan.

Now, it is not just New York that benefits. Another group of States that benefit are States that have lower incomes in general. There as the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORDON] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] have pointed out, the average middle-class person, the low end of the middle class will benefit as well.

I picked out a few States, and the fact that there are some Democratic Senators wavering on whether to vote for the President's plan that comes to the States in purely coincidental. I just thought we ought to see which States.

Let us take Arizona. There are 256,000 current beneficiaries, plus 20,000 new working families, an additional $120 million each year, $300 that averages per low-income family.

How about Oklahoma? We have heard a lot about the Senator from Oklahoma, about defending big oil. How about defending the little people of Oklahoma?

In Oklahoma, one in every seven Oklahoman, that is more than in my State, get the EITC benefits. After this passes, it is going to one in six.

Oklahomans will get another $104 million in the EITC.

The State of Georgia. We have another of our good friends in our party from Georgia wondering whether he should vote for the bill. One in six Georgians get it now. Under the Clinton plan, it was up to 18 percent, $275 million pumped into the economy from the EITC changes.

Nebraska. One in ten Nebraskans get it now. Five thousand new families eligible, $37 million each year into Nebraska.

Again as the gentleman from Texas pointed out, this money goes to working people, people who are hanging on. They struggle, they work, they want their little piece of the rock.

In previous years it seemed that government instead of helping them has kicked them around. This is a chance to help them, and they are all over America.

They are in Louisiana, 29,000 new families, $201 million.

They are in New Jersey, 27,000 new families, $164 million.

They are in Wisconsin, 14,000 new families, $91 million.

So this is a plan that benefits the people we often talk about, but rarely help, not the people at the very bottom but the people who are on the next rung.

I would say in conclusion, all of us, whatever party we are, whatever part of the country, we want to see this country stay the greatest country in the world. I would hate to see that my young children grow up as the sun sets on the United States.

Well, one way to do it is get people working and keep them working. We all know that. That benefits every one of us.

There is no better way than the EITC. The President has invested considerable capital and a great deal of courage in putting this in his bill. How can we turn it down?

So I would urge my colleagues to think twice about the benefits of the EITC as part of this plan. I would urge us to pass the Clinton plan and I would greatly thank the gentleman from Texas for his leadership and foresight in taking out this special order so we might inform our colleagues and our country about this wonderful program that has largely been forgotten in the Sturm and Drang debate over the tax bill.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much.

My time is about over. I am grateful for the opportunity to have visited with my colleagues today. We have had colleagues here on the floor from a cross-section of States, Tennessee, Maryland, Connecticut, New York, North Carolina, West Virginia, I am from Texas.

This is a truly national issue. This is a national issue that is going to put money back into the hands of people who work hard every day and who are the backbone of America. We need this plan. We need it to be passed next week so we can get on with making sure that this continues to be the greatest country in the world.

I thank the gentleman very much.

□ 1720

CHILDREN'S INITIATIVES IN THE BUDGET RECONCILIATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have this opportunity to speak with you on an issue that is certainly very close to my heart—our children.

Today my comments will come from a number of different perspectives. As a mother and grandmother I have an intimate knowledge of the needs and conditions of children. As a former local government official, I have a knowledge of the services that should make the lives of our children healthy and happy. And as a Member of Congress, I have the privilege of being at the table and in a position to urge my colleagues to place children and families at the top of our national agenda.

The children of our Nation are living outside the American dream. In the richest country on Earth, there are over 12 million children living in poverty. They die at an alarming rate before their first birthday, and for black babies the tragedy is even more horrifying. They are dying at nearly three times the rate of white babies and the gap is growing.

Children are also among the fastest growing group of homeless Americans,

and those suffering from crippling, deadly diseases. We have not been kind to those who are powerless to defend themselves. We have for too long ignored those who do not have well-financed lobbyist, and are too young to pull the lever in the voting booth.

My colleagues, let us not continue down that path of neglect. Surely, we are big enough to open our hearts to the children of America. If the true measure of a nation is how well it treats its children, over the past 20 years our record is really our national shame. Child abuse is up dramatically, and our children are hungry because they are in families who are stuck in the binds of persistent poverty.

We have reached a turning point in our history. At this hour, and over the next few days, we will be taking the opportunity to speak for our children. As we labor at the task of shaping a reconciliation budget plan that we can all support, I urge all of you to join me in keeping childhood immunization, the earned income tax credit, the Mickey Leland Hunger Program, and the Family Preservation Act, on the table and in tact.

We must be ever cognizant of the fact that these programs really represent the dynamics of investing in people early, and reaping the benefits of that investment in terms of well-educated, compassionate, productive citizens, in the future.

The President has presented us with plans to curb infant mortality by allowing for full immunization of all children and an increase in Head Start funding, to level the playing field for poor children. Though Head Start is not at issue in this process, we still must carry that banner because there are those who would lead us to believe that it is no longer necessary. The program is too important to let that happen.

Most of those children are in families that would benefit greatly from the earned income tax credit. Instead of continuing to force these citizens to rely on expensive welfare systems, we should encourage them to continue working and supporting their families. The EITC is a good way to balance the scales. It gives working families with children a fighting chance.

And the Mickey Leland Hunger Program is designed to help those families avoid the pitfalls of hunger and malnutrition. Even the most skeptical among us cannot deny the unmistakable link between low achievement among children and malnutrition. Because they have no self esteem or confidence, these children are doomed to drop out of school and become drains on society.

They may be wards of the State through the juvenile system or simply on public assistance of some sort. The truth of the matter is that we spend an incredible amount of money at the back end of the problem, when it is too late, because we do not spend the small amount that is required for prevention.

And finally, we must begin to answer the problem of neglect and abuse in our families. We have all heard the horror stories of social service agencies with overworked employees who do not follow through on families in crisis. Too often the result is a battered child, or one with fatal injuries. The Family Preservation Act is designed to ease this situation and give families the support they need to recover successfully from difficult times.

Many of us in Congress came to this body to bring about a change. We realize that change must include embracing issues that have been neglected for so long. We are now facing a moral deficit from which we may never recover. We must act now.

I must share with you that we won't always be together on what is good and what is not good for our children. But I think you can feel good about the fact that these issues are now being discussed, and that there is a new attitude in this body about what is important.

We know many of the answers to what is wrong in this society. We understand that taking care of families means the children of this Nation have a fighting chance. We do know these things. Now we must have the courage to act.

From the National Commission on Children:

> When society values its children and the quality of family life, individuals, families themselves, and outside institutions are moved to make the necessary commitment, and to create supportive environments at home, at school, at work, and in the community.

As a Member of this body charged with the responsibility of creating a better quality of life for the people I represent, and the Nation as a whole, I pledge my support for our children and families. I could do no less.

Finally, I urge my colleagues to join me in standing up for America's children and families by keeping these four initiatives in tact and fully funded in the final reconciliation budget.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that several of my colleagues are joining me. In the audience is the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER], and I am pleased that she is entering in with me in this discussion in support of our children. Welcome.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am certainly grateful to my colleague, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON], who organized this evening's special order remarks around the issue of children and familiy issues, and poverty.

Just this past May, I hosted a children's summit meeting back in my district, in Rochester, NY. It was a gathering of over 600 local child poverty, health and education agency representatives and advocates, who met for a day-long session to plan new, more effective measures to deal with children and families in poverty. This was just part of my community's response to a 1992 children's defense fund study which revealed that one out of every four children in Rochester was living in poverty, a statistic that shocked us.

Among the national problems identified during this summit meeting were:

Unprecedented levels of homelessness among children throughout the United States;

Unprecedented school drop-out rates—nationwide, there are 1,900 teens dropping out of high school every day;

We have over 14 million U.S. children living below poverty level—more than in any year since 1965;

Five million children are going hungry every day; nearly 3 million are abused or neglected each year, and 8 million children lack adequate health care; and

As a country we have the lowest immunization rate for children in the Western Hemisphere, save Bolivia and Haiti.

Somewhere, somehow the safety net of our civilized society has failed each and every one of these children. Fortunately, we now have a chance to do something concrete and definitive to provide real help to poor children all across this country. I am talking about passage of a fully funded childhood immunization program, which we must enact as part of the budget reconciliation process.

The statistics about the poor job this country is doing to immunize its children are frightening. Overall, by age 2, only about 58 percent of all American children are vaccinated against polio, measles, rubella, mumps, diphtheria, pertussis, and tetanus.

Such diseases are no respecter of income—or of whether or not a child has insurance coverage. We cannot sit by and watch our Nation fall behind the rest of the world in immunization rates—not when we have the capacity to eliminate the problem. Not when we, the United States pioneered the vaccine. We cannot allow children to die from preventable diseases, such as typhoid, tuberculosis, polio, and measles. Last year, I submitted a proposal to expand the Federal effort to immunize preschoolers—no matter whether they were uninsured, Medicaid recipients, or underinsured kids whose families also cannot pay for vaccination.

This year, the President submitted a similar proposal, which the House supported in modified form—but which the other body unfortunately saw fit to almost completely destroy.

Our two Houses must now come to an accommodation. But serious questions still remain to be resolved. Questions such as, how should we handle the kids whose coverage does not include immunization?

The answer to me is obvious. We must ensure that each child has access to vaccines. How can we exclude these children from the same health protection that other children will be receiving. In good conscience, we cannot.

One notion which has received some support, yet which I find especially troubling, is the idea of levying punitive sanctions against AFDC families who fail to get their children vaccinated. Talk about punishing the victim. Not only will the child in question be deprived of immunization, he or she will also have badly needed money for food and shelter taken away. No one in their right mind could possibly believe this is a constructive solution.

The real answer to the problem of expanding immunization lies in affordability, access, and education.

Immunization must be affordable to all families. And the price of vaccines, which has risen so in the past generation, can be held down by allowing the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate with drug companies and buy in bulk for distribution to the States.

Access can be expanded by improving the delivery system. We need expanded health clinic hours, and efforts to make it affordable for private physicians to vaccinate Medicaid children.

Education is the final, crucial element. We must make a greater effort to instruct parents, especially teen parents, about the importance of immunization. These parents want to do what is best for their child—but they need instructions, not sanctions.

I quote from a Tuesday editorial in the Washington Post on this very topic. "The immunization rate among U.S. children ought to be 100 percent. Among lower-income children particularly, it is not." They concluded that the House program "is legislation to make good on a service that the public sector already prides itself on providing. Why not try it?"

Why not, indeed. there is no good reason not to enact this program, which will benefit more than 11 million American children. So, I guess that means there are 11 million good reasons why we must support the House's childhood immunization program.

□ 1730

Mrs. CLAYTON. Thank you for bringing that up, and also making the statement that you did; 11 million children is an awful lot of people for us to ignore.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. That is our future.

Mrs. CLAYTON. It is.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Children today who get measles, if they recover, and 85,000 died a year ago, but if they recover they are often left with hearing or seeing problems that they will have for the rest of their lives that could have been prevented just by vaccine. If we are going to have a good healthy educated work force in the next century, and we must, we cannot afford to let 11 million children be left prey to diseases which we could cure.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased now to recognize and give time for the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY] who has joined us to share in this discussion.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I first want to commend my friend, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON], who is president of our Democratic freshman class, for organizing this special order.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the provisions of the Child Welfare and Family Preservation Act contained in the President's program.

It will provide important new investment in child welfare services, one of our most crucial social programs.

I am encouraged, Mr. Speaker, that the President is seeking to help States and cities cope with the escalating crisis in child welfare.

Simply put, President Clinton's proposal seeks to preserve and protect our most precious resource: the American family.

In New York City, which I am proud to represent, the American family is under siege.

During the past ten years, crack addiction, the AIDS epidemic and a huge increase in homelessness have destroyed thousands of families and forced tens of thousands of children into foster care.

Federal cutbacks to our major cities—including aid for Federal housing—have made matters even worse for many families.

New York City has seen a 63-percent cut in Federal aid during the past decade. As a result of these factors, the number of New York City children in foster care has tripled in 6 years from 17,000 to a staggering 54,000. Personally, I find this drastic increase, indicative of the magnitude of the decline of the American family.

New York City has the largest human service delivery system in the country, spending $1 billion a year on foster care. But less than half of it is eligible for Federal reimbursement. In New York City, a child is reported neglected or abused every 13 minutes. In 1991, over 100 children—more than two children a week—died from child abuse in New York City.

It is a tragedy when the children who should be our future needlessly become a part of our past.

Mr. Speaker, this is a crisis of enormous magnitude.

When I ran for Congress last fall, I shared the President's commitment to help children escape this terrible cycle of poverty, drug abuse, and neglect.

Like many Americans, I was heartened when the President offered a number of innovative ideas to create new support programs for parents and children.

In meeting his promises of last fall, the President has proposed a new capped entitlement program to promote cost-effective family support services so that troubled families can get help before they begin to disintegrate. In that regard, this is not a spending program, but an investment program. It is preventive care, not reactive band-aids.

The family support programs will ensure that fewer children will fall into costly foster care, and that those who do will receive better parenting. It will also reduce abuse and neglect. Repeated studies have shown that abused or neglected children are far more likely to develop emotional, developmental and educational difficulties.

They are also far more likely to engage in criminal behavior. It costs more than $37,000 a year to hold a juvenile in custody. And the prisons are filled with adults who were abused or neglected children.

This proposal sets a new direction for our States and cities and offers hope for millions of impoverished families in America.

Over the next 5 years the proposal would provide $1.7 billion to set up these programs including over $85 million for New York State. It is not everything that we want for the impoverished children of this country, but it is a start.

But money alone will not solve the child welfare crisis in this country. Policies and practices cry out for review and reform. Social workers and child abuse investigators need to be better trained and better supervised.

We also need to place a stronger emphasis on finding the best possible placements for children. Right now, in New York City, 20 percent of all foster care children are on the adoption track, but only 2 percent a year are actually placed for adoption. These provisions would make numerous important improvements to our foster care and adoption system.

In addition, we must be aware that the American people are demanding that they get what they pay for.

In order to help American families, we need to make sure that States distribute these funds directly to cities and rural communities where they are most needed.

They must not use these funds to replace State funding for programs already in place. Obviously, we also must ensure that the cities themselves use these funds to enhance their family preservation programs and not as offsets for other budget cuts.

The Child Welfare and Family Preservation Act, is a measure that every mother could love.

□ 1740

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for bringing that particular phase of the program to

our attention and also citing the issues and problems in New York City.

I just want to say that for the State of New York, if indeed the program is approved in the House, in 1994, the State would receive at least 4 million additional dollars to go along with what the State is already allocated. That will go a long way, it seems to me, to encourage family support and foster care, if that could happen.

Mrs. MALONEY. That is very true, president [EVA CLAYTON] of our class.

As I stated earlier, the increase in foster care in New York City in just 6 years, it jumped from 14,000 to 54,000. That is a dramatic indication of the problem we confronted with families distintegrating and not having the support system.

If we can keep these families together and keep the young people out of the foster care system and the never-ending cycle of poverty, then we will, in fact, not only help the young people, help the families, but help in a cost-effective way our country.

Mrs. CLAYTON. This chart really shows, it is an old chart, it is the latest information we could get. In 1989, we had a little less than 400,000 young people who were in foster care. As you indicated, it is growing each day.

I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT]. I thank him for coming and caring for children and speaking out for children.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to, again, congratulate the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] for organizing this special order. It is the second one this week that she has organized on behalf of children, which represent 25 percent of the present and 100 percent of the future.

Mr. Speaker, it has been estimated that approximately 430,000 children are in foster care today in America. The vast majority of these children are in foster care because they are either abused or neglected by their parents. In fact, 2.9 million children are reported abused and neglected each year.

Once children are in foster care, for far too many their circumstances only marginally improve.

Increasingly, research is discovering that both foster care and abuse and neglect are only symptoms of bigger problems. Just as the number of abuse and neglect cases are tripled over the last decade, we have also seen an increase in the number of unemployed people in this society, an increase in the number of school dropouts and the numbers of homeless families, increasing numbers of families needed AFDC or Food Stamps, and the incidence of substance abuse and the incidence of both juvenile and adult crime are on the increase.

Mr. Speaker, the increases in these multiple statistics is not coincidental. There is a definite correlation, a connection between these occurrences, because when the head of the household loses his or her job, the substance abuse and child abuse, child abuse and neglect will often follow. Applications for food stamps and other assistance will also increase.

The cycle continues, when you have the increased possibility of homelessness and lack of income, and criminal activities also are closely related.

As decisionmakers, Mr. Speaker, we must begin to see this connection and we must stop our historical piecemeal approach in dealing with just the symptoms. And we must begin to deal with the whole problem.

In our efforts to begin to address the societal ills that face American families, we must first ensure that the heads of these families have jobs, jobs that pay them a fair wage for a fair day's work.

Simultaneously, these families must have the support necessary to help them to understand and to solve the problems which face them. And we cannot do one without the other.

In our budget reconciliation deliberations, we are making progress toward reinventing the economic condition of America and creating jobs. And with the earned income tax credit, those who are fortunate enough to get jobs can work their way out of poverty.

But just as important in those deliberations is the Family Preservation and Support Act, which is an integral part of the second prong in that solution. That is, empowering and enabling American families to succeed. We will never be able to insulate families from stress. Workers will be laid off, even in the best of times. Financial woes will confront our families. School problems will arise. Sickness will occur. But we can give these families the tools and support to handle these crises.

The family preservation and support bill will reduce child abuse and neglect by providing funding for programs which teach parenting skills. It will help States to develop and expand programs for families that are in crisis so that the crisis will not lead to the separation or dissolution of the family unit.

The bill will provide the quality foster care for those children who regardless of interventions will need foster care assistance, and it generally places a focus on working with the entire family to enhance its functioning.

Mr. Speaker, the Family Preservation and Support Act will provide help to families before the problems occur. So for once, we will be preventing problems before they occur.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me and others in supporting the family preservation and support provisions in the Budget Reconciliation Act. I sincerely hope that we can pass this measure, because it will be an essential cog in our efforts to better America's future.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for those very thoughtful thoughts.

We are also joined by the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. THURMAN], who has a concern for children and wants to share those concerns with us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. THURMAN].

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, I first want to join with my colleagues in expressing my appreciation to the gentlewoman from North Carolina for her leadership in organizing this special order. We rise to speak for those who otherwise would not have a voice in this body but who do have the greatest stake in the future of this country: America's children.

As a former middle school math teacher of 9 years, I know firsthand the importance of providing support for our Nation's children.

In my tenure as an educator, I worked with active, bright, hopeful young people, and I consider myself very lucky for the opportunity to play a role in shaping their futures. From my experiences, I learned that we have a nation of remarkable children. America's children are possessed of great ideas and active imaginations. Every child, including the child who faces seemingly insurmountable difficulties, has much to offer, and holds so much promise. That is why it disturbs me to know that every day in Florida, 403 children are reported abused or neglected, 464 students are suspended from school, 383 youth are arrested, and 142 run away from home.

We stand at a crossroads, and we have a hard choice to make. The issue is not whether to provide the $1.5 billion for the President's Family Preservation and Support Program. Instead it is when and where we are going to provide those resources. The challenges children face today are not going to magically disappear, and we must make a concerted effort to help America's children beat the odds. We must offer them the means by which to succeed.

I rise in support of the Family Preservation and Support Program out of compassion for our Nation's children, out of recognition for their needs. But I also rise today for practical purposes.

Consider the following: We can put $3,000 per family toward family preservation services that help keep families together or $10,000 for 1 year of intensive child abuse therapy; we can pay $6,700 per youth, per year, for intensive community-based services or $40,000 to maintain a youth at a correctional facility; also, we can direct $1 toward childhood immunizations now or $10 toward medical costs later.

The Family Preservation and Support Program focuses on rebuilding our support system. We need a system that protects children from abuse and neglect, a system on which children can

rely when circumstances become threatening. According to 1991 reports, 57,130 children in Florida were abused, 76,667 suffered from neglect, and 39,578 were threatened harm. What I am talking about here are basic principles of humanity and compassion. Our children must be able to trust us, and we need to be there for them.

Over 400,000 children are in foster homes today, and unfortunately, too many children are still left unprotected. I am confident that all Floridians remember the tragic case of Bradley McGhee, a toddler who drowned at the hands of his father after being repeatedly dunked in the toilet head first. At the end of lengthy criminal and legislative investigations, Floridians knew what Florida Health and Rehabilitative Services professionals and Bradley's foster family knew all along: There simply were not enough resources to save the life of this 2-year-old boy.

The Family Preservation and Support Program offers much needed reinforcement to thousands of dedicated child advocates, such as foster care families and child welfare personnel. I want to ensure that these concerned individuals get the necessary tools and support to help our children.

We have an opportunity here not only to defend our children, but also to invest in America's future. Our children of today become tomorrow's educators, medical researchers, farmers, national leaders, even peace negotiators. But perhaps most importantly, today's children become tomorrow's parents. We know that in many instances, children who experience abuse are at risk of becoming violent toward their own children. If we can provide children with stable, caring environments, then we begin to tackle patterns of abuse which children cannot overcome by themselves.

This program is about helping parents. Most parents today want their kids to have a safe home, a good education, quality health care, and a bright future. Expectant parents do not envision abusing their children mentally or physically. No parent wants an unstable family life for kids. However, circumstances such as poverty and unemployment continually drive our Nation's parents to a crisis point. Let us reach out to them before they reach that critical point.

I know that we can make a difference, because I have seen efforts in Florida that give families stronger foundations. In fiscal year 1992–93, 16,000 kids came to the doors of Florida Network Programs of Youth Services seeking help. After dedicated individuals of these networks worked with the families involved, over 90 percent were reunited.

In Pasco County, many of us worked to provide teen mothers with viable job skills, parenting classes, and onsite day care. These women also received prenatal and postnatal care to ensure that their babies would be born healthy and would be guaranteed a good start.

In 1991, the Committee for Economic Development, an independent research and educational organization of corporate leaders and educators, acknowledged that, "The ability of children to succeed in school and in life is largely dependent on the quality of their early development." How many of our children are robbed of decent futures because of the hardships they are unable to endure early in their childhoods? It is as though our system maps out a road for some children who turn to violence and anger as they express their frustrations and cope with their needs that fail to be met. We must ask ourselves if this outlook is fair to those children or to the children who will be the victims of their aggression.

I know that every day in Florida, 565 babies are born, 1 in 7 of whom are born to teenage mothers. How many of these kids will be overwhelmed by barriers like instability and hopelessness in a nation that prides itself on opportunity? The Family Preservation and Support Program will allow our children to move ahead of these obstacles. We have identified the direction in which we need to go; this act will map the path to get there.

□ 1750

Mr. Speaker, I have to tell the Members, I appreciate the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] coming and being a leader on this issue.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for sharing with us and giving us those very practical opportunities, not only for doing the right thing, but for doing the fiscally responsible thing.

Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] has joined us, and we are delighted to have her. She is joining this discussion, as well. I yield to the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

I am really delighted that our colleague, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON], has taken this initiative to draw attention to this critical issue. The conferees are scattered all over Capitol Hill right at this very moment, making decisions that are going to affect the lives of our innocent children for the next 5 years. We refer to this document that will come out sometime at midnight tonight as the Budget Reconciliation Act, as though it was a collection of papers and numbers and figures; as though it was simply some budgetary consolidation.

A budget, as far as I am concerned, is a priority that a country gives in terms of its resources and how it is going to expend them. It is not just a matter of finding funds to reduce the deficit. It is a document which expresses the will and the determination of the people of this country to adhere to their core sense of justice and to elaborate its social priorities. It is in this context that I applaud our colleague, who has taken the time tonight to address this issue, because there really is not a more powerful, more imperative concern, that the American Nation should have than what it is doing to our children.

I know the time is short. I have prepared a long document which I will insert at this time in the RECORD.

DIMENSIONS OF THE PROBLEM

Twenty-seven American children die every day from poverty-related effects. More than 12 million children, a startling 1 in every 4, live in poverty in our country, and the number continues to grow. These youngsters make up one-third of all of our Nation's poor people. Because many families cannot scrape up the money for shelter, 100,000 American children go day after day without a roof over their heads. Contrary to popular myth, the majority of these children are not black or on welfare; they live in working families and outside inner cities in small-town, rural, and suburban America, according to the Children's Defense Fund. Of cities with the worst child poverty statistics, Detroit, MI, Laredo, TX, and New Orleans, LA, register child poverty figures of nearly 50 percent.

How did we completely negate our successes of the 1960's and 1970's when governmental commitment and economic growth pulled more than 6 million children and half our adult population out of poverty?

Cuts in Federal programs to help the poor, coupled with economic setbacks for families with children, and increasing child care costs for low-income working parents, worked to push child poverty rates back up to 1965 levels, according to Marian Wright Edelman of the Children's Defense Fund.

Families headed by parents younger than 30 were hit the hardest; the median income of this group plummeted by one-third from 1973 to 1990. At the same time, the CDF says crucial income support programs such as Aid to Families With Dependent Children and unemployment insurance eroded further beyond their already inadequate levels. Instead of bolstering programs, Federal Government retreated from housing assistance for families as more and more low- and moderate-income families were priced out of home ownership and rental markets. Today only about one in three poor households gets any help with its housing costs from the Government.

Besides having no money or shelter, an unprecedented 12 million children go to sleep hungry every day, unsure about when they will see their next meal. This unbelievable figure includes nearly a million and a half in California in the worst case, and 20,000 in Arkansas in the best case, according to a Tufts University study. Child hunger percentages in West Virginia, Kentucky, Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas, and New Mexico rank the highest, anywhere from 25 to 35 percent. Not a single State can boast of a child hunger percentage lower than 5 percent.

American children not only suffer pain in their stomachs from hunger, but many resign themselves to live with pain as a part of routine life because they cannot obtain adequate health care. We are failing to protect the fragile health of our children. The National Commission on Children reports 40,000 babies born in the United States die before their first birthdays. African-American babies are twice as likely to die as white babies. This is largely attributed to low birth weights. This dismal infant mortality record ranks higher than those of 21 other industrialized countries, including Japan, Sweden, Canada, and France.

Ten million American children have no health insurance to speak of, Mr. Speaker, according to the Children's Times 1992 Annual Report. The Children's Defense Fund estimates that 25 million—40 percent of all children—are not provided access to employer-provided health insurance. Without the means to pay their medical bills, poorer children are denied often urgently needed health care services. Urban centers and rural counties alike see millions of cases annually of children stricken with chronic and disabling conditions, many of which could have been avoided if diagnosed early enough. Those living in poor housing are at a greater risk of impairment because of the likelihood that they will be exposed to high levels of lead. The National Commission on Children reports that an estimated 12 million American children, mostly poor children, are at risk of lead poisoning and hundreds of thousands of these children have their intellectual growth stunted each year because of lead exposure.

Costs for vaccine have skyrocketed in the last 10 years and private physicians have increasingly referred families to understaffed and poorly funded public clinics. Largely because of this, half the young children in inner cities go unprotected against communicable diseases, as reported by the National Commission on Children. Only 70 percent of 2-year-olds nationwide receive satisfactory immunizations against measles, mumps, and rubella. The failure to immunize has cause measles outbreaks in many U.S. cities in the past few years. More than 26,000 cases of measles were reported in 1990. Compare that to an average of 3,000 cases annually in most of the 1980's—an increase of 23,000 children per year stricken with the childhood disease.

We lacked the vision in the past to push for enough preventive funding; instead, we have allowed massive deterioration in our health care system with regards to our youngest citizens. Totals on medical bills continue to spiral as amounts needed for additional and specialized care add up.

On top of being poor, hungry, and in ill health, a growing subpopulation of our children also suffer from child abuse and neglect; figures more than doubled over the last decade, and this is not just due to an increase in numbers of cases reported to authorities. The U.S. Advisory Board on Child Abuse and Neglect found that hundreds of thousands of children each year are being abandoned, burned, severely beaten, raped, sodomized berated, or belittled.

Every day, up to 2 million children are left completely alone while their parents work. 1,383 children died from abuse or neglect in 1991—most before they reached their first birthdays. Such abuse or neglect has been inextricably linked to poor health, emotional or developmental problems, difficulty in school, and delinquent or criminal behavior, as reported by the Child Welfare League of America.

By permitting children to remain in unfit social conditions, Mr. Speaker, we deprive them of the security and care they need to develop sound morals and values. These children do not have anyone to talk to about the horrors they experience and no means of escape. Low self-esteem developing out of this, drives many children and teenagers to alcoholism, drug addiction, sexual promiscuity—the very things that are tearing at the precious fabric of our society. Learning by example and peer pressure are extremely powerful forces to the young and impressionable, and difficult not to imitate when no alternative experience presents itself. Again, we are dealing with the results of our failures, not the prevention of these tragic results.

Everything I mentioned already does not cover thousands of other injustices American children endure in schools, Mr. Speaker. 135,000 children bring guns to school every day, and every day 10 children die and 30 are wounded by guns. Almost 2,500 teenagers drop out of school every day. Because of budget cuts in the 1980's, thousands of eligible students are denied school lunch.

My point is that the issues that the conferees are dealing with are dollars, how much money are we going to give to the area of earned income tax credit; how much money is going to go into family preservation and Mickey Leland and immunization.

Apart from those dollar figures, I hope that the conferees will understand the human element of what we are dealing with. Twenty-seven American children die every day from poverty-related effects. I hope people understand that. More than 12 million children, this is one in every four that we hear about, 12 million children live in poverty in our country, and the number continues to grow because many families cannot scrape up enough money for shelter. One hundred thousand American children go day after day without a roof over their heads.

I think these poverty statistics are what should be the numbing reality of our social and political responsibility. We have to deal with all of these young people in our communities. We have to provide food, shelter, and health services. The health services are so critical. In most areas, it is the children that fall between the cracks, do not have the child care or health services that are so important.

Feeding them with Mickey Leland, making sure that their family life is solid and preserved and protected with family preservation, making sure that their health concerns with immunization become a social national priority, that is what we are talking about, and lifting these families out of poverty.

I have a lot of statistics that my staff, my intern, Melissa Unemori, who is with me just for a short time, has gathered. They are really startling statistics, and I hope that the conferees pay attention to these young voices all over America who are crying out for help, and with the commitment of this Congress, help can be made available to them.

I commend the leadership of the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] in giving us this time.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her statement, for the statement she is going to enter into the RECORD, and for her passionate plea to have children as the head of our priority.

I thank the gentlewoman from Utah [Ms. SHEPHERD] for joining us.

Ms. SHEPHERD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. CLAYTON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Utah.

Ms. SHEPHERD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yieldingto me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to first commend my freshman colleague from North Carolina on arranging this important special order. She is one of the most vocal advocates for working families that I know, and am proud to join her as she provides a leadership role on this critical issue.

This is really a very simple issue. So simple, in fact, that it's unfathomable to me how the earned income tax credit has become one of the bargaining chips among budget reconciliation conferees. If you believe that work should be rewarded and that children deserve security, you should support expanding the earned income tax credit. Plain and simple.

Thousands of working families in my district and across this Nation are right now struggling to make ends meet. They are one paycheck away from losing their home, losing their car, and falling onto the public welfare rolls. Many of them are single mothers with one of two kids, for whom child support payments do not pay the bills.

I have come to support expanding the EITC from the standpoint of a former business owner. There are basically two ways in which Government can give these families more take-home pay. First, we could mandate a higher minimum wage. I don't support such a policy at this point in time because I think businesses need more flexibility, not less, in today's economy. In addition, many of today's minimum wage workers aren't the kinds of workers we want to help—they're often the kids of upper-income Americans working to earn a few extra bucks in the summer.

The second option is to provide a targeted tax incentive to America's working poor. The second option makes much better sense because it effectively gives workers added take home pay without cutting into an employer's profit margins. It gives people the gift

of time to work harder, to keep hope, to pull themselves above the poverty line.

Critics of this proposal in Congress have called the earned income credit a new entitlement program. I would suggest that the EITC is no more an entitlement program than the mortgage interest deduction or the deduction for entertainment expenses. It is not an entitlement program, it is a tax cut for working families, and I think that any of the over 75,000 working families in my State who received an earned income tax credit have earned the dignity of being able to have a living wage. The EITC keeps people out of the cycle of welfare dependency, which is a goal we should all be supporting. The only thing to which an EITC recipient is entitled is the dignity of being rewarded for working.

The EITC is a program that we already have and that has already earned the support of Members on both sides of the aisle. The proposed expansion of the EITC only makes that program better. If you call yourself conservative, as I do on a number of issues, expanding the EITC is the first step toward comprehensive welfare reform. This is a tax cut, an incentive to work. If you call yourself a liberal, this proposal represents a tremendous step in bringing the working poor out of poverty. The earned income tax credit is not a Democratic idea, and it's not a Republican idea. Americans across the political spectrum believe that a worker who puts in his or her 8 hours a day shouldn't have to live in poverty. I urge the conference committee to expand the earned income tax credit for working parents. It is the best investment we will ever make.

□ 1800

Mrs. CLAYTON. I thank you too, Congresswoman SHEPHERD. There is an old saying that to help children you have to help their families, and to help families you have to make sure they have enough resources and income to take care of themselves.

This chart, as you indicated, shows most of the poor children really have one member in their family either working full or part-time. So I thank you for bringing that to our attention.

I am delighted and pleased that the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia has joined us, and I will note that she is not a freshman, but she cares about these issues, and I thank her so much for joining us.

Ms. NORTON. Thank you very much, Madam Chairman of the freshman class. I want to publicly thank you for organizing, doing the grunt work to organize a truly critical special order at a crucial moment in time. I feel I am here on an emergency mission. Mr. Speaker, the conferees are faced at this moment with competing priorities, and very frankly, no one can say that we are going to meet the President's $500 billion goal and have fairness.

I am very afraid that those who are least powerful will be thrown over the side, and that is why I wanted to join in this evening. I want to speak about two groups of silent Americans, the silent poor and hungry children, and much of what I will say I will say from a black perspective, and the earned income tax credit, and the Leland program have hugely disproportionate effects in the African-American community. And the truth has got to be told about these effects and the priority that the country should place on these programs because of those effects.

I represent a district that has great swings. It is one of the highest income districts in the United States. It has many rich people. It has many well-to-do people, black and white, because of the special circumstances of the District of Columbia, the capital city. And at the other end it has astonishing numbers of poor people as well. One in every six District of Columbia households that filed an income tax return in 1992 received the earned income tax credit as of that time.

I am not going to talk about the earned income tax credit recipients you hear most about, the families. We have finally begun to get movement on families. I am going to talk about the most forgotten working poor in this country, and those are childless working poor people. Time and again we have enhanced the earned income tax credit, and each time we gravitate appropriately enough toward poor families and the effect this has had on poor single people trying to maintain an attachment to the work force is truly astonishing.

Since 1980 the proportion of income paid in Federal taxes by the poorest one-fifth of nonelderly households without children has risen a stunning 38 percent. Mr. Speaker, how many of us have seen our taxes go up 38 percent during that period? How are we to keep young people attached to the work force when the competition is there from the underground, not to mention the criminal economy which will make their lives much easier in that respect and guarantee that they will not pay any taxes at all?

We have got to stop taxing these people into poverty and put a human face on these working poor people who do not happen to have a child, and who have paid dearly for not having a child through their income taxes.

If the gasoline tax is raised and the childless worker credit is dropped, this trend will worsen still more. Therefore, I wish to point to these silent working people who nobody speaks for, because they do not have the classic tender-hearted trapping, the child, to make people notice them.

And where do they go? Well, they are dispersed in my black communities. I must tell you when they get into the wage economy and find that they are paying in Federal income taxes the same as people with far higher incomes, many of them give up. We must use this opportunity to give them the chance they deserve, and if something must be thrown over the side, let us not throw over the side once again childless working poor people.

Finally, let me say a word about the Leland Act which also may be cut deeply. These figures in the black community should be noted. More than half of all working poor African-American families with children would receive the earned income tax credit. That is more than half of the working poor African-American families, while 41 percent of all African-American children live in families that receive food stamps for part of the year. There has to be a shocking increase in hunger in this country, and who bears the brunt of it? Our children.

When I was a young woman in the civil rights movement, I remember that the country moved very far toward eliminating hunger for children, and for Americans, and we have slid back. I hate to see us slide back when we made very significant progress as we did with hunger, and the Leland Act gives us an opportunity to move forward once again. Including either the childless worker credit or meaningful food stamp increases through the Leland Act, but not both, will still cause 50 percent of poor households to be taxed further into poverty. Thus I ask the inclusion of both the childless worker credit and the Leland Act so that we can make progress first with those who are doing the most they can to help themselves, but have received almost no reward for it, childless working poor people, and secondly innocent children who deserve at the very least enough to eat.

□ 1810

I want to thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for the opportunity to be here and join with her.

Mrs. CLAYTON. I thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia for bringing up the childless worker, because she is absolutely right, if the taxes we know are going to be enacted—that is, those that are being discussed—they would disproportionately affect the childless worker because 15 percent of those taxes will impact them directly. And that is not all that will impact them. You will have a gas tax, you will have other taxes involved in that. These are people who are trying to make it. In fact, they want to become perhaps with children. You should want to raise them so they are not dependent, so that they will be independent when they do have children.

So I think the gentlewoman is so right to bring that up because it is so

easy to forget that. They do not have the all-American scene. So you put them out of the picture. But we must keep them in focus. It is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE] has joined us, and I yield to her at this time.

Ms. FURSE. I thank the gentlewoman for having this special order.

It is such a pleasure to join my colleague, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] and thank her for putting together these special orders. She serves her district so well, but she also serves our freshman class as our class president. It is a great honor to be part of that class.

We are here today on the brink of a historic agreement. Next week we will be voting on a comprehensive 5-year deficit reduction plan. Reducing the deficit, really reducing the deficit really means making hard choices. You cannot reduce the deficit unless you are prepared to make those hard choices. That is what all the discussion around the country is about, what are the hard choices we are going to make?

I am here tonight to put in my 2 cents for our choices and the direction, the real direction that I think this Nation must take, because lost in the din of the discussion of tax provisions, deficit goals has been, I think, the real goals of this administration, and in that din we have lost that. Most of my colleagues here in the House, particularly those of us, I think, who came here this year, we are refocusing our attention this year on the children of America, because children are without a constituency. They do not have a vote, but to me the children of my district are the most important constituency that I have.

We ask, I think, too often in this country, we ask too much of our families. Too often they are working two jobs, they do not have enough education, they have no job security, and in that suffering of those families the ones who suffer the most is the children.

So I think it is up to us in this House to try to do our bit to always think how can we relieve the suffering of the children? We can do that by supporting their families.

I would like to quote to you from a Member of this House who will be doing a very important job tonight and all the way through, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, who said:

> Those of us in Government, those who have the privilege of exercising power, should also feel a special obligation to those powerless in our society. We can't expect effective lobbying from a 15-year-old pregnant girl who lives in a 1-parent home. She cannot take the time nor have the energy to call me, the Member. So I have to be outgoing and ready to think of her interests. They deserve political representation even if they do not have the strength to fight for it. Their humanity entitles them to a decent standard of living.

Now, as you know, I was not born in this country, but I am very interested that every day in this country we talk genuinely about our concerns for the children. But what I think we have to ask ourselves every day is what are we doing for those children, really doing for them? Soon, as a Member of this House, I am going to be given that privilege to vote for a budget that I hope will include funding for the Mickey Leland Hunger Program, will include money for childhood immunization. What a saving. If we immunize our children today, we will not have the huge costs of their health care later.

Then, also I hope we will fund the family preservation and support provisions.

And when we say, and we do say it, "Our children are our future," I ask what kind of a future are we preparing them for? What are we doing for their present that will make them the kind of citizens that we want them to be in the future? Because if we do not invest that belief in our children now, invest in housing, health care, protecting them, providing food, if we do not do all of that, how will they be invested in us as a society, how will they protect this great democracy if they do not feel that we were there to protect them when they were so vulnerable?

So, I want to remind Members who serve in this great body of one thing: That it costs more to keep a person in prison for 1 year than it does to send that same person to Harvard for 1 year. Let us prioritize where we put our money. So, as every day in this institution we are called upon to represent our districts, I have to thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for having this great privilege today, standing here representing the interests and the lives of the children in my district. I hope we will get a budget that would represent and support those children, not just for today but for their future.

Mrs. CLAYTON. I thank the gentlewoman for her comments and kind words. I also thank her for caring about children and their future.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois. [Mr. RUSH] has joined us. We are delighted to have the gentleman join us and to care about children. It is a delight to see men also care about children as well as families.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina, who has done a remarkable, outstanding job of again organizing something that benefits the American people so well.

The gentlewoman has organized meetings and discussions with the President and other types of events. But I think tonight during this series of events, the gentlewoman has outdone herself.

Mrs. CLAYTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RUSH. I thank the gentlewoman. It is quite extraordinary.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for this opportunity to add my voice to those of my colleagues in the House who support the children and family initiatives currently being debated in the conference committee.

I cannot think of a single thing more important to the lives of children and families than this Nation's ability to support the willingness of parents and single heads of households to work.

Contrary to popular Republican misinformation, most Americans, especially poor and low-income Americans, want to work.

The problem is we are currently experiencing a structural overhauling of the American economy from a manufacturing base to a service base. As a result, millions of people are unable to access certain types of jobs. And, they frequently are unable to get retrained to work in new and emerging industries.

As I stand here today, I do so in the company of a majority of the American people. According to the latest public opinion poll, 43 percent of all Americans believe that President Clinton's economic plan must be adopted by this Congress. They are calling on us to act.

When we vote to approve this plan, a major increase in the level of funding for the earned income tax credit will be included.

The more than $18 billion in anticipated new funding for the tax credit means that millions of low-income and working class families will be able to receive lump sum cash payments. These payments will help to offset annual child care expenses.

The higher funding will now make it possible to increase the maximum amount that can be returned to families. This amounts, annually, to $3,371 per family.

The President's proposal represents a critical first step on perhaps his most important campaign promise. In his words, "If you work 40 hours a week and you've got a child in the house, you will no longer be in poverty."

The President's tax credit proposal helps us begin to meet this objective. I believe that is a vision everyone can support. The time has come for America to redefine how it views low-income Americans. Wealthy Americans and those who pay the taxes must stop assuming that poor people are lazy and do not want to work.

Likewise, people who find themselves on welfare must understand that nothing in life is free. All of us must accept the reality that the proper role of government is to offer a helping hand to its citizens when they are down on their luck. A temporary helping hand—not a long-term way of life.

The earned income tax credit provides an added incentive for those who are trying to work their way out of

poverty. It offers low-income Americans a helping hand, not a handout.

As today's poll results demonstrate, most Americans are tired of Republican policies that hinder rather than help the American spirit.

The earned income tax credit gives struggling Americans an incentive versus a disincentive to work.

Voting for the earned income tax credit, and the entire Clinton economic package, represents a long overdue first step in the process of putting America's economic engine back on track.

And when we do that, everyone wins.

□ 1820

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from the State of Illinois for that strong voice for children of America.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER] has come in. I just want to advise the gentleman, we may have some revision of time. We may have less time than we originally thought, but I thank the gentleman for being here. We will try to get all the three persons still remaining.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER].

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I want first of all to commend the gentlewoman from North Carolina for her leadership in support of children. I am very pleased to be able to join this distinguished group of both new and senior members.

Mrs. CLAYTON. The gentleman honors us by joining us, and I thank the gentleman for coming.

Mr. OLVER. Not very senior, in joining in the support for children.

We are in a time of crunch as we consider the deficit reduction and budget reconciliation package. Above all, it is time to end the gridlock that has allowed a quadrupling of debt, while the fiscal health of the country weakened over a period of quite a number of years.

While almost everyone has focused on some key provisions of that deficit reduction package, the need for at least $500 billion of reduction, the balance in that plan between cuts in government and taxes, those are important as well, and even focused on the tax fairness issues, the idea that 80 percent of that balanced amount of taxes would be paid by people who have incomes higher than $115,000 a year in our society, and at the other end of the scale the balance of providing tax fairness, that at the other end of the scale there would be a broad expansion of the earned income tax credit which allows or should allow people who are working full time and who have children, but their wages are so low they are still living in poverty and their children are growing up in poverty will have a tax cut, a significant tax cut to help to balance what are very difficult economics for them.

All of those are important features, but I want to stress several modest but important provisions in the House version of the legislation which I hope will be included in the final plan that would help our children who desperately need our help.

Statistics show there has been a dramatic rise in poverty in children in this country. In 1979, 10 million were living in poverty. By 1991, it was over 14 million.

More than 21 percent of the population under the age of 6 is growing up in poverty. That represents one in five children.

We have seen the Government safety nets fail during that period of time.

In 1979, roughly one out of five who would otherwise be in poverty were lifted out of poverty by Government assistance.

In 1991, only one out of eight were so helped out of poverty.

There has been a recurrence of childhood diseases in cases like rubella and measles, a 500-percent increase just in the last decade alone.

There has been a rise in childhood abuse and neglect. There were 2.9 million children reported abused and neglected in 1992. That is an average of 8,000 children a day, and more than three times the number of cases reported in 1980, only a little bit more than a decade earlier.

There are several provisions in this Reconciliation bill in the House version that form some help in children's initiatives. There is the Mickey Leland Childhood Hunger Relief Act, the Childhood Immunization Program, the Family Support and Preservation Program, and the earned income tax credit expansion that I have mentioned.

I just want in finishing here quickly in our short time to relate for the people of Massachusetts what those provisions mean for my State and our State.

In childhood immunizations, 100,000 additional children would be immunized if the House versions are adopted.

On the preservation issue, $20 million additional would be provided over a 5-year period to help strengthen families, because we know that children in broken families are far more likely to be growing up in poverty and leading to other kinds of social ills.

On the Mickey Leland Childhood Hunger Relief Act, almost 500,000 people would see their food stamp allocation expanded. They would have more to buy food to avoid hunger which is so much a problem for children.

On the Earned Income Tax Credit it helps low-income families, working families, working full-time to dig out of poverty, the poverty that plagues their families and the children growing up in those families, we would see $20 million more each year in the hands of those families that would help them with the desperate needs that they have in helping those families dig out of poverty.

□ 1830

So, those are important features that I hope very much will be in the bill when it comes out, and I want to thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] very much for taking the leadership that she has in proving us the time for this special order.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER] for speaking about those four critical programs, and they all should be in the Reconciliation Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. HILLIARD). The Chair advises the gentlewoman from North Carolina that she has 5 minutes remaining.

Mrs. CLAYTON. With that, Mr. Speaker, I have two more speakers, and I think they will recognize that the time is limited and will make their statements very brief. We appreciate their coming, and the gentleman who is from Michigan, we are delighted that he cares about children and is willing to speak.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] for organizing this special order and for reminding us of the truth, the truth we seldom hear in the debate on President Clinton's deficit reduction package. The Clinton deficit reduction package accomplishes something for our children that no other reconciliation package could do. It reduces the Federal deficit by $500 billion. President Clinton is attacking the Federal deficit problem head-on instead of passing it on to our children and our grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, so much of the public debate about this program has centered around spending cuts and revenue increases. That is good. It should center around these crucial issues, but there has not been enough attention paid to the investments this budget makes in our Nation's families and children.

Our children are our future, and this budget invests in our future.

This plan especially helps families and children in rural regions of the country like my district in northern Michigan where the average income for a worker is low, where access to quality health care is difficult to achieve, and where preventive medicine, which is so important to maintain a healthy standard of living for children, is sparse.

According to the Detroit Free Press, in Michigan's Upper Peninsula we see more doctors leaving town than staying to set up shop. Rural doctors typically receive a third to half as much money for their services as doctors in urban and suburban regions of the country.

In Delta County, where I grew up, there is only one pediatrician for the county's 11,200 residents aged 19 and under, and that doctor is leaving to take a post in the University of Illinois.

Children in rural America need preventive health care and the President's package invests in preventive care for our children.

The President's budget calls for a 96 percent increase in the funding received by the Centers for Disease Control for childhood immunizations.

According to the Detroit Free Press, in my district many more children live in greater poverty than the rest of the State of Michigan.

The earned income tax credit is nearly doubled in the President's budget. This plan ensures that no American family with a full-time worker will live below the poverty line.

I believe that the earned income tax credit is the central piece of the Clinton budget that is good for rural families. Many people in rural America live in poverty, but the Clinton budget ensures that no family with a working member will live below the poverty line, and there are other programs. There is the Head Start Program, there is the WIC Program, the Women, Infant, and Children Program, that helps our children grow up healthy, not hungry. There is the Mickey Leland Program that we heard about tonight.

But the sad point is in all the political rhetoric about the budget the truth has been lost. We have lost the truth. Politics has taken over. Politics has forgotten our children. Our families have been forgotten.

So, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] for reminding us why we are here and why we are in Congress. I thank her for reminding us of our children and of our families. Let this Congress pass a reconciliation package that is honest, with dignity for all Americans, for our families and especially for our children.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK].

The gentleman from the State of California [Mr. BECERRA] will be our last participant in this discussion about children and families. I thank him for joining us.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] first of all for her tireless efforts on behalf of children and, of course, for her taking the time to sponsor this special order.

Mr. Speaker, our words are most timely at this stage, and they must be registered.

I also thank our colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], who has given us generously a few extra minutes to go on with this special order.

Not only as a Member of Congress, Mr. Speaker, but as a new father, I wish to address these issues that affect our children. I feel very privileged today to be here with my colleagues to speak on behalf of our Nation's future, and that is, of course, our children. We must send a clear message, I believe, to the conference committee for budget reconciliation that it must preserve the budget provisions that protect our Nation's children and offer them a window of hope. The message is simple, and it must register. We must hold children harmless.

How do we do that? How do we hold children harmless? Well, we have got several programs that people have talked about today, such as the childhood immunization initiative, and we have to focus on some of the facts that have been presented to us earlier.

For example, by the age of 2, Mr. Speaker, a child needs 15 immunization shots. Yet today only 55 percent of our 2-year-olds are fully immunized against vaccine-preventable diseases. The House budget reconciliation bill would provide vaccines to 11.1 million children, almost 5 million of whom currently have no health insurance for immunizations. The Senate version of the budget, on the other hand, offers nothing to these uninsured, unimmunized children. Yet we know from research that for every dollar invested in child immunization that we save 4 or more dollars in averted health-care costs.

Another program is the family preservation and support program. In 1992, Mr. Speaker, 2.9 million children were reported abused or neglected, an average of about 8,000 per day. Family preservation and support focuses on prevention of child abuse and neglect and improves our foster care, adoption, and our welfare systems at the same time. The House bill provides $1.5 billion for this initiative. The Senate offers no such provision.

We have the Mickey Leland Hunger Program, and, as we have heard, over 11 million children are at risk of going hungry in the United States already. The Mickey Leland Hunger Program increase food assistance to the poor and encourages child support from absent parents, mostly fathers. The Senate version offers no funds to combat childhood hunger. The House reconciliation bill would provide $7.3 billion.

And of course we have the earned income tax credit. With so many people struggling in today's economy, Mr. Speaker, we must do whatever we can to provide them with some assistance to lift themselves, if possible, out of poverty. The House bill provides $28.3 billion for the earned income tax credit for the working poor. The Senate, $18 billion. We are talking about people, in the case of a family of two, a mother and a child, $9,441. It is nothing to get rich on.

Mr. Speaker, it would be tragic if these provisions were denied to our families and their children. Again I strongly urge my colleagues on the conference committee to remember the children, these children whom we brought into the world and to whom we are responsible. They do not deserve to live in poverty, go hungry, be abused or be denied immunization when we can offer them an alternative. We must support the children's provisions in the reconciliation bill, and we must, most of all, hold children harmless in this budget debate.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] for her time.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA] as a young father for speaking to the point.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] on the other side of the aisle for giving us this extra few minutes to allow us to finish this discussion. I say to the gentleman, "Thank you. It's very kind of you."

Mr. Speaker, finally I want to urge my colleagues to join me in standing up for America's children and families by keeping those initiatives we heard discussed here today fully intact and fully funded, fully committed to those children and families who cannot speak for themselves. We ask our conferees to be reminded that we are indeed here to make a difference, to make a differences for those who cannot speak for themselves.

Mr. FILNER. Last December, I was proud to run for office with a Presidential candidate whose slogan was "Putting People First."

Mr. Chairman, today I am joining my colleagues to call for a budget that keeps people first—keeping people first by providing for our Nation's families.

I am urging our budget conferences to hold fast to the House provisions in the reconciliation bill and to keep people first by enacting the following priorities.

Childhood immunization. Only 55 percent of our 2-year-olds are fully immunized against vaccine preventable diseases. Recently, a measles epidemic affected over 55,000 victims between 1989 and 1991. The House immunization plan would serve 11.1 million children nationwide—651,000 more in my home State of California than are currently receiving immunizations.

Childhood hunger. Over 11 million children in this country under the age of 12 are at risk of hunger. This is a national disgrace. The House bill provides an increase of $7.3 billion for the Mickey Leland Hunger Program—serving almost 3 million people in California alone.

KEEPING CHILDREN FIRST

Earned income tax credit. If a parent in a family of four works full-time, year-round, that family should not have to live in poverty. Families in my own State of California will receive approximately $1 billion in earned income tax credit in the legislation passed by the House.

Family preservation and support. We must help States develop programs for families in crisis, to keep children safe, to prevent child abuse and neglect, and to keep families together. In the House bill, California's programs will get almost $7 million for families and children.

KEEPING FAMILIES FIRST

We are the voice of our families, speaking out today. We are the voice of our children, speaking out today. We must remember that we have been sent here to make changes, to reorder our priorities, to ensure that we are keeping people first.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the children and family initiatives included in the House budget reconciliation bill and to urge the budget conferees to include these provisions in the conference report.

Among the children and family priorities in the reconciliation bill are provisions for family preservation and support, for an earned income tax credit, for universal childhood immunizations and for childhood hunger relief. These provisions represent a comprehensive set of reforms necessary to preserve and strengthen families in need of assistance.

Forty-two percent of American families with children are living on incomes under $30,000. In my district alone, Mr. Speaker, 19,750 children are living in poverty and many more children and their families are struggling to survive just over the poverty line. These figures are intolerable. We cannot stand idly by as thousands of our children—our future—live in destitution, hungry, sick, abused, and neglected.

The children's programs in the House reconciliation bill will provide food assistance to children whose families cannot afford enough food. No child should go to bed hungry. The programs will also provide uninsured and Medicaid-eligible children with needed immunizations. No child should be denied health care.

The initiatives will encourage parents to choose work over welfare, supplementing the incomes of those whose working wages are lower than welfare payments. They will also help to keep families together by fighting the alarmingly high incidence of child abuse and neglect through early intervention, education and support.

These provisions are good for children and families of the United States. They are also fiscally forward-looking, costing us much less in the short run and in the long run than if we were to not implement them. Clearly, offering subsidies to the working poor costs less than paying them welfare. Immunizing and properly feeding children costs less than healing them once they are sick. Protecting children from neglect and abuse while working to keep families together costs less than aiding victims with emotional and developmental problems and providing family alternatives like foster care.

Though the House reconciliation bill includes funding for all these necessary programs, the Senate version of reconciliation falls short on each of them. We know that our conferees must emphasize the importance of these provisions as they work out the details of the budget conference report.

Americans decided last November that it was time to put people first. Our budget should be responsive to the needs of people. The budget should not be about tax breaks for the wealthy, about corporate writeoffs, about loopholes—it should be about people.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot emphasize enough that these initiatives are the most important part of our entire budget. Why? Because children are the most important part of our country. Children are our future, they are our hope. The wisest investment we can make is in our children and we cannot afford to scrimp when it comes to this investment.

Mr. Speaker, I implore my colleagues on the budget conference committee to fight for the children and family initiatives—initiatives that this body has already voted for and passed—and make them their top priority. Congress cannot afford to compromise on the needs of our Nation's most destitute children.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

JOBS FOR U.S. WORKERS—IMPLEMENT NAFTA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, this evening I want to talk, as we have been talking before, about the North American Free-Trade Agreement. I am joined this evening by my colleague from California [Mr. DREIER].

I heard earlier in the discussion about women and children and problems that we have, and I think many of us can relate to that. What we heard underscored the issue of jobs, and jobs is really what we are talking about here with the North American Free-Trade Agreement.

It is not, as one of the speakers on the other side talked about in the earlier special order, that I believe that Republicans, or those from other parts of the country, or those who may not represent heavily minority districts, do not care about jobs. We care very much about jobs. It is indeed jobs that is the driving force of the economy.

For whatever reason we come to this Congress, for whatever group we represent, jobs are important. Jobs are important to us. Jobs are what makes it possible for the people we represent to carry on with the lives that they have, to provide for the education of their families, to have a roof and a shelter over their head, to clothe and feed them. Jobs are important for all Americans. And that is why I stand today as such a strong supporter of the North American Free-Trade Agreement, because the North American Free-Trade Agreement is about creating jobs.

Let me just begin by pointing out the number of jobs that have been created in this country with the increased exports that we have had to Mexico over the last several years.

As a result of the changes that have taken place in Mexico, as they have joined the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs, as they have reduced their tariffs, as they have opened up their economy to the private sector and to more market-oriented forces, and as their economy has grown and they have found it possible to buy more goods in this country, we have increased our exports, that is, the dollar sales of goods and services to Mexico, by a whopping 227 percent since 1986. That is the time that Mexico joined the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs.

That increase, from $16 billion in 1987, and actually about $13 billion in 1986, to more than $43 billion last year, represents not only an increase in a percentage figure of 227 percent, but, more importantly, 700,000 jobs, jobs for working men and women in America, jobs for men and women who have families and children, jobs in the inner cities, jobs in the manufacturing heartland of America, jobs in the agricultural sector producing the corn and soybeans and grain that is being absorbed in such increasing amounts in Mexico. Jobs in cities like Houston, where engineering firms are adding new people in order to provide the services that are needed in Mexico. These are the jobs that make America go.

Exports have provided 70 percent—let me underscore that figure—70 percent of the growth in this country. Since 1985, 70 percent of our growth has come from our growth of exports. We can ill afford to turn our back on any country that offers us the opportunity to sell more goods and services to them, and certainly we can ill afford to turn our backs on Mexico, a country that is a growing market, a country that has a growing economy, a country with a growing middle class, a country with growing wealth, and an increasing demand and desire for American goods.

□ 1850

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], who I notice has put up a map there which illustrates in very concrete terms how, on a State-by-State basis, what I have been talking about and what he and I have been talking about and he so eloquently has talked about through these last several months about NAFTA and shows how jobs have been created in each State.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I congratulate him for taking out this special order and for diligently remaining on the front line to try and implement what I happen to believe is the single most important job creation proposal that we will face here in the U.S. Congress.

Many of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle share our concern about job creation. We happen to know, based on every shred of empirical evidence that we have, that implementation of a North American Free-Trade

Agreement is clearly going to create jobs right here in the United States.

One of the things that I think is important for us to realize in our goal of job creation, we, interestingly enough, are joined with President Clinton, Labor Secretary Robert Reich, and other leaders in the Clinton administration in supporting the North American Free-Trade Agreement.

I think something that we should point to is that as we look at the many very partisan arguments that take place in this body, clearly implementation of NAFTA is one of the very few bipartisan areas of agreement.

There are many very thoughtful, hardworking Democrats who want to join with Republicans in implementing NAFTA. Why? Because as my friend from Tucson has said so well, it will create jobs here in the United States.

We, frankly, want to see jobs created not only here in the United States but in Mexico. And the confusion surrounding the whole debate on NAFTA is, if you want to create jobs and maintain them here in the United States, you have got to pull them from Mexico. And this argument that we constantly hear is that trade and NAFTA itself is something other than a zero-sum gain and that there are, in fact, winners and losers.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has made a very good point. The media is making much these days and, in fact, the President of the United States has been going around the country talking about gridlock. But this is an example of where none of us are interested in gridlock. We are interested in making sure there is not gridlock. We are interested in being sure that there is bipartisan support for this.

You and I and a lot of other Republicans and a lot of other Democrats have been on the forefront of this issue.

President Bush began the negotiation for this; President Clinton has endorsed it and said that he supports it and that he will send it up without altering the agreement itself.

I think that Republicans and Democrats can endorse it as a job creation program. So for those out there talking about gridlock, I would say, wait, look at the issue. What we are talking about here, where there is clear, common economic interest for the country, such as the North American Free-Trade Agreement, there is no gridlock here in Congress. There is only the common spirit of working together to solve this problem.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, let us get right to this issue of job creation, job creation specifically here in the United States, because this is what is of great concern. This is the red herring that has been thrown out there that somehow implementation of NAFTA is going to encourage the flow of business from the United States to Mexico.

One of the things that my friend has not said this evening but he has said on many occasions in the past is that as we have looked at the economic growth which has taken place in Mexico over the past 7 years, it has come about for really a few very basic reasons.

At the very end of the last administration in Mexico, Miguel de la Madrid, who was President of the country, began very gradually moving in the direction of the rest of the world. The rest of the world moved toward free markets, elimination of barriers, lower levels of taxation, and a lower level of regulation.

Mr. KOLBE. As the gentleman knows, it was President de la Madrid who brought Mexico into the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs, GATT, and that really has been the impetus for Mexico having to make so many other changes in its economy that has now brought it to the state we are talking about today, the free-trade agreement.

Mr. DREIER. Absolutely. And then the transition to the Presidency of President Carlos Salinas de Gortari has been one which has been so overwhelming and bold. It has brought about clearly the most dramatic positive changes in Mexico's recent history. I think that as we look at the arguments that have so often been made by our colleagues who are opponents to NAFTA that somehow we see this great level of corruption in Mexico, we do not stand here as apologists of the present government. We stand here recognizing that positive changes have taken place.

What has been the byproduct of that? We have seen privatization of the banking industry, the telephone industry, a wide range of other industries in Mexico. And as the economy is improved, and we have witnessed just last year an economic growth rate in Mexico which was clearly twice the economic growth rate right here in the United States.

So from 1987 to 1992, what has that brought about? It has brought about an unprecedented level of exports from the United States to an economically improved Mexico.

Mr. KOLBE. Here is a fact. The gentleman is quite correct about the rapid growth of the economy in Mexico. Here is a fact that I think a lot of people do not understand. Mexicans have a very high propensity for buying their goods that they buy outside of Mexico in the United States. In fact, few other countries spend 70 cents of every dollar that is spent overseas in one country. But Mexico does. It is in the United States, and it has resulted in the growth of exports.

I think the gentleman from California may want to share just a few of the data there, particularly in light of the fact that we hear so often on this floor from opponents of NAFTA who come from the heartland of America who say that it is going to be bad for the industrial Midwest. That just simply is not borne out by these statistics here.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask that we focus at this moment on this map which shows State export growth to Mexico of goods manufactured in the United States from 1987 to 1992. And remember, it was in 1987 that we began seeing these moves toward privatization.

There are 11 States, the red States here that have seen over 300-percent growth in their level of exports between 1987 and 1992: the States of Washington, Oregon, Nevada, Illinois, Kentucky, Tennessee, North Carolina, Georgia, Pennsylvania, Vermont, Maine, and Maryland. I guess that is 12 States that have seen this kind of growth, over 300 percent, in the level of exports from their States to Mexico.

And then if one looks at the yellow States here, Montana, Idaho, New Mexico, Iowa, Wisconsin, Alabama, Florida, South Carolina, Virginia, the District of Columbia, and New Hampshire, we have seen between 200- and 300-percent growth between 1987 and 1992 in the level of exports of goods manufactured in those States to Mexico.

Mr. KOLBE. So it goes right down the line. I think you will find that there are only two States, I believe it is Utah and North Dakota that have actually had a drop in exports. So two relatively small States. And actually, if you included 1992 figures in there, that would not be true of those two States.

My State of Arizona, which is in the blue, showing around 100-percent increase, would be very different if 1992 figures were included.

The gentleman from California may be interested to know that Arizona last year experienced 92-percent increase in one year's time from $930 million to $1.9 billion of exports to Mexico. That places us now fourth in the Nation in total dollars being exported to one country and a dramatic increase.

No other State even comes remotely close to a 92-percent growth rate in one single year. So there are very dramatic increases that are taking place here.

What I would like to do, after I yield to the gentleman, is go through some of the myths that we have about this and perhaps dispel some concerns that people have.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I think it is important for us to realize that my friend from Tucson, AZ, happens to represent the border with Mexico. I represent Los Angeles, CA, not quite the border. It is a couple hundred miles or 150 miles or so north of the border, the Los Angeles Basin. And so one would conclude that we happen to be, being on the border, interested in just taking advantage of the opportunity to

export there. And one should conclude that our States would be at the top. But I think it is interesting to note that it is other States, like the opposite end of the country, Maine, which has had a growth rate significantly higher, between 1987 and 1992, than ours.

Now, our States do export in great amounts to Mexico, but there are States which also are on here that are often mentioned by our colleagues as States that are great losers under the present situation and, they argue, would be greater losers under NAFTA.

□ 1900

If one looks at the State of Michigan, Michigan has been discussed on a regular basis here, and there are many companies in Michigan which today are exporting goods to Mexico. Their increase in Michigan has been up to 100 percent between the period of 1987 to 1992.

Ohio has had the exact same percentage growth rate between 1987 and 1992 as my friend's State of Arizona and my State of California, so I think that we should realize that while we often hear this argument made here on the floor that if you drive through Pennsylvania and Ohio and Michigan, what one will see is a situation where businesses have closed down, now, those businesses have closed down and there is no NAFTA. I like to argue that it is going to be implementation of NAFTA which will help us respond to that.

Pennsylvania's growth, for example, is in the very top level, being a State in red here with over 300-percent growth in exports between 1987 and 1992.

Mr. KOLBE. The gentleman's figures are very helpful to us, and I think this map illustrates as clearly to the American people and to the Members of Congress as we could possibly point out to them, how the trade is actually enhanced and increased by having additional trade with Mexico.

We should be keeping in mind that for every $1 billion of increase in exports to Mexico, and remember, the figure has gone from $16 billion in 1987 to $43 billion a year ago, that is a tremendous increase.

Mr. DREIER. Will my friend repeat that figure again?

Mr. KOLBE. The increase is from $16 billion in 1987 to $43 billion.

Mr. DREIER. $16 billion in goods manufactured in 1986?

Mr. KOLBE. That is right. That is a $27 billion increase, increase in actual exports, sales of goods to Mexico. For every $1 billion of exports, economists on all sides seem to agree on this figure, about 20,000 jobs are created.

If my math is correct, you multiply 20,000 times the $27 billion increase, and we are talking about 540,000 jobs that have been added since 1987 in this country as a result of the trade with Mexico.

Mr. DREIER. If my friend would yield briefly, I think something else we ought to point out is that as we have moved from that $16-billion level of exports in 1986 to $43 billion, which has taken us from a trade deficit in 1986 of around $4 billion to a trade surplus of nearly $6 billion last year, we have to realize that there are still punitive tariffs which penalize the United States.

In fact, the average tariff on United States-manufactured goods going to Mexico today is 10 percent, whereas the average tariff on Mexican goods coming into the United States is only 4 percent, meaning there is a 2½-times differential, which actually makes it more difficult for United States manufacturers to export to Mexico today.

In spite of that, we have seen this very dramatic increase in our level of exports to Mexico in the latter part of the 1980's.

Mr. KOLBE. And that tariff rate that Mexico has is almost five times as high as the tariff rate that Japan applies to products coming from the United States. We have been engaging in a lot of talk with Japan, some of it not so pleasant, and a lot of it hard efforts to try to get the Japanese companies and Government to increase their purchases of American goods and services. Think of what would happen with Mexico if they were to reduce their average tariff to 2 percent, or under NAFTA, to zero. Imagine the increase in the amount of sales that we have to Mexico.

Caterpillar has estimated that there are 1,300 people that work in Decatur and Peoria, IL, whose jobs depend solely on the sales of Caterpillar equipment to Mexico. Last year, Mr. Speaker, $360 million of Caterpillar equipment was sold to Mexico. Those jobs, not to mention all the others that work in related services in Decatur and Peoria, would be lost if we did not have access to that Mexican market. Think how much more we could sell if their tariffs came down to zero.

There was a wonderful picture that I saw not too long ago of a ceremony that took place in Erie, PA, where General Electric rolled out the first diesel engine for the Mexican railroad system. They were going to have a several-hundred-million-dollar contract over the next several years of building diesel engines for the Mexican railroad. The people in Erie, PA, in that General Electric plant, they understood exactly where their jobs were coming from, because they were all there at this ceremony, waving United States and Mexican flags, saying, "Thank God for the business we are doing with Mexico that allows us to have a job here in Erie, Pennsylvania."

Those people who say that the United States cannot compete with the Mexican wages simply are not stating the facts. We can compete. We are competing. We do compete every single day. That is one of the myths I think that we need to dispel.

There is another myth, and maybe my colleague might want to comment on that. We have kind of talked about the larger myth about jobs, but then there is kind of a subset of that, where it is said, "Well, yes, the United States will gain jobs in the long run, but we are going to have severe job loss in the short run."

The facts and the studies simply do not bear that out. Perhaps the gentleman would like to comment on that.

Mr. DREIER. If my friend would yield briefly on that, for starters, implementation of NAFTA is going to help to ensure that we maintain the 700,000 jobs that are in existence today, based on exports that are taking place to Mexico. That includes that growth that we have seen during the latter part of the 1980's and the early 1990's, and clearly, based on every economic study that I have seen to date on this issue that relates to job creation under NAFTA by 1995, and here we are midway through 1993. If we can implement NAFTA by the end of this calendar year, we will create an additional 200,000 jobs here in the United States.

I hear many of my friends argue that what we should do is change the timing of NAFTA. If we really want to work at creating U.S. jobs now, we should as quickly as possible move toward implementation of NAFTA. Any short-run job loss in import-sensitive industries will be minimized by extended phaseout periods for United States restrictions on Mexican goods.

Mr. KOLBE. I think that this is a very important point the gentleman has just raised. NAFTA does not instantaneously go into effect with regard to phasing out the tariffs on every product. Both sides recognized there were certain products that were particularly sensitive, certain industries that were sensitive, so, for example, with fruits and vegetables that are of particular concern in the gentleman's State of California, the Central Valley, and in the Rio Grande Valley of Texas and in central Florida with citrus and with tomatoes, there are particularly long provisions, in fact, as long as 15 years, for the phaseout of some of those tariffs.

We do have an opportunity to protect ourselves against that. At the same time we are getting access to the market down there in areas where there is not that kind of protection that is needed.

Mr. DREIER. One of the things that I think needs to be pointed out, too, is that job gains have already begun based on the prospect of implementation of NAFTA. We have discussed it on several occasions. We most recently saw this amazing coalition that was put together, the United Auto Workers joined with General Motors, and they made a decision to move directly from

Mexico a Chevrolet Cavalier manufacturing operation back to Lansing, MI. Based on the projections on that, it should create a thousand jobs in Lansing, MI, so this was a very positive sign that came based on the fact that we have seen a five times greater level of productivity of American workers juxtaposed to those workers in Mexico.

Mr. GRANDY. Mr. Speaker, would my friend yield to me on that point?

Mr. KOLBE. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman. We are delighted to be joined by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GRANDY] who has been a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, one of the outstanding leaders on that committee on trade issues, as well as health care and a variety of other issues. His knowledge and understanding of these issues I think adds a great deal to the debate in this House. I am very pleased that the gentleman is here this afternoon.

Mr. GRANDY. I appreciate those kind compliments from the gentleman. Let us be honest. It is 7 o'clock. We are all dressed up and we have nowhere to go, so we come to the floor and talk about NAFTA, and I join the gentlemen enthusiastically.

Mr. DREIER. Speak for yourself.

Mr. GRANDY. I want to put this in some context. As the debate rages, there are obviously other events that are going on. Two things have happened most recently. The President has gone to Japan and at least begun some kind of positive negotiations to get them to open up their markets. It just so happens that yesterday I was meeting with a member of the business community who happens to represent one of the larger grain producers, and he informed me that because of the potential of NAFTA, this particular company, which produces feeds for animals and has a company in Mexico, has found that the Mexicans, because they are so eagerly anticipating this trade agreement, have begun to reduce their rather prohibitive licensing agreements, which would require American companies making feed in Mexico to buy Mexican grain. Something they would rather not do because the quality is, quite honestly, not as good. They are now, under NAFTA, able to buy American grain to make the feed in Mexico.

□ 1910

Now that is exactly what we want the Mexicans to do. Am I not right on this? I mean, we have been waiting for them to open up their markets, source more of our inventory to put into their products.

The gentleman and I were in Tokyo last year and met with the Japanese parliamentarians, and as I recall, they were very concerned about these North American content requirements under NAFTA, because it is going to require these products to source 65 percent North American components, is that not true?

Mr. KOLBE. It is 65 percent in the automobile industry, and not as much or as high in some of the others. But, still, it is well over 50 percent in every industry.

Mr. GRANDY. Yes, but the auto industry is exactly the sticking point we have with Japan, and that is why I wanted to make that point. What we are begging, and hoping, and cajoling, and threatening Japan with, and hoping that they will do is exactly what Mexico is doing voluntarily. They are right next door, and are much more capable of sourcing inventory for products that are finished in Mexico than Japan will ever be.

Mr. KOLBE. I think, if I might interject for just a minute, the gentleman is absolutely right and his point is well taken. I have a little story that I know some of my colleagues have heard before, but it illustrates this point exactly.

Not long ago I was in Hermosillo, which is the capital of Sonora, the state directly south of us in Arizona, and I visited a plant that was being built there, about 170 square foot plant being built for a Mexican subsidiary of a Hong Kong toy manufacturing company. Now what they are going to do at this point in that plant is to manufacture all the Barbie Dolls in the world. They currently manufacture them in the People's Republic of China. But they are going to move the production to Hermosillos. Currently they buy all of their plastic, which is 85 percent of the value of the Barbie Doll, in South Korea and Japan, and they are going to move it to Hermosillos because the tariffs have come down from an average of 50 to 10 percent, and with the prospect of zero, and now they are going to buy all of that plastic in the United States. So literally scores, probably hundreds of jobs in the United States will be created just supporting, making the plastic, hundreds of millions of dollars of plastic that will go each year into making Barbie Dolls in Mexico, jobs that used to be in Japan and South Korea and China, which will now be brought back to Mexico and the United States. It is a classic example of what is happening and why so many of the Asian rim countries are concerned indeed.

Mr. GRANDY. Is the gentleman directing that comment on the Barbie Dolls at me as a consumer of Barbie Dolls? Because, that is true. I have a 4-year-old daughter, and Barbie Dolls make up a very significant part of her particular toy inventory, which in our home takes up two rooms.

Mr. DREIER. My friend is quite a job creator in both the United States and in Mexico.

Mr. GRANDY. Hey, is this a great country or what? All I am saying is these stories are going to proliferate as NAFTA begins to fix itself into the America economy.

Let me just add one more point about job creation. And I am sure you gentleman have discussed this thoroughly. There have been criticisms and I think shibboleths frankly about environmental concerns directed against the Mexican Government. Right now the Mexican Government is obligated and is trying to implement more quickly than required by statute the auto emissions standard in Mexico City, arguably one of the most polluted places on Earth. The contract for those emission monitoring standards and cleanup is going to a company in Connecticut, an environmental-produced job, creating jobs in the United States.

Mr. DREIER. If my friend will yield on that point, I think that is something that is important for us to realize, that there are a lot of people who criticize the Clean Air Act here in the United States, and I argued supporting that as I am a representative from the Los Angeles Basin, one of the most polluted areas in the entire country. And if anyone happened to see Dan Rather's 48 Hours last night in which he talked about the traffic congestion and the problems which are not as bad as Mexico City, but still very, very serious, it is obvious that implementation of the Clean Air Act is going to enhance the opportunity for businesses not only in Connecticut, but in other parts of the United States which are moving into the area of improving air quality, and will have opportunities to sell in Mexico, other parts of Latin America and other emerging democracies, as we know full well that economies that see a higher standard of living naturally insist on higher environmental quality. That is why I am so concerned when I constantly hear my colleagues point to the admittedly horrendous environmental situation that today exists along the border and in other parts of Mexico. And they believe that implementation of NAFTA will not help. But we know that the rising tide lifts all shifts concept is going to see the improvement of the economy in Mexico, and a byproduct of that will be an insistence on the improvement of environmental quality. And the way they do that is to purchase U.S.-manufactured technology.

Mr. GRANDY. If my friend will yield, just no less a person than the Vice President of the United States has made a rather big deal of this first as a candidate, and now as the Vice President of the United States. What he was talking about in terms of environmental compliance, producing new cottage industries in environmental technology is actually coming home to roost under NAFTA, so I hope those people who supported him when he was a candidate, and now that he is the No. 2 executive in the United States will listen and heed some of the things that

he specified in Earth in the Balance, which actually we have to admit as Republicans are really taking shape.

Mr. KOLBE. As the gentleman has correctly pointed out, the theory of a rising tide lifting all boats I think absolutely applies here.

There is another area we have discussed on this floor in the last several weeks several times that I think bears some attention, and that is the issue of immigration. We are concerned with illegal immigration, and yet I think ultimately most of us would have to concede, if we honestly answer the question, that in the long run the only solution to the problem of illegal immigration is if we lift the economy of the country that is shipping people to our country, if we lift the economy so they do not have to have jobs.

Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the gentleman, in fact I would like, Mr. Speaker, contrary to what the gentleman from Iowa said, some of us do have other obligations.

Mr. GRANDY. Don't ask, don't tell, don't pursue. I am not assuming the gentleman has nothing to do today.

Mr. KOLBE. I yielded earlier some of my time to the other special order, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask unanimous consent to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KOLBE. I thank the gentleman for participating.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my friend from Tucson who has done an excellent job of focusing a great deal of attention on this issue.

I want to get into this immigration question, but I also want to follow up briefly on the statements made by my friend from Iowa that relate to the Vice President's commitment to the improvement of environmental quality. We know that this has been an issue that has been of great concern. And I think that we should underscore the fact that Vice President GORE and President Clinton are strong supporters of the North American Free-Trade Agreement. In fact, we are standing here in hopes that we will be able to implement NAFTA based on meetings that we have had with my fellow Californian and the U.S. Trade Representative, Mickey Kantor, and others in the administration. I mentioned Labor Secretary Robert Reich, who is not necessarily known as a supporter of the Republican economic policies of the past. He has committed to this plan which has been put into place initially by President Bush and is now supported by President Clinton.

So this commitment to the environment exists among Members of both political parties, and something that we said earlier, and I know my friend is serving on the Trade Subcommittee and knows this, that there is bipartisan support within the Trade Subcommittee for implementation of NAFTA. And we have many on the other side of the aisle who have been trying to make this in some way a partisan issue. But they have to know that it is Republicans who are standing with President Clinton in support of NAFTA.

I am happy to yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. GRANDY. I want to reemphasize this point. There has been a lot of ugliness on this floor this session in the short time we have been here, and a pronounced lack of bipartisanship on most issues. But that does not take into consideration the ongoing cooperation that the gentleman and I have had with colleagues on the Democratic side, and the U.S. Trade Representative, as he mentioned, and other administration officials who are trying to complete this deal, because we know it is good for the country. This is economic stimulus that both Republicans and Democrats understand, and I cannot make the point strongly enough, because this is one place where the gentleman from California and I walk in absolutely lockstep with the President of the United States and the Vice President, and his Cabinet officials.

As a matter of fact, we have, as you know, implored the administration to use the bully pulpit more, because this is a very easy selling product, if we bother to go out and market it.

Mr. DREIER. If I can reclaim the time, I think it is important for us to note that last week the New York Times had an interesting story. They did a survey among several economists, some Republicans, some Democrats, some independents, and in fact it included among them Ed Yarnell with C.J. Lawrence who had been a strong supporter of President Clinton's in the campaign, and they said that he said that quite frankly he believed that the best thing that the President could do would be to find a politically expedient way to step away from his budget package, and as they talked about what should be their economic priorities for the Clinton administration they had several points.

□ 1920

First, they said they should work more diligently to bring about spending cuts rather than tax increases. Second, they said go slowly on taxes. The third point is, go very cautiously on implementation of this so-called health care plan that is under consideration.

The fourth item which seemed to come to the forefront from virtually every economist was, move as quickly as possible to implement the North American Free-Trade Agreement. So, we have seen people from a broad cross section of the political perspective argue in strong support of it. Why? Because they know it is going to be one of the best job-creating mechanisms we could possibly put into place.

Mr. GRANDY. But the alternative is frightening. To do nothing and let that market be grabbed off either by our Asian counterparts or European counterparts is, to me, economic treason.

Mr. DREIER. My friend is absolutely right. We have tried to point out that that is an accurate statement on a regular basis here. In very, very strong presentations, our opponents of NAFTA have stood at the well and at the microphones throughout the chamber pointing out human rights problems, enivornmental problems, economic problems that exist in Mexico. You are supposed to infer from that that all of these things came about because of the North American Free-Trade Agreement. The thing I would like to underscore is that all of these things happened without NAFTA. I happen to believe that as we look at some of the problems of jobs and businesses moving from the United States to Mexico, even though we now run a $6 billion trade surplus with Mexico, which has grown, from 1986, from a $4 billion trade deficit to a $6 billion surplus level, but as we move in that direction, clearly implementation of NAFTA is the best way to counter the horrendous situation which has been outlined by our colleagues who are opponents of NAFTA.

Mr. GRANDY. If my friend would yield, and I know he wants to discuss the immigration component of this and I want him to because even though I am not from a border State I want to be part of this discussion because it affects an area like Iowa, too.

Mr. DREIER. I do know that the gentleman has spent a great deal of time in one particular border State and has benefited from the economy in that border State.

Mr. GRANDY. California was very good to me. The gentleman is correct. However, I am proud to not be a resident of California. I must say when the gentleman talks about how dirty the L.A. basin is, it is always a mystery to me how tidy the gentleman is, despite all that pollution and filth and moral decay.

But let me say one thing about immigration: Because I think the best statement on this was uttered by no less a person than the President of Mexico, who said some time ago—and I use this in all of my pro-NAFTA speeches—it only works one way, either Mexico gets jobs or America gets Mexicans.

I say this now representing a community of Sioux City, IA, 100,000 people, that has one of the fastest-growing Hispanic communities in the United States because we have got people who come up here and take jobs in packing plants that Americans no longer want. That has produced a problem in the

schools with English as a second language. It is of critical proportions. I was meeting today with one of our school principals. We teach 11 languages in the Sioux City public school system. Ten years ago we had one, English.

Mr. DREIER. I mentioned last night this program, "48 Hours," with Dan Rather. They had a segment on Hollywood High School in that segment, and they talked about the famous alumni of the Hollywood High School, referred to the fact that at that time years ago there was one language. Today there are 52 languages spoken at Hollywood High School. And even more throughout the Los Angeles school system.

So, my friends in Sioux City have something to look forward to if we do not deal with this issue of trying to enhance the economies of other parts of the world.

Mr. GRANDY. That is really kind of a Malthusian prediction, if we do not do something. But clearly, and the gentleman from Arizona said it before he departed, if we do not do something to raise the standard of living, that standard of living will come up into this country and seek to entitle itself to the benefits that are now obviously attracting many folks up into this particular society.

Mr. DREIER. It is so interesting because I happen to be an advocate of toughening up our border patrol, and I supported the amendment that we had 2 weeks ago to provide an additional $60 million in the Commerce, State, Justice appropriation bill, as I am sure my colleague did, to toughen up the border patrol because we cannot allow this flow of illegal immigrants to come across the border.

In fact, during the month of August I am going to be touring the border and looking at the situation.

But I have argued consistently that there is no way we are going to be able to block people as long as they continue to want to come across the border. Why is it people flee Mexico and other parts of Latin America for the United States? One simple, very simple, basic reason: economic opportunity, whether it is a job or whether it is the Government services that are created by the unfunded Federal mandates which the Federal Government imposes on the State of California, the county of Los Angeles and other States, forcing them to provide a wide range of services which really should not be provided unless that State chooses to provide those services.

I happen to believe that if we could eliminate that magnet which draws people across the border for Government services, and create the opportunity for those who come across the border to the United States and gain a job and save the money that they have from that job and send it back to their families in Mexico or they have an opportunity in Mexico to get a job, which implementation of NAFTA will clearly aid and create, we would be better off if we get at the root of the immigration problem which is so serious.

Mr. GRANDY. As the gentleman knows, we had a rather nasty and petulant debate on the floor of this House yesterday about an immigration-related matter. It seemed extraneous at the time, but it became a rather, I would have to say, painful debate on immigration. I think we can expect more of that unless we own up to the fact that unless we do something to provide opportunity on the other side of the border, and by that I mean trade, not aid, because the gentleman will also have to argue that most of those programs have failed miserably. Indeed, if we are talking about programs like AID, they have actually taken jobs out of this country in an attempt to subsidize growth through Government programs in foreign countries. So, we know the kind of Government-sponsored relief is at best a poor substitute and usually an opponent of the economic growth that we try to expand through market-oriented policies.

We do not have many choices here, as I see it.

We have either got to let the Mexican Government, through acceptance of NAFTA, create the opportunities they want and follow through with the reforms that President Salinas has bravely undertaken, or we are going to have debates the likes of which yesterday will be timid compared to the kind of anger and bitterness that will explode on this floor if we do not do something to provide more opportunity south of the border.

Mr. DREIER. If we look at the past several years, clearly the United States has had a pattern of providing foreign assistance to countries throughout the world. We know how, No. 1, politically unpopular that is; and how financially difficult it is as we look at a $4.6 trillion national debt and a $300 billion-plus deficit; clearly it is not a positive thing. But I happen to believe that the most positive thing is, as my friend said, trade. I have always argued that trade is the currency of friendship.

If we are going to strengthen this relationship among the three countries—Canada, the United States, and Mexico—the best way to do that is to encourage the diminution of those trade barriers which, heretofore, have played a role in jeopardizing a strong relationship.

Mr. GRANDY. But, again, I want to stress that what we do on this floor to the casual observer has to be inherently contradictory if you watch these debates in context. A few months ago we stood up here and extended again with bipartisan cooperative efforts aid and free-market opportunity to the emerging Russian Republics because we know that without that kind of underpinning, Boris Yeltsin will fail and the Republics will dovetail behind him.

What is good for Russia is good for Mexico. Yet, we do not seem to draw that kind of economic comparison, which I think should be kind of standard operating procedure for us.

Mr. DREIER. I do think we should underscore the disparity which exists there, too. There are 27,000 nuclear warheads among the 15 former Republics of the Soviet Union; 6,000 alone in the Ukraine. One of the goals of the assistance package which we provided from the Congress to the Russian Republic was to deal with the dismantling of those warheads. Another aspect, of course, was to bring home many of the troops who have been overseas. So, we have a very unstable political situation there which has led to that.

□ 1930

Frankly, Mexico has moved light years ahead of so many other countries in their economic growth due to that privatization and the political reforms which have taken place in that country in the last 7 years.

Mr. GRANDY. Well, again, just to kind of reemphasize and underline that from an agricultural point of view, because obviously agriculture in Iowa is very well under the free-trade agreement, we know in our country that unless we start processing more of what we produce, unless we start having what we call value-added agriculture, which would be soybean oil or corn meal or livestock, poultry, and dairy, we will not be able to survive as a farm-intensive State.

Mexico is our largest purchaser of high-value agriculture, specifically red meat, dairy, soybean meal, products you only buy when you have money, exactly the things we want the Soviets to buy, the former Soviets once they stabilize their currency and begin to get beyond their basic needs.

Again, to make the gentleman's point, Mexico has moved light years beyond. We unfortunately seem to want to move light years back from an opportunity that they are I think willing to go more than halfway to meet.

Mr. DREIER. Quite frankly, as we look at a wide range of the proposals that have been considered in this Congress, we are moving in a direction that is 180 degrees from many of the emerging democracies throughout the world.

It seems to me one of the points that I like to make on this as we look at this issue of fairness, which is something to which we all aspire on a regular basis, the argument that has been given by the chairman of the Trade Subcommittee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], who has pointed to the fact that Mexico has had virtual one-way free trade with the United States for three decades. For three decades Mexico has had the ability to sell

goods and services into the United States with virtually no tariffs.

The goal of NAFTA is to create a two-way opportunity and that is why it strikes me that we are going to be in a position where we will greatly enhance the U.S. economy.

I would not stand here, as I know my friend would not, either, as a strong proponent if we thought that this was going to in any way jeopardize job opportunities right here in the United States.

Mr. GRANDY. Well, we do know, of course, there will be sectoral losses, offset by much larger gains.

Now, of course, if you come from one of those regions that is going to experience job loss, NAFTA is a tough sale, and obviously we acknowledge that politically; but just again, from an Iowa point of view, a State that is very export dependent, because we are dependent on agriculture and will be for long in the future, but our biggest trade surplus with Mexico right now is in computer equipment and light manufacturing, things you do not associate with a State like Iowa; so the opportunities for diversification in our economy between the Missouri and the Mississippi, assuming they stay relatively within their borders, is almost unlimited, and that has generally been lost, too.

For example, I know a State like Ohio, which has some of the most virulent opponents of NAFTA among their delegation, has done extraordinarily well with their balance of trade to Mexico.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit me on that point, once again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to focus attention on this map here which points to all 50 States and the level of increase in exports over the past 7 years.

As we look at this issue, there are—I guess I forgot Hawaii when I was talking earlier—I guess there are 12 or 13 States that have seen an increase from 1987 to 1992 of over 300 percent in export growth. Among those top 12 or 13 States, as my friend has pointed out, includes Ohio. Ohio has seen a 100-percent or 200-percent increase.

Pennsylvania, which is another State to which opponents of NAFTA often refer as being devastated with the prospect of NAFTA, has seen an increase in exports of over 300 percent from 1987 to 1992. Ohio has been between 100 and 200 percent. So the kind of improvement has been dramatic.

Last night when I was here I referred to some of the specific job creating operations in the district of my friend, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] who is a virulent opponent of NAFTA, and yet there are many businesses in her district in Ohio which have benefited from the present structure that exists, that being the privatization of Mexico, and clearly will benefit even further if we are to zero out that tariff from the United States to Mexico.

Mr. GRANDY. Well, I watched some of the debate last night and was impressed by the numbers that were slung back and forth, particularly those relating to job loss.

I wonder if we can really calculate some of the dynamic economic activity that has happened and will happen even to a greater extent when NAFTA is enacted.3

For example, yes, the apparel industry will probably experience some short-term job loss; but do not forget, many of those jobs have already located to low labor markets in Southeast Asia. With the opportunities of NAFTA, there is a good chance many of those companies will come back to the Northern Hemisphere, namely, Mexico, and source their inventory in the United States. That produces jobs in our country that otherwise would not be created, because obviously if you are making clothing in Taiwan, you are probably not going to buy your fabrics in Ohio.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, if I could strengthen that argument, if my friend would bear with me for just a moment, I was asked to read a letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that was sent to our very good friend and colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina. This letter is addressed to CASS BALLENGER and it gets right to the point that my friend has raised. It was written to him by William Armfield IV, who is vice chairman of Unifi, and he says:

UNIFI,
July 23, 1993.

Hon. CASS BALLENGER,
House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CASS: As the first vice president of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute [ATMI] and Vice Chairman of Unifi, Inc. which operates two facilities in your district employing nearly 1,500 of your constituents, I am writing to inform you of my unequivocal support for the North American Free Trade Agreement [NAFTA], and to ask for your support. Under NAFTA, I am confident that Unifi will export more yarn to the Mexican market which will benefit Unifi workers in your district and our other 3,100 employees across North Carolina.

For Unifi and the American textile industry, NAFTA represents opportunity—it is a trade agreement that is fair, balanced, reciprocal, and equitable, one in which the United States does not open its market unilaterally.

Last year, Mexico was our second largest customer for textile exports. In fact, in 1992 we rang up a $3 billion deficit in nonapparel textile trade with Asia while we had a surplus with Mexico. In just 4 years' time, this industry's exports to Mexico have doubled—to nearly $700 million—and our trade surplus has more than doubled to $481 million. This was done without NAFTA and while Mexico's average import duty on goods from the United States is more than twice as high as the average tariff on goods we import from Mexico.

NAFTA will create a common market of some 370 million consumers, all of whom need clothes to wear, sheets to sleep on, towels to dry with, automotive upholstery to ride on and so on. The increase in wages, disposable income and living standards that will occur in Mexico as a result of NAFTA will make it possible for more Mexican consumers to buy more of these American products. Also, as Mexico continues its program of economic reform, greater quantities of industrial fabrics will be needed.

In addition to creating textile jobs in the United States, NAFTA will also help the U.S. textile industry preserve American jobs. Without NAFTA, many of these jobs will be lost forever to the Far East. If Mexico cannot get the investment, technical expertise, raw materials and economic cooperation it needs from the United States, it will get them elsewhere, probably from Asia. Then, our worst nightmare will become reality: Mexico will become a springboard for Asian firms wishing to export to the United States. There will be no strong rules of origin, there will be no enhanced Customs enforcement and surveillance and there certainly will be no inclination on the part of the Mexico Government to go out of its way to use United States components and inputs. Instead of a friendly partner on our southern border, we will have a neighbor who feels appreciated by and obligated, not to the United States, but to the Far East.

The Mexican economy will continue to grow and with the Mexican market but the United States will not have preferential access to that market. Ironically, the fears of those who oppose NAFTA will come to pass only if those opponents succeed—that is, if NAFTA fails to be approved.

For those who fear jobs will be lost to Mexico, they should realize that many jobs are already going to Mexico without NAFTA. American companies can go to Mexico today to seek lower labor costs, if that is all that truly matters to them, and defeating NAFTA will not slow this exodus. There are other selection criteria which manufacturers consider including access to raw materials, infrastructure, energy and other manufacturing costs, and availability of a skilled, experienced workforce.

Thank you for giving consideration to my views. Please let me know if I can provide you with any additional information.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. ARMFIELD IV,
Vice Chairman.

Now he makes some incredibly positive points here, and I think one of the most important ones has to do with the fact that we want to maintain a strong working relationship with Mexico.

I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GRANDY].

Mr. GRANDY. Mr. Speaker, on that point, he knows because we have fought on the same side of many trade battles in this House. A textile vote is always a tough one on a trade issue because it is a protected industry, and it is a vulnerable industry. But the fact that the gentleman kept referencing Asia reminds me of the slugfests that he and I have had over MFN in China. One of the arguments that is always made is about the Chinese apparel industry ripping off jobs from the United States, one——

Mr. DREIER. We are always on the same side of that one, too, I should say.

Mr. GRANDY. But one of the most effective ways to fight that is to pass

NAFTA so those jobs would move closer to home, and——

Mr. DREIER. Exactly.

Mr. GRANDY. That is a point that is usually not argued when we fight back and forth on MFN, but if it is true that the Chinese are having labor costs that are perhaps subsidized by their prisoners and some of the other horror stories that we have heard when we have debated that issue, fight the market with the market.

Mr. DREIER. Exactly, and I think that one of the points that needs to be made is that there are many people who have said that with implementation of NAFTA and a zeroing of that tariff we are going to see so many countries coming to Mexico to use Mexico as a springboard for these products to sell them in the United States, and we know that under NAFTA that is the only way that we can ensure these tough, as Mr. Armfield says, rule-of-origin requirements, but that without NAFTA that invites the Mexican Government to say to countries like China, Japan, and other countries throughout the world, "Come here. We will, in fact, create a situation in a climate which will allow you to export into the United States," and so clearly those who are concerned about the prospect of that should support NAFTA because it is the only way that with these tough rule-of-origin requirements we can prevent other countries from using Mexico as an export platform.

Mr. GRANDY. And, if the gentleman would yield, think of the message that it sends to Central and South American nations that are watching carefully to see what we actually do or do not do under NAFTA. As Mexico goes, so go most of the Central American nations, clearly so go most of the South American nations.

As the gentleman knows, Mr. Speaker, Chile is waiting in the wings to create a free-trade agreement with the United States, and, if we do not follow through on the Enterprise of the Americas initiative that was created by President Bush and strongly endorsed by many of those countries, again we will lose markets that are just crying out for American participation.

Mr. DREIER. And I think that I have always felt uncomfortable as we have looked at this competition that is being created by so-called trading blocs. As we have seen the emergence of EC '92, as we have seen four countries on the South American continent unite as they plan to in 1995, forming a free-trade zone among them, as we see the unity being established in the Pacific rim, I felt uncomfortable about that because I happen to believe in GATT and the needs to try and bring about a reduction of barriers all the way around. But the fact of the matter is, as we work toward this zero goal, we should, as a hemisphere, realize that there is no benefit whatsoever to the United States of America having a poor southern neighbor, and, as we look at that issue itself, clearly benefiting and improving the economies of the Americas will benefit the United States because we cannot.

We, as Republicans, and I cannot understand why Republicans have opposed this because we have been the ones who have heralded the fact that we have seen technological expansion which brought down the Berlin wall and allowed satellite technology to give us cellular telephones and cable television, CNN and C-SPAN, and all these other things, and yet at the same time there is a desire to maintain this barrier right here in the Americas.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is why it is such a difficult one for me to reconcile and why I feel so strongly about it.

I am happy to yield.

Mr. GRANDY. Well, as the gentleman knows, the irony is we know the Mexican economy is not going to turn south and move back to the kind of command structures that crippled it for so many years, and I had a conversation the other day with the Guatemalan Ambassador who again paraphrased President Salinas who said, "I do not——"

Mr. DREIER. The gentleman runs with a pretty impressive crowd there.

Mr. GRANDY. Yes, very impressive, but the point that I took away from that meeting is Salinas has said, "Look, I don't want to be the best nation in the Third World. I want to be a rising nation in the First World." And it would be a terribly ironic circumstance if, because we could not get our political act together, there was a North American trading bloc that did not include the United States.

Mr. Speaker, that could happen if we continue to kind of fuss and fret over side agreements and various sectors being denied various accesses, and I hope that that does not happen because there are too many people now in the global market, as the gentleman knows, and more are arriving all the time who know a market when they see it and will capture it if we do not respond first.

Mr. DREIER. As the gentleman knows, it is very interesting what my friend has said, and I hope he is right, that Mexico does not take a retrograde step if we do not see NAFTA implemented. But, as the gentleman knows, one of the things that opponents of NAFTA have said is that President Salinas is only moving toward addressing the questions of the need for political pluralism.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HILLIARD). The time of the gentleman has expired.

JOBS FOR U.S. WORKERS—IMPLEMENT NAFTA

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

Mr. DREIER. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that, as we look at the threat of Mexico taking a retrograde step on the kinds of political reforms that have been taking place there, improvements in human rights, there are many of our friends who are opponents to NAFTA who have stood here and said that President Salinas is only doing those things so that he can gain access to the United States markets.

Well, quite frankly, if that is the reason it is, frankly, fine with me because he is recognizing the changes that have taken place in the world. But the gentleman and I know, and my friend has been following this debate recently, that one of the things that we have had are some very, very tragic stories told by our colleagues who are opponents to NAFTA who have talked about human rights violations, the political problems which exist in Mexico, and I think that what we should do is spend just a moment focusing on the improvements that have taken place there.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that in 1929 Mr. Cardenas nationalized the oil industry and established the PRI party, the commanding party, the Institutional Revolutionary Party, of Mexico, and there is no doubt about the fact that over the past 60-plus years we have seen basically one-party control, and in many cases a very, very backward electoral system and a control which has not allowed for the kind of freedom which we in the United States would like to see. And there are people who say that, because we are supporters of NAFTA, we are somehow apologists for this kind of behavior.

Mr. Speaker, nothing could be further from the truth as we look at this issue because the issue of human rights and political pluralism is one which has dramatically improved, and we have seen the Salinas administration focus attention on it. In fact, in July 1990, Mr. Speaker, President Salinas established his Federal Code of Electoral Institutions and Procedures, and we know that the National Action Party, the PAN party, which is the center-right opposition to the Institutional Revolutionary Party, has been able to, for the first time ever, win governorships and mayoral votes throughout Mexico. We would like to see a greater degree of political pluralism, but there are many who have said that we cannot in any way support a system like that.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, some of those who are opponents to NAFTA have not focused attention on the agreement itself, and I know my friend is well aware of this. If we witnessed the kind of political problems which some people say will come about if we implement NAFTA because President Salinas is only doing these things because of the prospect of NAFTA, the United States can, within a 6-month period, withdraw the agreement.

As my colleagues know, there is this belief that, once we get in it that there is no turning back at all. If we find that there are serious problems with NAFTA, Mr. Speaker, we can, in fact, withdraw from the agreement.

Mr. GRANDY. Well, obviously we do have an out clause, as we do in any treaty, but I think it should not be lost in the discussion that President Salinas has probably done more with his economy in the last 5 years than we have done with our economy in the last 5 years. His has gone north. Ours continues to go south. We are constantly kind of badgering him to make environmental breakthroughs and reforms in labor law, and, quite honestly, what have we done over the last 7 years but add more labor restrictions which have impinged upon small businesses, which, as the gentleman knows, is the greatest engine of job growth in the country?

□ 1950

We have not in many cases effectively enforced some of our environmental laws, and in many other cases created new conditions that have made them unenforceable. I happen to come from a part of the country that is wetland sensitive, even more so now that we have floods. But what it has created is a body of statutes that is so confusing that even the bureaucrats do not understand what the laws mean.

Now, clearly that should not be a message that we want to send down to the Salinas government in terms of getting their act together. I find it sometimes just a little bit patronizing that America is so quick to criticize our partners in these trade deals, when we ourselves cannot really point to a stellar record of accomplishment, particularly over the last few years in these areas.

Mr. DREIER. As my friend once again raises this issue of the environment, we constantly hear of the horrendous environmental conditions that exist in Mexico. Not everyone knows that in 1988, under what is known as the Sedui, which includes what would be our Environmental Protection Agency, as part of it the Mexican Government implemented a law which is modeled after our environmental laws here in the United States to improve environmental quality there.

Opponents of NAFTA say yes, it looks great on the books, but they do not enforce it at all. There is no enforcement provision, and they basically ignore that law.

One of the things that has been said to both of us in meetings that we have attended is that we need to get newer industry in Mexico so that we can have the technological advances which will allow us to have a better environmental quality there. One of the boldest statements that was made was actual action by President Salinas, when about 2 years ago he looked at the greatest polluter in Mexico City, which was a major oil refinery. It employed 5,000 Mexican workers. To improve the environment of Mexico City, President Salinas said he could not continue polluting like this, and he closed down this refinery, demonstrating a strong commitment to an improvement in environmental quality.

Mr. GRANDY. That is a Government-run facility, is it not?

Mr. DREIER. Absolutely.

Mr. GRANDY. Therein lies the difference between what is a potential for environmental protection in a command economy, and what is the potential in a market economy.

Mr. DREIER. Absolutely. I think the point that needs to be made is if you look at the poorest countries throughout the world, that is where the environmental quality is the worst. And there are so many people who are opponents to NAFTA who seem to want to maintain the status quo. What does that do to improve the environment?

One of the things we have talked about time and time again on this issue was this decision that was rendered by Judge Charles Richey, which basically jeopardizes the implementation of NAFTA because of the environmental question which has been raised here in the ruling that came down saying that compliance with the Environmental Policy Act here is a prerequisite for implementation of NAFTA.

The thing that you have to conclude is, is the prevention of implementation of NAFTA going to improve the environmental quality on either side of the border? Absolutely not.

Mr. GRANDY. To that point, and I think we both anticipate that that decision will be overturned, and hopefully within the next 6 weeks, but even from the administration point of view, an administration obviously that the gentleman and I did not support in the last election, but clearly support the constitutional sovereignty of the President of the United States, whoever he or she may be, to effect multilateral agreements, whether it is trade or foreign policy.

Can you imagine NEPA taking effect in an arms agreement? Are we going to use this as a one-size-fits-all litmus test the next time we want to get into some kind of arms proliferation agreement, or a strategic armament dismantlement discussion, the likes of which we are currently having with the former Soviet Union? It is ridiculous and I think very pernicious to the Constitution, let alone NAFTA.

Mr. DREIER. I would like to focus for just a moment, since we have this map here of the 50 States, on one point, and then I am going to yield back to the balance of my time here because we have spend a great deal of time on this, and I know there are going to be opportunities in the future, and I do have something else to do now that it is 5 minutes to 8 o'clock.

There was a survey recently conducted which showed that 40 out of 50 State Governors happen to be strong proponents of NAFTA, and not one Governor of a State has actually come out in opposition to the North American Free-Trade Agreement.

I think as we look at a number of these States which have seen improvement in job creation in their areas, we have got to realize that these governors, who are actually on the front line dealing with the job creating challenges that their States face, clearly do recognize that implementation of a North American Free-Trade Agreement is the wave of the future and going to be beneficial.

I would like to thank my friend for his diligent work, not only for the people of Sioux City and the people of the United States, but for his strong effort in addressing the trade challenges that we face, and the fact that eliminating trade barriers throughout the world is going to enhance the opportunity for us to create jobs right here in the United States of America.

THIRD BIENNIAL REVISION (1994–95) TO THE U.S. ARCTIC RESEARCH PLAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of the Arctic Research and Policy Act of 1984, as amended (15 U.S.C. 4108(a)), I hereby transmit the third biennial revision (1994–1995) to the United States Arctic Research Plan.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 29, 1993.*

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MCDADE (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today, on account of medical reasons.

Mr. DERRICK (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today.

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 Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WELDON, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. DOOLITTLE, for 5 minutes, today, and for 60 minutes on July 30.

Mr. GOSS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. BENTLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BOEHLERT, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SCOTT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. NADLER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EDWARDS of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LAUGHLIN, for 60 minutes, on August 3.

Mr. KANJORSKI, for 60 minutes each day, on August 2, 3, and 4.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. BOEHLERT) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HOUGHTON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. LIVINGSTON) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PORTER, for 5 minutes, on July 30.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. FROST) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MCCLOSKEY, for 5 minutes, on July 30.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SOLOMON in two instances.

Mr. GILMAN.

Mr. BALLENGER.

Mr. RIDGE.

Mr. LAZIO.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SCOTT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ in two instances.

Mr. FORD of Michigan in two instances.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. HAMBURG.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DREIER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BONIOR in two instances.

Mr. BARCIA in two instances.

Mr. MCCURDY.

Mr. FAWELL.

Mr. DEUTSCH.

Mr. WELDON

Mr. BROWN of California.

Mr. WOLF.

Mr. KOPETSKI.

Mrs. SCHROEDER.

Mr. MFUME.

Mr. CARDIN in two instances.

Mr. WAXMAN.

Mr. SWETT.

Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1131. An act to extend the method of computing the average subscription charges under section 8906(a) of title 5, United States Code, relating to Federal employee health benefits programs; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROSE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

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

H.R. 2683. An act to extend the operation of the migrant student record transfer system.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, July 30, 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:

1672. A letter from the Principal Deputy Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter stating, that on June 1, 1993 the Department notified the Congress of its intent to obligate up to $30 million to assist the Russian Federation in establishing a Central Chemical Weapons Destruction Analytical Laboratory, this letter is to inform the Congress that the funds appropriated for the Advanced Tactical Airborne Reconnaissance System ($12.8 million from Aircraft Procurement, Air Force and $17.2 million from RDT&E Air Force appropriations) will be the funding source for this effort; jointly, to the Committees on Appropriations and Armed Services.

1673. A letter from the Director, Congressional Budget Office, transmitting the CBO Staff Memorandum, "The Inpatient Psychiatric Hospital Benefit Under Medicare"; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MONTGOMERY: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 821. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend eligibility for burial in national cemeteries to persons who have 20 years of service creditable for retired pay as members of a reserve component of the Armed Forces (Rept. 103–197). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MONTGOMERY: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 2535. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide additional authority for the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide health care for veterans of the Persian Gulf War, with amendments (Rept. 103–198). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MONTGOMERY: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 2647. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide that the effective date of any changes in benefits under the Servicemen's Group Life Insurance program shall be based on the International Date Line, with an amendment (Rept. 103–199). 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. HALL of Texas:

H.R. 2795. A bill to expand the mail-order pharmaceutical program of the Department of Defense to cover all members and former members of the uniformed services, and their dependents, who are eligible for health care in medical facilities of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PAXON:

H.R. 2796. A bill relating to the tariff treatment of certain footwear; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. SCHROEDER (for herself, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. MEEK, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DANNER, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. TORRES, Mr. DEUTSCH, Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. BOUCHER, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. INSLEE):

H.R. 2797. A bill to improve programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs relating to women's health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SHAYS:

H.R. 2798. A bill to revive the suspension of duty 3,5,6-trichlorosalicylic acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2799. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on anthraquinone disulfonic acid sodium salt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 2800. A bill to promote and support management reorganization of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. SHAYS:

H.R. 2801. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on acid violet 19; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLACKWELL:

H.R. 2802. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt unemployment

benefits from Federal and State income taxation; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAROCCO:

H.R. 2803. A bill to amend the Consumer Credit Protection Act to improve disclosures made to consumers who enter into rental-purchase transactions, to set standards for collection practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. WAXMAN (for himself and Mr. CARDIN):

H.R. 2804. A bill to establish a national policy respecting medical residency training programs and the health care work force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GONZALEZ (for himself, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. LEACH, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. WHEAT, and Mr. BARLOW):

H.R. 2808. A bill to facilitate recovery from the recent flooding of the Mississippi River and its tributaries by providing greater flexibility for depository institutions and their regulators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. LANCASTER (for himself, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. PARKER, Mr. ROSE, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. VALENTINE, and Mr. WHITTEN):

H.R. 2809. A bill to establish a national research program to improve the production and marketing of sweet potatoes and increase the consumption and use of sweet potatoes by domestic and foreign consumers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. MINK (for herself, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. FURSE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. MALONEY, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD):

H.R. 2810. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for programs regarding ovarian cancer; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COX:

H.J. Res. 244. Joint resolution designating September 6, 1993, as "Try American Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H. Con. Res. 128. Concurrent resolution commending Israel concerning the decision of the Supreme Court of Israel in the case of John Demjanjuk, Sr.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII.

230. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of The Mariana Islands, relative to establishing a nonvoting Delegate from the Northern Mariana Islands within the U.S. House of Representatives; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. STUPAK:

H.R. 2805. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade of the United States and on the Great Lakes and their tributary and connecting waters in trade with Canada for the vessel *Amanda*; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 2806. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade of the United States and on the Great Lakes and their tributary and connecting waters in trade with Canada for the vessel *Juliet*; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H.R. 2807. A bill for the relief of John Demjanjuk, Sr.; 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. 52: Mr. HANCOCK.

H.R. 87: Mr. SHAW.

H.R. 127: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 253: Mr. MCNULTY.

H.R. 429: Mr. BLUTE, Ms. DUNN, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. LINDER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 436: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CANADY, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. HUFFINGTON, Mr. KLUG, Mr. MICA, Mr. WALKER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. MCINNIS, and Mr. ROBERTS.

H.R. 466: Mr. ENGEL and Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H.R. 587: Mr. VENTO and Mr. INSLEE.

H.R. 830: Mr. HUFFINGTON, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. WELDON, and Mr. KLUG.

H.R. 921: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. WYNN, Ms. THURMAN, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 1056: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. STUPAK, Mrs. MEEK, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. TORRICELLI.

H.R. 1152: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. KLUG.

H.R. 1153: Mr. GLICKMAN.

H.R. 1181: Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 1238: Mrs. LLOYD.

H.R. 1314: Mr. BOUCHER and Mr. GLICKMAN.

H.R. 1324: Mr. MINGE.

H.R. 1360: Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 1402: Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.

H.R. 1406: Mr. TORRES, Mr. PASTOR, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. WELDON.

H.R. 1407: Mr. MENENDEZ.

H.R. 1472: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. BACCHUS of Florida.

H.R. 1687: Mr. BAESLER.

H.R. 1702: Ms. BYRNE.

H.R. 1738: Mr. FARR.

H.R. 1795: Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 1900: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. WILSON, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. FAZIO, Ms. MALONEY, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. BORSKI.

H.R. 1915: Mr. HUGHES and Mr. WILSON.

H.R. 1923: Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 1989: Mr. HANCOCK.

H.R. 2092: Mr. RAVENEL and Ms. DANNER.

H.R. 2134: Mr. CARDIN.

H.R. 2140: Mr. MINGE, Ms. MALONEY, and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H.R. 2226: Mr. COX, Mr. KLUG, Mr. FROST, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. PARKER, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 2268: Mr. MCDADE, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. FINGERHUT.

H.R. 2326: Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. STUMP, Mr. GALLO, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. RAVENEL, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. CASTLE, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. FURSE, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Ms. LONG, Mr. GINGRICH, and Mr. THORNTON.

H.R. 2331: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H.R. 2375: Mr. KOPETSKI, Mrs. UNSOELD, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2394: Mr. RANGEL, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, and Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.R. 2395: Mr. RANGEL, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, and Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.R. 2414: Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. MALONEY, Mr. BROWDER, and Mrs. SCHROEDER.

H.R. 2434: Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. CANADY, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON.

H.R. 2438: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. STARK, Mr. BILBRAY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. FROST, Mr. GLICKMAN, Ms. MALONEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. KOPETSKI, and Mrs. ROUKEMA.

H.R. 2469: Mr. BAESLER, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. MCHALE, and Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 2481: Mr. BOUCHER, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. HOLDEN.

H.R. 2535: Mr. DURBIN.

H.R. 2571: Mr. HALL of Texas, Mrs. UNSOELD, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. MORAN, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. OWENS, and Mrs. SCHROEDER.

H.R. 2573: Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FROST, Mrs. MEEK, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. TUCKER, and Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 2602: Mr. BARLOW.

H.R. 2662: Mr. FILNER, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. MEEK, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H.R. 2691: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. LAZIO, and Mr. LAFALCE.

H.R. 2706: Ms. SHEPHERD, Mr. MINGE, Mr. SAWYER, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 2735: Mr. JACOBS, Mr. PENNY, and Mr. POSHARD.

H.J. Res. 49: Mr. SOLOMON.

H.J. Res. 79: Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin, Mr. DICKS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, Mr. HAMILTON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H.J. Res. 86: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. STUMP, and Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin.

H.J. Res 106: Mr. HAMILTON and Mr. RANGEL.

H.J. Res. 142: Mr. WYDEN and Mr. SMITH of Oregon.

H.J. Res. 157: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. DIXON, Mrs. KENNELLY, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CRANE, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. RICHARDSON, and Mrs. BENTLEY.

H.J. Res. 185: Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HYDE, Mr. KING, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDADE, and Mr. WILSON.

H.J. Res. 198: Mrs. VUCANOVICH and Mr. SKEEN.

H.J. Res. 204: Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. HOYER, Mr. GINGRICH, and Mr. GALLO.

H.J. Res. 205: Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MCDADE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr.

WOLF, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. PAXON, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. WISE, Mr. DICKS, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. PORTER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. MANTON, and Mr. WILSON.

H.J. Res. 209: Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. CHAPMAN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE-JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. LAFALCE, Ms. THURMAN, Mr. FROST, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. DIXON, Ms. MALONEY, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HOBSON, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. GEKAS.

H.J. Res. 243: Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. PETRI, Mr. HAYES, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. HYDE, Mr. CRANE, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. WELDON, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. FAZIO, and Mr. RAVENEL.

H. Con. Res. 24: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H. Res. 13: Mr. BONILLA.

H. Res. 175: Mr. SMITH of Oregon.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

[Omitted from the Record of July 28, 1993]

H.R. 1420: Mr. BACCHUS of Florida.