HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, September 30, 1993*

The House met at 10 a.m.

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

Grant to each person, gracious God, the hope and faith to meet this day and all the days ahead. May our aspirations find a home, may our hopes bring us fulfillment, and may our ambitions be realized. Yet, we pray, that in all our goals we will be faithful to our commitment to service to others through deeds of love and concern. This is our earnest prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. HEFLEY 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces that it will limit requests for 1-minute recognition to seven per side.

WOMEN'S HEALTH SERVICES ACT OF 1993

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

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce to this Chamber a piece of legislation that I believe addresses two of the most devastating diseases affecting American women; breast cancer and osteoporosis.

The Women's Health Services Act, which I am introducing today, creates preventive and early detection mechanisms under the Medicare Program to battle the catastrophic results of these two deadly diseases.

Every 3 minutes a women in America dies of breast cancer. The National Cancer Institute estimates that in 1993, 46,300 women will die from the deadly disease, and that 183,000 new cases will be diagnosed. What is worse is that American women are dying of breast cancer today at the same rate that they did in 1930.

Osteoporosis is a deadly bone disease. It decreases its victims' bone mass, causing an increase in the risk of bone fracture. While osteoporosis is found in more than 24 million Americans, more than 80 percent of its victims are women.

Osteoporosis is associated with an estimated cost of $7 to $10 billion each year. Yet its costs are even deeper in human terms. More than 20 percent of the elderly women who suffer from hip fractures die within 6 months of the incident.

The Women's Health Services Act which I am introducing today changes current Medicare law to cover mammography screening services for all women over the age of 50 on an annual basis. Currently, for most of these women, Medicare covers only biannual screening.

For osteoporosis victims, the Women's Health Security Act covers an early detection test, called the bone mass measurement test. Early detection can eliminate many devastating effects later.

And finally, this legislation would provide permanent coverage to an osteoporosis drug—coverage which under current law will expire in 1995.

For the sake of our grandmothers, mothers, sisters, daughters, and friends, I urge you to cosponsor this necessary women's health legislation.

THE FALL CLASSIC

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, we start the month of October. In the Clinton era, that means the start of two things: The World Series and the gas tax. In deference to the fall classic, let me put the gas tax in terms any baseball fan can understand.

We must all be Brave, as we face this Giant increase in the gas tax.

We all know this tax really Sox it to the middle class. Every time we Phillie up our tanks, we will be reminded that we are giving more money to the Government for more spending and higher deficits.

From Chicago to Atlanta, from Philadelphia to San Francisco, this gas tax sends a cruel reminder that the President threw the country a nasty curve ball with his budget.

He may have said during the campaign that he opposed a gas tax, but tomorrow we will witness first hand how useful the President's promises really are.

COMMENDING PRESIDENT CLINTON FOR HIS HEALTH CARE REFORM INITIATIVE

(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, I commend President Clinton for his courage and conviction to boldly reform our country's health care system, which has been critically ill for many years. The fatal flaws of the current system must be corrected if we are to control our economic and health care destiny.

Under our current system: General Motors spends more on health care than on steel; by the year 2000, 1 out of every 5 dollars spent in the United States will be for health care; insurance companies happily insure healthy people and actively work to avoid their responsibilities when those same people become ill; and over the next 2 years, 1 out of every 4 Americans will find themselves without insurance.

No American should ever have to choose between paying the mortgage and taking a sick child to the doctor. By seizing the initiative, President Clinton has allowed the Nation to take a giant step toward real health care reform so that no American will ever have to make that choice.

TOMORROW

(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, tomorrow will be a day of firsts. It will be the first day of the new Clinton gas tax. Now you will recall the White House passed that tax—along with a few hundred billion dollars more—because they could not cut spending.

Tomorrow also will be the first day of life under the new "continuing resolution" Congress passed yesterday. Now in case you don't know, a "CR" is what Congress passes to keep the Government running because it was unable to pass the bills it was supposed to pass to keep the Government running.

69-059 O—97 Vol. 139 (Pt. 16) 21

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Well, let me mention one more thing: These are the same people who want to bring you a new Government-run health care system. After 9 months in office this administration has started to slowly unveil a health care plan they claimed they had all through last year's campaign. They still cannot tell you how much it will cost, but they will tell you it will run better and cost less than what you have now. Trust them.

Let me offer a little advice to Americans: Get a fill-up tonight and while you are at it, maybe you should get a check-up too. Because unlike Annie's song, tomorrow will not always be just a day away.

GET REAL TIME ON CAMPAIGN REFORM

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

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Speaker, it is "get-real" time around here. Now that most people admit that the "public financing beast" is dead, for a variety of legal, philosophical, and political reasons, it is time for us to move on to the most doable campaign finance reform plan.

There are acceptable ways to set voluntary spending limits and restrain special interest money. At the least, we can eliminate the perverse incentives in current law that encourage excessive reliance on big money in congressional campaigns.

Earlier this year I introduced a comprehensive proposal, the Fair Campaign Finance Reform Act, that would establish voluntary spending caps at $600,000 and limit aggregate PAC contributions to less than half of that amount. The plan offers a mixture of incentives—such as reduced rate TV, radio, and mail rates—for candidates to accept the voluntary limits.

Today I am introducing the Big Spenders Sin Tax Act, which would place a "sin tax"—forfeiture of currently unlimited tax exempt status, reduced rate mailings, and lowest unit rate broadcasting—on all campaigns exceeding the $600,000 mark for campaign receipts and $300,000 for PAC contributions.

It is "get-real" time on campaign finance reform.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WISE). The Chair would remind Members there are only seven 1-minutes to each side, of which each side has now had three.

CONGRESS SHOULD START DEBATING THE CRIME ISSUE

(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, 25,000 Americans are murdered every year. In the last 3 years there were more American citizens killed in our streets than soldiers killed during the entire Vietnam War, ladies and gentlemen.

There is drive-in, drive-by, drive-through killings, on and on and on; families have fallen apart; schools and churches are now starting to raise our kids. And while Uncle Sam does everything for everybody, Congress does absolutely nothing about crime.

In fact, Congress will not even enact the death penalty for kingpin drug dealers who bring in tons and tons of heroin and cocaine—unbelievable, ladies and gentlemen.

And after all this, one of the greatest officers, drug fighters, in our history, Joe Occhipinti, was railroaded and sent to jail for political reasons. I think Congress should start debating crime. We will find more of our jobs in crime than we will in an unemployment bill.

I have been asked by many law enforcement groups around the Nation to personally investigate the Joe Occhipinti case, and I shall.

HEALTH CARE REFORM: MINIMIZE THE BUREAUCRACY

(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, we are clearly going to do some reform in health care; the question is what do we do and how do we do it? I think the most compelling question is how much bureacracy is going to be involved.

I would like to read from Mike Royko's column. He took a look at the bureaucracy, and this is what he said:

> My lack of trust is based on a list I once made of things the Federal Government does well: fight wars. It is a very short list, as you can see. In recent years we have learned what the Federal Government doesn't do very well. It is not good at watching lending institutions; we also know the Federal Government can't protect our borders. That is why we have thrown up our hands and tell millions of illegal aliens, "Come here and just stop by the office and we will make you legal." It's not good at preventing tons of dope from flowing into this country; it is of little or no use in protecting us from crime, absolutely awful at handling money.

So, he concludes: "Why throw everything up for grabs and create another army of bureaucracy?"

We ought to give that some thought.

REFORM OF SUPERFUND LAW NEEDED

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

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, I met with several hundred Kansans to hear their views on the Federal Superfund Program. Virtually everyone issued a stinging indictment of the liability provisions of the Superfund law.

Fixing Superfund is an urgent priority for my constituents in Kansas, and also for the country. Reauthorizing Superfund should focus on cleaning up contaminated sites in the most cost-effective way possible, while holding responsible parties' feet to the fire.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Treasury Department recently released suggestions for reform of the Superfund law. In their report, the Treasury Department advocates replacing retroactive, strict, joint and several liability with a strict and apportioned liability scheme. I commend the Treasury Department for its sensible recommendations. I believe their proposal gives us an excellent framework within which to begin developing practical and fair solutions.

I will submit a copy of the Treasury Department's report in today's Extension of Remarks. I call on my colleagues as well as on the Clinton administration to move forward on this important issue during the 103d Congress.

HEALTH CARE REFORM: MINIMIZE FEDERAL CONTROLS

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

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, last week, the President gave an inspiring speech extolling the virtues of his health care goals, most of which we all share.

He spoke of making the health care system more secure, more simple, and more cost efficient.

The President is a gifted speechmaker. However, there were some details he left out, Mr. Speaker. And, as always, the devil is in the details.

We didn't hear much about the National Health Board—a Federal bureaucracy that will dwarf many Federal agencies, and that will decide how much Americans are allowed to spend on health care.

This much bureaucracy and governmental control makes many of us nervous—on both sides of the aisle. We fear that such increased Government involvement will do more harm than good.

Mr. Speaker, let us remember what Hippocrates taught all doctors: "First, do no harm."

Let us be careful; let us minimize, not increase Federal control; let us trust the private sector to do a better job than Government—certainly the American people do.

HEALTH CARE REFORM: PEACE OF MIND AT AN AFFORDABLE PRICE

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

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, just about everyone I know has a personal story about a health care nightmare, a loved one who has suffered from catastrophic illness and had everything wiped out, someone afraid of losing a job or locked into a job he does not like for fear that he may lose health insurance as well.

The overriding goal of the President's courageous and inspired plan is to end those nightmares. To be sure, there are those who may disagree with aspects of the plan, and new ideas will be generated, and the debate will be a healthy one; but at the end of that debate we owe it to all Americans to produce a health care reform that will provide for all of us peace of mind at a price that as individuals and as a nation we can afford.

BINH LY: QUESTIONS ABOUND

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, last night I spent 4 hours taping an interview with Mr. Binh Ly, the man who has made allegations and accusations against the Secretary of Commerce, Ron Brown, by saying that he took $700,000 in bribes and other considerations from the Vietnam Government in order to get the embargo lifted, even though we have not had a full accounting of our 2,200 POW's and MIA's.

In that interview some very distressing things were brought to my attention. First of all, there was an FBI investigation that took place investigating Mr. Ly, and during that investigation he passed a lie detector test, and the investigation went on; they even gave him an electronic beeper so they could stay in touch with him.

But on April 23 the FBI investigation involving Mr. Ly was stopped. I found that that was a little over 1 month after Janet Reno was confirmed as the Attorney General of the United States. We have to ask the question: Why was that investigation stopped?

Second, there has been a grand jury empaneled in Miami, and Mr. Ly has not been called to testify. Why has he not been called to testify?

And third, tonight there will be a special order on this, and we will go into great detail. So anybody that is interested, pay attention, and at 2:30 this afternoon we will have the tapes.

NATIONAL FIREFIGHTERS DAY

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the congressional fire services caucus I am honored today to join with the bipartisan cochairs of the caucus to introduce legislation honoring those loyal men and women who serve as the domestic defenders of our great country. This bill designates October 29, 1993 as National Firefighters Day in commemoration of the 2 million firefighters who risk their lives every day of the year in an effort to preserve the lives and property of the American people.

Few can say they risk their lives to preserve the safety and livelihood of family, friend, and neighbor. However, this is exactly the job of the men and women of the fire services. National Firefighters Day gives the American people an opportunity to recognize these unsung heroes whose efforts are often under appreciated.

As we turn the corner on fire prevention week which starts next Monday, I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this resolution, and honor the efforts and memory of those who work to protect our communities and families. Please join me and the leadership of the congressional fire services caucus in supporting National Firefighters Day.

□ 1020

COUNTRY MUSIC GAS TAX

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, last night, as the world watched the Country Music Awards, one couldn't help but think that the President's gas tax will go into effect tomorrow.

Earlier this year, I spoke about the President's affection for country music, and about how he could easily write a song called Achey-Breaky Promises because of his broken campaign promises.

In fact, I am sure that many Americans wish the President would stand by his stand to not raise the gas tax.

But when the people go "On the Road Again" this Friday, they will realize that, as Patsy Cline might say, the Government's Cheating Heart is taking their hard-earned money for more spending.

To Garth Brooks' "Friends in Low Places," this gas tax really hurts. To the truck drivers, to the middle-class consumers, a nickel a gallon adds up to a lot of money.

The President made his Democrat allies "Walk the Line" on the gas tax and his budget package. I bet these members now think that Bill Clinton got the gold, and they got the shaft when it comes to raising taxes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill (H.R. 3116) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes. I may be permitted to include tables and other extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3116) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not to exceed one hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] and myself.

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

□ 1022

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. 3116, with Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the unanimous consent agreement, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA].

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

Mr. Chairman, we have debated the authorization bill for 32 hours.

Mr. Chairman, I bring to the House of Representatives the fiscal year 1994 Defense appropriations bill. I'd like to thank all the members of the Defense Subcommittee for the hard work they have performed all year. I'd like to give special thanks to the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, my friend from Pennsylvania, Mr. MCDADE. I'd like to

thank the new members of the subcommittee, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. DARDEN, and Mr. SKEEN. They have made an invaluable contribution to our deliberations this year.

The Appropriations Committee is recommending to the House a total of $240.1 billion in the new budget authority for fiscal year 1994 for the Defense Department. This figure is $14 billion below the budget request and $937 million below the current year funding level. These spending levels do not include funds for the nuclear weapons program of the Department of Energy or for military construction. Those activities are funded in separate appropriations bills.

At this point in the RECORD I will insert a table outlining the committee's recommendations by account:

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1993 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1994

Agency and item	Appropriated, 1993 (enacted to date)	Budget estimates, 1994	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with appropriated, 1993	Bill compared with budget estimates, 1994
[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]
RECAPITULATION					
Title I—Military personnel	76,275,025,000	70,083,770,000	71,277,520,000	−4,997,505,000	+1,193,750,000
Title II—Operation and maintenance	69,405,963,000	74,239,308,000	73,771,103,000	+4,365,140,000	−468,205,000
Title III—Procurement	55,375,931,000	45,067,328,000	45,654,493,000	−9,721,438,000	+587,165,000
Title IV—Research, development, test and evaluation	38,234,848,000	38,620,327,000	36,546,014,000	−1,688,834,000	−2,074,313,000
Title V—Revolving and management funds	1,737,200,000	1,451,895,000	1,581,900,000	−155,300,000	+130,005,000
Title VI—Other Department of Defense programs	11,027,823,000	11,082,748,000	10,969,594,000	−58,229,000	−113,154,000
Title VII—Related agencies	246,600,000	312,088,000	146,988,000	−99,612,000	−165,100,000
Title VIII					
General provisions	380,925,000		21,700,000	−359,225,000	+21,700,000
(Additional transfer authority)	(1,500,000,000)	(2,000,000,000)	(2,000,000,000)	+500,000,000)	
Total, Department of Defense	253,156,315,000	240,857,464,000	239,969,312,000	−13,187,003,000	−888,152,000
Scorekeeping adjustments	956,424,000	224,067,000	175,227,000	−781,197,000	−48,840,000
Grand total	254,112,739,000	241,081,531,000	240,144,539,000	−13,968,200,000	−936,992,000

Note.—This bill is below the budget request; below the budget resolution; below the 602(b) allocation in budget authority; and conforms with the outlay level in the 602(b) allocation.

DECLINE IN DEFENSE SPENDING

In light of these geopolitical events, the committee supports the downsizing of the force structure and the need to reduce spending for defense. However, the committee notes the scope of the reductions in defense that have already occurred in recent years and the projections for the outyears is extremely large. For example:

First, the fiscal year 1994 budget represents the ninth consecutive year of reductions in budget authority for defense when measured in constant dollars. Statistic does not include the one time spike in spending for Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm. However, these costs were reimbursed by donations from foreign nations.

Second, by the end of fiscal year 1994, the Active Force level will be 513,000 below the level in place when the Berlin Wall came down in 1989. This number is higher than all the forces we had stationed overseas in 1989 and equal to the entire force we deployed to the Persian Gulf during the war with Iraq in 1991.

Third, by the end of fiscal year 1994, the number of civilians employed by the Department of Defense will be 198,000 below the level in place when the Berlin Wall came down.

Fourth, the reduction of 711,000 military and civilians since the Berlin Wall came down is approximately equal to the entire population of San Francisco or Baltimore.

Fifth, the projected uniformed strength by 1997 of 1,400,000 would be the lowest number of personnel in the Armed Forces in 57 years.

Sixth, this year's spending level for defense as a percent of the gross national product, is projected to be the lowest it has been since before World War II with the exception of fiscal year 1948.

Seventh, U.S. military presence either has or soon will be ended, reduced, or placed on standby at over 800 overseas installations.

Eighth, a rapid reduction in the U.S. base structure in ongoing.

Ninth, millions of jobs will also be eliminated in the private sector as a result of these reductions.

Tenth, the procurement account has declined by 64 percent in 9 years.

Eleventh, budget outlays for national defense as a percentage of the Federal budget are the lowest since before World War II.

In historical perspective and in the perspective of America's total wealth, the funds provided in this budget for defense are indeed modest.

PRIORITIES

Mr. Chairman, in fashioning this bill we have placed our highest priorities on maintaining a high quality force, maintaining a high level of readiness and ensuring that it is a highly mobile force.

Also, the committee continues to support, as a national priority, an adequate strategic deterrent to prevent a nuclear strike and guard against nuclear terrorism.

A brief summary of the committee's recommendations in these areas follows.

QUALITY FORCE

The committee's highest priority is to maintain a high quality force. It is absolutely essential to recruit, train and retain high quality personnel. There have been some indicators recently that the quality and morale of the troops is declining. For example, as we point out in the report accompanying this bill:

The propensity to enlist has been declining as shown in a series of polls taken of high school seniors as to their intention to enlist.

The number of recruits that are high school graduates had been at 100 percent for the services, but has declined in recent years.

There is anecdotal and statistical evidence that the personal lives of many of our military personnel are in increased turmoil as the rapid downsizing proceeds.

To help ensure that a high quality force with a high morale is maintained, the committee has added $1.1 billion for a 2.2-percent increase for uniformed personnel.

READINESS

Within the operation and maintenance accounts, the committee has added $1.1 billion for training, depot maintenance backlog and facilities repair. While these items are not glamorous, they are essential to maintaining our forces at a high level of readiness.

MOBILITY

A central focus of the downsize force structure is the need for a high degree of mobility in the strategic and tactical arena. This requirement is especially important as the United States continues its steady withdrawal from overseas bases. The following table lists the committee's recommendations for a variety of programs which will enhance strategic and tactical mobility.

Program	Budget request	Committee recommendation
C–17	$2,318,000,000	$2,018,000,000
C–130	0	446,000,000
KC–135 Re-engining	0	160,000,000
Osprey	82,295,000	102,295,000
Maritime Fund	290,800,000	490,800,000

PEACEKEEPING

Mr. Chairman, I would like to address the issue of peacekeeping funds. The budget request included a $300 million request for a peacekeeping fund. As we state in our report, the committee is concerned that an open-ended approval of this request would in effect, put Congress in a position of prospectively approving the funding resources for unspecified and undetermined future military operations.

Thus, while the committee has approved a fund for peacekeeping, it has also included bill language which requires the administration in power to notify the Committee on Appropriations and Armed Services 15 days before approving the U.S. military personnel in carrying out any international humanitarian assistance, peacekeeping, peacemaking, or peace-enforcing operations. The notification to the Congress, which is to be in accordance with established reprogramming procedures, must specify:

Estimated cost of the operation;

How it is to be paid for;

Projected duration and scope of the operation;

Goals of the operation; and

U.S. interests that will be served by the operation.

INTELLIGENCE BUDGET

Between fiscal years 1982 and 1992 the intelligence budget has grown by over 100 percent in real terms. In comparison, the defense

budget has grown by only 5 percent during the same period. The fiscal year 1994 budget request for the National Foreign Intelligence Program includes significant growth over the fiscal year 1993 level. This bill reduces the budget request by $800 million thus freezing funding for the National Foreign Intelligence Program at the fiscal year 1993 spending level. The House Intelligence Committee proposed freezing the intelligence budget at the fiscal year 1993 level; however, fiscal year 1993 dollars were rescinded after the authorizing committee's mark. The bill also recommends a mandatory 4-percent reduction to the National Foreign Intelligence Program personnel levels when compared to fiscal year 1992 levels.

Following are the funding levels for major programs in the procurement account and the research, development, test and evaluation account.

FUNDING LEVELS FOR MAJOR PROGRAMS

PROCUREMENT

The Committee recommends $18,069,473,000 in new obligational authority. Major programs funded in the bill include the following:

$386,000,000 for 24 AH-64 Attack helicopters;

$233,557,000 for 60 UH-60 Blackhawk helicopters;

$216,000,000 for 36 AHIP helicopter modifications;

$135,231,000 for 144 Avenger systems;

$207,268,000 for 1000 Javelin missiles;

$276,717,000 for 34 MLRS launchers and 12,000 MLRS rockets;

$152,559,000 for 255 ATACMS missiles;

$192,437,000 for the Bradley Fighting Vehicle Base Sustainment Program;

$159,526,000 for the 155 MM Howitzer program;

$119,710,000 for 72 Abrams Upgrades;

$620,787,000 for Army ammunition;

$174,737,000 for 4661 HMMWV vehicles;

$458,258,000 for 945 Palletized Loading Systems;

$352,465,000 for SINCGARS radios;

$129,601,000 for 4 AV-8B aircraft;

$1,521,534,000 for 36 F-18 aircraft;

$276,484,000 for 12 CH/MH-53E helicopters;

$143,274,000 for 12 AH-1W helicopters;

$189,276,000 for 7 SH-60B helicopters;

$149,839,000 for 8 SH-60F helicopters;

$259,225,000 for 12 T-45 trainers;

$118,461,000 for E-6 modifications;

$983,345,000 for 24 Trident II (D5) missiles

$248,288,000 for 216 Tomahawk missiles;

$215,028,000 for 220 Standard missiles;

$100,125,000 for 108 Mk-48 ADCAP Torpedoes

$1,000,000,000 for the Carrier Replacement program;

$2,642,772,000 for 3 DDG-51 destroyers;

$893,848,000 for 1 LHD-1 amphibious assault ship;

$124,175,000 for 1 Mine Warfare command and control ship;

$604,339,000 for the B-2 aircraft;

$724,700,000 for 24 F-16 fighter aircraft;

$1,772,809,000 for 6 C-17 transport aircraft;

$241,823,000 for 1 JSTARS aircraft;

$268,325,000 for F-15 modifications;

$203,143,000 for C-135 modifications;

$489,929,000 for 749 AMRAAM missiles; and

$470,585,000 for Space Boosters.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

The Committee recommends $36,546,014,000 for the RDT&E title, a reduction of $2,074,313,000 from the budget request. Specific recommendations of selected programs are as follows:

The Committee provided $367,080,000, the budget request, for the RAH-66 Comanche helicopter.

The Committee provided $237,846,000, the budget request, for the Armored Systems Modernization program. The Committee also added $33,000,000 for Bradley upgrades, $34,600,000 for the M1A2 program, and $20,000,000 for the Advanced Command and Control Vehicle above the budget request.

The Committee provided $92,672,000 for the Sense and Destroy Missile Armament Missile (SADARM), an increase of $57,661,000 to the budget request.

The Committee added $25,000,000 for Horizontal Battlefield Integration program to digitize the battlefield.

The Committee added $25,000,000 to accelerate the Line-of-Sight, Antitank (LOSAT) program.

The Committee provided $476,000,000, the budget request, for the Centurion next generation attack submarine.

The Committee provided $92,328,000, the budget request, for Advanced Surface Machinery Systems which provides next generation propulsion for surface ships.

The Committee provided $460,764,000 for ship self-defense, an increase of $106,800,000 to the budget request.

The Committee denied the request for $399,218,000 for development of the A/F-X next generation attack aircraft.

The Committee provided $1,485,496,000, the budget request, for the F-18E/F aircraft development program.

The Committee provided $149,995,000 for upgrades to the F-14 aircraft, an increase of $78,000,000 to the budget request.

The Committee provided an additional $205,000,000 for Navy manufacturing technology programs.

The Committee provided $80,000,000 for the National Aero Space Plane, an increase of $36,741,000 to the budget request.

The Committee provided $126,543,000 for the B-1B Bomber, an increase of $33,000,000 to the budget request.

The Committee provided $790,497,000, the budget request, for the B-2 Advanced Technology Bomber. In addition, the Committee added $48,000,000 for the GPS-Aided Targeting System/GPS-Aided Munition (GATS/GAM) to provide an earlier and effective precision guided conventional munition for the B-2.

The Committee provided $154,799,000 for the C-17 program, a decrease of $25,000,000 to the budget request.

The Committee provided $2,250,997,000, the budget request, for the F-22 Advanced Technology Fighter.

The Committee provided $125,014,000 for high definition display systems, an increase of $67,800,000 to the budget request.

The Committee provided $2,870,040,000 for Ballistic Missile Defense (formerly the Strategic Defense Initiative), the amount recommended by the House Armed Services plus funding for the Brilliant Eyes program as explained in the Space and Related Programs section of this report, a decrease of $767,095,000.

The Committee provided $190,556,000 for maritime technologies, a new program.

The Committee provided $624,000,000 for dual use technologies, an increase of $300,000,000 to the budget request.

The Committee denied the request of $147,733,000 for a Departmental level manufacturing technology program, and provided funds in the Service accounts instead.

The Committee transferred $122,819,000 for the High Performance Computing Modernization Program to the Procurement, Defensewide appropriation.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Defense appropriations bill for fiscal year 1994. This bill contains $240 billion for the Department of Defense for our national security. As Members know this continues the overall adjustment of our military posture and is below last year's level of $254 billion.

This is the 13th and final regular appropriations bill for fiscal year 1994 to come before the House. The Senate is marking up and passing our bills, and we're conferencing as quickly as we can so that congressional action can be completed as soon as possible.

Mr. Chairman following is a status of all our regular bills:

STATUS OF FISCAL YEAR 1994 APPROPRIATIONS BILLS

1 signed into law: Legislative (P.L. 103-69).

3 conference reports:

Agriculture (2 amendments returned to House);

Treasury-Postal Service (passed House); and

Foreign Operations (passed House and Senate).

5 passed House and Senate:

Commerce-Justice-State (conferees appointed September 29);

District of Columbia (conferees appointed September 27);

Interior (conferees appointed September 29);

VA-HUD; and

Labor-HHS-Education.

3 passed House and reported by Senate:

Energy and Water;

Military Construction; and

Transportation.

1 reported by House committee: Defense.

Mr. Chairman, by the August recess we had 11 of our 13 bills through the House. I thank all Members for their cooperation.

I want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA], chairman of the Defense Subcommittee, and also the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE], the ranking minority member of the subcommittee on the excellent job they have done in bringing out this bill. Also, Mr. Chairman, we have an excellent staff on this subcommittee as we do on all of our 13 subcommittees. We are grateful for the hard work they have done.

Mr. Chairman, this bill provides for the important defense programs that are needed to assure our national security. It provides for these important programs in a responsible and careful way as we continue adjusting our military to world conditions. The cold war is over, yet our Department of Defense continues to be called on an increasing basis for various deployments all over the world. We must keep in mind that not withstanding the end of the cold war, we currently have many trouble spots or potential trouble spots all over the world. We have serious problems in the former Republics of Yugoslavia, in North Korea, in the former Soviet Union. We have terrorism worldwide. We must not neglect our military responsibilities under these circumstances. The Defense Appropriations Subcommittee has faced up to these problems and has done an excellent job.

Again, I want to commend the chairman and the ranking minority member and all the other members of the subcommittee for a good bill, and I urge its adoption.

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

Mr. Chairman, we have debated most of these issues at great length and we will debate more as we get into the amending process.

I want to compliment Chairman MURTHA and my good friend JOE MCDADE—who cannot be here today because of a severe case of the flu—for their leadership in presenting a Defense bill which is far less than we really would like because of the funding constraints we are under, but at the same time provides a ready, sustainable force, with particular attention to our greatest national defense asset—our people.

I also want to compliment every member of our subcommittee who have labored for many hours in a truly bipartisan manner to craft a bill which meets our needs.

This bill, for the 9th year in a row is less than it was last year.

Between 1985 and 1990, the Congress cut defense requests by a total of $108 billion.

In the 1990 budget agreement, Defense budget authority was cut by an additional $210 billion for fiscal years 1991 through 1995.

In January 1992, President Bush proposed an additional cut of $50 billion including a $7 billion cut to last year's bill which the Congress doubled to $14 billion.

And in February of this year, President Clinton proposed an additional $127 billion in defense cuts over the next 5 years including a cut of $11 billion for the bill we have under consideration, to which we added an additional $1 billion cut.

You add it all up and we will have cut $503 billion from defense between 1985 and 1998.

Over the past 5 years, active duty troop levels have been cut by nearly 25 percent—over 510,000 troops.

And have we asked these fewer troops to do less?

Absolutely not, in fact we have asked them to do even more. In fact, in addition to preserving peace we've added humanitarian assistance missions around the world.

Today, forces of the U.S. military are deployed in every State in the Union and 87 foreign countries

We have 13 ongoing international humanitarian missions including: Southern Watch—Iraq (air escort surveillance); Provide Confort—Iraq (feeding refugees); Continued Hope—Somalia (feeding country); Provide Promise—Bosnia (air drops); and Able Sentry—Macedonia (keep Bosnia from overflowing)

And when you consider the other nondefense related costs we are being asked to fund such as the almost $5 billion in environmental expenditures and the $3.2 billion in economic conversion, it is a miracle that our defense dollars go as far as they do.

We can be proud that because of the stability we provided to the rest of the world: The Berlin Wall is down, the Warsaw Pact is dissolved, the Soviet Union is no longer a threat, and democratic forces have emerged in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union.

But Mr. Speaker, the world we fact today is a dangerous place, we are currently monitoring 75 hotspots around the world including 12 shooting wars in Soviet Georgia: Abhazia, Cambodia, Armenia, Azerbajan, Angola, Rwanda, Liberia, Somalia, Sudan, Ossettia, and Bosnia.

The Russian White House is surrounded by armed troops. Nuclear and chemical capability is spreading throughout the Third World at alarming rates.

This is not the time to dismantle our defense capability and return it to the hollow force we found ourselves in during the seventies.

Mr. Speaker, I support this bill. But it is far from perfect. In keeping with the bottom's up review, we have set the Marine Corps end strength at 174,000. It should be 177,000 if we are really concerned about the extremely high deployment rates for marines who are away from home more than 50 percent of the time. Among the most important accounts of all—but far from glamorous—is the operation and maintenance account. We had to cut that $478 million from the budget request due to our outlay constraints. We've cut the C–17 program $300 million in keeping with the authorized level, even though our aircraft situation is very troubling. We cut $100 million from Milstar. We cut the national foreign intelligence program by $880 million, leaving a level equal to fiscal year 1993, and $340 million less than the House-passed authorization. We've cut the drug interdiction program by $410 million which is $383 million less than last year.

But we've done the best we can with the allocation we were given. In fact JACK MURTHA and JOE MCDADE and the dedicated staff they have assembled are real heroes for being able to cram so many good ideas, many from Members who do not serve on the subcommittee or the full committee into this package without decimating our ability to provide for our national security, particularly with regard to readiness. The readiness of our forces and their sustainability are real keys to their effectiveness. And this bill is right on the edge. We cannot afford to reduce readiness and it wouldn't take much more of a cut to do that and return our forces to the hollow levels of the seventies.

So I urge my colleagues, stick with us.

As tempting as it is to beat up on defense spending, resist those efforts to cut the bill we present today even further so that if we are ever required to go in harms way again as we were in Desert Storm, that we will go there with the knowledge that we have the right people, with the right equipment and the proper training to promote our national security interests anywhere in the world.

And if necessary—to fight and to win.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3116, the Defense appropriations bill for fiscal year 1994. I congratulate Chairman MURTHA for his outstanding leadership and cooperative approach to a very important issues that we face today. I commend Mr. MCDADE, the ranking member, and all of my colleagues on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee for their efforts to produce a bill that addresses our national security requirements despite the fiscal constraints and emerging world developments. I also want to thank the staff of the subcommittee for their professional support and the long hours they labored to make this bill possible.

In H.R. 3116, the committee recommends $240.1 billion in new budget authority, nearly $14 billion below that of the fiscal year 1993 budget. Considering the world realities and our own budgetary constraints, this important reduction represents the ninth consecutive year of decline in defense spending, and a significant contribution toward deficit reduction.

The world is still a very uncertain place and we are faced with challenges and events that will continue to shape our national security policy for the years to come. The President and the Secretary of Defense have presented to the country a defense plan, that supports a leaner, but effective force. While world events almost certainly justify overall reductions in spending, we must continue to maintain our responsibilities and interests around the world. This committee continues to support the proposed reductions in defense spending as consistent with our legitimate security requirements. However, these moves must be carefully executed so that we maintain a credible military force and not place our security in jeopardy.

H.R. 3116 offers a real reduction in defense spending, with the crucial goal to support a smaller overall military; ready, well trained and equipped, to meet future threats and missions. The transition to a smaller armed forces has not been a painless task. Elements of the defense industrial base, which for years has provided our military the specialized weapons systems that gave us the superior military technology and capability unmatched anywhere in the world, are being terminated, and shut down. This country recently experienced a very painful round of base closures. To date, more than 800 bases have been closed around the world. The Secretary of Defense has already predicted the next round will be even larger—and undoubtedly more painful.

This bill provides $575 million for innovative technology programs with potential commercial applications through the technology reinvestment project more then double the amount in the President's fiscal year 1994 request. By bringing defense and commercial industries together, I believe there are exciting opportunities to decrease the development costs of an acquisition program as well as stimulate the economy.

The committee has maintained its priorities on maintaining the quality of our troops, their training, readiness and flexibility. We have expressed concern with the current funding levels of operations and maintenance, and have funded the readiness accounts $1 billion over the House authorization bill. This committee has been at the forefront of insisting a pay increase for our service members. This committee has provided more than $1 billion for this 2-percent pay increase, which has been authorized by the House and Senate committees.

Our national military strategy and objectives mandate a global capacity for rapid response to regional crisis and the projection of national power with forces based primarily in the United States. To meet this requirement, this committee has sought to expand and modernize our ability to provide strategic lift both from the air and sea. These initiatives must be a priority for defense investment. Reaction/response time becomes even more important as the world's adversaries become more difficult to detect. While we continue to withdraw our forward deployed troops, we relieve the forward logistics disadvantage with increased air and

sealift, which includes the prepositioning of equipment and supplies. Combined with quick lift, light and heavy divisions, equipment and supplies can be transferred to all parts of the world. We have funded the C–17 and we are awaiting the outcome of the defense advisory board to determine what assets will be needed to complement the C–17.

This bill encourages the consideration of using commercial widebodies, with minimal military modifications, to remedy the severe existing airlift shortfalls. The Air Mobility Command reported that only 27 percent of the C–141 fleet are fully mission capable. Airlift is essential to our national military strategy, and peacetime airlift operations are at an alltime high. We must have a more effective airlift capacity, and I believe that commercial widebodies, with state-of-the-art avionics, and with worldwide depot and maintenance support will provide such capability.

Future threats, as well as the budgetary constraints we face, continue to influence what weapon system capabilities will be required. Secretary Aspin is restructuring our defense capabilities, but there are limited funds available, and we must prioritize what can be committed. The first priority must remain the ability to deliver significant ordnance over long distances with little warning or advanced basing. I remain convinced that 20 B–2's offer revolutionary conventional capabilities for this requirement.

In light of the small contingency forces, the B–2 with smart conventional weapons and global reach, is exactly the kind of weapon we need for the future. The world still has a great deal of threat, and the B–2, in its conventional role, remains our greatest source of deterrence.

Arms control remains an important priority of this administration. President Clinton, in his speech to the United Nations on Monday, indicated that proliferation is one of our most serious challenges. As administration officials have testified to this Congress, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction must be reigned in. One of the President's efforts will be ban on the production of fissile materials. Another effort must be to continue the dismantlement of the former Soviet Union arsenal, to track and protect that inventory. Fiscal year 1994 marks the third year that funds are authorized in support of the demilitarization of the former Soviet Union.

In light of the President's recent announcement of national health care, it is important to note how supportive the members of this committee have been to improve the health care for the military, their families, and the uniformed retirees. These people deserve better care. I am very encouraged by the fact that the Department is aggressively pursuing the expansion of the managed care support program in Washington and Oregon.

This committee continues to be concerned with the environmental cleanup of our defense bases. The new administration and the Department have placed the protection of the environment high on its priority list. This bill provides nearly $11 billion for environmental cleanup. This bill also makes a number of recommendations to improve environmental restoration programs in order to expedite the completion of remedial action and have resulted in wasted expenditures.

I urge my colleagues to join the members of this subcommittee in support of this bill.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, if there were ever a time for us to reorder our spending priorities it is now. If there were ever a vehicle in which to do that, it should be this bill. While the Appropriations Committee has attempted to convert some of our defense spending to civilian purposes they have strayed from the goal in certain areas of this bill which could have been markedly improved through the adoption of several amendments.

Representative KENNEDY offered a good amendment which would have eliminated the funding for the Army School of the Americas. This anachronism might as well be known as Noriega University since it is the institution that has trained him and many of the other nondemocratic military regimes which have ruled by force over the peoples of South and Central America. In our new world order this particular institution is clearly out of place. Instead of educating future dictators we might pay attention to the education crisis which faces our own children here at home.

The bill could have been improved if we had adopted the Maloney amendment which eliminated another anachronism, the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice. This institution which was established after the Spanish-American War to improve the readiness of recruits into the Armed Forces has long since served its usefulness. Today it has become merely a method of funneling cheap weapons and ammunition to members of the National Rifle Association. I can't imagine anything more outrageous than the Federal Government promoting the stockpiling of guns and ammunition when the rational approach would be to deny a few people the opportunity to practice their target shooting and provide more of our children safer neighborhoods to live in.

These amendments, along with a few others, show the many opportunities for prudent cuts in spending that were not agreed to. The time to reduce spending on these many unnecessary defense programs and begin spending on some of our urgent domestic crisis such as health care, homelessness, violence prevention and education has long passed.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize that we are beginning to shift our emphasis from defense spending toward other immediate domestic needs, but I am afraid this bill does not move decisively in that direction. For that reason I will be voting against H.R. 3116 and I urge my colleagues to join me.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 3116, and to discuss certain provisions of the bill affecting the Small Business Innovation Research [SBIR/STTR] Program. The program, established in 1982, was the vision of Representatives NEAL SMITH, JOE MCDADE, myself, and several other legislators who sat on the Small Business Committee at that time. Under the program, the Department of Defense and 10 other Federal agencies are required to allocate certain percentages of their extramural R&D budgets for research projects conducted by small businesses. Since its inception, the program has generated a remarkable amount of innovation by small, high-technology businesses, as documented in studies by the General Accounting Office and Small Business Administration, and a report by the National Academy of Sciences. The Department of Defense has warmly endorsed the program, citing "its positive effect on all R&D programs," and last year a House Armed Services Committee panel on the defense industrial base, and a Senate Republican leadership report on Defense change, called for doubling the size of the program.

On the basis of such evidence, last year the Small Business Committee, which I chair, worked with the Armed Services Committee and others to secure passage of legislation—Public Law 102–564—which significantly expanded the program's size and concept.

This year the Department of Defense, in its budget request, submitted specific funding lines for SBIR/STTR, and the Appropriations Committee has modified those funding lines in the committee report accompanying H.R. 3116. I have sought Chairman MURTHA'S assistance in clarifying that the Department of Defense must still fulfill the percentage funding requirements specified in Public Law 102–564. The chairman has graciously agreed, and I wish to include in the RECORD our exchange of letters indicating that to the extent the SBIR/STTR funding lines fall short of the total percentage requirements, the Department must identify the remainder in order to fully comply with the percentage requirements set forth in the law. The letters follow:

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS,
Washington, DC, September 23, 1993.

Hon. JOHN P. MURTHA,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Defense, House Committee on Appropriations, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to seek a clarification of certain provisions in the Defense Appropriations bill (H.R. 3116) affecting the Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR/STTR) program.

The Committee Report accompanying H.R. 3116 indicates (p. 189) that SBIR funding should be a percentage of the appropriated amounts for extramural research and development (R & D), rather than a percentage of the Administration's requested budget. I fully agree; such an interpretation is consistent with the SBIR Act which passed last year (Public Law 102–564) and the way in which the program has been administered since its inception in 1982.

However, the specific line items for SBIR/STTR in the Report add up to less than the percentage requirements set forth in the SBIR Act. I therefore seek your clarification that these line items indicate where part of the money for SBIR/STTR is to come from, and that, as in previous years, the remainder will need to be identified by the Department in order to fully meet the percentage requirements set forth in the SBIR Act.

I appreciate your attention to this important matter, and I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

JOHN J. LAFALCE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, DC, September 28, 1993.

Hon. JOHN J. LAFALCE,
Chairman, Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter dated September 23, 1993 concerning

small business innovative research. I appreciate your concurrence with our Committee's approach for the DoD RDT&E appropriations. If our position is sustained in conference, I intend that the amounts calculated for the SBIR funding lines will either be consistent with the requirements of the SBIR Act or else other provisions will be made to ensure that the Department is required to meet the total funding requirements in the SBIR Act. Our staffs are communicating on how to count funding for SBIR within Ballistic Missile Defense (formerly SDI), which accounts for a large portion of the apparent difference in the amounts calculated by our Committees. The Subcommittee on Defense will consider your request during its deliberations in conference on the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1994.

Sincerely,

JOHN P. MURTHA,
Chairman,
Subcommittee on Defense.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, one of the key provisions of this legislation is our continued support for SEMATECH, the industry-Government consortium on semiconductor manufacturing.

I am pleased to report to my colleagues that SEMATECH has continued its impressive record of technology successes which have helped the U.S. semiconductor industry and U.S. semiconductor equipment industry regain top ranking in the world market share.

When we first established SEMATECH in 1987, the United States chip industry found itself losing ground to foreign competitors. Furthermore, the Department of Defense was concerned about the increasing reliance on foreign sources for key technologies used in our most advanced weapons systems.

SEMATECH has been an important investment for the semiconductor industry and our Nation. Working with the Advanced Research Projects Agency and its 11-member companies, SEMATECH's scientists and engineers have helped reverse the decline in world market share for U.S. chip manufacturers while ensuring that the Department of Defense will have the latest technology available domestically for its next generation of weapons, communications, and surveillance systems.

For example, SEMATECH and its members have developed key semiconductor manufacturing equipment that is used to make chips for weapons such as the F–22, the Patriot, and many missile systems such as the AMRAAM, Hellfire, and Tomahawk.

The consortium's technology also is used in the production of a number of defense systems, to include the Phalanx ship defense system, tactical and battlefield communications, the pilot survival radio, battlefield surveillance, and cluster bombs.

Dr. William J. Perry, Deputy Secretary of Defense, has stated that the Department of Defense must increasingly rely on dual-use technologies. SEMATECH provides ARPA the ability to leverage industry dollars and expertise to ensure U.S. technological superiority in semiconductor manufacturing for critically needed defense electronics.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this measure, and I want to commend the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the ranking minority member [Mr. MCDADE], for the excellent work they have done on behalf of our Nation's Armed Forces.

I want to speak about several items that will also affect the well-being of veterans who have left the Armed Forces. This bill will help to sustain and enhance benefits and services for former service members in a number of ways.

Several months ago, I contacted the chairman of the subcommittee to advise him of my strong interest in establishing an environmental medical unit to help study undiagnosed ailments of Persian Gulf war veterans. As I told Chairman MURTHA in my letter to him of June 18:

I am working with our colleague, the Honorable Pat Schroeder, Chairwoman of the Armed Services Subcommittee on Research and Technology, on an important provision which I have suggested be included in the DOD authorization bill this year. The legislation would authorize a grant for the Secretary of Defense to establish a new environmental medical unit aimed at resolving an important question regarding health care concerns of many active duty members and veterans who served during the Persian Gulf War in Southwest Asia.

As you are aware, a significant number of those who served in the Persian Gulf have experienced a pattern of chronic disabling symptoms including fatigue, joint pain, weight loss, and intermittent fever and diarrhea. In many instances, these symptoms have defied exhaustive efforts at diagnosis and treatment. A recent hearing held by our committee produced very compelling testimony regarding the importance of conducting research to explore the growing belief that this very disabling syndrome may be related to unique sensitivity to low level chemical exposures on the part of those affected. A recent National Academy of Sciences report identified the need for a specialized environmental isolation unit within a hospital as a setting for such research.

The research being called for appears to have scientific merit according to an April 28, 1993 letter from the Deputy Director of the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS) to the Commanding General of Walter Reed Army Medical Center. What is needed are the funds to construct and equip the research unit.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania has responded affirmatively to my request. This bill includes $1.2 million for such a unit to be established in conjunction with a medical school and a military hospital affiliated with the Department of Veterans Affairs.

This bill also provides substantial support for the Department of Veterans Affairs' acclaimed medical and prosthetic research program. The bill includes $30 million in funding for joint DOD/VA research projects. The medical research proposals funded by this program are aimed at areas of interest common to DOD and VA. It is a unique and very successful program. I am delighted that the chairman and members of the subcommittee continue to support this program.

The bill also includes $1.7 million for a study of the effects of depleted uranium on military personnel. Along with several other members of the Armed Services and Veterans' Affairs Committees, I supported the authorization provision which addresses this subject and want to express appreciation to the subcommittee chairman for his responsiveness to the concerns of present and former servicemembers on this matter.

The report accompanying this measure also urges the Secretary of the Navy to consider transferring the Orlando Naval Hospital while still fully operational, without compensation or reimbursement, to the Department of Veterans Affairs. The Secretary of Veterans Affairs has visited the Naval hospital recently to determine the feasibility of using the facility as an outpatient clinic and nursing home care unit. The Department has announced plans to build a new outpatient clinic and a nursing home care unit in Orlando. The present outpatient clinic is very inadequate and VA should proceed to expand its outpatient clinic operation without further delay.

I would also like to comment on the provisions in the bill directing the Department of Defense to award a CHAMPUS reform initiative [CRI] type contract to cover the State of Florida. Included in this provision is language which would allow the Department of Veterans Affairs to participate in such a contract, and I urge the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to consider making VA facilities available for this purpose. The President has announced that as part of the Health Security Act of 1993, he intends to allow VA medical facilities to participate as providers in health alliances. Participation in a managed-care CRI initiative would give VA valuable insight into the challenges ahead of it, and I urge the Secretary to actively consider a VA role in this initiative.

The subcommittee has recommended $10 million for a Model Veterans Training and Employment Demonstration Program. This is a program which I was pleased to sponsor in the DOD authorization bill. This program would train and place recently separated servicemembers in construction and hazardous waste remediation industries. The American Legion has been successful in placing veterans in high-paying construction jobs. This pilot program has great potential to provide meaningful training and long-term employment to recently separated servicemembers, and I want to thank the subcommittee for including funding support in this measure for this purpose.

The $25 million contained in the DOD authorization bill we passed yesterday to train and place in good jobs service personnel being phased out of the military is not included in this bill. However, I have been assured that should the Senate include the $25 million in the bill it passes, it would be favorably considered in conference.

Again, I want to thank the very able chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. MURTHA] and the distinguished ranking minority member [Mr. MCDADE] for their leadership and support of these provisions.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3116, the Department of Defense appropriation for fiscal year 1994.

This is a difficult bill to write. The pressure to reduce defense spending must be balanced against the need to ensure the reductions are reached in a way that leaves us with a fighting force capable of performing all the missions asked of it. This bill reflects that balance and I commend Mr. MURTHA and Mr. MCDADE for their outstanding efforts on our behalf.

I also commend the subcommittee for attempting to take action on the issue of U.N. peacekeeping. The subcommittee included language requiring notification to Congress when American troop deployments are planned for humanitarian interventions. I share Mr. MURTHA and Mr. MCDADE's concern that administration plans to establish a fund for peacemaking and peacekeeping is to ask Congress to establish funds for the United States to engage in unspecified and undetermined future military operations without the consent of Congress.

At my request, the subcommittee also included language prohibiting the use of Department of Defense funds to renovate and turn over to the United Nations a defense facility for use as a U.N. peacekeeping headquarters. In addition, at my request, the subcommittee also included report language directing the administration to report to Congress on its plans to strengthen the United Nations.

Many of us are concerned the administration's plans to strengthen the United Nations is not being explained in a straight forward manner to Congress or the people. President Clinton went to the United Nations on Monday and said the things Americans want to hear. Mr. Clinton warned the United Nations not to become engaged in every one of the world's conflicts, he expressed American desire to reduce our assessed costs for peacekeeping operations, and encouraged the United Nations to make serious efforts to reduce wasteful spending.

Unfortunately the President's speech does not match his actions. For months now the Clinton administration has been preparing Presidential Decision Directive-13 and its annex Presidential Review Document-13. Among the many proposals included in this new policy are: placing U.S. troops under U.N. command; repealing the laws which limits the amount of troops the United States can commit to peacekeeping operations without congressional approval, and bypassing the congressional budget process by establishing new slush funds for U.N. peacekeeping.

We have seen bits and pieces of the administration's proposed policy in various bills, yet the administration refuses to provide Congress the total policy as embodied in Presidential Decision Directive-13.

Last night's action by the Rules Committee, to strip on procedural grounds the 15-day notification period from the bill, is an example of the Democrat leadership of this House allowing the President to say one thing at the United Nations and still give him the freedom to involve our troops in any U.N. operation he sees fit.

The administration must be made to understand that no funds will be provided for expanded peacekeeping commitments through backdoor funding. Congress must fully debate this issue before any further financial commitments can be made.

Again, I commend Mr. MURTHA and Mr. MCDADE for a well written bill and urge the entire House to support this bill.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the Defense Appropriations Committee and Chairman JOHN MURTHA and JOE MCDADE for their hard work on this excellent piece of legislation. I appreciate and commend the committee's strong support for continued funding for SEMATECH.

SEMATECH is a partnership between 11 American semiconductor manufacturers and the Department of Defense dedicated to solving the technical challenges required to keep the United States No. 1 in the global semiconductor industry.

President Clinton and Vice President GORE praised SEMATECH when they outlined their technology policy in Silicon Valley in February. In its paper, "Technology for America's Economic Growth, A New Direction to Build Economic Strength," the White House wrote:

> SEMATECH, an industry consortium created to develop semiconductor manufacturing technology, will receive continued matching funds from the Department of Defense in FY 94. This can serve as a model for federal consortia to advance other technologies.

I applaud the leadership of Dr. Bill Spencer at SEMATECH, and his predecessor, Dr. Bob Noyce. SEMATECH began as a bold experiment in industry-government cooperation. Today, it stands as a model program that is effective, cost-efficient, and a true national asset. SEMATECH continues to be representative of the growing partnership of industry, government, and academia that has been prospering in this country.

In addition, SEMATECH determined that it can accomplish what it needs to accomplish in 1994 with a budget of $180 million. Therefore, their request for funding this year was reduced by $10 million.

I commend the House Defense Appropriations Committee led by Chairman MURTHA for continuing its recognition of the importance of high technology to this Nation's economic and national security and the substantial contribution that SEMATECH has made since its inception in 1987.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, last year, in the fiscal year 1993 House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee report, this committee expressed its support for the Army's goal to equip its soldiers with the most technologically advanced equipment in sufficient quantity. But the committee also expressed real concern that because of budgetary constraints that are beyond the Army's control, the Army is continually being forced to stretch out programs, cut back, and even eliminate many of its very important modernization and acquisition programs.

Mr. Speaker, this year, the Army testified before our committee that modernization is the key to tomorrow's readiness, and that they have made a conscious effort to maintain the technological base. Continuous modernization is the means by which we sustain our forces and capabilities. The challenge ahead of our military is to maintain the technological edge by sustaining modernization, and to reshape the leaner force with the equipment of the future. Yet, the Army procurement budget is 60 percent lower than where it was expected to be just 3 years ago.

In fiscal year 1991, the Army planned a procurement budget for fiscal year 1994 was $18.7 billion, but the Army today has a procurement budget of only $6.8 billion.

And the overall Army budget continues to decline. In fiscal year 1991, the Army projected a budget of $98.3 billion for fiscal year 1994, but today for fiscal year 1994 the Army has a budget of $60.7 billion.

This year, the R&D technology base is 12 percent less than last year. Mr. Speaker, I believe this level of funding is inadequate to support the Army's mission.

Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned about the continuous decline in resources available to the Army—especially when one considers the proportional amount of dollars available to the Army in relation to total DOD funding. Mr. Speaker, continuing to take these large, proportional reductions to the already small Army budget exacerbates the decline of modernization programs, and certainly affects the Army mission of maintaining a well-trained and well-equipped force for the future. Any further reductions will put our Army at risk. I believe modernization must complement readiness as key factors in preventing the return to the hollow force.

This modernization effort is accomplished in many ways: A system needs to be in production, needs to be upgraded, or the next generation system must be in development. Without this, the erosion begins, as we lose the critical skills, the industrial base diminishes, technology becomes stagnant, the equipment ages and becomes obsolete; in many cases the restart of a cold production line is cost prohibitive. The end result is the reduction of our military superiority over many potential threats.

With the end of the cold war, our military strategy is shifting quickly from a strategic, to a more conventional role for our forces, and I believe that it is essential that our Nation's Army be fully capable and ready.

Mr. Speaker, an example of this procurement problem is the Army's family of medium tactical vehicle requirements, the Army truck—at the current acquisition schedule, it will take the Army 30 years to buy out the currently required inventory. This means that by the time the fielding is accomplished, the soldier that received the first truck would be driving a 30-year-old truck. Acquisition programs this slow are unacceptable, but because of the limited budget provided to the Army, this unfortunately is becoming the norm.

Another example is the further development of the RAH–66 Comanche Helicopter. It is fortunate that the past 25 years have produced tremendous advances in armed helicopter capabilities and the associated technologies. The Comanche represents an opportunity to build on the record of accomplishment. As it becomes operational, it will replace 30-year-old aircraft in the current inventory, and will provide many times the capabilities of its aging predecessors. The future of the Army's modernization program necessitate the Comanche as part of a conventional force, and the support of this program is crucial.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize that the future defense budgets may provide even more limited funding. While additional cuts will be necessary, further cuts to the Army should only be made based upon a weighted average of the dollars available. I believe that the Army's allocation needs to be increased, and the salami slicing must be stopped.

I believe the Army needs at least a 2-percent increase of DOD total obligation authority to meet minimum requirement of a force projection Army.

I urge the Secretary of Defense to fully evaluate the future impact on modernization and readiness of the current and projected Army funding levels as he begins to prepare for the future defense budgets, and to promote more sufficient levels of funding for the Army's requirements.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3116

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, for military functions administered by the Department of Defense, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

MILITARY PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Army on active duty (except members of reserve components provided for elsewhere), cadets, and aviation cadets; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97-377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), to section 229(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 429(b)), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund; $21,571,207,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Navy on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere), midshipmen, and aviation cadets; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97-377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), to section 229(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 429(b)), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund; $18,633,383,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Marine Corps on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere); and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97-377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), to section 229(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 429(b)), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund; $5,763,117,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Air Force on active duty (except members of reserve components provided for elsewhere), cadets, and aviation cadets; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97-377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), to section 229(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 429(b)), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund; $15,916,937,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Army Reserve on active duty under sections 265, 3021, and 3038 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 672(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 678(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and expenses authorized by section 2131 of title 10, United States Code, as authorized by law; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund; $2,143,272,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Navy Reserve on active duty under section 265 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 672(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 678(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, and for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and expenses authorized by section 2131 of title 10, United States Code, as authorized by law; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund; $1,565,838,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Marine Corps Reserve on active duty under section 265 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 672(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 678(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, and for members of the Marine Corps platoon leaders class, and expenses authorized by section 2131 of title 10, United States Code, as authorized by law; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund; $350,490,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Air Force Reserve on active duty under sections 265, 8021, and 8038 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 672(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 678(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and for members of the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and expenses authorized by section 2131 of title 10, United States Code, as authorized by law; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund; $783,158,000.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Army National Guard while on duty under section 265, 3021, or 3496 of title 10 or section 708 of title 32, United States Code, or while serving on duty under section 672(d) of title 10 or section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 678(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and expenses authorized by section 2131 of title 10, United States Code, as authorized by law; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund; $3,334,183,000.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Air National Guard on duty under section 265, 8021, or 8496 of title 10 or section 708 of title 32, United States Code, or while serving on duty under section 672(d) of title 10 or section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 678(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and expenses authorized by section 2131 of title 10, United States Code, as authorized by law; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund; $1,215,935,000.

TITLE II

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Army, as authorized by law; and not to exceed $14,437,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Army, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes; $15,221,091,000 and, in addition, $880,200,000, to be derived by transfer from the Defense Business Operations Fund and $150,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund: *Provided,* That $450,000 shall be made available only for the 1994 Memorial Day Celebration and $450,000 shall be made available only for the 1994 Capitol Fourth Project.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Navy and the Marine Corps, as authorized by law; and not to exceed $4,667,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Navy, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes; $18,097,782,000 and, in addition $1,092,700,000, to be derived by transfer from the Defense Business Operations Fund and $150,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund: *Provided,* That $350,000 shall be available only to connect residences located in the vicinity of the Naval Air Warfare Center, Warminster, to the Warminster municipal water supply system.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance

of the Marine Corps, as authorized by law; $1,773,889,000 and, in addition, $121,000,000, to be derived by transfer from the Defense Business Operations Fund.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Air Force, as authorized by law; and not to exceed $8,787,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Air Force, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes; $18,305,447,000 and, in addition, $941,400,000, to be derived by transfer from the Defense Business Operations Fund and $200,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund: *Provided*, That $15,500,000 shall only be used to operate, maintain and enhance the Tactical Interim CAMS and REMIS Reporting System (TICARRS-92): *Provided further*, That TICARRS-92 be reestablished, with direct maintenance data input, as the supporting system for at least one wing each of F-15, F-16, and F-117A aircraft by no later than February 1, 1994: *Provided further*, That TICARRS-92 be reestablished, with direct maintenance data input, as the supporting system for all F-15, F-16, and F-117A aircraft by no later than April 1, 1994: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act shall be used to operate, maintain or otherwise support an automated maintenance management system for F-15, F-16, and F-117A aircraft other than TICARRS-92 after April 1, 1994: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, not more than $9,538,000 shall be available only for a grant to the Women in Military Service For America Memorial Foundation, Inc., to be used solely to perform the repair, restoration, and preservation of the main gate structures, center plaza, and Homicycle of the Arlington National Cemetery. These funds shall be made available solely for project costs and none of the funds are for remuneration of any entity or individual associated with fund raising for the project: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, $5,000,000 shall be made available only for continued environmental restoration of the former Olmsted Air Force Base, Pennsylvania.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), as authorized by law; $9,497,133,000, of which not to exceed $25,000,000 may be available for the CINC initiative fund account; and of which not to exceed $19,422,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of Defense, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated by this paragraph, $996,001,000 shall be made available only for the Special Operations Command: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated in this paragraph, $427,705,000 shall not be obligated or expended until authorized by law.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Army Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications; $1,115,095,000: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated in this paragraph, $19,505,000 shall not be obligated or expended until authorized by law.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Navy Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications; $807,200,000: *Provided*, That operational control of the Naval Reserve Personnel Center, including its functions and responsibilities, shall be under the command and control of the Commander, Naval Reserve Command: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated in this paragraph, $31,400,000 shall not be obligated or expended until authorized by law.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Marine Corps Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications; $86,855,000: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated in this paragraph, $11,805,000 shall not be obligated or expended until authorized by law.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Air Force Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications; $1,370,222,000: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated in this paragraph, $15,644,000 shall not be obligated or expended until authorized by law.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For expenses of training, organizing, and administering the Army National Guard, including medical and hospital treatment and related expenses in non-Federal hospitals; maintenance, operation, and repairs to structures and facilities; hire of passenger motor vehicles; personnel services in the National Guard Bureau; travel expenses (other than mileage), as authorized by law for Army personnel on active duty, for Army National Guard division, regimental, and battalion commanders while inspecting units in compliance with National Guard Bureau regulations when specifically authorized by the Chief, National Guard Bureau; supplying and equipping the Army National Guard as authorized by law; and expenses of repair, modification, maintenance, and issue of supplies and equipment (including aircraft); $2,272,018,000: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated in this paragraph, $10,000,000 shall be available only for a National Guard Outreach Program in the Los Angeles School District: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated in this paragraph, $48,763,000 shall not be obligated or expended until authorized by law.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For operation and maintenance of the Air National Guard, including medical and hospital treatment and related expenses in non-Federal hospitals; maintenance, operation, repair, and other necessary expenses of facilities for the training and administration of the Air National Guard, including repair of facilities, maintenance, operation, and modification of aircraft; transportation of things; hire of passenger motor vehicles; supplies, materials, and equipment, as authorized by law for the Air National Guard; and expenses incident to the maintenance and use of supplies, materials, and equipment, including such as may be furnished from stocks under the control of agencies of the Department of Defense; travel expenses (other than mileage) on the same basis as authorized by law for Air National Guard personnel on active Federal duty, for Air National Guard commanders while inspecting units in compliance with National Guard Bureau regulations when specifically authorized by the Chief, National Guard Bureau; $2,695,233,000: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated under this paragraph, $3,000,000 shall be made available only for the operation of Air National Guard C-130H operational support aircraft of the 159th Air National Guard Fighter Group and the 169th Air National Guard Fighter Group: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated in this paragraph, $30,000,000 shall not be obligated or expended until authorized by law.

NATIONAL BOARD FOR THE PROMOTION OF RIFLE PRACTICE, ARMY

For the necessary expenses and personnel services (other than pay and non-travel-related allowances of members of the Armed Forces of the United States, except for members of the reserve components thereof called or ordered to active duty to provide support for the national matches) in accordance with law, for operation and maintenance of rifle ranges; the instruction of citizens in marksmanship; the promotion of rifle practice; the conduct of the national matches; the sale of ammunition under the authority of title 10, United States Code, sections 4308 and 4311; the travel of rifle teams, military personnel, and individuals attending regional, national, and international competitions; and the payment to competitors at national matches under section 4312 of title 10, United States Code, of subsistence and travel allowances under section 4313 of title 10, United States Code; not to exceed $2,483,000.

COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS, DEFENSE

For salaries and expenses necessary for the United States Court of Military Appeals; $5,855,000, of which not to exceed $2,500 can be used for official representation purposes: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated in this paragraph, $245,000 shall not be obligated or expended until authorized by law.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of Defense; $1,716,800,000, to remain available until transferred: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, research and development associated with hazardous wastes and removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of Defense, or for similar purposes (including programs and operations at sites formerly used by the Department of Defense),

transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of Defense as the Secretary may designate, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations of funds to which transferred: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided under this heading, not less than $200,000,000 shall be available only for the expedited cleanup of environmentally contaminated sites and only in accordance with a comprehensive plan submitted to Congress by the Secretary of Defense.

SUPPORT FOR INTERNATIONAL SPORTING COMPETITIONS, DEFENSE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses of logistical support (including security planning and services) and personnel services provided by the Department of Defense for the World University Games, the 1996 Games of the XXVI Olympiad, and the World Cup USA Organizing Committee, (other than pay and nontravel related allowances of members of the Armed Forces of the United States, except for members of the Reserve components thereof called or ordered to active duty to provide support for such international sporting competitions), as authorized by law, provided by any component of the Department of Defense to such sporting competitions, $6,000,000, of which not less than $2,000,000 shall be available only for the 1996 Games of the XXVI Olympiad, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That unobligated balances of funds appropriated in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1992 (Public Law 102–172) under the headings "World University Games" and "Summer Olympics" and unobligated balances of the funds appropriated in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1993, (Public Law 102–396) under the headings "World University Games" and "Summer Olympics" and "World Cup USA 1994" in title II of that Act shall, notwithstanding section 8003 of Public Law 102–172 and section 9003 of Public Law 102–396, upon the enactment of this Act, be transferred to this appropriation, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the funds so transferred from such Acts under the headings "Summer Olympics" shall be available only for expenses for, or incurred in anticipation of, the support provided, or to be provided, to the 1996 Games of the XXVI Olympiad: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated in this paragraph shall not be obligated or expended until authorized by law.

HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE

For transportation for humanitarian relief for the people of Afghanistan and sub-Saharan Africa, acquisition and shipment of transportation assets to assist in the distribution of such relief, and for transportation and distribution of humanitarian relief supplies, and excess non-lethal property; $15,000,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 1995: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated in this paragraph, $15,000,000 shall not be obligated or expended until authorized by law.

GLOBAL COOPERATIVE INITIATIVES, DEFENSE-WIDE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For support of Department of Defense responses to national and international natural disasters and the expenses of other global disaster relief activities of the Department of Defense; for acquisition, transportation, and distribution of humanitarian relief supplies, including the acquisition and shipment of transportation assets to assist in the distribution of such humanitarian relief supplies; and for Department of Defense expenses of participation in, and support for, multilateral, international peacekeeping and humanitarian efforts, including the provision of military personnel, supplies, and services, under national or international auspices, in connection with such efforts; $383,000,000, to remain available for transfer until September 30, 1995: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense shall, upon determining that such funds are necessary to carry out the purposes of this appropriation, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations or funds available to the Department of Defense, as the Secretary may designate, to be merged with, and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period, as the appropriations or funds to which transferred: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided in this paragraph is in addition to any transfer authority contained elsewhere in this Act: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be obligated or expended for costs incurred by United States Armed Forces in carrying out any international humanitarian assistance, peacekeeping, peacemaking or peace-enforcing operation unless, at least fifteen days before approving such operation, the President notifies the Committees on Appropriations and Armed Services of each House of Congress in accordance with established reprogramming procedures: *Provided further*, That any such notification shall specify—

(1) the estimated cost of the operation;

(2) whether the method by which the President proposes to pay for the operation will require supplemental appropriations, or payments from international organizations, foreign countries, or other donors;

(3) the anticipated duration and scope of the operation;

(4) the goals of the operation; and

(5) the United States interests that will be served by the operation:

Provided further, That no other funds appropriated or made available to the Department of Defense, other than funds appropriated under this heading or under the heading "Humanitarian Assistance" in this Act, shall be obligated or expended for costs incurred by United States Armed Forces in carrying out any international humanitarian assistance, peacekeeping, peacemaking or peace-enforcing operations: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated in this paragraph shall not be obligated or expended until authorized by law.

FORMER SOVIET UNION THREAT REDUCTION

For assistance to the republics of the former Soviet Union, including assistance provided by contract or by grants, for facilitating the elimination and the safe and secure transportation and storage of nuclear, chemical and other weapons; for providing incentives for demilitarization; for establishing programs to prevent the proliferation of weapons, weapons components, and weapons-related technology and expertise; for expansion of military-to-military contacts; for supporting the conversion of military technologies and capabilities into civilian activities; and for retraining military personnel of the former Soviet Union; $400,000,000, to remain available until expended.

TITLE III

PROCUREMENT

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of aircraft, equipment, including ordnance, ground handling equipment, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interest therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes; $1,726,164,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 1996: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated in this paragraph, $219,627,000 shall not be obligated or expended until authorized by law.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of missiles, equipment, including ordnance, ground handling equipment, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes; $1,126,110,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 1996: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated in this paragraph, $41,795,000 shall not be obligated or expended until authorized by law.

PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of weapons and tracked combat vehicles, equipment, including ordnance, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes; $892,709,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 1996: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated in this paragraph, $15,712,000 shall not be obligated or expended until authorized by law.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of ammunition, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including ammunition facilities authorized by section 2854, title 10, United States Code, and the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such

lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes; $620,787,000, and, in addition, $100,000,000, to be derived by transfer from the Conventional Ammunition Working Capital Fund of the Department of Defense, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 1996.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of vehicles, including tactical, support, and nontracked combat vehicles; the purchase of not to exceed 16 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; communications and electronic equipment; other support equipment; spare parts, ordnance, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes; $2,904,933,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 1996.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of aircraft, equipment, including ordnance, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; $5,664,216,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 1996.

WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of missiles, torpedoes, other weapons, other ordnance and ammunition, and related support equipment including spare parts, and accessories therefor; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; $2,808,986,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 1996: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated in this paragraph, $44,162,000 shall not be obligated or expended until authorized by law.

SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY

For expenses necessary for the construction, acquisition, or conversion of vessels as authorized by law, including armor and armament thereof, plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools and installation thereof in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; procurement of critical, long leadtime components and designs for vessels to be constructed or converted in the future; and expansion of public and private plants, including land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title, as follows:

Carrier replacement program, $1,000,000,000: *Provided*, That these funds shall not be available for obligation or expenditure until September 30, 1994;

Refueling overhauls, $31,127,000;

DDG–51 destroyer program, $2,642,772,000;

LHD–1 amphibious assault ship program, $893,848,000;

Mine warfare command and control ship, $124,175,000;

Oceanographic ship program, $110,049,000: *Provided*, That pursuant to 10 U.S.C. section 2304(c)(5), the last vessel of the T–AGS 60 oceanographic research ship program may be procured as an option to the contract for the construction of the lead ship of the class: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this Act or any other Act may be obligated for T–AGS multibeam sonar systems prior to review by the Committees on Appropriations of a Navy plan detailing compliance with the recommendations of the Comptroller General of the United States set forth in his decision of August 19, 1993 (Case B–253129);

For craft, outfitting, post delivery, production design support, first destination transportation, and cost growth, $595,131,000;

In all: $5,397,102,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 1998: *Provided*, That additional obligations may be incurred after September 30, 1998, for engineering services, tests, evaluations, and other such budgeted work that must be performed in the final stage of ship construction: *Provided further*, That none of the funds herein provided for the construction or conversion of any naval vessel to be constructed in shipyards in the United States shall be expended in foreign facilities for the construction of major components of such vessel: *Provided further*, That none of the funds herein provided shall be used for the construction of any naval vessel in foreign shipyards: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated in this paragraph, $1,236,914,000 shall not be obligated or expended until authorized by law.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For procurement, production, and modernization of support equipment and materials not otherwise provided for, Navy ordnance (except ordnance for new aircraft, new ships, and ships authorized for conversion); the purchase of not to exceed 609 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; $2,980,815,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 1996: *Provided*, That of the funds herein provided for the Computer Acquisition Productivity Program, not less than $20,000,000 shall be available, obligated, and expended only for automatic data processing investment equipment and peripheral equipment and related software for Defense Accounting Office and Naval Computer and Telecommunications Station, New Orleans, the Enlisted Personnel Management Center, and the Naval Reserve Personnel Center: *Provided further*, That all Naval and Marine Corps active and reserve personnel central design activities and personnel accounting programs shall be managed and coordinated at the Enlisted Personnel Management Center and the Naval Reserve Personnel Center: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall provide a report on establishing a full service finance and accounting operation for joint reserve functions at the Defense Accounting Office, New Orleans and the Naval Reserve Forces Command: *Provided further*, That the operations and functions of the Reserve Financial Management System shall remain colocated with the Commander, Naval Reserve Force: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated in this paragraph, $119,335,000 shall not be obligated or expended until authorized by law.

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

For expenses necessary for the procurement, manufacture, and modification of missiles, armament, ammunition, military equipment, spare parts, and accessories therefor; plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools, and installation thereof in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; vehicles for the Marine Corps, including the purchase of not to exceed 96 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; and expansion of public and private plants, including land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; $527,754,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 1996: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated in this paragraph, $56,733,000 shall not be obligated or expended until authorized by law.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For construction, procurement, and modification of aircraft and equipment, including armor and armament, specialized ground handling equipment, and training devices, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment; expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes including rents and transportation of things; $6,887,201,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 1996: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated in this paragraph, not less than $20,000,000 shall be available only for the C–130J aircraft.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For construction, procurement, and modification of missiles, spacecraft, rockets, and related equipment, including spare parts and accessories therefor, ground handling equipment, and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes including rents and transportation of things; $3,845,354,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 1996: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated in this paragraph, $224,483,000

shall not be obligated or expended until authorized by law.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For procurement and modification of equipment (including ground guidance and electronic control equipment, and ground electronic and communication equipment), and supplies, materials, and spare parts therefor, not otherwise provided for; the purchase of not to exceed 2 vehicles required for physical security of personnel, notwithstanding price limitations applicable to passenger vehicles but not to exceed $180,000 per vehicle; the purchase of not to exceed 710 passenger motor vehicles of which 695 shall be for replacement only; and expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon, prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; $7,336,918,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 1996.

NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT

For procurement of aircraft, missiles, tracked combat vehicles, ammunition, other weapons, and other procurement for the reserve components of the Armed Forces; $1,178,100,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 1996: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated in this paragraph, $184,825,000 shall not be obligated or expended until authorized by law.

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

For expenses of activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments) necessary for procurement, production, and modification of equipment, supplies, materials, and spare parts therefor, not otherwise provided for; the purchase of not to exceed 1 vehicle required for physical security of personnel, notwithstanding price limitations applicable to passenger vehicles but not to exceed $180,000 per vehicle; and the purchase of not to exceed 438 passenger motor vehicles, of which 420 shall be for replacement only; expansion of public and private plants, equipment, and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; $1,557,344,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 1996: *Provided*, That the funds available under this heading for the High Performance Computer Modernization plan may be used only for: (1) the execution of existing contract upgrade options of installed stable supercomputer facilities that have not kept technically current; or (2) the acquisition in open, competitive procurements of architecturally stable, fully user-operational, compatible supercomputers possessing essentially stable system software, which have been successfully demonstrated using statistically valid samples of the current workload of the laboratories in question without substantive reprogramming or program conversion.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES

For activities by the Department of Defense pursuant to sections 108, 301, 302, and 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2061); $200,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of these funds shall be obligated for any project unless a Presidential determination has been made in accordance with the Defense Production Act: *Provided further*, That the Department of Defense shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate sixty days prior to the release of funds for any project not previously approved by Congress.

TITLE IV

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, as authorized by law; $5,560,082,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 1995: *Provided*, That $2,000,000 shall be made available only for the Center for Prostate Disease Research at the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research: *Provided further*, That $5,000,000 shall be made available only for the Center of Excellence in Breast Cancer Research and Training at the National Naval Medical Center, in Bethesda, Maryland: *Provided further*, That not less than $1,000,000 of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be made available only to a joint research partnership involving an educational institution, not now engaged in a large volume of basic research, and a biomedical research institute, including a working arrangement with Canadian and German scientists, for the development and testing of a new insulin derivative for the treatment of diabetes and hypoglycemia in the dependents of active duty military members: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated in this paragraph, $142,941,000 shall not be obligated or expended until authorized by law.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, NAVY

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, as authorized by law; $8,604,777,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 1995: *Provided*, That for continued research and development programs at the National Center for Physical Acoustics, centering on ocean acoustics as it applies to advanced antisubmarine warfare acoustics issues with focus on ocean bottom acoustics, seismic coupling, sea-surface and bottom scattering, oceanic ambient noise, underwater sound propagation, bubble related ambient noise, acoustically active surfaces, machinery noise, propagation physics, solid state acoustics, electrorheological fluids, transducer development, ultrasonic sensors, and other such projects as may be agreed upon, $1,000,000 shall be made available, as a grant, to the Mississippi Resource Development Corporation, of which not to exceed $250,000 of such sum may be used to provide such special equipment as may be required for particular projects: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated in this paragraph may be obligated or expended to develop or purchase equipment for an Aegis destroyer variant (commonly known as "Flight IIA") whose initial operating capability is budgeted to be achieved prior to the initial operating capability of the Ship Self-Defense program, nor to develop sensor, processor, or display capabilities which duplicate in any way those being developed in the Ship Self-Defense program: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated in this paragraph for Aegis Combat System Engineering tactical display simplification may be obligated only to develop equipment on an interim basis which is planned to be installed in Aegis ships prior to the date that the first production unit of the Advanced Display System is planned to be accepted by the Government: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated in this paragraph for Aegis Combat System Engineering tactical display simplification may not be obligated on contracts which include production options for ship installations planned beyond the date that the first production unit of the Advanced Display System is planned to be accepted by the Government: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated in this paragraph for development of E-2C aircraft upgrades may not be obligated until the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition submits a plan to the Committees on Appropriations and Armed Services of each House of Congress for development and deployment of a fully participating cooperative engagement capability on E-2 aircraft to be fielded concurrent with and no later than major computer upgrades for the aircraft: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated in this paragraph for development of the L-X ship may not be obligated unless the baseline design of the ship includes cooperative engagement capability and sufficient own-ship self-defense capability against advanced sea-skimming antiship cruise missiles in the baseline design to achieve an estimated probability of survival from attack by such missiles at a level no less than any other Navy ship: *Provided further*, That after January 1, 1994, funds appropriated in this paragraph for the Naval Research Laboratory may not be obligated unless the Navy's Manufacturing Technology Program Office has responsibilities and position equivalent to the Science and Technology Directorates at the Office of Naval Research and is fully staffed to meet those responsibilities.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, as authorized by law; $12,608,995,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 1995: *Provided*, That not less than $21,000,000 of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be made available only for the Joint Seismic Program and Global Seismic Network administered by the Incorporated Research Institutions for Seismology: *Provided further*, That not less than $60,000,000 of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be made available only for the National Center for Manufacturing Sciences (NCMS).

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE

For expenses of activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation; advanced research projects as may be designated and determined by the Secretary of Defense, pursuant to law; maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, as authorized by law; $9,526,918,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 1995: *Provided*, That not less than $97,000,000 of the funds appropriated in this paragraph are available only for the Extended Range Interceptor (ERINT) missile: *Provided further*, That the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO) shall continue its current

strategy of flight testing, ground testing, simulations, and other Government analyses of the Patriot Multimode Missile and the Extended Range Interceptor for selection of the best technology in terms of cost, schedule, risk, and performance to meet PAC-3 missile requirements for theater missile defense and that the Director, BMDO, will determine when there is adequate information to proceed to selection for engineering and manufacturing development: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this paragraph may be used to operate more than one external affairs office in the Washington, D.C. area for ballistic missile defense programs: *Provided further*, That not less than $15,000,000 of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be made available as a grant awarded through competitive procedures to a State supported historically black college or university with a demonstrated expertise in physics and materials science, a doubled enrollment over the past seven years, and a leading enrollment of National Achievement Scholars over the last several years, for construction to expand facilities for basic sciences and engineering associated with research, development, and other programs of major importance to the Department of Defense: *Provided further*, That not less than 25 percent of the funds appropriated in this paragraph for the High Performance Computing initiative may be obligated only for research designed to develop improved performance from high performance computing systems and technology utilizing parallel vector processing architecture: *Provided further*, That not less than $20,000,000 of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be available only for an Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCOR) in the Department of Defense which shall include all States eligible as of the date of enactment of this Act for the National Science Foundation Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated in this paragraph for research, development, demonstration, or commercialization of electric vehicles and the related infrastructure; fuel cell research; natural gas research; or coal research, authorized to be conducted by the Secretary of Energy under statutes administered by such Secretary shall be obligated by the Secretary of Defense except in accordance with the applicable provisions of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 and other relevant statutes and pursuant to an agreement, made available to the applicable legislative and appropriation Committees of Congress, between the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Energy that provides for coordination of all such activities with the relevant programs at the Department of Energy administered under such Acts: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, not less than $52,000,000 shall be made available only for the Computer-aided Acquisition and Logistics Support (CALS) Shared Resource Center (CSRC) program. Of that amount, not less than $30,000,000 shall be made available only for the continued operation of the original CSRC by the current nonprofit institution or its successor in interest, as the Department's tri-service CALS standards and technologies development, deployment, training, and education hub for the CSRC program; the continued operation of the CSRC Regional Satellite (CRS); and the establishment and continued operation of additional CRSs to be operated by educational or other nonprofit institutions. In addition, $20,000,000 shall be made available only for the continued operation of the six original CRSs: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act can be expended to pay the salaries or expenses of the Department's CSRC Program Management Office unless such office is located within the Office of the Secretary of Defense: *Provided further*, That nothing shall prohibit use of the CSRC or CRSs by industry, associations, other Department of Defense services and agencies, and other government agencies for efforts to be separately negotiated and funded: *Provided further*, That $2,300,000 shall be made available only for cell adhesion molecule research.

DEVELOPMENTAL TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, of independent activities of the Director, Test and Evaluation in the direction and supervision of developmental test and evaluation, including performance and joint developmental testing and evaluation; and administrative expenses in connection therewith; $232,592,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 1995.

OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the independent activities of the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation in the direction and supervision of operational test and evaluation, including initial operational test and evaluation which is conducted prior to, and in support of, production decisions; joint operational testing and evaluation; and administrative expenses in connection therewith; $12,650,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 1995.

TITLE V

REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS

DEFENSE BUSINESS OPERATIONS FUND

For the Defense Business Operations Fund; $1,091,100,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds available in the Defense Business Operations Fund shall be used for any hardware procurement, new development, or expansion of the Defense Business Management System; except that funds may be used to continue minimal maintenance efforts of the Defense Business Management System for the Defense Logistics Agency to continue daily operations.

NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For National Defense Sealift Fund programs, projects, and activities, $490,800,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That up to $200,000,000 shall be available for transfer to the Secretary of Transportation for costs (as defined in section 502 of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990) of loan guarantee commitments under title XII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended by H.R. 2401, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994: *Provided further*, That any facilities financed by the foregoing loan guarantee commitments must make use of new technologies and processes which have been demonstrated by Department of Defense organizations prior to construction of facilities: *Provided further*, That all loan guarantees or loan guarantee commitments made by the Secretary of Transportation shall occur only after consultation with the Secretary of Defense: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Transportation shall give priority to providing loan guarantees to businesses located in enterprise zones and investing private funds in developing integrated design and manufacturing facilities technologies: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, all loan guarantees or loan guarantee commitments for ship construction shall be made without regard to gross ton weight.

TITLE VI

OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS

DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, for medical and health care programs of the Department of Defense, as authorized by law; $9,644,447,000, of which $9,368,185,000 shall be for Operation and maintenance, of which $276,262,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 1996, shall be for Procurement: *Provided*, That the Department shall competitively contract during fiscal year 1994 for mail service pharmacy for at least two multi-state regions in addition to the ongoing solicitations for Florida, South Carolina, Georgia, Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Hawaii, as well as each base closure area not supported by an at-risk managed care plan; that such services shall be procured independent of any other Department managed care contracts; that one multi-state region shall include the State of Kentucky: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated in this Act, such funds as necessary shall be used for the continuation of the cooperative program model being established at Madigan Medical Center for severely behavior disordered students: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated in this paragraph, $265,000,000 shall not be obligated or expended until authorized by law.

CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, DEFENSE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the destruction of the United States stockpile of lethal chemical agents and munitions in accordance with the provisions of section 1412 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986, (50 U.S.C. 1521) and for the destruction of other chemical warfare materials that are not in the chemical weapon stockpile, $397,561,000, of which $292,061,000 shall be for Operation and maintenance, $74,800,000, to remain available until September 30, 1996, shall be for Procurement, and $30,700,000, to remain available until September 30, 1995, shall be for Research, development, test and evaluation: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated in this paragraph, $30,700,000 shall not be obligated or expended until authorized by law.

DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For drug interdiction and counter-drug activities of the Department of Defense, for transfer to appropriations available to the Department of Defense for military personnel of the reserve components serving under the provisions of title 10 and title 32, United States Code; for Operation and maintenance; for Procurement; and for Research, development, test and evaluation; $757,785,000: *Provided*, That the funds appropriated by this paragraph shall be available for obligation for the same time period and for the same purpose as the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided in this paragraph is in addition to any transfer authority contained elsewhere in this Act: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated in this paragraph, not less than $5,900,000 shall be available only for the Gulf States Counter-Narcotics Initiative.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For expenses and activities of the Office of the Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended; $169,801,000, of which $169,001,000 shall be for Operation and maintenance, of which not to exceed $400,000 is available for emergencies and extraordinary expenses to be expended on the approval or authority of the Inspector General, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes; and of which $800,000, to remain available until September 30, 1996, shall be for Procurement.

TITLE VII

RELATED AGENCIES

NATIONAL FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM FUND

For payment to the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System Fund, to maintain proper funding level for continuing the operation of the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System; $182,300,000.

NATIONAL SECURITY EDUCATION TRUST FUND

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available in Public Law 103-50 for the National Security Education Act under the heading "National Security Education Trust Fund", $10,000,000 is hereby rescinded.

Of the funds made available in Public Law 102-172 for the National Security Education Trust Fund, $140,000,000 and interest earned and accrued thereon is hereby rescinded.

COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT STAFF

For necessary expenses of the Community Management Staff; $114,688,000.

TITLE VIII

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 8001. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes not authorized by the Congress.

SEC. 8002. During the current fiscal year, provisions of law prohibiting the payment of compensation to, or employment of, any person not a citizen of the United States shall not apply to personnel of the Department of Defense: *Provided*, That salary increases granted to direct and indirect hire foreign national employees of the Department of Defense funded by this Act shall not be at a rate in excess of the percentage increase authorized by law for civilian employees of the Department of Defense whose pay is computed under the provisions of section 5332 of title 5, United States Code, or at a rate in excess of the percentage increase provided by the appropriate host nation to its own employees, whichever is higher: *Provided further*, That this section shall not apply to Department of Defense foreign service national employees serving at United States diplomatic missions whose pay is set by the Department of State under the Foreign Service Act of 1980.

SEC. 8003. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 8004. No more than 20 per centum of the appropriations in this Act which are limited for obligation during the current fiscal year shall be obligated during the last two months of the fiscal year: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to obligations for support of active duty training of reserve components or summer camp training of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, Army.

SEC. 8005. Section 9005 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1993 (Public Law 102-396) is amended by striking out "contained in this Act" and inserting "or any other funds available to the Department of Defense" in lieu thereof.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8006. Upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary in the national interest, he may, with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget, transfer not to exceed $2,000,000,000 of working capital funds of the Department of Defense or funds made available in this Act to the Department of Defense for military functions (except military construction) between such appropriations or funds or any subdivision thereof, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation or fund to which transferred: *Provided*, That such authority to transfer may not be used unless for higher priority items, based on unforeseen military requirements, than those for which originally appropriated and in no case where the item for which funds are requested has been denied by Congress: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall notify the Congress promptly of all transfers made pursuant to this authority or any other authority in this Act.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8007. During the current fiscal year, cash balances in working capital funds of the Department of Defense established pursuant to section 2208 of title 10, United States Code, may be maintained in only such amounts as are necessary at any time for cash disbursements to be made from such funds: *Provided*, That transfers may be made between such funds and the "Foreign Currency Fluctuations, Defense" and "Operation and Maintenance" appropriation accounts in such amounts as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget, except that such transfers may not be made unless the Secretary of Defense has notified the Congress of the proposed transfer. Except in amounts equal to the amounts appropriated to working capital funds in this Act, no obligations may be made against a working capital fund to procure or increase the value of war reserve material inventory, unless the Secretary of Defense has notified the Congress prior to any such obligation.

SEC. 8008. Using funds available by this Act or any other Act, the Secretary of the Air Force, pursuant to a determination under section 2690 of title 10, United States Code, may implement cost-effective agreements for required heating facility modernization in the Kaiserslautern Military Community in the Federal Republic of Germany: *Provided*, That in the City of Kaiserslautern such agreements will include the use of United States anthracite as the base load energy for municipal district heat to the United States Defense installations: *Provided further*, That at Landstuhl Army Regional Medical Center and Ramstein Air Base, furnished heat may be obtained from private, regional or municipal services, if provisions are included for the consideration of United States coal as an energy source.

SEC. 8009. Funds appropriated by this Act may not be used to initiate a special access program without prior notification 30 calendar days in session in advance to the Committees on Appropriations and Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives.

SEC. 8010. None of the funds contained in this Act available for the Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services shall be available for payments to physicians and other authorized individual health care providers in excess of the amounts allowed in fiscal year 1993 for similar services, except that: (a) for services for which the Secretary of Defense determines an increase is justified by economic circumstances, the allowable amounts may be increased in accordance with appropriate economic index data similar to that used pursuant to title XVIII of the Social Security Act; and (b) for services the Secretary determines are overpriced based on allowable payments under title XVIII of the Social Security Act, the allowable amounts shall be reduced by not more than 15 percent (except that the reduction may be waived if the Secretary determines that it would impair adequate access to health care services for beneficiaries). The Secretary shall solicit public comment prior to promulgating regulations to implement this section. Such regulations shall include a limitation, similar to that used under title XVIII of the Social Security Act, on the extent to which a provider may bill a beneficiary an actual charge in excess of the allowable amount.

SEC. 8011. None of the funds provided in this Act shall be available to initiate (1) a multiyear contract that employs economic order quantity procurement in excess of $20,000,000 in any one year of the contract or that includes an unfunded contingent liability in excess of $20,000,000, or (2) a contract for advance procurement leading to a multiyear contract that employs economic order quantity procurement in excess of $20,000,000 in any one year, unless the Committees on Appropriations and Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified at least thirty days in advance of the proposed contract award: *Provided*, That no part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available to initiate a multiyear contract for which the economic order quantity advance procurement is not funded at least to the limits of the Government's liability: *Provided further*, That no part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available to initiate multiyear procurement contracts for any systems or component thereof if the value of the multiyear contract would exceed $500,000,000 unless specifically provided in this Act: *Provided further*, That no multiyear procurement contract can be terminated without a 10-day prior notification to the Committees on Appropriations and Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate: *Provided further*, That the execution of multiyear authority shall require the use of a present value analysis to determine lowest cost compared to an annual procurement.

SEC. 8012. (a) None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available to convert a position in support of the Army Reserve, Air Force Reserve, Army National Guard, and Air National Guard occupied by, or programmed to be occupied by, a (civilian) military technician to a position to be held by a person in an active duty status or active Guard or Reserve status if that conversion would reduce the total number of positions occupied by, or programmed to be occupied by, (civilian) military technicians of the component concerned, below 69,061: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated by

this Act shall be available to support more than 46,111 positions in support of the Army Reserve, Army National Guard, or Air National Guard occupied by, or programmed to be occupied by, persons in an active Guard or Reserve status: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to include (civilian) military technicians in computing civilian personnel ceilings, including statutory or administratively imposed ceilings, on activities in support of the Army Reserve, Air Force Reserve, Army National Guard, or Air National Guard.

(b) None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used to include (civilian) military technicians in any administratively imposed freeze on civilian positions.

SEC. 8013. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, governments of Indian tribes shall be treated as State and local governments for the purposes of disposition of real property recommended for closure in the report of the Defense Secretary's Commission on Base Realignments and Closures, December 1988, the report to the President from the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, July 1991, and Public Law 100-526.

SEC. 8014. (a) The provisions of section 115(a)(4) of title 10, United States Code, shall not apply with respect to fiscal year 1994 or with respect to the appropriation of funds for that year.

(b) During fiscal year 1994, the civilian personnel of the Department of Defense may not be managed on the basis of any end-strength, and the management of such personnel during that fiscal year shall not be subject to any constraint or limitation (known as an end-strength) on the number of such personnel who may be employed on the last day of such fiscal year.

(c) The fiscal year 1995 budget request for the Department of Defense as well as all justification material and other documentation supporting the fiscal year 1995 Department of Defense budget request shall be prepared and submitted to the Congress as if subsections (a) and (b) of this provision were effective with regard to fiscal year 1995.

SEC. 8015. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used in any way, directly or indirectly, to influence congressional action on any legislation or appropriation matters pending before the Congress.

SEC. 8016. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be obligated for the pay of any individual who is initially employed after the date of enactment of this Act as a technician in the administration and training of the Army Reserve and the maintenance and repair of supplies issued to the Army Reserve unless such individual is also a military member of the Army Reserve troop program unit that he or she is employed to support. Those technicians employed by the Army Reserve in areas other than Army Reserve troop program units need only be members of the Selected Reserve.

SEC. 8017. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense may be used for the floating storage of petroleum or petroleum products except in vessels of or belonging to the United States.

SEC. 8018. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretaries of the Army and Air Force may authorize the retention in an active status until age sixty of any officer who would otherwise be removed from an active status and who is employed as a National Guard or Reserve technician in a position in which active status in a reserve component of the Army or Air Force is required as a condition of that employment.

SEC. 8019. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, proceeds from the investment of the Fisher House Investment Trust Fund will be used to support the operation and maintenance of Fisher Houses associated with Army medical treatment facilities.

SEC. 8020. (a) None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used to make contributions to the Department of Defense Education Benefits Fund pursuant to section 2006(g) of title 10, United States Code, representing the normal cost for future benefits under section 1415(c) of title 38, United States Code, for any member of the armed services who, on or after the date of enactment of this Act—

(1) enlists in the armed services for a period of active duty of less than three years; or

(2) receives an enlistment bonus under section 308a or 308f of title 37, United States Code,

nor shall any amounts representing the normal cost of such future benefits be transferred from the Fund by the Secretary of the Treasury to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs pursuant to section 2006(d) of title 10, United States Code; nor shall the Secretary of Veterans Affairs pay such benefits to any such member: *Provided*, That, in the case of a member covered by clause (1), these limitations shall not apply to members in combat arms skills or to members who enlist in the armed services on or after July 1, 1989, under a program continued or established by the Secretary of Defense in fiscal year 1991 to test the cost-effective use of special recruiting incentives involving not more than nineteen noncombat arms skills approved in advance by the Secretary of Defense: *Provided further*, That this subsection applies only to active components of the Army.

(b) None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available for the basic pay and allowances of any member of the Army participating as a full-time student and receiving benefits paid by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs from the Department of Defense Education Benefits Fund when time spent as a full-time student is credited toward completion of a service commitment: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not apply to those members who have reenlisted with this option prior to October 1, 1987: *Provided further*, That this subsection applies only to active components of the Army.

SEC. 8021. Funds appropriated in this Act shall be available for the payment of not more than 75 percent of the charges of a postsecondary educational institution for the tuition or expenses of an officer in the Ready Reserve of the Army National Guard or Army Reserve for education or training during his off-duty periods, except that no part of the charges may be paid unless the officer agrees to remain a member of the Ready Reserve for at least four years after completion of such training or education.

SEC. 8022. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available to convert to contractor performance an activity or function of the Department of Defense that, on or after the date of enactment of this Act, is performed by more than ten Department of Defense civilian employees until a most efficient and cost-effective organization analysis is completed on such activity or function and certification of the analysis is made to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to a commercial or industrial type function of the Department of Defense that: (1) is included on the procurement list established pursuant to section 2 of the Act of June 25, 1938 (41 U.S.C. 47), popularly referred to as the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act; (2) is planned to be converted to performance by a qualified nonprofit agency for the blind or by a qualified nonprofit agency for other severely handicapped individuals in accordance with that Act; or (3) is planned to be converted to performance by a qualified firm under 51 percent Native American ownership.

SEC. 8023. None of the funds appropriated or made available by this Act may be obligated for acquisition of major automated information systems which have not successfully completed oversight reviews required by Defense Department regulations: *Provided*, That the automated information systems oversight review board will be independent of any other Department review function and chaired by the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Command, Control, Communications and Intelligence): *Provided further*, That except for those programs to modernize and develop migration and standard automated information systems that have been certified by the Department's senior information resource management (IRM) official as being fully compliant with the Department's information management initiative as defined in Defense Department Directive 8000.1, no funds may be expended for modernization or development of any automated information system (AIS) by the military departments, services, defense agencies, Joint Staff or Military Commands in excess of $1,000,000 unless the senior official of the Office of the Secretary of Defense with primary responsibility for the functions being supported or to be supported certifies to the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Command, Control, Communications and Intelligence that the functional requirement(s) is valid and that the system modernization or development has no unnecessary duplication of other available or planned AISs: *Provided further*, That the Department shall develop the capability for open systems integration of commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) applications within the Composite Health Care System (CHCS): *Provided further*, That the Department shall limit deployment of the Defense Blood Standard System (DBSS) to donor and processing centers, and shall procure, install, and integrate by April 1, 1994, at two or more CHCS sites an open system compliant COTS hospital-based blood bank/transfusion application, with security access by application function and developed in the same application language as CHCS: *Provided further*, That the Department shall procure and install at all CHCS alpha and beta sites by April 1, 1994, an open system integrated anatomic pathology COTS application with security access by application function and developed with the same software application language as CHCS: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the one time investment cost, including the procurement or lease of new or reutilized automatic data processing investment equipment, peripheral equipment and related software, for the July 16, 1993 DOD Data Center Consolidation Plan shall not exceed $309,000,000.

SEC. 8024. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Navy may use funds appropriated to charter ships to be used as auxiliary minesweepers providing that the owner agrees that these ships may be activated as Navy Reserve ships with Navy Reserve crews used in training exercises conducted in accordance with law and policies governing Naval Reserve forces: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated or

made available in this Act may be used to inactivate, disestablish, or discontinue the Navy's Craft of Opportunity Program.

SEC. 8025. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Department shall competitively award contracts in fiscal year 1994 for at least four new region-wide, at-risk, fixed price managed care support contracts consistent with the following requirements: (1) each contract or acquisition shall reflect the major features of the CHAMPUS Reform Initiative and include provision for the commanders of major military medical centers to participate as the regional lead agents; (2) each such contract or acquisition shall include a triple option benefit; (3) one similar contract or acquisition shall cover the State of Florida (which may include Department of Veterans Affairs' medical facilities with the concurrence of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs); (4) one similar contract shall cover the States of Washington and Oregon; (5) each other such contract or acquisition shall include at least one complete State; (6) the managed care support contracts for California and Hawaii, Florida, Washington and Oregon shall not be counted for purposes of the required four new contracts of acquisitions; and (7) the Department shall modify a currently operating CHAMPUS service contract to include an at-risk managed health care provision, to provide services not later than 90 days after enactment of this Act, in the area of Homestead Air Force Base, to include the Homestead and South Miami Hospitals as institutional providers, with a benefit structure substantially identical to that established in fiscal year 1993 for the Carswell, Bergstrom and England Air Force Bases (including a retail pharmacy network available to Medicare-eligible beneficiaries), said provision to remain effective as an interim measure until implementation of the competitive at-risk contract for Florida as required by this section: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated, or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense, by this or any other Act of Congress, shall be used to implement or administer any changes to the operating CHAMPUS Reform Initiative-like contracts unless the scope of benefits and program management structure are consistent with the basic CHAMPUS Reform Initiative design in operation on January 1, 1993: *Provided further*, That any law or regulation of a State or local government relating to health insurance, prepaid health plans, or other health care delivery, administration, and financing methods shall be preempted and shall not apply to any contract entered into pursuant to chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code: *Provided further*, That any requirements for the certification of cost effectiveness, access and quality of any managed health care programs will be construed to require that the certification compare on a national basis the program to be certified with the standard CHAMPUS program as determined by the application of sound actuarial principles: *Provided further*, That the Department shall competitively award at least two contracts in fiscal year 1994 for stand-alone, at-risk managed mental health services in high utilization, high-cost areas, consistent with the management and service delivery features in operation in the Contracted Provider Arrangement (CPA) Tidewater Demonstration.

SEC. 8026. Funds appropriated or made available in this Act shall be obligated and expended to continue to fully utilize the facilities at the United States Army Engineer's Waterways Experiment Station, including the continued availability of the supercomputer capability: *Provided*, That none of the funds in this Act may be used to purchase any supercomputer which is not manufactured in the United States, unless the Secretary of Defense certifies to the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees of Congress that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes that is not available from United States manufacturers.

SEC. 8027. For the purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Public Law 99-177) as amended by the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Reaffirmation Act of 1987 (Public Law 100-119) and by the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-508), the term program, project, and activity for appropriations contained in this Act shall be defined as the most specific level of budget items identified in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1994, the accompanying House and Senate Committee reports, the conference report and accompanying joint explanatory statement of the managers of the Committee of Conference, the related classified annexes and reports, and the P-1 and R-1 budget justification documents as subsequently modified by Congressional action: *Provided*, That the following exception to the above definition shall apply:

For the Military Personnel and the Operation and Maintenance accounts, the term "program, project, and activity" is defined as the appropriations accounts contained in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act: *Provided further*, That at the time the President submits his budget for fiscal year 1995, the Department of Defense shall transmit to the Committees on Appropriations and the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a budget justification document to be known as the "O-1" which shall identify, at the budget activity, activity group, and subactivity group level, the amounts requested by the President to be appropriated to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance in any budget request, or amended budget request, for fiscal year 1995.

SEC. 8028. Of the funds appropriated to the Army, $217,600,000 shall be available only for the Reserve Component Automation System (RCAS): *Provided*, That none of these funds can be expended—

(1) except as approved by the Chief of the National Guard Bureau;

(2) unless RCAS resource management functions are performed by the National Guard Bureau;

(3) to pay the salary of an RCAS program manager who has not been selected and approved by the Chief of the National Guard Bureau and chartered by the Chief of the National Guard Bureau and the Secretary of the Army;

(4) unless the Program Manager (PM) charter makes the PM accountable to the Chief of the National Guard Bureau and fully defines his authority, responsibility, reporting channels and organizational structure;

(5) to pay the salaries of individuals assigned to the RCAS program management office unless such organization is comprised of personnel chosen jointly by the Chiefs of the National Guard Bureau and the Army Reserve;

(6) to pay contracted costs for the acquisition of RCAS unless RCAS is an integrated system consisting of software, hardware, and communications equipment and unless such contract continues to preclude the use of Government furnished equipment, operating systems, and executive and applications software; and

(7) unless RCAS performs its own classified information processing: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds appropriated shall be available for procurement of computers for the Army Reserve Component which are used to network or expand the capabilities of existing or future information systems or duplicate functions to be provided under the RCAS contract unless the procurement meets the following criteria: (A) only RCAS automated data processing (ADP) equipment may be procured and only in the numbers and types allocated by the RCAS program to each site; (B) the requesting organizational element has no computer for stand-alone office automation usage; (C) replacement equipment will not exceed the minimum required to maintain the reliability of existing capabilities; (D) replacements will be justified solely on the cost and feasibility of repairs and maintenance of present ADP equipment as compared to the cost of replacement; and (E) the procurement is recommended by both the Chief of the respective Reserve Component and the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, and approved by the Functional Proponent in the Department of Defense.

SEC. 8029. None of the funds in this Act may be available for the purchase by the Department of Defense (and its departments and agencies) of welded shipboard anchor and mooring chain 4 inches in diameter and under unless the anchor and mooring chain are manufactured in the United States from components which are substantially manufactured in the United States: *Provided*, That for the purpose of this section manufactured will include cutting, heat treating, quality control, testing of chain and welding (including the forging and shot blasting process): *Provided further*, That for the purpose of this section substantially all of the components of anchor and mooring chain shall be considered to be produced or manufactured in the United States if the aggregate cost of the components produced or manufactured in the United States exceeds the aggregate cost of the components produced or manufactured outside the United States: *Provided further*, That when adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis, the Secretary of the service responsible for the procurement may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8030. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Department of Defense may transfer prior year, unobligated balances and funds appropriated in this Act to the operation and maintenance appropriations for the purpose of providing military technician and Department of Defense medical personnel pay and medical programs (including CHAMPUS) the same exemption from sequestration set forth in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Public Law 99-177) as amended by the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Reaffirmation Act of 1987 (Public Law 100-119) and by the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-508) as that granted the other military personnel accounts: *Provided*, That any transfer made pursuant to any use of the authority provided by this provision shall be limited so that the amounts reprogrammed to the operation and maintenance appropriations do not

exceed the amounts sequestered under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Public Law 99–177) as amended by the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Reaffirmation Act of 1987 (Public Law 100–119) and by the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 (Public Law 101–508): *Provided further*, That the authority to make transfers pursuant to this section is in addition to the authority to make transfers under other provisions of this Act: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may proceed with such transfer after notifying the Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate twenty calendar days in session before any such transfer of funds under this provision.

SEC. 8031. None of the funds appropriated by this Act available for the Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services (CHAMPUS) shall be available for the reimbursement of any health care provider for inpatient mental health service for care received when a patient is referred to a provider of inpatient mental health care or residential treatment care by a medical or health care professional having an economic interest in the facility to which the patient is referred: *Provided*, That this limitation does not apply in the case of inpatient mental health services provided under the program for the handicapped under subsection (d) of section 1079 of title 10, United States Code, provided as partial hospital care, or provided pursuant to a waiver authorized by the Secretary of Defense because of medical or psychological circumstances of the patient that are confirmed by a health professional who is not a Federal employee after a review, pursuant to rules prescribed by the Secretary, which takes into account the appropriate level of care for the patient, the intensity of services required by the patient, and the availability of that care.

SEC. 8032. All new Department of Defense procurements shall separately identify software costs in the work breakdown structure defined by MIL–STD–881 in those instances where software is considered to be a major category of cost.

SEC. 8033. During the current fiscal year and thereafter, of the funds appropriated, reimbursable expenses incurred by the Department of Defense on behalf of the Soviet Union or its successor entities in monitoring United States implementation of the Treaty Between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range or Shorter-Range Missiles ("INF Treaty"), concluded December 8, 1987, may be treated as orders received and obligation authority for the applicable appropriation, account, or fund increased accordingly. Likewise, any reimbursements received for such costs may be credited to the same appropriation, account, or fund to which the expenses were charged: *Provided*, That reimbursements which are not received within one hundred and eighty days after submission of an appropriate request for payment shall be subject to interest at the current rate established pursuant to section 2(b)(1)(B) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (59 Stat. 526). Interest shall begin to accrue on the one hundred and eighty-first day following submission of an appropriate request for payment: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated in this Act may be used to reimburse United States military personnel for reasonable costs of subsistence, at rates to be determined by the Secretary of Defense, incurred while accompanying Soviet Inspection Team members or inspection team members of the successor entities of the Soviet Union engaged in activities related to the INF Treaty: *Provided further*, That this provision includes only the in-country period (referred to in the INF Treaty) and is effective whether such duty is performed at, near, or away from an individual's permanent duty station.

SEC. 8034. Funds available in this Act may be used to provide transportation for the next-of-kin of individuals who have been prisoners of war or missing in action from the Vietnam era to an annual meeting in the United States, under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe.

SEC. 8035. None of the funds available in this Act to the Department of Defense or Navy shall be obligated or expended for (or to implement) automatic data processing, data processing center, central design activity, DMRD 918, defense information infrastructure, military or civilian personnel and finance and accounting function consolidation plans, consolidations, and disestablishment or realignment plans that impact, in terms of reductions in force or transfers in military and civilian personnel, end strength, billets, functions, or missions, the Enlisted Personnel Management Center, the Naval Computer and Telecommunications Station and Defense Accounting Office, New Orleans, and the Naval Reserve Personnel Center and related missions, functions, and commands until sixty legislative days after the Secretary of Defense submits to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a report, including complete review comments and a certification, by both the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General, justifying and certifying that such plans and actions: (1) do not consolidate, plan to consolidate, disestablish or realign Department of Defense or Service data processing functions or centers, central design activities, finance and accounting or military and civilian personnel functions and activities, or claim savings from such function and activity consolidations and disestablishment, realignment, or consolidation plans, that are in more than one defense management report plan or decision or any other Department of Defense or Service consolidation, disestablishment, or realignment plan; (2) utilize criteria primarily weighted to evaluate, measure, and compare how data processing centers, central design activities, financing and accounting and military and civilian personnel functions and activities are ranked in terms of operational readiness, customer satisfaction, and the most cost effective and least expensive from a business performance, and regional operations cost standpoint; (3) will provide equal or better service for DOD customers; (4) will not adversely impact the quality of life and benefits of the individual service person, dependents, and civilian personnel; and (5) will not adversely impact the mission and readiness of the Navy and Naval Reserves: *Provided*, That none of the provisions in this section shall, in any way, affect the implementation of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission recommendations.

SEC. 8036. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, during the current fiscal year, the Secretary of Defense may, by Executive Agreement, establish with host nation governments in NATO member states a separate account into which such residual value amounts negotiated in the return of United States military installations in NATO member states may be deposited, in the currency of the host nation, in lieu of direct monetary transfers to the United States Treasury: *Provided*, That such credits may be utilized only for the construction of facilities to support United States military forces in that host nation, or such real property maintenance and base operating costs that are currently executed through monetary transfers to such host nations: *Provided further*, That the Department of Defense's budget submission for fiscal year 1995 shall identify such sums anticipated in residual value settlements, and identify such construction, real property maintenance or base operating costs that shall be funded by the host nation through such credits: *Provided further*, That all military construction projects to be executed from such accounts must be previously approved in a prior Act of Congress: *Provided further*, That each such Executive Agreement with a NATO member host nation shall be reported to the Committees on Appropriations and Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate thirty days prior to the conclusion and endorsement of any such agreement established under this provision.

SEC. 8037. All obligations incurred in anticipation of the appropriations and authority provided in this Act are hereby ratified and confirmed if otherwise in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 8038. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense in this Act shall be used to demilitarize or dispose of more than 310,784 unserviceable M1 Garand rifles and M1 Carbines.

SEC. 8039. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available to pay more than 50 percent of an amount paid to any person under section 308 of title 37, United States Code, in a lump sum.

SEC. 8040. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used by the Department of Defense to assign a supervisor's title or grade when the number of people he or she supervises is considered as a basis for this determination: *Provided*, That savings that result from this provision are represented as such in future budget proposals.

SEC. 8041. Of the funds appropriated by this Act, no more than $18,500,000 shall be available for the mental health care demonstration project at Fort Bragg, North Carolina: *Provided*, That adjustments may be made for normal and reasonable price and program growth.

SEC. 8042. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to pay health care providers under the Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services (CHAMPUS) for services determined under the CHAMPUS Peer Review Organization (PRO) Program to be not medically or psychologically necessary. The Secretary of Defense may by regulation adopt any quality and utilization review requirements and procedures in effect for the Peer Review Organization Program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (Medicare) that the Secretary determines necessary, and may adapt the Medicare requirements and procedures to the circumstances of the CHAMPUS PRO Program as the Secretary determines appropriate.

SEC. 8043. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available for payments under the Department of Defense contract with the Louisiana State University Medical Center involving the use of cats for Brain Missile Wound Research, and the Department of Defense shall not make payments under such contract from funds obligated prior to the date of the enactment of this Act, except as necessary for costs incurred

by the contractor prior to the enactment of this Act, and until thirty legislative days after the final General Accounting Office report on the aforesaid contract is submitted for review to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate: *Provided*, That funds necessary for the care of animals covered by this contract are allowed.

SEC. 8044. None of the funds provided in this Act or any other Act shall be available to conduct bone trauma research at the Letterman Army Institute of Research until the Secretary of the Army certifies that the synthetic compound to be used in the experiments is of such a type that its use will result in a significant medical finding, the research has military application, the research will be conducted in accordance with the standards set by an animal care and use committee, and the research does not duplicate research already conducted by a manufacturer or any other research organization.

SEC. 8045. The Secretary of Defense shall include in any base closure and realignment plan submitted to Congress after the date of enactment of this Act, a complete review for the five-year period beginning on October 1, 1993, which shall include expected force structure and levels for such period, expected installation requirements for such period, a budget plan for such period, the cost savings expected to be realized through realignments and closures of military installations during such period, an economics model to identify the critical local economic sectors affected by proposed closures and realignments of military installations and an assessment of the economic impact in each area in which a military installation is to be realigned or closed.

SEC. 8046. No more than $50,000 of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act shall be used for any single relocation of an organization, unit, activity or function of the Department of Defense into or within the National Capital Region: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate that such a relocation is required in the best interest of the Government: *Provided further*, That no funds appropriated or made available in this Act shall be used for the relocation into the National Capital Region of the Air Force Office of Medical Support located at Brooks Air Force Base.

SEC. 8047. During the current fiscal year, funds appropriated or otherwise available for any Federal agency, the Congress, the judicial branch, or the District of Columbia may be used for the pay, allowances, and benefits of an employee as defined by section 2105 of title 5 or an individual employed by the government of the District of Columbia, permanent or temporary indefinite, who—

(1) is a member of a Reserve component of the armed forces, as described in section 261 of title 10, or the National Guard, as described in section 101 of title 32;

(2) performs, for the purpose of providing military aid to enforce the law or providing assistance to civil authorities in the protection or saving of life or property or prevention of injury—

(A) Federal service under section 331, 332, 333, 3500, or 8500 of title 10, or other provision of law, as applicable, or

(B) full-time military service for his State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or a territory of the United States; and

(3) requests and is granted—

(A) leave under the authority of this section; or

(B) annual leave, which may be granted without regard to the provisions of sections 5519 and 6323(b) of title 5, if such employee is otherwise entitled to such annual leave:

Provided, That any employee who requests leave under subsection (3)(A) for service described in subsection (2) of this section is entitled to such leave, subject to the provisions of this section and of the last sentence of section 6323(b) of title 5, and such leave shall be considered leave under section 6323(b) of title 5.

SEC. 8048. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available to perform any cost study pursuant to the provisions of OMB Circular A-76 if the study being performed exceeds a period of twenty-four months after initiation of such study with respect to a single function activity or forty-eight months after initiation of such study for a multi-function activity.

SEC. 8049. Funds appropriated by this Act for the American Forces Information Service shall not be used for any national or international political or psychological activities.

SEC. 8050. Notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, the Secretary of Defense may adjust wage rates for civilian employees hired for certain health care occupations as authorized for the Secretary of Veterans Affairs by section 7455 of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 8051. During the current fiscal year, none of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used to reduce the military or civilian medical and medical support personnel end strength as of September 30, 1993, as defined by section 711(c) of Public Law 101-510: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used to reduce the military or civilian medical and medical support personnel end strength at a base undergoing a partial closure or realignment, where more than one joint command is located, below the September 30, 1991 level.

SEC. 8052. Of the funds made available in this Act, not less than $11,679,000 shall be available for the Civil Air Patrol, of which $4,642,000 shall be available for Operation and Maintenance.

SEC. 8053. None of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act shall be used to reduce or disestablish the operation of the 815th Weather Squadron of the Air Force Reserve, if such action would reduce the WC-130 Weather Reconnaissance mission below the levels funded in this Act.

SEC. 8054. During the current fiscal year, withdrawal credits may be made by the Defense Business Operations Fund to the credit of current applicable appropriations of an activity of the Department of Defense in connection with the acquisition by that activity of supplies that are repairable components which are repairable at a repair depot and that are capitalized into the Defense Business Operations Fund as the result of management changes concerning depot level repairable assets charged to an activity of the Department of Defense which is a customer of the Defense Business Operations Fund that became effective on April 1, 1992.

SEC. 8055. (a) Of the funds for the procurement of supplies or services appropriated by this Act, qualified nonprofit agencies for the blind or other severely handicapped shall be afforded the maximum practicable opportunity to participate as subcontractors and suppliers in the performance of contracts let by the Department of Defense.

(b) During the current fiscal year, a business concern which has negotiated with a military service or defense agency a subcontracting plan for the participation by small business concerns pursuant to section 8(d) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(d)) shall be given credit toward meeting that subcontracting goal for any purchases made from qualified nonprofit agencies for the blind or other severely handicapped.

(c) For the purpose of this section, the phrase "qualified nonprofit agency for the blind or other severely handicapped" means a nonprofit agency for the blind or other severely handicapped that has been approved by the Committee for the Purchase from the Blind and Other Severely Handicapped under the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act (41 U.S.C. 46-48).

SEC. 8056. During the current fiscal year and thereafter, there is established, under the direction and control of the Attorney General, the National Drug Intelligence Center, whose mission it shall be to coordinate and consolidate drug intelligence from all national security and law enforcement agencies, and produce information regarding the structure, membership, finances, communications, and activities of drug trafficking organizations: *Provided*, That funding for the operation of the National Drug Intelligence Center, including personnel costs associated therewith, shall be provided from the funds appropriated to the Department of Defense.

SEC. 8057. During the current fiscal year and thereafter, the Navy may provide notice to exercise options under the LEASAT program for the next fiscal year, in accordance with the terms of the Aide Memoire, dated January 5, 1981, as amended by the Aide Memoire dated April 30, 1986, and as implemented in the LEASAT contract.

SEC. 8058. During the current fiscal year, net receipts pursuant to collections from third party payers pursuant to section 1095 of title 10, United States Code, shall be made available to the local facility of the uniformed services responsible for the collections and shall be over and above the facility's direct budget amount.

SEC. 8059. None of the funds in this Act shall be obligated for the procurement of Multibeam Sonar Mapping Systems, and supporting software, not engineered and manufactured in the United States: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the military department responsible for such procurement may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis and that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes.

SEC. 8060. During the current fiscal year and thereafter, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Department of Defense is hereby authorized to develop and procure the LANDSAT 7 vehicle.

SEC. 8061. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used to fill the commander's position at any military medical facility with a health care professional unless the prospective candidate can demonstrate professional administrative skills.

SEC. 8062. Of the funds appropriated by this Act for the Defense Health Program, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the amount payable for services provided under this section shall not be less than the amount calculated under the coordination of benefits reimbursement formula utilized when CHAMPUS is a secondary payor to medical insurance programs other than Medicare, and such appropriations as necessary

shall be available (notwithstanding the last sentence of section 1086(c) of title 10, United States Code) to continue Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services (CHAMPUS) benefits, until age 65, under such section for a former member of a uniformed service who is entitled to retired or retainer pay or equivalent pay, or a dependent of such a member, or any other beneficiary described by section 1086(c) of title 10, United States Code, who becomes eligible for hospital insurance benefits under part A of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) solely on the grounds of physical disability, or end stage renal disease: *Provided*, That expenses under this section shall only be covered to the extent that such expenses are not covered under parts A and B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act and are otherwise covered under CHAMPUS: *Provided further*, That no reimbursement shall be made for services provided prior to October 1, 1991.

SEC. 8063. During the current fiscal year, the Secretary of Defense may accept burdensharing contributions in the form of money from Japan, the Republic of Korea, and the State of Kuwait for the costs of local national employees, supplies, and services of the Department of Defense to be credited to applicable Department of Defense operation and maintenance appropriations available for the salaries and benefits of national employees of Japan, the Republic of Korea, and the State of Kuwait, supplies, and services to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and time period as those appropriations to which credited: *Provided*, That not later than 30 days after the end of each quarter of the fiscal year, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Congress a report of contributions accepted by the Secretary under this provision during the preceding quarter.

SEC. 8064. (a) Funds appropriated in this Act to finance activities of Department of Defense (DOD) Federally Funded Research and Development Centers (FFRDCs) may not be obligated or expended for an FFRDC if a member of its Board of Directors or Trustees simultaneously serves on the Board of Directors or Trustees of a profit-making company under contract to the Department of Defense unless the FFRDC has a DOD approved conflict of interest policy for its members.

(b) None of the funds appropriated in this Act are available to establish a new FFRDC, either as a new entity, or as a separate entity administered by an organization managing another FFRDC, or as a nonprofit membership corporation consisting of a consortium of other FFRDCs and other nonprofit entities.

SEC. 8065. None of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act shall be used to procure carbon, alloy or armor steel plate for use in any Government-owned facility or property under the control of the Department of Defense which were not melted and rolled in the United States or Canada: *Provided*, That these procurement restrictions shall apply to any and all Federal Supply Class 9515, American Society of Testing and Materials (ASTM) or American Iron and Steel Institute (AISI) specifications of carbon, alloy or armor steel plate: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the military department responsible for the procurement may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis and that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes: *Provided further*, That these restrictions shall not apply to contracts which are in being as of the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 8066. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no more than 15 percent of the funds available to the Department of Defense for sealift may be used to acquire, directly or indirectly, through charter or purchase, ships constructed in foreign shipyards: *Provided*, That ships acquired as provided above shall be necessary to satisfy the shortfalls identified in the Mobility Requirements Study: *Provided further*, That any work required to convert foreign built ships acquired as provided above to United States Coast Guard and American Bureau of Shipping standards, or conversion to a more useful military configuration, must be accomplished in United States domestic shipyards: *Provided further*, That none of the funds shall be used to purchase the following major components: bridge or machinery control systems, or interior communications equipment, auxiliary equipment, including pumps for all shipboard services, propulsion system components (that is, engines, reduction gears, and propellers), shipboard cranes, and spreaders for shipboard cranes for sealift ships unless the systems or equipment, and their components, are manufactured in the United States: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the military department responsible for such procurement may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis and that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes.

SEC. 8067. For the purposes of this Act, the term "congressional defense committees" means the Committees on Armed Services, the Committees on Appropriations, and the subcommittees on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations, of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

SEC. 8068. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, during the current fiscal year, the Secretary of Defense may acquire the modification, depot maintenance and repair of aircraft, vehicles and vessels as well as the production of components and other Defense-related articles, through competition between Department of Defense depot maintenance activities and private firms: *Provided*, That the Senior Acquisition Executive of the military department or defense agency concerned, with power of delegation, shall certify that successful bids include comparable estimates of all direct and indirect costs for both public and private bids: *Provided further*, That Office of Management and Budget Circular A-76 shall not apply to competitions conducted under this section.

SEC. 8069. (a)(1) If the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the United States Trade Representative, determines that a foreign country which is party to an agreement described in paragraph (2) has violated the terms of the agreement by discriminating against certain types of products produced in the United States that are covered by the agreement, the Secretary of Defense shall rescind the Secretary's blanket waiver of the Buy American Act with respect to such types of products produced in that foreign country.

(2) An agreement referred to in paragraph (1) is any reciprocal defense procurement memorandum of understanding, between the United States and a foreign country pursuant to which the Secretary of Defense has prospectively waived the Buy American Act for certain products in that country.

(b) The Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on the amount of Department of Defense purchases from foreign entities in fiscal year 1994. Such report shall separately indicate the dollar value of items for which the Buy American Act was waived pursuant to any agreement described in subsection (a)(2), the Trade Agreement Act of 1979 (19 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.), or any international agreement to which the United States is a party.

(c) For purposes of this section, the term "Buy American Act" means title III of the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes", approved March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a et seq.).

SEC. 8070. (a) Of the funds made available in this Act in title II, Operation and Maintenance, Army, $5,000,000 shall be available only to execute the cleanup of uncontrolled hazardous waste contamination affecting the Sale Parcel at Hamilton Air Force Base, in Novato, in the State of California.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in the event that the purchaser of the Sale Parcel exercises its option to withdraw from all or a portion of the sale, as provided in the Agreement and Modification, dated September 25, 1990, between the Department of Defense, the General Services Administration, and the purchaser, as amended, the purchaser's deposit of $4,500,000 shall be returned by the General Services Administration and funds eligible for reimbursement under the Agreement and Modification, as amended, shall come from the funds made available to the Department of Defense by this Act.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in the event that the purchaser purchases only a portion of the Sale Parcel and exercises its option to withdraw from the sale as to the rest of the Sale Parcel, the portion of the Sale Parcel that is not purchased (other than Landfill 26 and an appropriate buffer area around it), together with any of the land referred to in section 9099(e) of Public Law 102-396 that is not purchased by the purchaser, shall be sold to the City of Novato, in the State of California, for the sum of One Dollar as a public benefit transfer for school, classroom or other educational use, for use as a public park or recreation area or for further conveyance as provided herein, subject to the following restrictions: (1) if the City sells any portion of such land to any third party within ten years after the transfer to the City, which sale may be made without the foregoing use restrictions, any proceeds received by the City in connection with such sale, minus the demonstrated reasonable costs of conducting the sale and of any improvements made by the City to the land following its acquisition of the land (but only to the extent such improvements increase the value of the portion sold), shall be immediately turned over to the Army in reimbursement of the withdrawal payment made by the Army to the contract purchaser and the costs of cleaning up the Landfill and (2) until one year following completion of the cleanup of contaminated soil in the landfill and completion of the groundwater treatment facilities, the sale must be at a per-acre price for the portion sold that is at least equal to the per-acre contract price paid by the purchaser for

the portion of the Sale Parcel purchased under the Agreement and Modification, as amended, and thereafter must be at a price at least equal to the fair market value of the portion sold. The foregoing restrictions shall not apply to a transfer to another public or quasi-public agency for public uses of the kind described above. The deed to the City shall contain a clause providing that, if any of the proceeds referred to in clause (1) are not delivered to the Army within 30 days after sale, or any portion of the land not sold as provided herein is used for other than educational, park or recreational uses, title to the applicable portion of such land shall revert to the United States Government at the election of the General Services Administration. The Army shall agree to deliver into the applicable closing escrow an acknowledgement of receipt of any proceeds described in clause (1) above and a release of the reverter right as to the affected land, effective upon such receipt.

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Air Force shall be reimbursed for expenditures in excess of $15,000,000 in connection with the total clean-up of uncontrolled hazardous waste contamination on the aforementioned Sale Parcel from the proceeds collected upon the closing of any portion of the Sale Parcel purchased by the contract purchaser under the Agreement and Modification, as amended.

SEC. 8071. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Defense may, when he considers it in the best interest of the United States, cancel any part of an indebtedness, up to $2,500, that is or was owed to the United States by a member or former member of a uniformed service if such indebtedness, as determined by the Secretary, was incurred in connection with Operation Desert Shield/Storm: *Provided*, That the amount of an indebtedness previously paid by a member or former member and cancelled under this section shall be refunded to the member.

SEC. 8072. Appropriations contained in this Act that remain available at the end of the current fiscal year as a result of energy cost savings realized by the Department of Defense shall remain available for obligation for the next fiscal year to the extent, and for the purposes, provided in section 2865 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 8073. During the current fiscal year, voluntary separation incentives payable under 10 U.S.C. 1175 may be paid in such amounts as are necessary from the assets of the Voluntary Separation Incentive Fund established by section 1175(h)(1).

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8074. Amounts deposited during fiscal years 1993 and 1994 to the special account established under 40 U.S.C. 485(h)(2) and to the special account established under 10 U.S.C. 2667(d)(1) are appropriated and shall be available until transferred by the Secretary of Defense to current applicable appropriations or funds of the Department of Defense under the terms and conditions specified by 40 U.S.C. 485(h)(2) (A) and (B) and 10 U.S.C. 2667(d)(1)(B), to be merged with and to be available for the same time period and the same purposes as the appropriation to which transferred.

SEC. 8075. In order to maintain an electric furnace capacity in the United States, preference for the purchase of chromite ore and manganese ore authorized for disposal from the National Defense Stockpile shall be given to domestic producers of high carbon ferrochromium and high carbon ferromanganese—

(A) whose primary output during the three preceding years has been ferrochromium or ferromanganese; and

(B) who guarantee to use the chromite and manganese ore for domestic purposes.

SEC. 8076. During the current fiscal year, none of the funds available to the Department of Defense may be used to procure or acquire (1) defensive handguns or defensive handgun ammunition unless such handguns or handgun ammunition are the M9 9mm Department of Defense standard handgun or ammunition for such handguns, or (2) offensive handguns and ammunition except for the Special Operations Forces.

SEC. 8077. During the current fiscal year, appropriations available to the Department of Defense may be used to reimburse a member of a reserve component of the Armed Forces who is not otherwise entitled to travel and transportation allowances and who occupies transient government housing while performing active duty for training or inactive duty training: *Provided*, That such members may be provided lodging in kind if transient government quarters are unavailable as if the member was entitled to such allowances under subsection (a) of section 404 of title 37, United States Code: *Provided further*, That if lodging in kind is provided, any authorized service charge or cost of such lodging may be paid directly from funds appropriated for operation and maintenance of the reserve component of the member concerned.

SEC. 8078. For fiscal year 1994, the total amount appropriated to fund the Uniformed Services Treatment Facilities program, operated pursuant to section 911 of Public Law 97-99 (42 U.S.C. 248c), is limited to $291,000,000, of which not more than $265,000,000 may be provided by the funds appropriated by this Act.

SEC. 8079. None of the funds available in this Act may be used to support in any manner, including travel or other related expenses, the "Tailhook Association": *Provided*, That investigations by the Secretary of the Navy or consultation with the Tailhook Association are not prohibited by this provision.

SEC. 8080. During the current fiscal year and thereafter, from funds available to the Department of Defense, the Director of the Air National Guard shall operate a Command, Control, Communications and Intelligence planning office manned by three full-time Air Guard officers in the rank of O-6, O-5, and O-4: *Provided*, That these officers shall be in addition to the strengths authorized in section 524 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 8081. None of the funds appropriated in this Act or made available to the Department of Defense and deposited into the Pentagon Reservation Maintenance Revolving Fund may be used for the purpose of constructing a Pentagon Maintenance Facility, a Logistics Support Extension, or any other building not an integral part of the present Pentagon building.

SEC. 8082. The President shall include with each budget for a fiscal year submitted to the Congress under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, materials that shall identify clearly and separately the amounts requested in the budget for appropriation for that fiscal year for salaries and expenses related to administrative activities of the Department of Defense, the military departments, and the Defense Agencies.

SEC. 8083. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense may be obligated or expended for construction of Ground Wave Emergency Network (GWEN) sites in Fiscal Year 1994.

SEC. 8084. The $15,000,000 made available in section 9088 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1993 (Public Law 102-396) for payment of claims to United States military and civilian personnel for damages incurred as a result of the volcanic eruption of Mount Pinatubo in the Philippines, shall remain available for obligation until September 30, 1994, notwithstanding section 9003 of that Act.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8085. In addition to any other transfer authority contained in this Act, $100,000,000 appropriated in this Act under the heading "Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide" may be transferred to appropriations contained in this Act which are available for the payment of civilian voluntary separation incentives, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred.

SEC. 8086. During the current fiscal year, amounts contained in the Department of Defense Overseas Military Facility Investment Recovery Account established by section 2921(c)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act of 1991, (Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) shall be available until expended for the payments specified by section 2921(c)(2) of that Act.

SEC. 8087. During the current fiscal year, annual payments granted under the provisions of section 4416 of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1993 (Public Law 102-428; 106 Stat. 2714) shall be made from appropriations in this Act which are available for the pay of reserve component personnel.

SEC. 8088. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to relocate the 116th Fighter Wing of the Air National Guard from Dobbins Air Reserve Base to Robins Air Force Base, or to convert that wing from F-15A aircraft to B-1B aircraft.

SEC. 8089. (a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), the Secretary of the Army may release, discharge, waive, and quitclaim all right, title, and interest which the United States may have by virtue of the quitclaim deed dated June 18, 1956, in and to approximately 6.89 acres of real property, with improvements thereon, in Harris County, Texas.

(b) CONDITION.—The Secretary may carry out subsection (a) only after obtaining satisfactory assurances that the State of Texas shall obtain, in exchange for the real property referred to in subsection (a), a tract of real property—

(1) which is at least equal in value to the real property referred to in subsection (a), and

(2) which shall be, on the date on which the State obtains it, subject to the same restrictions and covenants with respect to the Federal Government as are applicable on the date of the enactment of this Act to the real property referred to in subsection (a).

(c) LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF REAL PROPERTY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the real property referred to in subsection (a) shall be based upon surveys that are satisfactory to the Secretary.

SEC. 8090. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used to procure aircraft fuel cells unless the fuel cells are produced or manufactured in the United States by a domestic-owned and domestic-operated entity: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the military department responsible for the procurement may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the

House of Representatives and the Senate that adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis and that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes.

SEC. 8091. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, not less than $750,000 of the funds appropriated under the heading "Operation and Maintenance, Army" in title II of this Act shall be made available until expended to conduct a demonstration program involving the Army Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps battalion at Indiana University-Northwest and Army Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps units near the University. The purpose of the program shall be to encourage minority students in secondary educational institutions to continue their education.

(b) Under the program, Senior Reserve Officers' Corps cadets may serve as mentors and tutors for students in Junior Reserve Officers' Corps units. Cadets and students may participate in combined activities, including summer camps, field training, and other traditional military activities.

(c) Senior Reserve Officers' Corps cadets who serve as mentors and tutors may be paid a stipend.

(d) After a cadet has satisfactorily served in the program, under criteria established by the Secretary of the Army and for a period of time determined by the Secretary, the cadet may be provided financial assistance tuition, books, laboratory fees, and similar educational expenses if the cadet continues to serve satisfactorily in the program.

SEC. 8092. During the current fiscal year, appropriations which are available to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance may be used to purchase items having an investment item unit cost of not more than $50,000.

SEC. 8093. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available for direct or indirect support of the joint Department of Defense/Department of Energy Safeguard C contingent nuclear testing program.

SEC. 8094. In connection with procurements of petroleum products made by the Department of Defense with appropriated funds, the Secretary shall consider all qualified bids from any eligible country under the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act which is hereby deemed a designated country pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2511(b).

SEC. 8095. During the current fiscal year, appropriations available for the pay and allowances of active duty members of the Armed Forces shall be available to pay the retired pay which is payable pursuant to section 4403 of Public Law 102-484 (10 U.S.C. 1293 note) under the terms and conditions provided in section 4403.

SEC. 8096. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used to pay the salaries of more than two Senior Executive Service positions within the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works: *Provided*, That the individuals in these positions may not be compensated at a rate higher than level three of the Senior Executive Service.

SEC. 8097. (a) During the current fiscal year, none of the appropriations or funds available to the Defense Business Operations Fund shall be used for the purchase of an investment item for the purpose of acquiring a new inventory item for sale or anticipated sale during the current fiscal year or a subsequent fiscal year to customers of the Defense Business Operations Fund if such an item would not have been chargeable to the Defense Business Operations Fund during fiscal year 1993 and if the purchase of such an investment item would be chargeable during the current fiscal year to appropriations made to the Department of Defense for procurement.

(b) The fiscal year 1995 budget request for the Department of Defense as well as all justification material and other documentation supporting the fiscal year 1995 Department of Defense budget shall be prepared and submitted to the Congress on the basis that any equipment which was classified as an end item and funded in a procurement appropriation contained in this Act shall be budgeted for in a proposed fiscal year 1995 procurement appropriation and not in the supply management business area or any other area or category of the Defense Business Operations Fund.

SEC. 8098. (a) The prohibition in section 133(a)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal years 1990 and 1991 (Public Law 101-189; 103 Stat. 1383) does not apply to the obligation of funds in amounts not to exceed $216,000,000 for the procurement of not more than 36 OH-58D Scout aircraft from funds appropriated in title III of this Act.

(b) The prohibition in section 132(a)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for 1990 and 1991 (Public Law 101-189; 103 Stat. 1383) does not apply to the obligation of funds in amounts not to exceed $368,430,000 for the procurement of not more than 24 AH-64 aircraft from funds appropriated in title III of this Act.

SEC. 8099. The Department of Defense may not purchase at wholesale or retail, a cement product manufactured by the burning of hazardous or toxic waste unless the following written notice is included with the product: "WARNING: This cement product was manufactured by a process that burns a hazardous material and may contain residue of the hazardous material. Use appropriately for the risk involved." This warning must be printed in a size and type that is clearly legible and on all bagged products and on the shipping manifest if the product is purchased in bulk.

SEC. 8100. (a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) the United States Government has not made adequate efforts to seek the payment of compensation by the government of Peru for the death and injuries to United States military personnel resulting from the attack by aircraft of the military forces of Peru on April 24, 1992, against a United States Air Force C-130 aircraft operating off the coast of Peru; and

(2) in failing to make such efforts adequately, the United States Government has failed in its obligation to support the servicemen and their families involved in the incident and generally to support members of the Armed Forces carrying out missions on behalf of the United States.

(b) SEMIANNUAL REPORT.—The Secretary of Defense shall submit a report to Congress on December 1 and June 1 of each year on the efforts made by the Government of the United States during the preceding six-month period to seek the payment of fair and equitable compensation by the Government of Peru (1) to the survivors of Master Sergeant Joseph Beard, Jr., United States Air Force, who was killed in the attack described in subsection (a), and (2) to the other crew members who were wounded in the attack and survived.

(c) TERMINATION OF REPORT REQUIREMENT.—The requirement in subsection (b) shall terminate upon certification by the Secretary of Defense to Congress that the Government of Peru has paid fair and equitable compensation as described in subsection (b).

SEC. 8101. Notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, the Department of Defense is directed to use available off the shelf, nondevelopmental items in filling small craft and small boat requirements when at all possible.

SEC. 8102. No part of the funds in this Act shall be available to prepare or present a request to the Committees on Appropriations for reprogramming of funds, unless for higher priority items, based on unforeseen military requirements, than those for which originally appropriated and in no case where the item for which reprogramming is requested has been denied by the Congress.

SEC. 8103. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available for payment of the compensation of personnel assigned to or serving in the National Foreign Intelligence Program in excess of 96 percent of such personnel actually assigned to or serving in the National Foreign Intelligence Program on September 30, 1992: *Provided*, That in making any reduction in the number of such personnel that may be required pursuant to this section, the percentage of reductions to Senior Intelligence Service positions shall be equal to or exceed the percentage of reductions to non-Senior Intelligence Service positions: *Provided further*, That in making any reduction in the number of such personnel that may be required pursuant to this section, the percentage of reductions to positions in the National Capital Region shall be equal to or exceed the percentage of reductions to positions outside of the National Capital Region.

SEC. 8104. None of the funds provided by this Act may be used to pay the salaries of any person or persons who authorize the transfer of obligated and deobligated appropriations into the Reserve for Contingencies of the Central Intelligence Agency.

SEC. 8105. During the current fiscal year and thereafter, funds appropriated for construction projects of the Central Intelligence Agency, which are transferred to another Agency for execution, shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 8106. During the current fiscal year and thereafter, monetary limitations on the purchase price of a passenger motor vehicle shall not apply to vehicles purchased for intelligence activities conducted pursuant to Executive Order 12333 or successor orders.

SEC. 8107. None of the funds appropriated by this Act for programs of the Central Intelligence Agency shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, except for funds appropriated for the Reserve for Contingencies, which shall remain available until September 30, 1995.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8108. During the current fiscal year and thereafter, no funds may be made available through transfer, reprogramming, or other means between the Central Intelligence Agency and the Department of Defense for any intelligence or special activity different from that previously justified to the Congress unless the Director of Central Intelligence or the Secretary of Defense has notified the House and Senate Appropriations Committees of the intent to make such funds available for such activity.

SEC. 8109. The classified annex prepared by the Committee on Appropriations to accompany the report on the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1994 is hereby incorporated into this Act: *Provided*, That the

amounts specified in the classified Annex are not in addition to amounts appropriated by other provisions of this Act: *Provided further*, That the President shall provide for appropriate distribution of the classified Annex, or of appropriate portions of the classified Annex, within the executive branch of the Government.

SEC. 8110. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds made available in this Act for the Defense Intelligence Agency may be used for the design, development, and deployment of General Defense Intelligence Program intelligence communications and intelligence information systems at the Unified and Specified Commands.

SEC. 8111. After March 1, 1994, none of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available for any National Foreign Intelligence Program: *Provided*, That this provision shall not apply for any National Foreign Intelligence Program for which budget exhibits were submitted to the House Committee on Appropriations which justifies in detail all funds requested for "base", "ongoing", and "new" programs for fiscal year 1995.

SEC. 8112. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available for the planning, programming or actual movement of any component or function of the Defense Mapping Agency Aerospace Center annex from the St. Louis, Missouri, area.

SEC. 8113. (a) During the current fiscal year and hereafter the provisions of law specified in subsection (b) shall not extend to any military firearms (or ammunition, components, parts, accessories, and attachments for such firearms) of United States manufacture furnished to any foreign government by the United States under the Arms Export Control Act or any other foreign assistance or sales program of the United States if—

(1) such firearms are among those firearms described in clause (i) of the second subparagraph (B) of section 38(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act; and

(2) such foreign government certifies to the United States Government that such foreign government has transferred such firearms to a person who is not an officer, employee, or agent of such foreign government for the purpose of returning such firearms to the United States for sale in the United States.

(b) The provisions of law specified in this subsection are—

(1) the prohibition under the regulations required by the second sentence of section 38(b)(1)(A) of the Arms Export Control Act; and

(2) the requirements contained in—

(A) subsections (a)(1), (a)(4), and (e) of section 505 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; and

(B) paragraph (2) of subsection (a), and the third sentence of such subsection, of section 3 of the Arms Export Control Act.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8114. In addition to amounts appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act, $21,700,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense and shall be available only for transfer to the United States Coast Guard for a 2.2 percent pay increase for uniformed members.

SEC. 8115. None of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act shall be obligated or expended for the performance of depot-level maintenance by the Department of Defense unless such activities are conducted in accordance with section 2466(a) of title 10, United States Code, as amended by Public Law 102-484.

SEC. 8116. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and in accordance with section 2905 of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, Public Law 101-510, the Department of Defense shall proceed with implementation of the 1993 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission recommendation concerning the consolidation of tactical missile maintenance at Letterkenny Army Depot.

SEC. 8117. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Navy shall obligate the funds appropriated for fiscal years 1992 and 1993 for the USH-42 Mission Recorder program for the A-6 aircraft.

SEC. 8118. In addition to amounts appropriated elsewhere in this Act, $200,000 shall be available only for settlement of claims and interest thereon, associated with contract numbered N62474-86-C-0253 for construction of a multipurpose range complex at the Marine Corps Air Ground Combat Center in Twentynine Palms, California: *Provided*, That such settlement shall be made pursuant to the recommendation of August 19, 1993, of the Comptroller General of the United States (case B-230871.3).

SEC. 8119. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds appropriated for fiscal year 1993 and fiscal year 1994 for the DDG-51 destroyer program shall be obligated or expended for procurement of the ring laser gyroscope inertial navigation system under a sole source contract.

SEC. 8120. The Secretary of the Navy shall carry out the establishment of the Mine Warfare Center of Excellence at the naval station at Ingleside, Texas (including the establishment of all subordinate units and the relocation of Navy mine warfare forces), in accordance with the schedule of the Navy for the establishment of such center and without regard to any alteration in that schedule that would otherwise be required pursuant to any other provision of law enacted during the first session of the 103d Congress that applies specifically to the construction and operation of that center or to the relocation of Navy mine warfare forces to Ingleside, Texas.

SEC. 8121. (a) The amount expended during fiscal year 1994 from funds appropriated by this Act or any prior Department of Defense Appropriations Act shall not exceed $255,795,000,000.

(b) The Secretary of Defense and the Director of Central Intelligence shall take such steps as necessary to ensure compliance with the requirement in subsection (a).

(c) The provisions of the Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 681 et seq.) shall not apply with respect to funds appropriated by this Act or any prior Department of Defense Appropriations Act to the extent necessary to enable the Secretary of Defense to comply with subsection (a).

(d) Any payment required to be made by the Department of Defense to a business concern that, but for this subsection, would be required to be made during September, 1994 may be made during the period beginning on October 1, 1994, and ending on the date that is 30 days after the date on which the payment would otherwise be required to be made. In determining the amount of any interest penalty under section 3902 of title 31, United States Code, for failure to make any such payment, any period for which the Secretary of Defense, under the preceding sentence, deferred the required payment date shall not be taken into account.

(e)(1) The Secretary of Defense shall, on each of the dates specified in paragraph (2), submit to the Committees on Appropriations and the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives a report on the implementation of this section. Each such report shall include—

(A) an analysis of cumulative obligations and cumulative expenditures from accounts subject to the limitation in subsection (a) during the period beginning on October 1, 1993, and ending on the last day of the month preceding the month in which the report is to be submitted, including a comparison of such obligations and expenditures with the relevant estimates of outlays made by the Office of Management and Budget and the Congressional Budget Office; and

(B) a description of the specific actions taken by the Secretary to ensure that the Department of Defense meets the requirements of subsection (a).

(2) The reports required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted not later than the following dates in 1994: January 15, April 15, July 15, September 15, and October 15.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8122. Upon enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall make the following transfers of funds: *Provided*, That the amounts transferred shall be available for the same purposes as the appropriations to which transferred, and for the same time period as the appropriation from which transferred: *Provided further*, That the amounts shall be transferred between the following appropriations in the amounts specified:

From:

Under the heading, "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 1990/1994":

AOE combat support ship program, $3,459,000;

To:

Under the heading, "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 1986/1990":

MHC coastal mine hunter program, $3,459,000;

From:

Under the heading, "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 1990/1994":

AOE combat support ship program, $46,000;

Oceanographic ship program, $538,000;

For craft, outfitting, post delivery, and ship special support equipment, $994,000;

Under the heading, "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 1991/1995":

For craft, outfitting, and post delivery, $3,806,000;

Under the heading, "Aircraft Procurement, Navy, 1992/1994", $28,710,000;

Under the heading, "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 1992/1996":

DDG-51 destroyer program, $41,800,000;

For craft, outfitting, and post delivery, $1,560,000;

Under the heading, "Weapons Procurement, Navy, 1992/1994", $36,000,000;

To:

Under the heading, "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 1988/1992":

SSN-688 attack submarine program, $26,596,000;

CVN nuclear aircraft carrier program, $83,600,000;

LHD-1 amphibious assault ship program, $3,258,000;

From:

Under the heading, "Aircraft Procurement, Navy, 1992/1994", $28,890,000;

Under the heading, "Aircraft Procurement, Navy, 1993/1995", $3,400,000;

Under the heading, "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 1993/1997";

Refueling overhauls, $909,000;

DDG-51 destroyer programs, $14,400,000;

MHC coastal mine hunter program, $9,343,000;

For craft, outfitting and post delivery, $27,250,000;

Under the heading, "Weapons Procurement, Navy, 1993/1995", $76,164,000;

To:

Under the heading, "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy 1989/1993":

TRIDENT ballistic missile submarine program, $11,655,000;

SSN-688 attack submarine program, $26,972,000;

SSN-21 attack submarine program, $40,800,000;

DDG-51 destroyer program, $71,500,000;

MHC coastal mine hunter program, $9,429,000;

From:

Under the heading, "Other Procurement, Navy, 1993/1995", $68,361,000;

Under the heading, "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy, 1993/1995", $45,000,000;

To:

Under the heading, "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy 1990/1994":

TRIDENT ballistic missile submarine program, $7,241,000;

DDG-51 destroyer program, $40,100,000;

MCM mine countermeasures program, $7,564,000;

T-AGOS surveillance ship program $58,456,000;

From:

Under the heading, "Weapons Procurement, Navy, 1993/1995", $24,015,000;

Under the heading, "Other procurement, Navy, 1993/1995", $102,439,000;

To:

Under the heading, "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 1991/1995":

SSN-21 attack submarine program, $70,654,000;

DDG-51 destroyer program, $31,300,000;

Under the heading, "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 1993/1997":

LSD cargo variant ship program, $24,500,000.

SEC. 8123. None of the funds in this Act are available for any board, committee, or panel which develops, sets, defines, or recommends National Foreign Intelligence Program requirements: *Provided*, That this provision shall not apply to any such board, committee, or panel for which a majority of the members are not career intelligence or cryptologic professionals.

SEC. 8124. The Departments of Defense and Air Force are directed to obligate, no later than thirty days after enactment of this Act, the $55,500,000 appropriated for research and development in Public Law 102-396 only for the continuance of the Space Nuclear Thermal Propulsion Program.

SEC. 8125. The Secretary of Defense and the Director of Central Intelligence shall deliver, in conjunction with the fiscal year 1995 budget request, a report providing the following information about all research and development projects involving the implementation, monitoring, or verification of current and projected international arms control agreements: (a) annual and total budgets, goals, schedules, and priorities; (b) relationships among related projects being funded by the Department of Defense, the National Foreign Intelligence Program, and other departments and agencies of the Federal Government; and (c) comments by the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency about the relevance of each project to the arms control priorities of the United States.

SEC. 8126. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds appropriated in this or any other Act shall be used for the purchase of a totally enclosed lifeboat survival system, which consists of the lifeboat and associated davits and winches, if less than 75 percent of the entire system's components are manufactured in the United States, and if less than 75 percent of the labor in the manufacture and assembly of the entire system is performed in the United States.

SEC. 8127. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used (1) to transfer to the United Nations a facility in the continental United States for use as a United Nations peacekeeping facility, or (2) for the renovation of such a facility in preparation for such a transfer.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill, through page 125, line 19, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

POINTS OF ORDER

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, I have four points of order

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the points of order.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, I make points of order against the following language in the bill. Beginning on page 27, line 23, through line 25;

Beginning with "Provided" on page 20, line 17, through "operations" on page 21, line 21, of the bill;

Against section 8099, beginning on page 198, line 20, through page 109, line 5; and

Against section 8113, beginning on page 114, line 3, through page 115, line 10.

These provisions give affirmative direction, impose additional duties, set aside existing law, go beyond the funding in this bill and appropriate for an unauthorized project.

This constitutes legislation in an appropriations bill and is in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida wish to be heard on the points of order?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, we reluctantly concede the points of order.

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

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, let me just express my appreciation for the consideration by the chairman in accepting these points of order. As chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I appreciate that very much.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI). Does any other Member wish to be heard on the points of order?

If not, the points of order are conceded.

The Chair understands that points of order beginning on page 27, line 23, through line 25 are against pages 20, line 17 through page 21, line 21, against the section beginning on page 108, line 20.

Does the gentleman also make points of order against section 8113, beginning on page 114, line 3, through page 115, line 10?

Mr. MURTHA. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Those points of order are conceded and sustained.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this bill and amendments thereto be concluded not later than 12:30 p.m.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT: 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 Secretary of Defense 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 fraudulent 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 was 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.

SEC. . 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 Secretary finds that such country affords comparable opportunities to companies organized under laws of the United States.

(b) EXCEPTION.—(1) The Secretary 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 of Tariffs and Trade or with any other international agreement to which the United States is a party.

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 amendment basically states we seek compliance with the Buy American Act. We give notice that with regard to people who get funds under this appropriation, we encourage them to buy American-made products when they can.

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

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

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, we support the gentleman's amendment and accept the amendment.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the support.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. FURSE

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. FURSE: Page 40, line 22, strike "$9,526,918,000" and insert "$9,376,918,000".

Mr. MURTHA [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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, I stand before you today in support of the Furse-Penny amendment. Our original amendment would have reduced funding for Ballistic Missile Defense by 10 percent—$329 million—from a little over $3 to $2.7 billion.

It is our desire that all of the considerable savings from this amendment be devoted to deficit reduction and we hope the appropriators will share that opinion in conference.

We arrived at the $2.7 billion BMD spending level because it is consistent with the findings of Defense Secretary Aspin's Bottom-Up Review, which was just released September 1. The review, in Mr. Aspin's words, is "the vehicle by which my Department will focus on the new dangers and opportunities of this post-cold war world." It is the document which projects our national defense needs for the fiscal year 1995–99 period.

The $3 billion funding level for BMD in this will was established in the authorization by the Armed Services Committee in its late July markup. Unfortunately, our committee did not have the benefit of the Bottom-Up Review's findings at that time.

In this review, Secretary Aspin stated new funding goals for BMD, and called for "a redirected BMD program that will provide a robust theater missile defense capability." The review calls for spending $18 billion over 5 years on BMD. A majority, $12 billion, would be spent on TMD. That is an average of $2.4 billion a year for TMD.

In addition, we are also concerned that at the present level of spending—over $3 billion—we are funding the development of systems that we cannot afford in the outyears. Earlier this year, the head of the Strategic Defense Initiative Office testified that the $1.8 billion in the administration fiscal year 1994 request for TMD would grow to an average of $3.3 billion over fiscal years 1995–99. The increase is a result of TMD's expected transition from research into the production phase later in the decade. Because it is universally acknowledged that production is more costly than research, it would be irresponsible of us to incubate more scientific BMD eggs than we can actually hatch. BMD supporters and opponents alike do not want to waste scarce Federal funds on programs that will end up being cancelled.

If we are to arrive at the Bottom-Up Review's recommended level of an average $2.4 billion a year for fiscal years 1995–99, then $1.3–$1.5 billion is the proper level for fiscal year 1994, based on the ratio provided by SDIO.

The other categories in BMD are being funded at steady levels. Those are national missile defense, research and support, and follow-on technologies; they add up to $1.2 billion. So, we add to that $1.2 billion the proper TMD funding level of $1.3–$1.5 for a total of $2.5–$2.7 billion. We chose $2.7 billion to give maximum flexibility to program planners.

The chairman of the Defense Subcommittee expressed his willingness to work with me on this amendment and has indicated that he will accept our amendment, with a change to a $150 million reduction in total BMD spending. I appreciate his interest in this issue and I look forward to continuing to build on this success next year. With the impact of compound interest, the $150 million we are saving today is actually a saving of $1.15 billion over 30 years. I am proud of what we have accomplished today and I urge my colleagues to support the Furse-Penny amendment to reduce BMD funding by $150 million in fiscal year 1994.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. FURSE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the committee for accepting the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PENNY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PENNY: Page 27, line 5, strike "$2,808,986,000" and insert "$1,680,390,000".

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time on this amendment be limited to 20 minutes, 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY] and 10 minutes to myself.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY].

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

Mr. Chairman, this bipartisan amendment—offered by myself, Congresswoman LYNN WOOLSEY, and Congressman SCOTT KLUG—reduces funding in the Navy weapons procurement section of this bill by just over $1.1 billion. It is my intention that this entire reduction be applied to the Trident II/D-5 Missile Program—resulting in the termination of this program after fiscal year 1993.

Mr. Chairman, this is primarily a budget issue. The Department of Defense is planning to spend over $10 billion over the next few years to procure over 300 additional D-5 nuclear missiles. At a time when we are reducing expenditures on many other nuclear weapons programs, the Department of Defense wants to continue spending billions of dollars on submarine-launched nuclear missiles.

In addition, the Department of Defense is tentatively planning to spend about $5 billion to replace the C-4 missile with the D-5 missile on the eight Trident I submarines. The question before us today is whether or not we can justify spending billions of dollars in the next few years on additional nuclear missiles.

Why do I believe that we can not afford to spend scarce taxpayer dollars on additional nuclear missiles?

First, while the opponents of this amendment downplay the fact that the cold war is over and that the Soviet Union no longer exists, the fact is that this missile was designed solely to penetrate the hardened targets found only in the former Soviet Union.

To illustrate the problem that the Navy has encountered with the fact that the cold war has ended, I have an article here from Defense News of 3 months ago which explains how the Navy is studying ways to use the D-5 missile for conventional purposes. Can we really afford to procure D-5 missiles—at a cost of $30 million per missile—for conventional uses when a less expensive missile could perform this mission? If the Navy so badly needs additional D-5 missiles for their strategic

submarine fleet, why are they studying ways to use this expensive missile for conventional purposes?

Second, there is the question of this amendment jeopardizing the START II Treaty. This amendment essentially requires the Navy to seek an agreement with the Russians to allow the United States to decrease the number of missiles per submarine—a procedure known as "detubing"—and increase the number of warheads per missile. Only the "detubing" part of this action is not allowed under the START II Treaty. The treaty counts 24 missiles per submarine—and four warheads per missile—whether there are 24 missiles on the submarine or not.

Therefore, in order to reduce the number of missiles per submarine—and have it counted that way—the United States would need to seek an agreement with the Russians on this issue of detubing. Does a requirement to ask the Russians about this issue—which would save American taxpayers billions of dollars—really jeopardize the START II Treaty? Not in my opinion.

If we vote today to terminate the Trident II/D-5 Missile Program, the worse result of asking the Russians to allow the United States to detube its Trident II submarines would be for the Russians to say "no" to this proposal sometime after termination of the D-5 missile. The Congressional Budget Office discussed this scenario in its recent report on the Trident II/D-5 missile.

According to CBO, the United States could in such a circumstance deploy no more than 1,248 submarine-launched ballistic missiles, which is about 30-percent fewer than what is permitted by the START II Treaty.

Yet even with a smaller deployment in that portion of the nuclear triad, the United States would still retain a total of about 3,000 deployed nuclear warheads—an arsenal which would be roughly equal to the number of warheads that Russia is expected to deploy under the START II Treaty, according to the Congressional Budget Office.

Mr. Chairman. I urge members to vote in favor of the Penny-Woolsey-Klug amendment.

□ 1030

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

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] and ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to yield time to other Members.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, we cannot do this. This is the only line that we have left dealing with nuclear missiles. This is the most survivable of our nuclear missiles, and if the former Soviet Union had dismantled all of their missiles and had destroyed them, we might be able to do this. But that is not the case. The former Soviet Union, their missiles are still in place, and they are still aimed at us, and we still need the strength of a deterrent, and this is our deterrent.

The President of the United States, Mr. Clinton, has asked that we preserve this system; the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, General Powell, has asked that we preserve this system; the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Aspin, has asked that we preserve this system, all in letters to the Congress, and this Congress itself has spoken at least four times in the last several weeks urging that we not destroy, or eliminate, or terminate the D-5 program. This is the only line that we would have left open to provide our Nation with a deterrent against a nuclear attack from anyone else that might have nuclear capability, and, as we all know, nuclear capability is growing throughout the world at a dangerous rate.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] on his statement.

I would also point out that it is not as if we are not doing something about reducing our production of nuclear weapons. We have stopped the Peacekeeper Program; we have stopped Midgetman; we have stopped the SRAM Program; we have eliminated the Cruise Missile Program, and this is the one remaining strategic nuclear program that we have.

Mr. Chairman, our entire arms control strategy, as we reduce down to 3,000 warheads, is based on the fact that we are going to have a credible, survivable missile at sea on the Trident submarines. This would undermine the President, undermine the Secretary of Defense, would undermine our entire arms control regime between the United States and the various republics in the former Soviet Union.

So, I commend the gentleman on his statement. He is exactly on target, and I would urge that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY] be defeated, and be defeated soundly, as it was before.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] for his statement.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], my friend, for yielding this time to me. It is amendments like this that are certainly penny wise and pound foolish. This is a foolish amendment, and the one which cut $150 million in RDT&E that passed by voice vote a few minutes ago is likewise foolish. I am going to express that opinion in the conference on both of these because this is not a peaceful world.

Mr. Chairman, we have recently learned that Russia has almost twice as many missiles as we believed them to have only a few years ago. There was an intelligence breakdown. There are more missiles pointed at us than we ever dreamed were pointed at us years ago. That must be dealt with. Hopefully, Russia will cease to be a threat because of the foreign aid bill that passed this House yesterday. But Belarus, Kazakhstan, Ukraine all have intercontinental missiles with a 10,000 kilometer range. China has ICBM's with 12,000 kilometer range. North Korea has a 1,000 kilometer range missile that can reach Japan. If we just unilaterally reduce our own capability to provide a nuclear deterrent, then we are acting in violation of our responsibilities to our children and our grandchildren.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] makes a very profound statement, and I hope the Members will vote as they have in the past.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN].

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to solicit my fellow Members' strong support for the Trident missile production program. Continued production of the Trident II/D-5 missile is necessary to maintain a strong national defense and to protect the future security of our country.

The Trident system forms the backbone of our Nation's strategic deterrent. Today, submarine-launched ballistic missiles carry over half of all U.S. warheads on alert. Under START II, SLBM's will carry more than two-thirds of these warheads.

Trident II is the most modern, most accurate, most reliable, most flexible, and most robust missile in the U.S. arsenal. And it has a longer designed service life than any of its predecessors. The Trident submarine, together with the D-5 missile, provide us with the highest degree of confidence in the credibility of our sea-based strategic deterrent.

And yet, this amendment would prematurely terminate D-5 production before all Trident II submarines have been outfitted with the very system they were designed to carry. It would do so without regard for the ultimate size and composition of U.S. strategic forces. With bombers removed from day-to-day alert, we now rely more on the other two legs of the triad. And as the number of strategic weapons comes down further under arms control, our strategic posture will rely more heavily on Trident II/D-5—our primary deterrent, operating at sea, with virtual invulnerability.

Our Nation's security deserve the best, most advanced, capable, cost-effective missile we

have to offer. The Trident II/D–5 is this missile. Please support the President's request for 24 more Trident II/D–5 missiles by defeating this amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California, a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I am a bit astonished sitting here on the floor. I, frankly, had not focussed on this amendment. This is an amendment that would eliminate the Trident missile; is that correct?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I would have to say to the gentleman that that would be the effect of it absolutely.

Mr. LEWIS of California. That is essentially the same amendment that lost so handily when the authorizing bill was on the floor, I believe; was it not?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. The gentleman is absolutely correct. This House has voted against this amendment several times already.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Well, that debate clearly outlined how fundamental this missile is in terms of our strategic defense. It is absolutely unbelievable to me that it is back here on the appropriations bill.

Nonetheless, Mr. Chairman, I certainly would oppose the amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] for his statement, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY].

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to remind my colleagues once again: The cold war is over, and the recent signing of Middle East Peace Accords shows us that peace is breaking out. But while Members of Congress keep saying that the cold war is over, they are failing to translate the message into sound peacetime spending policies.

The CBO estimates that this bill will cost us $262 billion. In a time when we have no superpower enemy, we are paying $262 billion on defense—five times the budget of the State of California. In contrast, the 1975 defense bill, which was passed at the height of the cold war, spent only $230 billion, adjusted for inflation. As the threat has gone down, the spending has gone up.

During the August district work period, Mr. Chairman, Members went home and heard their constituents tell them to make more spending cuts. Well, we came back in September to consider the defense authorization bill, and in the first week we had a chance to save the American taxpayers $10 billion by voting to end production of the Trident D–5 missile, a wasteful cold war relic. This amendment failed, 183 to 240. This shows me that while the Members of this body are constantly saying "cut spending first," some refuse to cut the most wasteful spending programs of all.

When I went back to Marin and Sonoma Counties—California's Sixth Congressional District—the people I spoke with were not interested in wasting another $10 billion on more submarine-launched nuclear missiles. They were interested in health care. They were interested in education reform. And, of course, they were interested in reducing the deficit. Mr. Chairman, I would hate to go home at the end of the year and tell the people of Marin and Sonoma that we failed to deal with these problems because we voted to spend $10 billion on the Trident D–5 nuclear missile. I would much rather tell them that we are solving the health care crisis, reforming our education system, and reducing that deficit.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote for the issues we were all elected on in 1992. You have gone home and heard the call to cut spending. I urge you to answer this call by joining Mr. PENNY, Mr. KLUG, and myself in voting to eliminate one of the most wasteful, and expensive, spending programs we have—the Trident D–5 missile. I urge you to invest in our country's future and vote to save billions of dollars.

□ 1040

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS].

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY] that would terminate production of the Trident II missile.

The Trident submarine force is the most survivable leg of the strategic deterrent. In addition, the D–5 is the only strategic missile still under production.

The world security environment has undergone revolutionary change over the last 5 years.

As noted in Secretary Aspin's bottom up review, "tens of thousands of nuclear weapons continue to be deployed on Russian territory, and on the territory of three other former Soviet Republics." The political future of these Republics is not cast in stone.

The United States has removed 80 percent of the START I required reductions in the number of warheads on ballistic missile systems, while the former Soviet Union has only removed 15 percent.

The Russians are currently developing, and plan to deploy, three new ballistic missiles within the next 10 years: A road-mobile, single RV, as well as a silo-based single RV, and a follow on missile for the *Typhoon* class ballistic missile submarine.

Nonetheless, the changed environment allows us to make dramatic reductions in these forces. Under START II, the Peacekeeper, small ICBM and Minuteman II ICBM's are eliminated. We are buying only 15 percent of the B–2 bombers originally programmed, the SRAM II program has been canceled and cruise missile carrying B–52's retired. We are scrapping all *Poseidon* submarines. The Trident submarine program has been capped at 18 and the W–88 warhead terminated.

The assertion that the Navy already has enough D–5 missiles for deployment is incorrect. As President Clinton has stated, "even at the lowest Trident levels pursuant to the bottom up review, additional D–5 missile procurements are required in fiscal year 1994 and 1995."

Mr. PENNY suggests that we just "Detube" the submarines. The President clearly stated the problems with this when he said—

> A United States proposal along these lines would open a pandora's box in terms of inviting counter proposals by our START partners for relief from other treaty dismantlement requirements they find onerous. If the United States were to ask Russia, Ukraine, Belarus and Kazakhstan for permission to revise or eliminate the strict START SLBM launcher elimination procedures, each of these States would likely demand a quid pro quo in areas under both START and CFE where they are already pressing us to simplify or waive weapons elimination requirements. The result would be an unraveling of the meticulously negotiated dismantlement procedures contained in both accords, with an attendant degradation in the irreversibility of these agreements.

Just 3 weeks ago, this body debated at length this very issue. The House of Representatives voted down those amendments that would terminate this important program.

I urge my colleagues not to support the Penny amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD a letter from Les Aspin, the Secretary of Defense, in regard to this matter:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, DC, August 2, 1993.

Hon. NORMAN D. DICKS,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR NORM: In advance of the upcoming consideration by the House of the President's FY 94 Defense Budget, I would like to reaffirm the importance I attach to continued Trident II (D–5) missile production.

While the risk of nuclear war is at an all time low, maintaining a robust and credible nuclear deterrent is critical as we work to reduce the residual nuclear threat. Looking out to our nuclear force under START II, the United States will rely more heavily on submarine launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs). Terminating D–5 missile production now would have the following adverse consequences:

The D–5 missile production requested for FY 94 and FY 95 is required to equip the ten Atlantic SSBNs scheduled to carry D–5 missiles, of which five are now operational and the remainder are in various stages of construction. Continued production in these years will be needed even if we were to reduce the number of operational tests to

below currently accepted levels. D-5 procurement in FY 96 and beyond depends upon future judgments regarding overall Trident submarine force size, the possible D-5 retrofit of C-4 missiles now carried by older Trident submarines, and the size of the operational test program.

Modifying the submarines under construction—as some have suggested—to carry C-4 missiles would leave us with brand new SSBNs carrying an aging, less capable missile whose service life is limited. We should not address the question of retrofitting the C-4 missiles now.

Terminating D-5 missile production now would shut down the only operating strategic ballistic missile production line in the United States. Sustaining a low rate of D-5 production, and the associated industrial and technology bases, provide a key and unique hedge against future uncertainties.

Finally, ending production would also eliminate incentives for Russia to implement both START I and START II. While we are optimistic that START I and II will ultimately enter into force, it is highly premature and unwise to make force structure decisions now—such as stopping D-5 missile production—based on that optimism.

Continued D-5 production is, therefore, essential to the future health of our deterrent capability. I strongly urge your continued support for this critical program.

LES ASPIN.

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

Mr. DICKS. I yield to my colleague, a member of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, it was apparent to me from hearing the previous speaker that she had not spoken with Members of this House who were in Russia just about 5 months ago. When we were in Aleksandr Rutskoy's office, we saw on the wall of his office not only a picture of Peter the Great, who unified Greater Russia, but also a map of the old Soviet Union.

One Member pointed to the map and said, "Aren't you living in the past, Mr. Vice President?" And he said, "No. That is the future."

In fact, Mr. Rutskoy is currently holed up in the White House, their legislative body, in Moscow, today. We do not know what the outcome will be 24 hours from now, but he could very well find himself installed as Russia's new leader. And we are standing here unilaterally trying to dismember America's nuclear deterrent.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that is one of the most incredible, foolish moves that we could possibly make.

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

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina, who is an expert on this matter.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is offered as an economy amendment, a way of cutting and saving money. But in truth we are building Trident submarines right now which are specifically outfitted to accommodate the D-5 missile. The underlying premise of this amendment is you can take the C-4 missile which we already have amply in stock and stick it in the silos of these Trident submarines.

They do not fit. As a matter of dimensions, you simply cannot do it. So you have got to take the D-5 submarines already build and those under construction and the keel has been laid on all of them, and reoutfit them so they will accommodate the C-4 missile. That will cost $350 million per submarine.

Then when you do that, what have you got? You have got an old missile, a C-4 missile, that you are putting in a new submarine. Its remaining life will be a fraction of the hull life of the new submarine. Before the hull life of the new submarine has expended itself, you have to buy a new missile. You have to schlep the old missile. Finally, you have an infrastructure built on the Atlantic Coast at King's Bay, GA, specifically to accommodate the D-5 Trident II missile. That will have to be reconstructed to take on the C-4 as well.

Mr. Chairman, this is an ill-thought-out proposal. What we get in return is an older missile that is less effective, that has less range, less operating territory, and a smaller target set. It is not a good idea, and it is not an economical proposal either.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG].

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding. We are going to miss his leadership next year when he decides to step down.

Mr. Chairman, let me say to my colleagues on this side of the aisle that I, like many of you, share an enthusiasm for doing cuts. And when the Citizens Against Government Waste announced its rating last week, I had a 95 percent track record of voting in this House for amendments to cut waste. In fact, the one vote I missed was for the space station. So I am not adverse whatsoever to financing technological advancement.

But let us make it clear how this world is more dangerous today than it was in the past, and why in some ways it is exactly the case of why this system is no longer needed.

I agree with the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] that we need to be awfully careful in preparing our defense for the next decade. But let me suggest what everybody has indicated we need to be more substantially worried about are smaller regional conflicts.

The D-5 Trident missile was specifically designed to hit hardened silos in the former Soviet Union. There are no other hardened silos at any potential other target in Iran, in Iraq, or any other kind of situations or scenarios that you can begin to paint. So we are left with the question about whether we are really spending a great deal of money increasing a nuclear deterrent to use on targets which simply do not exist anywhere except in the former Soviet Union. And you and I may disagree on the potential volatility of the former Soviet Union at some point.

But let me make it clear. That with 400 C-5 missiles and 300 D-5 submarine-launched ballistic missiles, and 3,500 nuclear warheads already in the United States arsenal, that would allow us to easily deploy the START II limitation of 1,750 warheads at sea.

Mr. Chairman, again, what we are talking about is a country that faces a $300 billion annual operating deficit, to say nothing of the $1 trillion of debt we have packed up in the past. I think we have to be concerned about the safety and the future of the United States and its people in the years ahead, but I think that makes all of us in this body make tough choices about what systems we can afford and what systems we cannot afford.

Mr. Chairman, let me say I join strongly with my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY], in arguing that we can save $1,200,000,000 in 1994, and we can save another $10 billion through 1999. It is a terrific missile system when needed against an enemy that no longer exists, and a target that, frankly, does not exist any place in the world, except an enemy that is dismantling at the same rate we are.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER].

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will save $10 billion over the next 7 or 8 years. The question we really face is why are we doing this in the first place?

This Congress and the President have not adjusted to the fact that the 50-year arms race, first with the Japanese and the Nazis, and then with the Soviet Union, is over. It has ended. An era in history has ended.

We should completely adjust our budget and our military budget for that. We have 656 submarine-launched ballistic missiles on station. At whom are they aimed? At Mr. Yeltsin, who we are possibly going to be aiding? At whom are they aimed? Six hundred fifty-six is enough.

□ 1050

The D-5 is a first strike weapon. It is intended to give us instant reaction capability, because the Soviet hunter killer subs are following our missile launchers, except they are not anymore. They are all in port. The danger they pose to us is not that they will destroy our missile submarines but that they will be gone at a fighter sale.

Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of this amendment.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, many Members may ask themselves, Why should I support a defense against ballistic missiles?

You can look to the past and to the future for answers.

During Desert Storm, American service personnel were killed by incoming Scud missiles. If we'd had a better defense, these soldiers and airmen would be alive today.

Israel sat night after night worrying and waiting for a Scud attack.

Desert Storm should have made it very clear: We need an effective defense against ballistic missiles.

How about the future? What can it tell us about the need for ballistic missile defense?

There are approximately 30 countries with a ballistic missile capability.

Some of these nations are our allies;

Many are unfriendly—China, Iraq, Syria, Iran, Libya, North Korea; and

Of the 30 nations which have a ballistic missile capability, 8 are in the Middle East.

There are hotspots around the world, where our troops could be deployed—which are in range of ballistic missiles from hostile countries.

Someday it might be Washington, DC, instead of the West Bank. China, Russia, and the Ukraine all have the ability right now to deliver a ballistic missile strike on the United States.

The current situation in Russia ought to cause us some concern.

What if a hardliner comes to power?

Even worse, what if a hardliner who believes that the old Soviet Union should be reconstituted or the United States needs to be annihilated gets control of nuclear weapons. A Russian Kamikazi.

What if North Korea, currently getting technical expertise from short-on-cash Russian scientists, develops a system. Not only can they strike our troops in South Korea, but possibly the United States.

What if Iran or Libya or Iraq or Syria were to have a nuclear capability?

Many in Congress would have us believe that everything in the world is Pollyanna—there will be no more wars.

We need to wake up. The world is hurling toward nuclear saturation.

The author of this amendment has insinuated that the administration supports the lower BMD funding. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Secretary of Defense Aspin said:

Saddam Hussein and the Scud missiles showed us that we need a ballistic missile defense for our forces in the field. That threat is here and now. In the future, we may face hostile or irrational states that have both nuclear warheads and ballistic missile technology that could reach the United States.

John Deutch, Assistant Secretary of Defense said in a letter to Chairman DELLUMS on September 7, after the bottom-up review:

As you are aware, the Department of Defense has completed the Bottom-Up Review and refocused the BMD program. The revised funding profile through the Future Year Defense Plan is $18 billion—averaging about $3.6 billion a year.

Maj. Gen. Malcolm O'Neill, the Director of BMDO said:

Further reductions [below the Appropriations Committee mark] will completely undermine our ability to effectively execute the President's BMD program.

I have been with my friend, Mr. PENNY, on many budget cutting issues. But I strongly disagree on this one.

Even the Clinton administration is opposed to this amendment. It would do irreparable damage to an effective antiballistic missile program.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on the Penny amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 178, noes 248, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 477]

AYES—178

Abercrombie
Allard
Andrews (ME)
Applegate
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Bilbray
Blackwell
Bonior
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Cardin
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Coble
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Coppersmith
Coyne
Danner
de Lugo (VI)
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Dingell
Dooley
Duncan
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Engel
English (AZ)
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Faleomavaega (AS)
Farr
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Goodlatte
Gordon
Grandy
Green
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamburg
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hoekstra
Holden
Hughes
Inslee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnston
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Klink
Klug
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
LaRocco
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Matsui
McCloskey
McDermott
McHale
McInnis
McKinney
Meehan
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Morella
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Norton (DC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Owens
Pallone
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Rahall
Ramstad
Reed
Reynolds
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sawyer
Schaefer
Schenk
Schroeder
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Shays
Skaggs
Slaughter
Snowe
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Synar
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (WY)
Thompson
Thurman
Towns
Unsoeld
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Volkmer
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Williams
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Zimmer

NOES—248

Ackerman
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Archer
Armey
Bacchus (FL)
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clement
Clinger
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeLay
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dixon
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
English (OK)
Ewing
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (TX)
Fish
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Geren
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goss
Grams
Greenwood
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings
Hayes
Hefley
Hefner
Hoagland
Hoke
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lancaster
Lantos
Laughlin
Lazio
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Machtley
Mann
Manton
Manzullo
Martinez
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McHugh
McKeon
McMillan
McNulty
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Mineta
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pickle
Pombo
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Ravenel
Regula
Richardson
Roberts
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Sarpalius
Saxton
Schiff
Schumer
Scott
Shaw
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sundquist
Swift
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thornton
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Traficant
Tucker
Valentine
Visclosky
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Whitten
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff

NOT VOTING—12

Ford (MI)
Goodling
Herger
Markey
McDade
Neal (NC)
Rangel
Ridge
Smith (MI)
Stark
Underwood (GU)
Washington

□ 1110

Mr. LAZIO, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. SLATTERY changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Ms. WATERS and Messrs. FOGLIETTA, DINGELL, and STOKES changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I regret my absence for rollcall vote No. 477, on an amendment offered by Congressman TIMOTHY PENNY to H.R. 3116, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1994. As a member of the National Education Goals Panel, I was attending the unveiling of the third "National Education Goals Report." I was unavoidably detained on my return to the Capitol and missed rollcall vote No. 477. Had I been present for the vote, I would have voted "nay."

□ 1110

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROWN of California: Page 125, after line 19, insert before the short title provision the following:

SEC. . None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used for a defense technology reinvestment project that is not selected pursuant to the applicable competitive selection and other procedures set forth in chapter 148 of title 10, United States Code.

Mr. MURTHA (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?

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. MURTHA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, this language actually tracks the existing law, and we are happy to accept the amendment.

Mr. BROWN of California. May I just take one moment then to thank the chairman of the subcommittee for his generosity. This amendment is restating the law with regard to the need for competitiveness in the process of selection. We know the chairman is going to do everything that he can in this regard. I commend him for it. This is one of the best bills that I have seen him bring to the floor.

I will assure him that I continue to be concerned about earmarks, but I am not going to pursue it in this particular forum.

Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk which is a limitation amendment to assure that competitive procedures be used in the technology reinvestment project of the defense conversion project.

The technology reinvestment project was created last year by the Congress as an attempt to cushion the impact of the defense downsizing and to help communities and firms revitalize through civilian market opportunities.

The TRP, as it is commonly known, was embraced by this administration, with the President, Vice President, Cabinet Secretaries, agency heads, and numerous program representatives crisscrossing the Nation to encourage communities and firms to apply.

The response from the public was overwhelming, with approximately 3,000 consortia comprising over 15,000 firms applying to the $472 million project.

Key to the TRP, was the promise to the public that this would be a fair, merit-based, competitive process. They are trusting that the Government will allow competition on a level playing field. And, this is what is prescribed in the law.

However, in fiscal year 1993, 26 percent of the TRP funds were earmarked in appropriations report language, and there are real concerns that these may influence the selection process.

In fiscal year 1994, in the report language to this bill, the percentage of earmarks in report language has grown to nearly 40 percent.

The public will not accept this, we should expect them to be outraged. And we should be outraged if we allow this to happen and violate the public's trust.

This amendment simply restates what is already written in the law, and I ask your support.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WAXMAN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WAXMAN: Page 52, after line 2, insert the following new section:

SEC. 8005A. Title IV of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1993 (Pub. L. 102-396; 106 Stat. 1890) is amended in the 9th proviso under the heading "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army" by striking "six months" and inserting "18 months".

Mr. WAXMAN (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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, in 1992, the other body added a provision to the Defense appropriations bill that required that a particular research trial be undertaken using a particular experimental AIDS vaccine. The provision allowed an exception to this requirement only if the Defense Department, the National Institutes of Health, and the Food and Drug Administration—all three—certified that the trial should not proceed by April 6 of this year.

April 6 has come and gone, and this certification was not made. Now, however, these three agencies have concluded that the vaccine trial in last year's Defense bill is not appropriate and they have told my staff and Congressman DINGELL's staff that they are prepared to certify that the trial should not proceed.

I will not take the Committee's time at this point to describe the relative merits of the vaccine or the allegations that have arisen. That may be appropriate at another time and another place. Suffice it to say that my amendment would simply extend the period during which the Defense Department, the National Institutes of Health, and the Food and Drug Administration are allowed to make their required certifications. After making these certifications, the Defense Department will use these funds for their other AIDS research activities.

Let me be clear on this matter: No one in this body wants an AIDS vaccine more than I do, and I have done all that I can to make that hope a reality. But I also believe that the original provision in the 1993 statute was inappropriate, and I do not want the Congress to force the expenditure of precious research dollars on a project that none of the agencies supports.

My amendment is supported by the administration. I urge Members to vote "yes."

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

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

Mr. MURTHA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we support the gentleman's amendment. We think it is a good amendment, and are prepared to accept it.

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

Mr. WAXMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am not intending to call a vote on this amendment. However, there is not unanimous support on this particular amendment, and I can assure the gentleman there will be additional discussion in the conference.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlemen.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey: Page 37, line 1, after "members:" insert the following: *Provided further*, That $1,000,000 of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be available for a lyme disease program:".

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURTHA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we are happy to accept the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge my colleagues to support my amendment to the Department of Defense appropriations bill funding a Lyme disease research program through the Army Environmental Hygiene Agency.

Lyme disease is a debilitative disease which robs men, women, and children alike of their health and spirit. Its victims suffer with extreme fatigue, chronic migraines, arthritis, epileptic seizures and other neurological side effects. Nearly 50,000 people have contracted the disease in the last decade—and the CDC believes this number to be a gross underestimate of the true number of sufferers as Lyme disease often goes misdiagnosed.

Men and women serving in the armed forces are at a particularly high risk of infection from this tick borne illness. During field maneuvers and other ordered activities, they are often in highly endemic areas, such as grassy or wooded lots. Over the past 2 years, the Army has seen a 300-percent increase in the rate of infection among its military and civilian personnel.

The Environmental Hygiene Agency has been the de facto lead agency for Lyme disease research for the Department of Defense since the DOD began tracking the disease in 1987. To date, they have funded their research on tick control, pest management, and other preventive methods with scraps of funding from their general operating budget. Unfortunately, military downsizing has put this important program in jeopardy and it may be eliminated altogether without the specific funding offered in my amendment.

Just 2 days ago, the House passed my amendment authorizing $1 million in funding for a Lyme Disease Program in the Army Environmental Hygiene Agency. This modest cost includes $500,000 for a one time start up cost of the program and $500,000 for operating expenses in fiscal year 1994. The amendment also requires that all pertinent information be shared with the general public through the Public Health Service.

This program represents the perfect military-civilian partnership. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the Smith amendment to the DOD appropriations bill.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. EVANS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EVANS: Page 11, line 14, insert after "Command" the following:

: *Provided further*, That, of the funds appropriated in this paragraph $10,000,000 shall be available for activities to support the clearing of landmines for humanitarian purposes.

Mr. EVANS (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 Illionis?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk. It would provide $10 million in funding to assist other nations in clearing the scourge of antipersonnel landmines.

It is ironic that in a world facing weapons of mass destruction that one of the deadlier threats would come from a weapon often smaller than a cigar box and as cheap as a few dollars to produce. Yet, the landmine has emerged as a significant problem throughout the world.

During the proxy battles of the cold war, countries used huge amounts of these cheap weapons. Unfortunately, they were not just employed against military targets. Both intentionally and unintentionally, innocent men, women, and children bore and continue to bear the brunt of these indiscriminate killers. An estimated 800 people a month are killed throughout the world by mines. In Afghanistan roughly 400,000 civilians were injured and 200,000 killed by mines.

Yet, landmines exact more than just a human cost. Entire countries are wounded by landmines use, preventing refugees from returning home and farmers from cultivating their fields, delaying recovery from war and conflict. A report released last month by the State Department called "Hidden Killers: The Global Problem with Uncleared Landmines" concluded that at least 85 million landmines are scattered in 62 countries around the world. Unfortunately, many of the countries cannot mount the efforts necessary to clear the mines. For example, it has been estimated that Cambodia would have to spend five times its GDP to clear all of its landmines.

It may not be possible to solve each countries' problem but we can help prevent the loss of life. DOD has a wide range of resources, including demining training, education on mine awareness, and mine clearance equipment that can be utilized by other countries to help clear mines. The U.S. Army has already conducted its first demining training course for foreign mine clearance instructors to rave reviews. The State Department report points to these DOD resources and reflects the thinking of the Demining Coordination Group [DCG] to utilize these resources to address this problem. The DCG, an interagency group including representatives from DOD, coordinates U.S. demining policy.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment. The carnage that antipersonnel landmines has visited on innocent men, women, and children is a senseless tragedy that we cannot ignore. We have the resources to help remove these killers and we should share them. It is a very small amount of money that would go a long way in preventing the needless loss of life and limb.

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

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

Mr. MURTHA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we think this is an important amendment, and we are happy to accept it.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments of the gentlemen.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS].

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make an amendment at this point in the bill, although it is on pages 33 and 34, and I am unable to do that because what I would like to take out is in the report language itself.

So I would like to raise the issue, if I might, to make you aware of it.

The language seeks to direct C-130's to Youngstown, OH.

The report language I am referring to seeks to direct C-130 aircraft to the Reserve unit at Youngstown, OH. There

are many aircraft wings across the country in far greater need of these C-130's than is the Youngstown group.

As part of the Air Force Reserve modernization program, the Air Force is trying to replace 20- to 30-year-old C-130E models with the new H models. After waiting for years, other units in greater need have received the new H models, and many aircraft wings have become priority reserve wings to receive new planes, according to the Department of Defense.

Remember, these 20- to 30-year-old airplanes, which need to be replaced, we are talking about the safety of air crews when we talk about this. And the Air Force has been doing this in a very logical, priority kind of way. But in the report language, a Congressman from Ohio has put language into this bill and the two previous defense appropriation bills designating the C-130's to Youngstown. This is not where the Department of Defense wants the planes to go. They did not ask for them to go there. They do not have facilities for them there, they do not have air crews for them there, and it will cost us considerable money to provide all of this at the Youngstown location.

All the other aircraft wings have the infrastructure to support the aircraft; Youngstown does not.

Just to build the additional infrastructure in Ohio, it will cost the taxpayers an additional $16.5 million. I have checked the figure with the Air Force three times, and that is a correct figure.

Additionally, the Youngstown unit would have to train an additional 14 crews at a cost of $4.1 million. This is also an Air Force figure.

Combined, that means the American taxpayer will have to cough up an additional $20.6 million to satisfy the desire of the congressional delegation from that particular area.

The Air Force should make the decisions on where these planes are to be based. They have told me again and again that they simply do not want these planes in Ohio. The Defense Department is already experiencing tighter budgets, and we cannot afford any longer the luxury of this type of micromanagement. Unfortunately, because the Appropriations Committee placed this in the report language rather than in bill language, I cannot get to it to remove it, but I want us to be aware of it. I want us to try to avoid—to see if we can avoid this kind of earmarking in the future.

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

□ 1120

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MURTHA

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MURTHA: On page 19 of the bill, strike out line 13 and all that follows through line 23 on page 21.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, let me explain to the House what we have done. Because the Defense Department asked for money for what they call global initiatives, we felt that if they had that money set aside we would put severe restrictions on that money.

Since the restrictions were removed on a point of order, we feel the money should not be made available.

We feel this $383 million should be removed from the bill until we can work out language to satisfy both the House and the Senate. The language I had worked out, a number of Members on the other side of the Capitol did not think was strong enough. I felt it was the most we could do under the Constitution.

So Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment to eliminate the $383 million in the global initiatives area until we can work it out in conference.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, let me say I really do not like to see this amendment adopted, but I think we have to adopt it if we are going to put any kind of controls on the deployment of U.S. forces without the United States Congress being a part of the decision. This is extremely important, since we are reducing the Defense budget by billions of dollars in short periods of time, while at the same time we are asking our military forces to take on more assignments than the average American is aware of.

Since the language that would have made those restrictions part of the law was stricken on a point of order, this is the only other way to address the issue. It is an important issue. We cannot be sending Americans everywhere in the world where somebody wants to start a civil war.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I think particularly now with all the concern about what we are going to do regarding Bosnia that to give $300 million is like giving them a blank check. I think that would be a mistake.

I think we should agree with the chairman's amendment and eliminate the $300 million in spending at this juncture.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], a member of the Defense Subcommittee and the ranking member on the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

I have to say, Mr. Chairman, that I agree with the chairman on his amendment.

We have lost 11 people, 11 young men in Somalia over the last 6 or 8 months. As long ago as January, 1993, when we were in Somalia, those pilots who were flying the C-130's were flying every day, 12 and 13-hour days, possibly 15-hour days.

The Marines, the sailors who were on the ships, had already been deployed 6 months. They were talking about extending their cruises for long periods of time.

Since that time, we have cut $14 billion under last year's Defense budget. There will be fewer men, fewer women in uniform; there will be fewer ships, fewer planes; they will be deployed more often, more frequently. There will be less maintenance, capability, and we are sending them to Somalia, possibly Bosnia, certainly Haiti and other parts of Africa, some 17 places around the world.

There are 73,000 troops currently deployed in peacekeeping missions today. The Congress of the United States cannot abdicate its authority in having a voice over those operations. If we do not pass this amendment, with the action taken by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], frankly we will not have a further voice in whether or not our troops, our young men and women in uniform, are deployed at great length and at great hazard in every corner of the world.

So Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of this amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has made an excellent statement in behalf of this amendment.

Because of the spending constraints that we are under and the reductions in the Defense appropriations bill, the end strength is coming down.

Just one quick example, the U.S. Marine Corps: With the end strength provided for in this bill, the average marine is going to be deployed more than 50 percent of the time. He will be away from his home base, be away from his family more than 50 percent of the time.

Mr. Chairman, we support the amendment.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURTON of Indiana: Page 11, line 5, strike "$9,497,133,000" and insert "$9,487,133,000".

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, we also accept the amendment.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I guess I do not need to go into detail about this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to raise a question which I raised in the authorizing committee yesterday, with no response.

I am concerned about the obligation we have to the great many military retirees and their families to provide medical care for those people. With the completion of the base closing of all the bases we have, we have many people located in some rural areas, in some smaller States, who have to drive hundreds of miles for medical care or to get a prescription filled.

I notice on page 283 that you provide for a temporary service in the Blue Grass Army Depot in Kentucky to provide until they get a mail service pharmacy.

Has any consideration been given about taking care of providing for these military retirees and their families? We have an obligation, when they entered the service and gave their service to the country through the years, we have an obligation to provide for their senior years, their older years, or when they have a handicap.

I see nothing being done by Congress to take care of these retirees and their families as far as pharmacies are concerned.

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

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, this has been a personal project with me, trying to increase the medical care for the dependents and the retirees in the military. I started about 7 years ago. It has been a frustrating experience.

We have had some tremendous successes in California and Hawaii where we have had about a 98-percent approval rating in the new proposal that we worked out there. We are expanding that to the rest of the country.

Of course, we do not know how it will fold in to any new national health care plan, but we are well aware of what the gentleman if talking about. We are doing everything we can to be sure that the dependents and retirees are taken care of.

If there is a specific problem, if the gentleman would bring it to the attention of the committee, we will try to take care of it. We will sit down and see what we can work out.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the committee chairman's remarks.

In my own State of Indiana, we are closing out the only two active stations there. That means people where I live in my district, military retirees, of which I am one, too, will have to drive 250 miles minimum to get to a pharmacy, let alone being taken care of in the other obligations we have.

Now, we have veterans' hospitals closer, but right now they cannot be treated at veterans' hospitals.

So Mr. Chairman, I hope the Congress will take this into consideration. We have an obligation to take care of these people.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the contributions he has made.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KENNEDY: Page 8, line 1, strike out $15,221,091,000" and insert in lieu thereof "15,218,191,000".

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would reduce the Army operation and maintenance account by $2.9 million, the amount dedicated to running the Army School of the Americas at Fort Benning, GA. The intent of the amendment is to close the school.

It has been called the School of the Dictators. Many of Latin America's most notorious foes of democracy and human rights violators went to the school. The Clinton administration has put the promotion of democracy and human rights at the center of U.S. foreign policy. Continued operation of the School of the Americas, given its history and tradition, stands in the way of establishing a new U.S. relationship with Latin America based on strengthening civilian, democratic institutions.

Let me give you some examples of who the SOA graduates are:

Leopoldo Galtieri, ex-head of the Argentine Junta; Roberto D'Aubuisson, organizer of Salvadoran death squads; and Manuel Noriega, presently a resident of the Federal Prison System.

In Guatemala, the three most senior officers who backed the Serrano coup in May of this year. Two of the three have been sacked for their role in the coup.

Last year a coalition of international human rights groups issued a report charging 246 Colombian officers with human-rights violations. More than 100 had been at the school, several as instructors. A Colombian lieutenant colonel attended the school after Colombian courts named him the subject of an investigation for a prominent massacre committed by troops under his command. This gave the impression, raised in the Colombian Congress in 1991, that the United States was shielding the officer from prosecution.

In El Salvador, 48 officers—over two-thirds—of the 69 officers cited for human rights violations in the report of the U.N. Truth Commission trained at the school. This includes Col. Elena Fuentes, one of the country's most notorious hardline officers. Elena Fuentes was in the room when Salvadoran military leaders gave the order to murder the Jesuit priests in 1989. He was an instructor at the school in 1985 and 1986. In fact, 19 of the 26 officers cited by the U.N. Truth Commission for involvement in the Jesuit murders and coverup were SOA graduates.

□ 1130

Some will object that the school counts among its graduates noble and courageous soldiers as well. I do not doubt this. The U.N. Truth Commission report tells of a Salvadoran officer—a graduate of the school—who objected to the massacre of civilians in San Sebastian in 1988. Tragically, his commanding officer, another SOA graduate, ordered the operation to go ahead.

I have heard some say that the record of Latin American militaries would be even worse without the School of the Americas. Mr. Speaker, this is surely a weak endorsement for an institution that costs the United States millions of dollars a year and identifies us with tyranny and repression.

The school has recently added a few hours of human rights training to its courses. I met with a human rights expert who was invited to speak to instructors and trainees this spring. He came away convinced that the school's instructors, many of them from Latin America, were either indifferent or hostile to his message, and that the school should be closed.

My amendment will not end any relationship between the United States and Latin American militaries. Each year the United States trains thousands of foreign soldiers by bringing them to the United States and by sending U.S. military trainers abroad. The Department of Defense is also crafting new initiatives to promote democracy through military-to-military contacts. Some of these initiatives may prove to be effective. But continued operation of the School of the Americas, with its history and tradition of abusive graduates, stands as a barrier to establishing a new and constructive relationship with Latin American militaries after the cold war. And it continues to associate the United States with those abuses.

I do not question the good values and the commitment of the U.S. personnel at the school. But after examining the record of school graduates, I cannot help but conclude that we need to make a fresh start, freed from this record and history of abuse.

We have left much of the money that will go to this school for the purposes of continuing the military in its current hiring quota, so we will not be

weakening our military. We will just be getting at the root cause of the abuses, which is the operations and maintenance account.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, the School of the Americas at Fort Benning, GA, has the nefarious distinction of being the place in the United States where the worst human rights abusers in the Western Hemisphere come to learn military tactics and to teach them.

Lists of the many dictators and petty tyrants who have both attended and taught courses at SOA were published in Newsweek and the Miami Herald. Some of the more infamous graduates of SOA include Manuel Noriega, the former dictator of Panama who is serving 40 years in a U.S. prison for drug trafficking and for whose capture the United States invaded Central America; 19 officers from El Salvador cited by the U.N. Truth Commission for involvement in the murder of 6 Jesuit priests, their housekeeper and her daughter; 2 of the Salvadoran officers cited for the assassination of Archbishop Oscar Romero; 10 of the officers of the massacre at El Mozote, El Salvador; 6 Peruvian officers linked to a death squad that killed 9 university students and a professor; and Humberto Regalado, the Honduran Chief of Staff linked to Colombian drug dealers. SOA is contrary to the international interests of the United States—to promote peace, democracy, and economic development around the globe.

It is admirable that the U.S. military feels capable of instilling in Central and South American soldiers the professionalism to which we are accustomed and the respect for civilian authority which is enshrined in our Constitution. However, such attempts have been a colossal failure at SOA. Too many times in recent memory the perpetrators of murder and massacre have been found to be graduates.

The Kennedy amendment would not end our international military training and education programs which occur on U.S. soil and abroad. What it would do is close a dark chapter in the military history of the Americas. Support the amendment; close the School of the Americas.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, could I get a time limit on this amendment being offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to reach an agreement on a time limit action; but I would advise the Chair there are several speakers on our side who want to be heard on this amendment.

Mr. MURTHA. How about 20 minutes to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BISHOP] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]?

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman intend to share the time in opposition to the amendment with this side?

Mr. MURTHA. I am sure that the gentleman will share the time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] making a unanimous-consent request that debate on this amendment be limited to 20 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BISHOP], with the time to be shared with the gentleman on the other side of the aisle?

Mr. MURTHA. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BISHOP] for 10 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and I urge the Members of this body, this Committee of the Whole, to not listen to what appears to be uninformed rhetoric and to really look at the facts about the School of the Americas.

Mr. Chairman, the School of the Americas is located at Forth Benning, GA, and was established in 1946. Its mission by public law is to develop and conduct for the Armed Forces of Latin America the most doctrinally sound, relevant, and cost-effective training program as possible to promote military professionalism, to foster greater cooperation among multinational military forces and to expand the Latin American Armed Forces' knowledge of U.S. customs and traditions, including democracy. It conducts 41 different training courses from the cadet level to the command in general staff equivalent. It includes training for U.S. service wives, foreign area officers, for Latin American coverage. The planned workload for 1994 is 1,743 students. The School of the Americas has trained over 54,000 students since its establishment. Its graduates include 10 Presidents, 38 ministers of defense and state, 71 commanders of armed forces, and 25 service chiefs of staff in Latin America.

Human rights awareness is an indispensable element in the school's curriculum. Students receive training in law and law welfare, the Geneva and Hague Conventions, and military law and ethics. The training focuses heavily upon civilian-military relations in the conduct of military operations and the effects of human rights violations. The school has played a significant role in the dramatic change in Latin America since 1976, from dictatorship, military juntas, to military supported democratic societies.

With all due respect to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], Mr. Chairman, I must respectfully suggest that his logic is flawed. I suggest that what we have here, as supported by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Colin Powell, the Department of Defense, the Committee on Armed Services of this House and of the Senate, are all of the appropriations and authorizations committees that supported this appropriation over the years. The gentleman from Massachusetts is just mistaken. What we are about to do is to throw out the baby with the bath water. We cannot destroy the school because of its graduates, some of its graduates. We might as well abolish M.I.T. because Michael Milken graduated from the Wharton School. We might as well abolish all of our schools in this country because they may happen to develop and to graduate a youngster that may get into crime. I suggest that this amendment is ill-conceived, it is not thought out properly, and we ought to oppose it, and defeat it, and support and strike a blow for democracy in Latin America.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN].

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, 2 months ago, I wrote to Secretary of Defense Les Aspin to express my concerns about the School of the Americas at Fort Benning, GA. I asked why we should be spending millions of dollars to train foreign soldiers who use the skills they learn at the School of the Americas to brutalize their own people. I received a reply this morning, and it makes me even more inclined to close the school than when I sent the letter. Let me quote from the DOD's response:

> To assume that one short course in the United States can counteract perhaps contradictory messages absorbed over a lifetime from within one's own culture and elsewhere overestimates the missions and power of School of the Americas training.

I couldn't agree more. One short course is not enough to instill respect for human rights, but it is more than enough time to teach the most effective and savage methods of repression. Even if the terrorists we taught at the School of the Americas didn't learn anything that helped them victimize the people they were supposed to protect, we should not have given them the legitimacy and prestige associated with official support from the U.S. Government.

The U.N. Truth Commission report released in March linked 47 graduates of the School of the Americas to human rights abuses in El Salvador. While the school's administration states that it "systematically advocates human rights awareness," the Truth Commission's report suggests that the school deserves a failing grade.

With the end of the cold war, the primary objective of U.S. foreign policy in the Western Hemisphere since World War II—to contain the expansion of Soviet influence—has been plant-supplanted by the need to encourage respect for democracy and human rights along with economic development and an end to narcotics trafficking. If the

School of the Americas does not meet these objectives, then its $2.9 million budget is difficult to justify. I do not know where the officers who murdered priests and raped nuns learned how to terrorize civilians, but I do not think we should be educating violent criminals in techniques they can use to violate the basic rights of innocent people. We should shut off funds to the School of the Americas before we contribute to the training of any more of those unsavory thugs.

□ 1140

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], and ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to yield time to other Members.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] that I very much understand the gentleman's intention. But I must say that I cannot help but believe strongly that his premise is fundamentally flawed.

Mr. Chairman, I presume the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] did not include Mr. Somoza on his list of people who had received military training who in some way abused his view of the world in Latin America. Would the gentleman from Massachusetts close the school that Somoza graduated from as well? Somoza is a graduate of West Point.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] that if any school in the United States had the record of abuse of this school, with the total number of graduates, the total number of hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of individuals that have been cited by all of the international courts for their human rights abuses, that any school would have been closed.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would suggest to the gentleman there are 54,000 graduates of that school, all of whom have been exposed to the United States in a very special way, who are making a difference. There are problems with a few graduates of every school.

Mr. Chairman, I must suggest that one way or another, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] should understand the training in the United States exposes people in a positive way to the best of our system. To suggest that a course some way determines a person's pattern of life, to say the least, is a misunderstanding.

Mr. Chairman, the motivations of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are appropriate, but I would suggest the gentleman is way off target.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COLLINS].

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

This amendment is misdirected. In spite of the gentleman's intent, this amendment does not directly impact the funding for the School of Americas. Instead, it recklessly cuts $2.9 million from an already streamlined operations and maintenance budget for the U.S. Army. Since the School of Americas is both authorized and a part of public law, the Army would still have to find funding for the School of Americas. And because of this amendment, they would be forced to find those funds in a smaller budget.

Additionally, I want to make it clear that I also oppose the intent of this amendment.

This amendment ignores the curriculum, mission, and history of the school. I encourage the gentleman to go to Fort Benning and review the school before depleting Army's operations and management funds.

The School of Americas was founded with a mission to develop and conduct doctrinally sound, cost-efficient military training programs for the Armed Forces of Latin America. It provides Latin American armies with first hand understanding of American democracy and customs. School of Americas is also a pioneer in training Latin American soldiers in human rights. For many of these soldiers, this is their only training in international human rights. While there have admittedly been some rotten apples who attended the school, one can imagine how many more human rights violations would take place in Latin America without this training.

Each year the School of Americas trains around 1,700 students from Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, Venezuela, and the United States. The vast majority of the 54,000 officers trained by School of Americas since 1946 have improved their home countries.

In many instances they have provided stability, turned back insurgency, brought down dictatorships, and served as important representatives for democratic ideals.

Each student must attend a class specifically focused on human rights, and human rights training is woven into every course. Students take courses such as law of land warfare, Geneva and Hague Conventions and military law and ethics. Every course emphasizes proper civil-military relations in combat operations. We should evaluate the school on the basis of their curriculum, their graduates overall record and their contribution to the community they serve.

Some have committed terrible human rights violations and I share the gentleman from Massachusetts' concerns about their conduct. But their actions are not due to their training at Fort Benning. Each individual is responsible for his own behavior, and should receive punishment for such actions. I deplore the humanitarian violations which have been attributed to some graduates of this program and hope that any individuals involved in such actions will be punished to the full extent of the law.

The Kennedy amendment misses the mark in reality and in intent. The school's curriculum and mission are sound. If reforms are to be made, they should be made in the recruitment process. School of Americas does not select their students. The State Department is involved in student selection and should set even stricter criteria on which soldiers are chosen for the program. Additionally, countries that send a high percentage of students later convicted of human rights abuses should be restricted accordingly.

The Department of Defense is looking into ways to improve the School of Americas program, and if changes are to be made, all parties including the State Department should be involved. This appropriations bill is not the proper venue to address School of Americas, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the Kennedy amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding, and I would like to point out that an amendment like this is like cutting off your nose to spite your face. Relationships created between Latin American military people and United States military people endure for their lifetimes. Tremendous good flows from their presence in this academy. There may be some bad eggs. The Newsweek article of August 9, indicates, "the Wharton School of Finance could be blamed because Michael Milken went there."

Mr. Chairman, in any group you will always have somebody controversial. But the good done by the relationships created in this school has enabled the

United States to foster relations and influence with countries to our southern border for generations, and we should not eliminate that potential for good influence. Today there are more democracies in Latin America than ever before in history. The proof is in the pudding.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment is defeated. It is very counterproductive. The graduates of this school that may have acted criminally did so in spite of what they learned, not because of it. The opportunity to train thousands of Latin American military in our country, in our traditions, in our human rights processes, is invaluable. Because a few go wrong does not vitiate the enormous good that comes from this school.

Mr. Chairman, as I recall, one of the 12 Apostles went bad. That does not mean the rest of the Apostles should have dispersed.

This is a terribly useful school in language, in human rights, and in tradition. It is an advantage that we have, in developing good relations with our neighbors to the south and we ought to avail ourselves of it.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment is defeated.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DARDEN].

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from the southern part of Georgia, from the area where Fort Benning and this school is located, for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment, while it is well-meaning, has very, very dangerous implications. Taken quite to its logical conclusion, as an alumnus of the University of Georgia, based on my alleged conduct since my graduation, someone one day might even want to close that fine university.

So let me say that this is a very misdirected effort, and let us look at the problem. Today there is $2.6 million in a program called IMET, International Military Education and Training, which comes under foreign operations appropriations. If we wanted to cut out the money which went to these students, we are actually going after the wrong money here. What we are going after is operation and maintenance of a school that stands up for democracy and freedom throughout Latin America. This amendment will not punish anyone but the instructors and employees in the school.

Mr. Chairman, it would be a terrible mistake to close this school, and I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, might I inquire how much time remains?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. FARR). The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BISHOP] has one 1 minute remaining, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. KOPETSKI].

Mr. KOPETSKI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to support the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] here and commend him for bringing this issue before us.

Mr. Chairman, today this body will have the opportunity to halt nearly $3 million of funding for this school with a history of training Latin American military thugs who have demonstrated utter contempt for basic human rights in Central and Latin America.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has outlined the honor roll of dishonor of hundreds, if not thousands, of graduates of this institution.

At a time when Oregon schools and our children face rising tuition costs that price them out of the university classroom, at a time when my students in Oregon go to school in overcrowded facilities, at a time when children in this country do not have enough books, they do not have play fields, they do not have all of those things that go into making learning healthy and creative, this is not the time, if there ever was, to provide millions of dollars of free tuition for graduate students in civil disruption, terrorism, and murder.

Mr. Chairman, if we do not support the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], which deletes the funding for this program, then we will be funding human tragedy. That is what this amendment is about, and that is why we ought to be voting "yes" on the Kennedy amendment.

□ 1150

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAMBURG].

Mr. HAMBURG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Kennedy amendment which will cut all funding for the School of the Americas.

In April, I led a delegation to El Salvador to examine the prospects for a democratic election in 1994. One of my stops included the university where six Jesuit priests, their cook, and her daughter were murdered in cold blood in November 1989. That act shook the conscience of the world and focused attention on the repressive practices of the Salvadoran Armed Forces.

Mr. Chairman, it appalls me to discover that 19 of the officers implicated in the U.N. Truth Commission report were graduates of the U.S. Army's School of the Americas in Fort Benning, GA. It enraged me even more to learn that almost three-fourths of the Salvadoran officers accused in seven other massacres during the civil war were also trained at the School for the Americas. I think most Americans would be appalled to learn that their tax dollars and their military contributed to the training of cold-blooded killers in Central American nations.

The School of the Americas has outlived whatever purpose it may have served in the cold war world. We should all be thankful that the civil wars that have marred the region for the past decade appear to be over. It is now time to assist those countries, countries that have suffered untold amounts of death and misery, rebuild their infrastructure and economies. In order to do this, we must move from the military mindset that has plagued our relationship with Central America.

The School of the Americas is a strong symbol of a confrontational policy toward Central America, a way of the past that in my estimation has done more harm than good. Let us terminate the program and move toward the future. I urge support for the Kennedy amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Kennedy amendment to cut funding for the School of the Americas, an institution which has been called an academy of torture and a school for dictators. Let us take a quick look at the honor roll from this school: 19 of the 27 Salvadoran officers implicated in the Jesuit murders were graduates of the school; 105 Columbian military officers charged with human rights violations are school alumni; and the school's most notorious graduate, Panamanian dictator Manual Noriega, had two separate tours at the school.

During the 1980's, death squads, dictators, and unchecked armies carried out a reign of terror on the residents of Central and Latin American nations. During the same period, the Uintd States spent billions of dollars to keep in power many of the individuals who carried out unspeakable crimes against peaceful citizens.

Mr. Chairman, what is done cannot be undone. However, we have the opportunity to ensure that the United States will not continue training potential dictators here in the United States. I ask my colleagues to join me in helping write an end to a sad chapter in this Nation's history. American taxpayers and the war-weary people of Central America deserve nothing less.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Georgia [Ms. MCKINNEY].

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Kennedy amendment.

The School of the Americas was established to train military officers for Central America's military forces. Supporters for continued funding for SOA

contend that it is one of the most effective foreign relation operations being operated by the U.S. Government.

Assuming that this is true, the question must be asked, at what price?

Let us look at El Salvador's track record where the SOA has been used for training military officers. In El Salvador, most of the atrocities were ordered or conducted by the Salvadoran military, aligned with paramilitary death squads. Some of the most infamous incidents were carried out by the military; the massacre by the army's elite of more than 200 civilians—mostly, children and elderly men.

The murder of Archbishop Oscar Arnulfo Romero as he was saying Mass in 1980. The rape and murder of three Maryknoll nuns and a Catholic lay worker in 1980.

The murder of six Jesuit priests, their housekeeper and her daughter at the Central American University in 1989. It would be sad to believe that my dear colleagues condone such outrageous conduct, oppression, torture, and rape of Latin American citizens.

United States trained militaries in Latin America supported dictators at the expense of the people in the regions.

Military, we support—humanity, we ignore. The cold war policy of U.S. buildup in arms was oblivious to human rights.

We are the No. 1 exporter of arms. The same guns being used to kill American sons and daughters were sold by American parents during the cold war.

I remember a Newsweek article dated, August 3, 1993. Its basic theme was "U.S. Training Does Not Turn Soldiers Into Democrats."

Therefore, I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting the Kennedy amendment.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI], chairman of the Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere Affairs.

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

There is no voice in this Congress that is heard more often on issues of human rights than the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. There are times, indeed, when I might, in the past, have joined him in this effort. But today it is simply dated.

For whatever abuses there have been in the past, the reality is today. For the first time in 200 years, democracy in Latin America is the coin of the realm. And from Argentina to Guatemala, coups are being resisted. Militaries are staying in their barracks. Democracy is being respected.

The School of the Americas is the contribution of the United States to this tremendous success. It is told best in a story of only a few months ago in Guatemala, a nation which has almost never seen a democratic government follow a democratic government.

A coup occurred, and an American-trained officer stood still while the democratic process and the courts worked their will. This school is a contribution. Its closing would be a tragedy. It would be a withdrawal of America from Latin America.

Resist the amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak in support of the Kennedy amendment, striking $2.9 million for funding for the School of the Americas.

Rather than serving as a bridge between the United States and our Latin American neighbors; the school of the Americas serves as a barrier to establishing new and constructive relationships with Latin American militaries in the wake of the cold war.

This school is not needed. We should be training people for peace and not for war. We should be teaching people to beat their swords into plowshares, to study war no more.

Many of the graduates of this school have a long history of human rights abuses. Their rolls read like a who's who of Central America's worst human rights violators.

Why should we continue to fund and condone military inspired murder? Why should we continue to train thugs to kill their own people?

Today, Mr. Chairman, I break with many of my colleagues in the Georgia delegation. But I believe that the time has come for someone to speak out for peace and an end to the financing of government-sponsored killing.

Vote for peace, vote for harmony, vote for the Kennedy amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 174, noes 256, not voting 8 as follows:

[Roll No. 478]

AYES—174

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews (ME)
Applegate
Baesler
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Berman
Blackwell
Blute
Bonior
Borski
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Cantwell
Cardin
Clay
Clayton
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Coyne
Danner
de Lugo (VI)
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Dickey
Dooley
Duncan
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Engel
English (AZ)
Eshoo
Evans
Faleomavaega (AS)
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Foglietta
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hamburg
Harman
Hefley
Hinchey
Hochbrueckner
Hoke
Holden
Hutchinson
Inslee
Jacobs
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Kopetski
Kreidler
Lambert
Lehman
Lewis (GA)
Long
Maloney
Mann
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McCloskey
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
Meehan
Meyers
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Norton (DC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reynolds
Roemer
Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shays
Shepherd
Slattery
Slaughter
Stark
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Synar
Taylor (NC)
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Towns
Unsoeld
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Volkmer
Waters
Watt
Wheat
Williams
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOES—256

Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Archer
Armey
Bacchus (FL)
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bellenson
Bentley
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (FL)
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Combest
Coppersmith
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
English (OK)
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Fowler
Frost
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Geren
Gibbons
Gilmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Green
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Herger
Hoagland
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Huffington
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Kaptur
Kasich
Kim
King
Kingston
Klein
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
LaFalce
Lancaster

Lantos	Oxley	Skelton
LaRocco	Packard	Smith (IA)
Laughlin	Parker	Smith (MI)
Lazio	Pastor	Smith (NJ)
Leach	Paxon	Smith (OR)
Levin	Payne (VA)	Smith (TX)
Levy	Peterson (FL)	Snowe
Lewis (CA)	Petri	Solomon
Lewis (FL)	Pickett	Spence
Lightfoot	Pickle	Spratt
Linder	Pombo	Stearns
Lipinski	Portman	Stenholm
Livingston	Price (NC)	Stump
Lloyd	Pryce (OH)	Sundquist
Lowey	Quillen	Talent
Machtley	Quinn	Tanner
Manton	Ravenel	Tauzin
Manzullo	Reed	Taylor (MS)
Mazzoli	Regula	Tejeda
McCandless	Richardson	Thomas (CA)
McCollum	Ridge	Thomas (WY)
McCrery	Roberts	Thompson
McCurdy	Rogers	Thornton
McHugh	Rohrabacher	Torricelli
McInnis	Ros-Lehtinen	Traficant
McKeon	Rose	Tucker
McMillan	Rostenkowski	Valentine
McNulty	Roth	Visclosky
Meek	Rowland	Vucanovich
Menendez	Royce	Walker
Mica	Sangmeister	Walsh
Michel	Santorum	Waxman
Miller (FL)	Sarpalius	Weldon
Molinari	Saxton	Whitten
Mollohan	Schaefer	Wise
Montgomery	Scott	Wolf
Moorhead	Sharp	Young (AK)
Murtha	Shaw	Young (FL)
Myers	Shuster	Zeliff
Natcher	Sisisky	Zimmer
Ortiz	Skaggs	
Orton	Skeen	

NOT VOTING—8

Ford (MI)	McDade	Washington
Hilliard	Neal (NC)	Wilson
Jefferson	Underwood (GU)	

□ 1219

Messrs. MANZULLO, SKAGGS, and WAXMAN changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. BRYANT, PAYNE of New Jersey, DERRICK, and SLATTERY changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. MALONEY

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. MALONEY: Page 15, strike line 15 and all that follows through page 16, line 8.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MALONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

□ 1220

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that each side have 13 minutes on this amendment, and if I may, I would like to extend the time so that each side would have 13 minutes.

We have agreed to a unanimous-consent request to proceed until 12:30, and I would like to extend it enough so that each side would have 13 minutes on the pending amendment.

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

Mrs. MALONEY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I ask for 15 minutes on each side.

Mr. MURTHA. All right, I will amend the request and ask for 15 minutes on each side, Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. MALONEY. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I assume the understanding of the subcommittee chairman is that we would receive half of the opposition time on this side.

Mr. MURTHA. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] will control the 15 minutes, and the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY] would control the other 15.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY] will be recognized for 15 minutes, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] will be recognized for 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY].

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

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would end an embarrassing Government boondoggle and an outdated, wasteful, gun program called the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice.

Buried in this year's Defense appropriations bill is an attempt to appropriate $2.5 million to subsidize the Civilian Marksmanship Program.

The program was created 90 years ago, following the Spanish-American War, when the Army found that too many recruits didn't know how to shoot. The program was designed to generate a pool of skilled marksmen and riflery trainers for the Army to call on in time of war.

But now, according to a GAO report the Army cannot identify "any training or mobilization reliance" for the program. At a time when we are downscaling the military, closing bases, and discharging military personnel who thought they had a job for life, we don't need to fund a Civilian Marksmanship Program.

Today, most of the $2.5 million a year in the Civilian Marksmanship Program goes to finance target shooting competitions among gun clubs, and the annual give-away of 40 million rounds of ammunition and firearm supplies to young people.

Without any compelling military purpose, this program amounts to nothing more than a Federal subsidy of a sportsman's hobby. If this program is justified, why do we not have Government-subsidized fishing trips? Of golf fees? Or windsurfing programs? Why not season tickets to the New York Giants? We have got to draw the line somewhere.

This is not an antigun amendment; it is an antiwaste amendment. How can we expect the American people to believe that we are really serious about cutting the deficit if we continue to subsidize recreational shooting?

The sum of $2.5 million might not seem like a great deal in a $1.3 trillion budget, but it is an awful lot to our families, of whom we are asking to contribute more to get the deficit under control.

Mr. Chairman, this program is a relic from a former time. Preserving it would only prove to the American people that this Congress is out of date and out of touch. It is time for Congress to bite the bullet and end the program.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GILLMOR].

Mr. GILLMOR. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I point out that the Federal Government does fund a number of youths and sports programs. The one proposed to be eliminated here is one of the most cost effective and efficient there is.

How many people are served? There are 51 State associations, 1,500 clubs, 126,000 affiliated club members, and that does not count the more than 400,000 Boy Scouts who benefit from DCM-funded programs. Primary emphasis is on gun safety, competitive marksmanship, and responsibility.

In a very real sense, DCM has enhanced the U.S. position in world competition; 9 out of 10 members of the U.S. Olympic shooting team in the 1992 summer games in Barcelona, including gold medalist Lonnie Mailley, are from this program.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BREWSTER].

Mr. BREWSTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Maloney amendment.

There has been a good deal of misinformation circulating about the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice and its Director of Civilian Marksmanship Program. I would like to take this opportunity to clear up some things.

The Director of Civilian Marksmanship Program [DCM] was restructured in the last Congress to allow this appropriation to be received only by youths aged 10 to 17. In the past, the appropriation provided free target practice and firearms training ammunition to all participants, adults, and youth.

Currently, only youths receive Federal funding support. All adult participants personally bear the full cost of

participation. In addition, DCM is more focused on youth competitive sports training emphasizing safety, self-esteem, discipline, and character.

This program provides good services at a cheap cost. DCM reaches almost one-half million Boy Scouts and youths at a cost of only $2.5 million. If these Scouts were the only people reached by the program it would be at a cost of only $5 per participant. However, many more youths other than Boy Scouts benefit from this program creating even a lower cost per participant.

Other youth participant programs have a much higher per-participant cost. The National Youth Program reaches only 70,000 youths, but at a cost of $9.4 million. This program costs the American taxpayer $134 per participant.

DCM is a good program that teaches self-esteem, discipline, character, and weapons safety. At a time in which this country is facing drastic problems with accidental shootings involving youths, I find it ludicrous to cut an inexpensive program that teaches youth gun safety.

Linking this program to inner-city violence, as the proponents of this amendment are doing, is nonsense. We might as well outlaw Olympic boxing, high school wrestling, and other such sports because they promote street violence.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK].

Mr. DERRICK. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Maloney amendment.

Today, we have an opportunity to eliminate funding for the U.S. Army's Civilian Marksmanship Program. While this program has a practical-sounding name, in reality this program is one that has outserved its usefulness and is now best called a Government boondoggle.

The Congress created this program some 90 years ago, and it now becomes our responsibility to end it. It was created in 1903 for a legitimate reason, but in 1993, the program's merits are no longer there.

It is now time for the Congress to take a second look and recognize it for what it is—wasteful spending. Funding for the CMP serves one purpose today and that is only to subsidize gun and rifle clubs and their participation in sport shooting.

The Civilian Marksmanship Program is a $2.5 million Federal subsidy that promotes recreational shooting with military-type semiautomatic weapons. It began as a way to provide marksmanship training to potential military recruits.

Back in 1903, those recruits were teenage boys and young men who worked on farms and in factories and who could be called upon to serve their country at a moment's notice. In many cases, they had no experience in shooting rifles and needed to be trained.

No one today can honestly argue that this program is an aid to national defense or is essential to military readiness. The Army does not rely on it for recruiting. Only a small number of the total participants in the CMP enlist in the Armed Forces. In fact, over half of the CMP participants are older than 26—which is a lot older than the normal Army enlistee.

Today's Army has well-trained reservists to call upon. We have State National Guard units to supplement the regular forces. Rifle clubs do not figure into the military's mobilization and training plans.

Today's Army depends on high technology and sophisticated machinery and weapons. Rifles play a much diminished role in the modern Army.

I ask my colleagues to look at this program for what it is—a Federal subsidy for rifle clubs. It is a Federal subsidy for a few sportsmen whose hobby is competitive shooting. The Civilian Marksmanship Program is an example of the type of funding this Congress should not hesitate to eliminate.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly believe that this is an important budget-cutting vote for this body today. But, I cannot leave the well of the House without remarking on what I see as an inconsistency between this program and the battle now ongoing with children and guns and violence.

The supporters of the Civilian Marksmanship Program tell us that this Army program is now focused on marksmanship training for American youth—for children as young as 10 years old.

The United States is not Somalia. Ten-, eleven- and twelve-year-old children are not a part of our well-regulated militia.

The supporters tell us that the CMP instills positive values in our children. Yet, over the past decade, we have witnessed a 2,000-percent increase in juveniles charged with homicide. Children are killing children with guns. Children are taking guns into the schools and endangering the lives of teachers and other students.

Too many children are learning to equate guns with power. That message is wrong. Children need a stronger and better message that teaches them to say "no" to guns.

Mr. Chairman, anyway you look at it, the Civilian Marksmanship Program does not serve a military purpose for adults or children. Ending the $2.5 million subsidy for shooting competitions will not threaten sportsmen who want to use firearms for their own enjoyment. The thousands of private gun clubs in this country will continue to support this activity for those who want to participate.

But let us stop kidding ourselves by calling this a military program essential to our military budget. Support the Maloney amendment and end this Federal subsidy for recreational target shooting.

The supporters of the civilian marksmanship program tell us that the Army program is now focused on marksmanship for youth; we do not need to be subsidizing money for people to learn how to shoot military weapons.

□ 1230

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, first of all, we have a crime bill coming up, and one of the items in there is the proper use and the safe use of weapons. In this course, gun safety, how to use and handle them, sports competition, not as the gentlewoman says, just to watch.

Second, to keep the kids off the streets, sports activities that are good.

The Fish and Wildlife Commission last night in the sportsmen's caucus, the Secretary said they are going into outreach programs for women and children in the inner cities in the proper use of weapons that we use.

It is not guns, as the liberal gentleman from New York says.

The gentlewoman from New York voted for the National Endowment for the Arts, a total boondoggle, voted not to cut it at all and would not even cut it 5 percent. Now she wants to save, through smoke and mirrors, $2½ million. Give me a break.

Military guns, how little does the gentlewoman know. She fails to see the solution to a very simple problem.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. STARK], the original sponsor of the amendment.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment because we cannot afford to continue to waste the taxpayers' money.

The DCM has lost its usefulness. It does not help in preparedness. It is not a good recruiting tool. Actually, marksmanship with all the high-technology stuff we have is no longer the important skill it was when the Army started this back in the early 1900's. Current Army training procedures already meet our soldiers' marksmanship needs. We do not need this.

And as to the Boy Scouts, I would put that in the same category as giving free footballs to top order teams. If we want to do that, we can.

The Army tells us they would not continue the program if we did not force them to.

Let us help the Army.

In 1990 we decided to continue funding because they promised that if given the chance they would achieve self-sufficiency. So much for that promise.

President Clinton has challenged us to reinvent government, to save taxpayer money by eliminating outdated

programs which cannot meet their own goals. This is a perfect example. Let us reinvent this boondoggle program and save the Nation some money. Support the Maloney amendment. It is good government. It is good sense. It is good economy and it is good for the United States.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to get up and speak because I am so angry.

The gentlewoman represents New York City. I represent upstate New York, rural areas, 10,000 square miles.

I vote time and time again to help the gentlewoman and her constituents in New York City, particularly for subsidizing mass transit. Now the gentlewoman turns around and stands up here and offers an amendment which hurts the children in my district and children all across this country.

The gentlewoman voted for tens of millions of dollars for the Endowment for the Arts. Do you know what this program she is trying to kill has done since 1903? It has trained young men and women, young boys and girls in the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts how to understand safety and how to respect a weapon. That is so important because hunting and fishing mean so much to the people of my area.

We do not have many playgrounds. What we do have in abundance are rural woods in the Catskill and Adirondack Mountains. Across this country it is much the same, especially in rural areas.

This is a vital, vital program. It spends pennies to save millions, to promote good character in young boys and girls when they grow up.

Why is the gentlewoman doing this? It is wrong. The gentlewoman should withdraw the amendment.

Please, please vote no on this amendment.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI].

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Chairman, 90 years ago this Nation had a real security problem. Young recruits were not prepared for the Spanish-American War.

This Congress responded by creating this program to train young marksmen. Now it is time to declare success. We are ready for the Spanish-American War and we can eliminate this program with real safety.

The fact of the matter is, this is a program, a Government expenditure in search of a rationale.

We are told it has no military value whatsoever. It is providing free ammunition to children, doing more than wasting money. It is an indictment on our national priorities.

This Congress has been unable to provide funding for children who are eligible for Head Start. Children go to school each day and there are no hot lunches, but we find $2½ million to give them free ammunition.

Mr. Chairman, this fails what I consider to be the "look 'em in the eye test."

There is not a Member of this Congress who could look a constituent in the eye and tell them, "I'm going to raise your taxes, restrict your Medicare, eliminate your program, but I am finding the money to give free ammunition to young children."

Mr. Chairman, support the Maloney amendment, end this program. If the NRA wants to give free ammunition, let them give some of the $80 million they have in their own treasury, the millions of dollars they find to fight gun control. That money is a better source, rather than the taxpayers' money.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI], the gentleman is listed as one of the biggest spenders by the taxpayers. The gentleman is talking about giving free ammunition to children, it is supervised information. Does the gentleman have any idea how many lives of children that are saved that go into homes knowing that a weapon is dangerous because of the proper use and understand the question of safety?

If the gentleman wants to let children go ahead untrained in weapons when they are all over the place that we do need to take off the streets, then vote against this thing.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY].

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, I am a Cub Scout coordinator. All of my children have participated in the Scouting program.

Prior to today, I have never heard the argument that this Department of Defense program was central to the success of Scouting.

Now, I acknowledge that one opportunity offered to these young people through the Scouting program is training in the proper use of guns, but I am here today to tell you that there are gun clubs all over America that would be happy to provide this gun training service to America's youth without a taxpayers' subsidy.

This program may have served a national purpose in 1903, but it is not needed in 1993.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support for the Maloney amendment.

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

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER].

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment gives the Members of this House an opportunity to improve the quality of our constituents' lives, while cutting Federal spending.

The Civilian Marksmanship Program has absolutely no defense value. Our military trains new recruits in the use of all weapons that they will need. Whatever value this program may have had in increasing national military readiness back in 1903 has long since gone the way of bolt-action rifles in combat.

What this programs does is hand out $2.5 million of our constituents' hard-earned money to support private citizens in their recreational use of firearms. While I assume that these people find the prospect of shooting up the rifle range at taxpayer expense highly entertaining, subsidizing this entertainment is indefensible, especially when we do not have sufficient funds to properly fight the TB and AIDS epidemics, to remove asbestos and lead paint from our schools, to provide decent housing and education for our people, to eliminate our $300 billion annual deficit, but we have plenty of money to waste to buy ammunition for private gun clubs.

I also do not know how the supporters of this provision would explain to the families of the thousands of Americans killed in drive-by shootings, or of those who have been shot by close acquaintances, or of the police officers killed in the line of duty, why the Congress sees nothing wrong with subsidizing recreational shooting.

Perhaps this is the new fiscal discipline I keep reading so much about. I hope not. I hope that my colleagues will keep their priorities straight and reject this giveaway.

Mr. Chairman, support this amendment, no more free bullets.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SCHENK], a sponsor of this amendment and a major deficit reduction hawk in our freshman class.

□ 1240

Ms. SCHENK. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY] for her tenacity in bringing this amendment to the floor.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong support of the efforts of the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY] to show the American taxpayer that we care about their money.

This is not about the Boy Scouts or the Girl Scouts. This is about cutting spending, and every Member that uttered those words during their most recent campaign must vote for this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I thought that I had seen a ridiculous waste of money in honey subsidies, and mohair subsidies and helium reserves, but spending $2

million, not smoke and mirrors, but $2 million of taxpayer money to give away bullets and to train people how to use rifles, really goes in the hall of fame of ridiculous spending.

I urge support of the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY].

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FINGERHUT], one of the leaders in the freshman class and one of the strong leaders in the freshman fiscal caucus.

Mr. FINGERHUT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, we have a talk show host back in Cleveland who calls Washington Disneyland on the Potomac. I think I know now what he means. This is a defense appropriations bill. This is the day when we are debating how much money to spend on the defense of our country. I have a lot to learn about those issues, but there is one thing I do know, and that is that the issue of the Boy Scouts is not part of that. The ultimate cynicism that is being portrayed here, to wrap this program around the Boy Scouts, frankly makes me ill.

If the NRA wants to play games, let them play games with other bills, not with our defense.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME].

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, in deference to my dear friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], I am compelled to support my other friend from New York in this amendment simply because I think it is time to end this civilian marksmanship program. There is not, nor has there ever been, any compelling military purpose, and what we are asking is what we have heard, that we are saying to taxpayers, "Please reach down and find a way to subsidize recreational shooting so that we might be able to provide ammunition to children."

Mr. Chairman, that is wrong, that is un-American, and we challenge the NRA and others who are hellbent to subsidize this cause to not put it on taxpayers.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY] for yielding this time to me, and I thank her for her amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is a BYOB amendment, bring your own bullets. It is about time.

Mr. Chairman, people have to buy their own immunizations for their children, they have to buy their own preschool education, they have to buy their own books, they have to buy their own cookies if they are den mothers for the Cub Scouts. Why in the world do we have a subsidy for bullets at a time when the GAO tells us there is absolutely no military need for this program? It is just a holdover from the great old ride'em and shoot'em up days of 1903.

So, it is 1993, and this is the way to save money. I salute the gentlewoman for bringing her amendment here, and I say to my colleagues, "Do, please, buy your own bullets. The Government doesn't have the money."

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I cannot say all I would like to say in opposition to this amendment in 1 minute, but I would like to invite the gentleman from Minnesota who spoke earlier in favor of the amendment to come to my State, to come to my hometown, and participate in a Boy Scout BB gun contest that has helped finance with these funds, and this is not just a local contest, my colleagues. It goes on, and this is for safety, for youth.

I say to my colleagues, "If you want to deny them that, that's fine, but I think that the people who have spoken in favor of this amendment really come from a different world than those of us who have learned to use guns, and use them rationally, use them legitimately. I'm afraid that some of these people who have spoken in favor of this amendment, when I go out deer hunting in November to try and shoot my deer, would object to that and be out there trying to rant and rave, and everything else, to save that little deer."

Well, my colleagues, I for one believe that we need gun safety here in the United States, and this program helps with gun safety.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Maloney amendment. If the Civilian Marksmanship Program, funded by the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, ever served a national need, that need has long since abated; in fact, any program that promotes the proliferation of weaponry and ammunition, which becomes readily available to the criminal element, is a disservice to the national interest.

Just a few years after I was elected to Congress, I was eyewitness to the greatest crime of the century—the assassination of President Kennedy. The President and I had been friends for many years, and he visited San Antonio before he went to Dallas together that fateful November in 1963. I had warned the President not to come to Texas then, as I had become aware of the proliferation of arms and ammunition available to extremists, especially to extremists who hated the President. Sadly, my advice was not heeded, and the tragedy was allowed to unfold.

After the President's assassination, I spoke out repeatedly on the House floor about the extremist right-wing hate group called the Minutemen. This group, and numerous others since then, received arms and ammunition free of charge from the U.S. Government's Civilian Marksmanship Program. What our Government did then, and has since done domestically, it is also doing internationally—the consequences of both practices are clear in today's militaristic and violent society.

If there is one truth about our country today, it is that there is no scarcity of ammunition and weaponry. There are bullets and guns everywhere—readily available, and enough for every man, woman and child. Surely we do not need to fuel this explosion any more, and I commend Representative MALONEY for taking the initiative this year in trying to eliminate the funding for the Civilian Marksmanship program. There has never been a better time or a better argument for passage of the Maloney amendment.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my support for the amendment offered by the gentlelady from New York [Mrs. MALONEY] to cut $2.5 million for the Civilian Marksmanship Program.

This program, for the purported purpose of educating young people in becoming responsible gun operators, is not the kind of assistance the taxpayers need to be paying for. Rather, we should be paying for education in reading and writing and arithmetic. There is no reason the public should pick up the costs for marksmanship training.

Twenty percent of our Nation's children are living in poverty, according to the UNICEF report issued last week. The $2.5 million cost of the Civilian Marksmanship Program would be better used in ways other than providing free bullets.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, one of the most frequently cited arguments that we hear from gun control advocates is that guns are the cause of numerous accidents, injuring thousands of Americans each year. The vast majority of these accidents occur because people do not treat guns with the care and intelligence that is required.

It is for this reason that I rise in support of the continuation of the Civilian Marksmanship program. By teaching respect for firearms, it promotes the safe use and handling of firearms. This program saves lives.

While it was originally conceived to train young men for the armed services, its mission has expanded over the years. It focuses on the instruction of youths between the ages of 10 and 17, the only participants to receive Federal support in the form of free ammunition, hearing and eye protection, and achievement medals. While it doesn't subsidize activities for adults, it does involve adults from all facets of the community. Parents, law enforcement officers, National Guardsmen, and reservists volunteer their time to work with youth organizations, such as the Boy Scouts, the Future Farmers of America, and 4–H clubs, to educate young Americans.

And as far as getting your bang for the buck, not many Government sponsored youth programs can compare with an average cost of only 50 cents per participant. A bargain price when you consider the tremendous civic benefits of the program.

I listen to critics who contend that by educating kids about firearms, we are somehow promoting violence. To these people, I reply that such an irrational claim is tantamount to

saying that driver education promotes irresponsible driving, or that sex education promotes teenage pregnancy. It just isn't the case.

My colleagues, if you are serious about reducing gun violence, then I would urge you to join me in supporting this program. Vote against the Maloney amendment to eliminate funding for the Civilian Marksmanship Program.

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of our time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 190, noes 242, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 479]

AYES—190

Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Bacchus (FL)
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Blackwell
Blute
Bonior
Borski
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Bunning
Byrne
Cantwell
Cardin
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Coble
Collins (IL)
Conyers
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
de Lugo (VI)
Deal
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Dixon
Dooley
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Engel
English (AZ)
Eshoo
Evans
Faleomavaega (AS)
Farr
Fawell
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Furse
Gejdenson
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hamburg
Harman
Hastings
Hefner
Hoagland
Hoekstra
Hughes
Inslee
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnston
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lantos
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moran
Morella
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Norton (DC)
Nussle
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Penny
Petri
Pickle
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Quinn
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Ridge
Roemer
Ros-Lehtinen
Rostenkowski
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sangmeister
Schenk
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Shays
Shepherd
Slattery
Slaughter
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Swett
Swift
Synar
Talent
Thompson
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Tucker
Valentine
Velázquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Zimmer

NOES—242

Abercrombie
Allard
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (OH)
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clinger
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Cooper
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Doolittle
Dornan
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
English (OK)
Everett
Ewing
Fazio
Fields (TX)
Fish
Franks (CT)
Frost
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Green
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hayes
Hefley
Herger
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kim
King
Kingston
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kyl
Lancaster
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Lloyd
Machtley
Manzullo
Martinez
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
McNulty
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal (NC)
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Rahall
Ravenel
Regula
Richardson
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Rose
Roth
Rowland
Royce
Sanders
Santorum
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Sharp
Shaw
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sundquist
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thornton
Thurman
Traficant
Unsoeld
Upton
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Whitten
Williams
Wise
Wolf
Wyden
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff

NOT VOTING—6

McDade
Romero-Barceló (PR)
Serrano
Underwood (GU)
Washington
Wilson

□ 1304

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Serrano for, with Mr. Wilson against.

Mr. POMEROY and Mr. COLEMAN changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. POSHARD, GUNDERSON, and DREIER changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to the bill?

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the "Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1994."

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. WISE] having assumed the chair, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, 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. 3116) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purpose, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were 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.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 325, noes 102, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 480]

AYES—325

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Bacchus (FL)
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Bateman
Becerra
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blackwell
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Buyer
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cunningham
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Duncan
Durbin
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Ewing
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
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
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Grandy
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hughes
Hutchinson
Hutto
Inslee
Istook
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Mann
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCrery
McCurdy
McHale
McKeon
McKinney
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Michel
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pickle
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Ridge
Roemer
Rogers
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Sabo
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sharp
Shaw
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Snowe
Spratt
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Synar
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (WY)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Upton
Valentine
Velazquez
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walsh
Waters
Waxman
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—102

Allard
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Baker (CA)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bellenson
Bentley
Bereuter
Boehner
Burton
Callahan
Canady
Collins (IL)
Combest
Conyers
Cox
Crane
Crapo
DeFazio
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards (CA)
Everett
Fields (TX)
Gilman
Goodling
Goss
Grams
Hamburg
Hancock
Hastert
Hefley
Herger
Hoekstra
Huffington
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Kim
King
Klug
Knollenberg
Kyl
Leach
Levy
Lewis (FL)
Linder
Maloney
Margolies-Mezvinsky
McCandless
McCollum
McDermott
McHugh
McInnis
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Molinari
Nadler
Nussle
Owens
Penny
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Ramstad
Roberts
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Rush
Sanders
Schaefer
Sensenbrenner
Shays
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Solomon
Spence
Stark
Stearns
Stump
Unsoeld
Vento
Walker
Watt
Wyden
Yates
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—6

Fawell
McDade
Serrano
Thomas (CA)
Washington
Wilson

□ 1326

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Wilson for, with Mr. Washington, against.

Messrs. BUNNING, PAXON, GOODLATTE, and DUNCAN changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 3116, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 3116, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, cross references, and make other necessary technical adjustments.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I noticed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD dated September 30, 1993, that my vote on final passage of the Defense appropriations bill for fiscal year 1993 (H.R. 3116) was not electronically recorded. However, I distinctly remember voting "no" on final passage of this measure. For whatever reason my vote was not recorded, I would like the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to show that I voted "no" on passage of the Defense appropriations bill for fiscal year 1993.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2491, DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2491) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. LEWIS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LEWIS of California 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. 2941, be instructed to agree to the Senate amendment numbered 1, contained on page 8, lines 4–5.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, very briefly, this is a noncontroversial motion to instruct addressing itself to the problem among VA hospitals and clinics across the country relative to the backlog in needed equipment. The motion to instruct would have us go to the Senate mark.

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

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Speaker, I concur with the gentleman's amendment. He has accurately stated the facts regarding it, and we have no problem with it.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. STOKES, MOLLOHAN, and CHAPMAN, Ms. KAPTUR, and Messrs. TORRES, THORNTON, NATCHER, LEWIS of California, DELAY, GALLO, and MCDADE.

There was no objection.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.J. Res. 267. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1994, and for other purposes.

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

H.R. 2518. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

That the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 2518) "An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health, and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes" requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HARKIN, Mr. BYRD, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. REID, Mr. KOHL, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. GORTON, Mr. MACK, and Mr. BOND to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2295) "An act making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and making supplemental appropriations for such programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes."

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

S. 1487. An act entitled the "Middle East Peace Facilitation Act of 1993," and

S. 1490. An act to amend Public Law 100-518 and the United States Grain Standards Act to extend the authority of the Federal Grain Inspection Service to collect fees to cover administrative and supervisory costs, and for other purposes.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2518, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2518) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

□ 1330

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. PORTER

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PORTER moves that the managers on the part of the House, at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on H.R. 2518, be instructed to agree to the Senate amendment numbered 24.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, this is a noncontroversial motion; it instructs the House to agree to the Senate amendment No. 24, regarding fraud in the Federal Employee Compensation Act, that is the FECA Program. The Senate amendment requires the Department of Labor to cut off FECA benefits for individuals convicted of fraud against the program.

Members may wonder why this is necessary. I want to take a few seconds to explain it.

Mr. Speaker, the office of workers compensation program at DOL lacks the authority to terminate benefits when it determines that a recipient has lied about his or her disability or illness. Incredibly, the Department lacks the authority to terminate benefits even when a recipient is convicted of fraud in a court of law.

There are many documented cases where the Department has been thwarted. The Senate amendment seeks to remedy that situation.

Mr. Speaker, cases of fraud in this program are well known.

Last year, a welder at a Naval shipyard claimed he injured his back on the job; he later received $150,000 in FECA benefits at the same time he owned and operated an excavation business.

In another case, a former postal worker injured his elbow in 1979; from 1979-91, he received $120,000 in FECA benefits while operating a used auto business. He failed to report his employment to the Department.

During 1990 and 1991, the Department obtained 63 convictions of fraud in the FECA Program but was unable to terminate payments to even half of those individuals.

The Senate amendment seeks to remedy this situation.

It is narrowly drawn to prohibit FECA payments to an individual convicted of fraud against the program.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of my motion.

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

Mr. PORTER. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. NATCHER. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, we have no objection to the motion to instruct on this side.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

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

The motion to instruct was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. NATCHER, SMITH of Iowa, OBEY, STOKES, HOYER, Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. PORTER, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BONILLA, and Mr. MCDADE.

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 260, I call up from

the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2493) making appropriations for Agriculture, rural development, Food and Drug Administration, and related agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments to House amendments to the Senate amendments numbered 29 and 164 thereto.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the pending legislation, and that I be permitted to include tables, charts, and other extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DE LA GARZA

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DE LA GARZA moves, pursuant to House Resolution 260 that the House concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment numbered 29 with an amendment as follows: In the matter proposed to be added by the Senate amendment, insert after the word "operations" the following: ", except for marketing year 1993".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the Senate amendment is considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, at the outset I would like to say this amendment we are offering today is an attempt to resolve obvious flaws and difficulties in the amendment to eliminate the wool and mohair program previously offered on the other side of the rotunda. Let me say I only know two people who are enrolled in this program, and I do not know of a soul in my congressional district who is enrolled.

But over the last several days I have had the opportunity to speak to literally dozens of men and women who earn a living across America raising sheep and goats and participate in the wool and mohair program. There are about 30,000 specialized sheep farms in America and 70,000 farms that have some income from wool sales. These 100,000 farms and ranches represent several hundred thousand farmers and their families. I believe many of them have accepted the reality that the future of this program is at best in doubt and quite likely will not be renewed any time in the near future.

What we are attempting to do with this amendment is to resolve a serious flaw in the Senate amendment. The Senate amendment was retroactive so that the farmers and ranchers enrolled in the program for this marketing year, 1993, would be denied the program payment which they were promised.

The net result of that is catastrophic, and I use that term advisedly; for the farmers and ranchers enrolled in the program, many of them would literally face bankruptcy unless the amendment which we are offering today is adopted. I do not believe anyone, even the harshest critics of this program, want to see that happen. Many of these farmers have gone to their banks and borrowed money, they have spent this money in anticipation of the Federal payments under the program. What we are attempting to do is to make it clear that farmers enrolled in the program for the marketing year 1993 will be paid as promised out of fiscal year 1994 funds.

Let me make this clear as well. We are making a statement to the U.S. Department of Agriculture that no funds are to be used for the 1994 marketing year of the wool and mohair program; that as of the passage of this legislation, only the 1993 marketing year program will be funded.

I believe that that is a fair resolution. I also think it is the right thing to do for the many men and women who stand to lose so much.

Let me add, too, it is not just a question of the producers. According to the Farm Credit Bank of Texas, which met yesterday, 15 banks in Texas have 30 percent or more of their loan portfolios collateralized against this incentive payment. It is estimated that 6 to 12 banks in Texas will go into liquidation unless we pass this amendment.

So this effort by the House today, I think, has serious consequences for the people who are enrolled in the program and those affected by it.

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

Mr. SKEEN. I thank the gentleman and the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I think the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations has bracketed and broached the question appropriately and given a good synopsis of exactly what has happened.

Shutting down this program has caused dire and severe effects in our part of the country in the Southwest, where so much of the fine wools that are used in manufacturing clothing in the United States. Let me tell you this, we produce only one-third of the wool used in domestic consumption in the United States. We must import two-thirds.

So this program was initiated years ago to provide the kind of high quality in production to keep the domestic industry alive and well and producing what was considered at that time, and still is to some extent, a strategic commodity.

So I think the least we can do is pass this resolution, keep sacrosanct the 1993 commitment that the Government has made to these growers, and not let the Senate action constitute a situation that cancels out the 1993 program. In effect, that is what we are doing today, holding sacrosanct the 1993 program.

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

□ 1340

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA], the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me. I apologize to the Speaker. There were three gentlemen from Texas standing at the same time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WISE). "The eyes of Texas are upon you."

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to be the one that was recognized.

Mr. Speaker, the problem we find ourselves in has been eloquently articulated by the chairman of the subcommittee and by the ranking member.

We have had meetings with everyone concerned, including a personal visit by myself with the author of the amendment in the Senate. We have come up with what we think is a particularly applicable resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment to remove the portion of the Senate amendment that retroactively eliminates funding for the wool and mohair programs.

I offer this amendment in order to prevent the Senate amendment from applying to the marketing of the 1993 crops of wool and mohair. Let me explain why the House should approve this amendment.

The Senate amendment would prohibit payments to wool and mohair producers during fiscal 1994. As a consequence, Government payments for the 1993 crops of wool and mohair—which would be paid during fiscal 1994—will be eliminated retroactively, without notice or warning.

Mr. Speaker, eliminating the program retroactively was not the intent of the author of the Senate amendment. Whether you think the wool program is worthwhile or not, I hope you recognize the unfairness of retroactive elimination to sheep and goat producers in all 50 States.

Whether you support the wool program or not, the reality is that a significant portion of income for wool and mohair producers comes from Government payments. That's the reality. Believe me, my preference and the desire of every farmer in this country is to compete on a level playing field and get a decent income from the marketplace.

But that is not the reality of the marketplace for wool and mohair. This industry faces a very depressed market for wool and mohair, in large part because of policy decisions taken by Australia. In addition, American wool-

growers face heavily subsidized competition from the European Community. That's the reality of the marketplace.

If we immediately and retroactively eliminate the wool and mohair programs this Congress could very well be forcing 25 to 30 percent of our Nation's 100,000 wool and mohair producers of the land and into bankruptcy court.

Lenders have extended loans based on the expectation that the market sale of this year's crop will be supplemented by a Government incentive payment next year. In some cases, the Government checks are the collateral—the woolgrower doesn't even get the Government payment, it goes straight to the bank to pay this year's operating loan.

If Congress eliminates the programs now, lenders will call in these loans. Retroactive elimination of the wool and mohair programs would economically devastate thousands of our Nation's wool and mohair producers.

Eliminating the wool and mohair programs, in the manner proposed in the Senate amendment, is also unfair because it allows for no transition time for producers to rearrange their financing and production plans. Again, the immediate and retroactive portion of the Senate amendment is simply unfair and must be corrected.

Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I received a letter from President Clinton thanking me and the committee for our work—included in the 1993 Reconciliation Act—to reform the operation of the wool and mohair programs. What we did in that legislation was reduce the maximum payments a wool or mohair producer could receive by two-thirds by 1997. This is what the President wrote to me:

> This represents an important step forward in reforming the program, and I commend you and the committee for moving forward aggressively on this issue.

That is what President Clinton wrote to me on our actions to reform the wool and mohair program.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize—as do all of us who represent farm and rural areas—that a majority in Congress and this administration want to see further savings achieved and further reforms in our farm programs. The House Agriculture Committee—just as Chairman DURBIN and his Appropriations Subcommittee have done in this conference report—is taking steps necessary to respond to these concerns.

The amendment I am offering eliminates funding for the wool and mohair programs in fiscal 1994 but it does allow producers to receive payments on their 1993 crops of wool and mohair.

Mr. Speaker, it is only fair that the Federal Government not renege on a financial compact that 100,000 American families based their financial decision on earlier this year.

This amendment puts wool and mohair producers on notice that they cannot expect Federal assistance next year.

Furthermore, it is my intention to have the House Agriculture Committee follow through with authorizing legislation—to be brought back to the House floor later this year—to amend the Wool Act and to give Members in the House the opportunity to vote on reforms or elimination of the program.

I urge Members to support my amendment.

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

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

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, do we have an amendment before us, the amendment of the gentleman from Texas?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes; the gentleman has a motion.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the committee chairman as to the intent of his amendment?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the intent of this amendment, and I want to make it clear, because I know the gentleman's position, the intent of this amendment is to tell the U.S. Department of Agriculture that they are only to expend funds under the Wool and Mohair Program for the marketing year 1993 and not to expand funds for the marketing year 1994.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, as we have three Texans on the floor, we now have two chairmen on the floor. I had actually directed the question to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA].

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, If the gentleman will yield, I apologize to the Members for the confusion, but I thank the chairman for his understanding.

I would reply to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], one, this amendment as was explained will permit wool producers to receive incentive payments for the 1993 crop only. These producers have already incurred financial obligations, et cetera.

This amendment does not terminate the program. That can only be accomplished by amending permanent law.

Therefore, my commitment to the gentleman and to this House is that we will bring legislation to the floor this year that will amend the Wool Act and give Members of the House the opportunity to seek reform or eliminate the program.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for his explanation. With that commitment, I will support his amendment and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and include therein extraneous material, on this motion.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER].

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am the principal sponsor of legislation that would prospectively deauthorize the Wool and Mohair Program. There are more than 30 cosponsors.

If I could ask for the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture to respond to an inquiry.

I would like to propound this question to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA]. I have read the text of the colloquy and I would like to clarify whether it is the gentleman's intention that the rule under which this reform legislation would come to the floor would permit an amendment of the sort that is embodied in my legislation, which would actually terminate the program prospectively, rather than simply modify the program.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the answer is yes. Our intent is to bring legislation that can be terminated or can be amended to suit the desires of the Members.

We always have come from the Committee on Agriculture with an open rule. We have never had closed rules, so our intent is to bring legislation, period, unless the House worked its will.

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment, but also to compliment the new chairman and the ranking member, for the first time the Agriculture Appropriations bill has included buy-American language in their bill. I believe it has been good language. It has been tailored with the help of the committee chairman, and I want to thank the committee and commend the committee for their work.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Thousands of individuals and dozens of communities will suffer if the House and Senate do not act with fairness, common sense, and humanity.

By abruptly ending the Wool and Mohair Incentive Program, the Senate vote last week would wreak havoc with the lives and financial livelihoods of thousands of Texas ranchers and their communities. This devastating approach to agricultural incentives will wipe out the economies of entire counties.

Without any warning, these payments that ranchers have been relying upon are being stripped away.

Some Members argue that this isn't really a retroactivity issue. But these Members fail to realize that the Wool Program is one of the few programs that pays for this year's activities with the next year's funds.

For comparison, Congress pays for military retiree COLA's in fiscal year 1994 with fiscal 1994 funds. It works the same way for Amtrak, NEA, and defense spending. But calendar year 1993 wool payments are not made with fiscal year 1993 funds like in other programs—they are made with fiscal 1994 funds.

Sheep and goat producers are already 9 months into the marketing year for the 1993 wool crop. The operating money for these farms and ranches was borrowed almost 1 year ago and the operating budgets included the incentive payments. Producers have already invested money and sweat relying upon 39 years of commitment by the Government.

The program is set up so that payments for this year's crop—which was produced earlier this spring—are not made until several months into 1994.

More than 350,000 people in small communities across America rely on income generated by the sheep industry. It is estimated that the loss of these incentive payments will affect 15,000 jobs directly, and 45,000 jobs indirectly, in Texas alone.

About 16,000 wool and mohair producers in 35 west Texas counties received incentives last year. West Texas provides 90 percent of the Nation's mohair and 25 percent of its wool. In many cases, the incentive payment makes or breaks the producer.

Texas ranks second in international mohair production, behind South Africa. About 90 percent of Texas mohair is exported for processing overseas.

In fact, the American Sheep Industry Association estimates that 25 to 30 percent of the Nation's 125,000 producers will go under if the program is abolished.

Such a cut will overwhelm many rural communities. The impact will be felt at every grocery store, feed store, restaurant and car dealership. This cut will cost jobs. It will have a ripple effect felt beyond the confines of rural America.

Faced with the fourth year of record low wool prices as well as the fifth year of lamb prices below the cost of production, elimination of this year's wool incentive payments will be the final blow to many farm families struggling to remain in business.

For those who believe these producers can simply convert to another crop, I invite you to travel to rural west Texas. You will find ranchers raising sheep and goats on land that would produce no other crop. Where a farmer could diversify, these folks have but one crop—goats and sheep.

Producers acted in good faith that the laws of the United States would not be changed overnight. Usually, this is a safe bet in Washington. But on September 23d, the Senate reversed a 39-year-old law in just a couple of hours. Without the benefit of hearings.

This amendment will simply allow producers to receive payments for their 1993 crop. It will allow producers to phase out without immediate default on their loans.

At the very least, these wool and mohair producers deserve respect enough not to be whipsawed by the political passions of Washington.

Like any industry, wool and mohair producers need time to adjust to drastic changes in the business climate. A sudden, unanticipated earthquake like the loss of all Federal incentives will surely swallow most if not all of an entire industry that is already struggling against unfair foreign competition.

At a minimum—a very minimum—Congress should act out of fairness, common sense and humanity, and allow wool and mohair producers to receive incentive payments from this year's crop. Our amendment does just that. Mr. Chairman, the honest, taxpaying ranchers and wool and mohair producers of west Texas deserve no less.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from New Mexico, for yielding this time to me.

I understand an agreement has been worked out so the wool and mohair producers will get their 1993 incentive payments. That is absolutely necessary, in the interest of common sense, justice, and fairness. On behalf of the wool and mohair producers in my district, I am delighted with that outcome.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BONILLA].

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, I just would like to say very briefly that we have been through the last several days with a lot of tension and anticipation out in communities throughout this country, and I just want to thank the gentleman from New Mexico, Chairman DURBIN and Chairman DE LA GARZA for addressing this problem that would have called for and created economic disaster in many communities throughout America, not just in my congressional district.

We have been working around the clock on this for the last couple days. I just want to thank everyone for helping us on this matter and correcting this mistake that was made in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one thing fundamentally clear. Today we are not voting on the Wool Act. The Wool Act is dead. This body will not be having a debate on the merits of a program which creates 350,000 jobs at no cost to the taxpayer. A program which has reduced the national debt by $5 billion since its beginning. We are not going to have an opportunity to vote or debate the merits of this program. The Senate has already acted and we will not have that vote.

Today we are voting on something else. We are voting on the word of our Republic. We are voting our commitment to keep our promises, to be honest with the American people. The Senate action would retroactively prevent payment for this year's crop. Common sense tells us that no payment for this year's crop is a retroactive cut, although I am sure that some may attempt to argue to the contrary. What cannot be argued is that retroactively stopping the payment will destroy the lives and livelihoods of thousands of Americans all across our great land. Thousands of ranchers have already made their business plans based on this year's crop payment. So have their bankers, as well as the small businesses in their communities. The amendment before us today will make the technical corrections to fix the Senate's drafting error that threatens to destroy so many of our fellow Americans.

To give some idea of the human impact of the Senate's action, I'm going to share with you a few of the comments I've received from hard-working people in Texas.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BONILLA: My mom and dad raise goats. They are very scared about the wool act and what will happen to our family. I am 8 years old and I want to know the government wants to take away why our living. My mom says we will be okay if they give us time to work with the bank. Can you tell them to take away the incentive after this year?

Thank you,

NELDA CORBELL.

SEPTEMBER 25, 1993.

Re: Mohair Incentive Program.

Congressman HENRY BONILLA.

I am a rancher that raises sheep and goats for a living. The ranch has been in my family for approximately 70 years. My incentive payments totaled approximately $12,000.00, which is surely not enough to drive a Lincoln Continental, which some Congressman and newspaper men believe all ranchers own. Our ranch life consists of hard work and long hours with small returns which most people in agriculture accept with the job. Our way of life is being threatened as are our communities by the loss of this program. Thank you for your time.

STEVE HAYNES.

DEL RIO, TX,
September 25, 1993.

Hon. HENRY BONILLA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. BONILLA: If you do not pay the wool incentive I will loose my job. I have a wife and 3 small boys who depend on my job for a living. If I do not get to work, I will have to go on welfare, and unemployment.

Please see what you can do so my boss will not have to get rid of his ranch.

Thank you,

HUMBERTO BALDERAS.

SEPTEMBER 27, 1993.

Hon. HENRY BONILLA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BONILLA: I support the efforts to reinvent government, as do Texas farmers and ranchers. But no one industry should be ask to bear the cuts alone or suffer those cuts in an unfair, retroactive manner when others have not yet made a sacrifice.

Last week the Senate amended the Conference Report to accompany H.R. 2493, the fiscal 1994 Agriculture Appropriation Bill, to eliminate spending for the wool and mohair program. The House now must either concur with the Senate or take other action. As Commissioner of Agriculture for the State of Texas representing a vital component of that industry, I respectfully request that you do not vote to concur with the Senate amendment, and that you support efforts to fund last year's program and restore economic stability to the sheep and goat industry.

As you know, Texas leads the nation in the production of wool and mohair. The amendment that the Senate passed does not look to the future of the program. It seeks to retroactively stop payments to those who have in good faith relied on the program. You may not be aware, but this is the only commodity program in which the appropriations are approved after the program year. In other

words, bankers, merchants, and transporters have outstanding loans and bills based on the fact that for the last forty years, producers have been paid by the wool and mohair program at the end of the crop year. As you know, the wool and mohair industry will do its fair share to reduce the national deficit and in fact have agreed to the $50,000 payment limitation for each producer. This Senate amendment will most affect small and medium size operations and I am concerned about the serious effects on Texas rural communities and our state's economy if this amendment is allowed to stand. We must decide whether we want an industry to contribute to our nation's and state's economies or to become a liability.

In the United States, 350,000 people are in sheep and sheep-related industries, $619.6 million is generated by purchase of lamb, $2.86 billion comes from the production and sale of wool clothing and other types of apparel, $25.2 million is generated by the export of live sheep from the United States, and $437.6 million is generated by the export of wool clothing. I encourage you to consider carefully if you want to eliminate private sector jobs and retard economic growth based on this $191 million investment.

Thank you for your time and consideration. If I may be of additional help, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely,

RICK PERRY,
Commissioner.

I was not elected to destroy the lives and livelihoods of honest and hard-working American families. Retroactively canceling the payment will bankrupt thousands of American ranchers, close hundreds of small businesses, and jeopardize the stability of hundreds of rural banks. In effect, if we fail to pass the de la Garza technical correction, we will be endorsing a congressionally created depression in rural America. A congressionally mandated natural disaster every bit as real and terrible as Hurricane Andrew or the recent Midwest floods.

But the significance of this retroactive misery extends far beyond rural America. If we fail to reverse this retroactive measure we are sending a message to each and every American that their Government's word is not it's commitment. I want every American watching this debate at home to know that I am hopeful every Member of this body will want America to keep its word and meet this commitment to our fellow Americans and join me and support this bipartisan amendment.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO].

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. Speaker, very briefly, I would just like to express my support for this motion.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this amendment. I do want to commend the gentleman from New Mexico, Mr. SKEEN, Chairman DE LA GARZA, Chairman DURBIN, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. STENHOLM, and many others who have worked so hard to work out what I think is a very reasonable compromise on this program.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment.

I commend Chairman DE LA GARZA and the gentleman from New Mexico, Mr. SKEEN, and others who have been involved in working out a compromise here to at least preserve the integrity of the 1993 season.

I have some frustration that we arrived at this point at all, given the fact that the Wool Program is funded through tariffs, and in fact generates revenue for the Treasury; but nonetheless, this is a compromise that has been reached at this point which will at least preserve things for wool growers during this 1993 wool season.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment offered by Chairman DE LA GARZA, although I also want to express enormous frustration that this body finds itself in this situation at all.

The House Agriculture Committee on which I serve, as well as the full House of Representatives, have passed legislation which provided for some important reforms in the Wool and Mohair Program, but which preserved the basic program intact. The Senate, however, has voted to not only abolish the Wool and Mohair Program outright, but to effectively make that termination retroactive.

The Senate language will prohibit the use of public funds to support the price of wool and mohair through loans, purchases, payments, or other operations during fiscal year 1994. Since producers typically receive their incentive payments for a given year's production the following April or May, the consequence of the Senate action would be to deny payments to wool and mohair producers for their current 1993 production.

South Dakota and other wool and mohair producers have borrowed money and otherwise entered into financial commitments based on the reasonable assumption that they would receive their incentive payments for their 1993 production. It would be outrageous to retroactively deny payment, and I'm pleased that the de la Garza amendment will correct that potential inequity.

The action of the Senate, however, is much more damaging than simply jeopardizing payments for the 1993 wool and mohair production. Even after passage of this amendment, the future continuation of the Wool and Mohair Program remains in doubt. The Members of this body should keep in mind that the American taxpayers are not responsible for directly paying a dime to run this important program. As of 1991, the tariff placed on imported wool products generated $7.4 billion in income and has paid out only $2.3 billion since its inception in 1954. In other words, this program has actually created a net surplus of $5.1 billion which was returned to the Federal Treasury.

I appreciate that there are those who would like to either abolish wool tariffs in the name of free trade or who believe that all revenue from the tariff should be directed to the Treasury for Federal deficit reduction. Nonetheless, the loss of this program, which has not been costing anything from the Treasury, will not only devastate growers, but will also have a terribly negative impact on shearers, truckers, herders, feed suppliers, packing house workers, and wool warehouses as well as Main Streets throughout rural America. Let there be no doubt that the complete termination of this program will lead to additional bankruptcies, loan defaults, unemployment compensation, food stamps, and welfare payments, simply so that some Members can claim to the press that they killed a Federal program.

Support the de la Garza amendment, but then join me in our effort to retain a reformed and no-cost Wool and Mohair Program that our producers can rely on for generations to come.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this amendment. I think this is a fairness amendment. It deals with solving this short-term problem and we can look longer to the other one.

I come from a district that has the largest wool production in the country, and I feel that you have done a great service for us here, and I support the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the motion offered by the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, Mr. DE LA GARZA.

Historically, the Wool Act has been an easy target whenever Congress looks at ways to reduce the budget. But it is frankly the wrong target. We should beware of too easy answers to our budget dilemma in which the end result would actually be a loss of revenue and perhaps the elimination of an entire industry nationwide.

In our rush to cut the Federal budget we are going to do it not by reducing the expenditures in areas of the Federal budget that have massive amounts of money but rather we are going after a few small worthwhile, but altogether insignificant, programs in the much larger scheme of our trillion dollar Federal budget. The Wool Act costs little and is frankly badly misunderstood by Members of both bodies. Killing the wool subsidy after the 1993–94 payment to help balance the budget is like swatting a gnat on the back of an elephant. Because of that logic and the constant inaccurate attacks on the Wool Act, we should think twice before we scuttle the Wool Act totally.

The Wool Act actually has put money back into the Federal treasury. Tariffs on imported wool have put billions more into the Federal Treasury than was paid to producers. This tariff was justified because it was feared that opening up imports would harm our domestic industry. It in fact did. Since the Wool Act became law the sheep population has declined from 31 million to just a little over 10 million today. It is important to keep these payments coming to help producers diversify their operations.

It is particularly distressing to me to think of which producers are the most likely to be eliminated by any wholesale elimination of this

agricultural stabilization policy that has now been in place for scores of years. The outright elimination of this program in an orderly manner will not just hurt families in the industry. It will be a further blow to country schools, to small communities, and to the rural way of life.

In Montana alone there are more than 3,600 wool and mohair producers. They raise sheep, for the most part, in country that quite frankly can't support any other forms of livestock or crops.

These producers should not be expected to pay the full cost of our attempts to reduce the Federal budget. We should seriously look at ways to cut the Federal budget so that we don't nail family ranchers in our efforts to eliminate tycoons from the program. This program and these families are what is right with America not what's wrong with it.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered on the motion.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA].

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1350

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DURBIN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer the motion made in order under the rule relating to amendment No. 164.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WISE). The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DURBIN moves, pursuant to House Resolution 260, that the House concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment numbered 164, with an amendment as follows: In the matter proposed to be added by the Senate amendment, insert before the period at the end of section 731 the following: ", except in the case of the Food and Drug Administration".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the Senate amendment is considered as read. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, let me say at the outset that there are two issues that are addressed by this Senate amendment. The first issue relates to the honey program. The second issue relates to the question of whether a floor shall be established for the number of employees to be hired at various agencies, and our debate today is specifically in reference to the Food and Drug Administration.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that I plan to ask for unanimous consent to withdraw this amendment and then offer a privileged motion to concur in the Senate amendment. The net effect of that motion on my part, if it prevails, will be to first remedy any flaws in the language that was passed by the House of Representatives providing that no funds are available for the crop year 1994 honey program and, second, to continue, as the Senate has previously decided, to state that there will be no floors on hiring in any agency affected by this appropriations bill.

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

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I want to clarify exactly where we are here.

If I understand correctly, the gentleman is going to attempt to make certain that the House action with regard to the honey program of ending all subsidies to the honey program is, in fact, taken care of here and that the problem that was created by the exact language of the House is now being corrected so that we do end, in fact, subsidies to the honey program.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is correct.

Mr. WALKER. Then beyond that the Senate amendment went to the subject of floors for employment at the FDA, and in that case the gentleman is going to ask unanimous consent to recede or to withdraw the language that was in the rule previously passed so that we can, in fact, accept the Senate amendment in that regard; is that right?

Mr. DURBIN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WALKER. Now the thing that concerned us a little bit about the process here and why we were concerned about the language within the rule, it did sound as though what we were about to do was in conflict with Vice President GORE's reinventing Government and his desire to remove all of these floors. Are we, in taking the action as the gentleman proposes by unanimous consent, ensuring that the floors for FDA are entirely eliminated?

Mr. DURBIN. For the next fiscal year, yes.

Mr. WALKER. I have just been handed a letter here that was written to the gentleman by Mr. Panetta with regard to this matter. Is there anything that is happening with regard to this letter which would, in fact, at least partially restore the floors? Has the OMB Director agreed that we are eliminating the floors altogether and that at this point there is no assigned number of personnel for the FDA?

Mr. DURBIN. The gentleman makes a good point and one I wanted to address during the course of this debate. I will address it at this point.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is correct that the reinventing Government report by the Vice President suggested dramatic changes in the administration of the Federal Government and a substantial reduction of Federal personnel. What we are attempting to do is to take action consistent with that promise made by the Vice President, and I hope, sincerely hope, that Congress will do its best to abide by that request.

I might say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the Food and Drug Administration really comes to this debate in a little different position than most other agencies. The gentleman probably recalls he may have supported the establishment of a user fee for the pharmaceutical industry in the United States. The pharmaceutical manufacturers in this country rely on the Food and Drug Administration to give approval to new drugs. Unfortunately, because of the number of drug applications pending, there has been a breakdown, or a delay, in the approval of new drugs. The industry came forward, working with our Committee on Energy and Commerce, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], and reached an agreement that they would pay a user fee which in the next fiscal year will amount to $54 million for the purpose of augmenting and improving the professional personnel at the Food and Drug Administration. This will provide for more professional employees on staff prepared to review the drug applications moving those drugs through the process more quickly. The industry reached the agreement with the House Committee on Energy and Commerce, we passed the bill, the Senate passed it, and it was signed by President Bush.

Now, of course once we have made that commitment, it suggests we have to increase the amount of personnel at the Food and Drug Administration consistent with the $54 million user fee that will be paid. Our conversations with the Office of Management and Budget have at least, in that respect, been directed toward hiring at least 300 new professional personnel at FDA, paid for through the user fee, in an effort to have more drug approvals and have them done more quickly.

The second part, I might say to the gentleman, relates to other actions taken by Congress over the last several years. We have over the last several years passed substantial and, I think, important legislation to improve health and health safety in America. It has been virtually unanimous in this House of Representatives and in the Senate where we have stood together and said we want to make certain, for example, that mammography clinics across the United States have the very best equipment. That in fact the people who are operating the equipment are qualified to do so, so that our daughters, wives, mothers, and friends who go for a mammography test can be confident that the results are accurate. It is literally a matter of life and death,

and yet, having passed this legislation, we have not provided the FDA with the resources and personnel to implement the act.

The clock is ticking. Exactly 1 year from tomorrow all clinics across the United States, and I believe there are about 10,000 of them, are supposed to be inspected and certified, and we have not provided the personnel for that purpose.

So, in my conversation with Director Panetta we have agreed that there should be additional personnel at FDA to meet that particular objective.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield further, and I appreciate his explanation, the only thing I would say to the gentleman parenthetically here is we have a tendency to pass laws and then provide the personnel. The FCC is facing that with regard to the Cable Reregulation Act that we passed last year, and we do that in a number of instances.

But I am concerned about a couple of sentences in this letter, and perhaps the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] could clarify it for me. In the first paragraph he says:

> Second, however, I want to emphasize the administration's commitment to ensuring that the FDA has sufficient personnel to fulfill its mission.

He then later emphasizes that point by saying in the letter:

> Further, as you know, we are committed to working with the Secretary to ensure that the FDA has sufficient FTE to enable it to implement the Prescription Drug User Fee Act of 1992.

The gentleman has explained to the House that with regard to that matter; that is, the user fee issue with the drug companies that he mentioned, that that is going to result in an increase of personnel at FDA of approximately 300 people. He has also mentioned that with regard to the clinics for mammography, that that, too, will result in an increase in personnel at FDA.

The question here is: In order to comply with the Vice President's recommendation, which I have to believe took into account these things when they made the recommendation; is the gentleman then telling us that they are going to cut personnel in other areas of FDA in order to allow them to hire the people in these new areas of jurisdiction?

Mr. DURBIN. I cannot answer that question, but I will tell the gentleman this: I mentioned the mammography clinic inspections. We anticipate that approximately 65 new employees will come on board at the Food and Drug Administration in an attempt to start the regulation process and inspect the 10,000 clinics across the United States. I think the gentleman would agree this is for a very important purpose. We also face serious backlogs at this agency. For example, in the area of medical devices, which includes such things as breast implants and heart valves, just a few years ago there was no backlog of applications waiting to be approved. Today there are 4,300 applications for medical devices waiting for approval. I cannot tell the gentleman from Pennsylvania that there is going to be a medical breakthrough in any one of the 4,300 applications. My guess is that for some families and some people suffering in this country the answer will be in the positive. Something there will help save lives. Will this require more personnel to set aside this backlog? Yes, it will, and I suggest the FDA will probably have to add new people on for that purpose.

□ 1400

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, my concern is I assume the Vice President took all of these things into account when he in fact made his recommendation that we cut personnel across the board and eliminate these personnel requirements. Reinventing Government does anticipate a significant savings from the reduction in Federal personnel.

If I understand the gentleman correctly, this may be an agency where they are not going to really reduce. They are actually going to increase personnel in this agency, if I understand the gentleman correctly, which means some other agencies then supposedly carrying out vital missions to the Government are going to have to be reduced even further to accommodate the fact that the Food and Drug Administration is growing.

Do we have some understanding of just what the impact of these kinds of actions is going to be?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would like to respond to the gentleman, and perhaps at that point the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] would yield the gentleman further time if he wants to continue this colloquy.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to believe that what Vice President GORE set out to do was to reduce Federal employment. I do not recall that he said specifically every single agency will be subject to the same percentage cut. So I think the judgments have to be made. I believe that the American people, when asked whether the Food and Drug Administration should be given additional personnel to do the things we have just described, would probably say yes, this is a good investment. This is an investment to find the medical breakthroughs and make life better for all Americans.

That also suggests the Vice President, if he is going to meet his goal in reinventing Government, will have to find other areas to cut in other agencies. So I think the net impact of the Vice President's suggestion would be a reduction in Federal personnel. Some agencies may find additional personnel, and others may find reduction in personnel.

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

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I think we do need to understand, I am informed by staff that the Vice President's recommendation was a 4-percent reduction in every agency's personnel by 1995. If that in fact is the case, I think we are just hearing here an example of the fact that we are about to begin modifying the reinventing Government by a fairly substantial margin. If in fact I understand the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], we are talking about at least 365 new people at the Food and Drug Administration to implement worthy goals that the Congress has outlined, but, nevertheless, things which it seems to me under the reinventing government plan have to be done within the context of the proposed reductions.

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

Mr. WALKER. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the gentleman is aware of the fact that the Food and Drug Administration is under the aegis of the Department of Health and Human Services. It is clear from the Vice President's goals that there will be reductions in that department.

I think the gentleman feels, as I do, that within the Food and Drug Administration there are important legislative objectives and health objectives to be met. I am hoping that their employment will stabilize soon, that they will meet their missions and goals, and that maybe at some later date we can even trim back the number of employees.

Mr. Speaker, I would really feel that we had not met our responsibility and duty if, come a year from tomorrow we had not really taken seriously the legislative mandate to inspect mammography clinics across the United States.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, if I understand what the gentleman has told us though, what his interpretation of the Vice President's goal is for the Department of HHS is for it to be reduced by 4 percent by 1995. The fact that this one agency within HHS is growing means that some of the other agencies within HHS, maybe Social Security, maybe the Public Health Service, some of the other agencies there are going to have to be trimmed even further to accommodate this growth in Food and Drug Administration. Is that what I hear the gentleman saying?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I am not going to interpret the Vice President's

missions and goal. I will only tell the gentleman we will reduce Federal employment pursuant to the Vice President's goals. How they will be reduced in each agency, how much will be reduced in each agency, I think is really up to the congressional process to determine, as it should be, through the appropriations and authorizing process.

But I think the gentleman will agree with me that the health goals we are trying to meet through the Food and Drug Administration are absolutely critical. We would be remiss if we said, a week after President Clinton spoke to us on health care reform, that we did not follow through and make sure this important health safety agency is well-funded.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I still want to clarify just exactly where we are. When we passed the continuing resolution yesterday, we included in that a 1-percent reduction in the overall personnel costs of every agency. That was a part of the language of the continuing resolution.

If I understand what the gentleman is now telling us, it is that was for HHS, but the Food and Drug Administration need not participate in that. In fact, the gentleman anticipated growth in the Food and Drug Administration.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I cannot tell the gentleman exactly how that will apply to the Department of Health and Human Services. It is beyond our jurisdiction on this subcommittee. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] has that authority.

Mr. WALKER. It will not apply to FDA.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I can say it is our intent that the number of full time equivalents, the number of personnel at the Food and Drug Administration, will increase during the next fiscal year for the reasons I have enumerated.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN]. He has been generous with his time, as has the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN].

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH].

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, it is said that too many cooks spoil the broth. But I say there cannot be any broth without a cook and a kitchen staff. This is the situation we are talking about with this amendment and the Food and Drug Administration.

Congress has assigned the FDA many important tasks. Last year, we told the FDA to improve and ensure mammography quality, and we were right to do it. As a breast cancer survivor, I know the importance of a high-quality mammogram and an accurate reading. It saved my life.

But Congress has not provided the FDA with staff to implement this act, so we currently have less than one dozen people working feverishly to develop a program within 1 year or mammography clinics will be closed. Without these tests, more women will die from an undiagnosed disease. It's like asking for water to be turned into wine. Only Commissioner Kessler has fewer apostles.

Mr. Speaker, we must provide the FDA with the appropriate staff levels to carry out its essential duties. I urge my colleagues to vote for this live-saving amendment.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL].

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

Mr. Speaker, I simply want to extend my thanks to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], as well as to the ranking Republican member, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN], because I ascertain that at least for fiscal year 1994, we have eliminated the honey program payment subsidies, and that is what I am, of course, very vitally concerned about.

I understand the gentleman is going to ask for unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment which he was going to present, and thus we have the Brown amendment being accepted.

Before concluding, I would like to take a moment to set the record straight about the amendment I offered in the House on August 6 because there have been several inaccurate reports of what happened.

Currently, honey producers can get Federal subsidy payments in any of three ways: First, producers can get loan deficiency payments up front for the difference between the market rate [47 cents/pound] and the price support level [53.8 cents/pound]; Second, they may obtain Federal loans for honey at the higher price support level, but pay them back within 9 months at the lower market rate with no interest; Third, they can get the loans, then forfeit the honey to the Government, pocketing the loan at the higher price support level.

The House did not limit subsidies when the House version of the Agriculture appropriation bill was first considered earlier this summer because an amendment was ruled out of order. Then, Senator BROWN amended the Senate version of the bill to limit subsidy payments to $50,000 per year, per producer. His amendment specifically included sections of the law dealing with all three types of subsidy payments mentioned in the paragraph above. The House-Senate conference adopted the Senate language, item No. 164, in technical disagreement with the House position.

When the conference report came to the House, I offered an amendment to the Senate language that simply replaced the $50,000 limitation with $0—my amendment was overwhelmingly adopted. I did not make a mistake in drafting my amendment—which did not change a single word in the underlying amendment—nor did Senator BROWN. The Congressional Research Service legal division has issued an opinion confirming that the Brown language, as amended by my amendment, eliminates all three types of subsidy payments.

Nevertheless, because of a subsequent conflicting opinion by the USDA questioning whether the third type of subsidy payment was eliminated, Senator BROWN and I decided it would be best to make it absolutely clear that all three subsidies were eliminated in the statute. Accordingly, Senator BROWN amended the House amendment clarifying this. This was adopted by the Senate last Thursday, and, I presume, will be adopted by the House today.

Again, I simply want to thank all of those who have worked with us here. I think we actually have eliminated, at least for 1 fiscal year, a program that all of us had been working on in regard to having it deleted. Again, my thanks to all of those who have been helpful in that regard.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA].

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I take this time to thank the chairman and ranking member for their cooperation with the Committee on Agriculture. I regret that it was problems in our jurisdiction that arose, from a multiplicity of reasons.

Mr. Speaker, the main reason for taking this time is to commend the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. This is his maiden trip. This is his first handling of the Appropriations Subcommittee. All of us are proud of the way the gentleman and his staff have worked. We appreciate the cooperation extended. I am sure I speak for all of the agencies that the gentleman dealt with, but principally for the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] has done a good job. We are proud of the work he has done. He has established a tremendous precedent and openness in working with the legislative area, and I want to thank and commend him on behalf of all of us for the excellent manner in which he has handled this legislation and brought it to fruition before the end of the fiscal year.

□ 1410

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

First, let me say I am very glad that I yielded to my colleague from Texas for that statement. I thank him for his kind remarks, but if there is any credit for this legislative achievement, it should be shared with my ranking minority spokesman, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN].

He has worked diligently, and his staff as well, and neither of us would be able to stand here today and take full credit without acknowledging the hard work of so many people on the subcommittee and members of the staff.

Let me conclude, if I might, by saying the following:

A week ago the President of the United States stood in this Chamber and, I think, rallied the American people to a debate which is absolutely essential on the future health of America.

He said to us and said clearly that we are going to take health care very seriously in this Congress.

I am happy to report today that this effort to make certain that the Food and Drug Administration has adequate personnel to perform its functions is consistent with the message which the President gave to us.

I have worked very closely with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Leon Panetta. He has a tough job, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania alluded to earlier. He has to find ways to cut overall Federal employment but to make sure, during the course of that, that the important missions of the Federal Government are protected.

I am one who believes that, in the Food and Drug Administration, some of the most important missions in the Federal Government are being performed.

We have discussed, and I would like to thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH] for her remarks on the important role the Food and Drug Administration plays in the inspection of mammography clinics.

The fact of the matter is, there is not a family in America that does not rely on the Food and Drug Administration and its representation every day.

Just a few months ago, a major soft drink manufacturer in the United States faced a scare because of the possibility that some foreign objects were being put in their product. It was on the nightly news and every newspaper and every radio program. There was a full-scale panic in reference to that product. There was real concern about what would happen to the company.

Then at a moment in that debate, the Food and Drug Administration stepped forward and said, it is a hoax. The American people can be confident that this product is safe. The story disappeared from the headlines.

It attests, I think, to the reputation of this agency, a reputation which we must jealously guard, those of us who have the responsibility to authorize and appropriate for that agency.

I want to salute the Committee on Energy and Commerce and its chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], who shares my feelings about the Food and Drug Administration, and the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN], who has been a real leader when it comes to public health issues.

We will continue to work on this subcommittee to make sure that this important agency and the Department of Agriculture as well as the other agencies in our jurisdiction receive adequate compensation and appropriations each year to perform their missions. We will be mindful of Vice President GORE's mission to reduce the size and the expense of Federal Government, but we will not lose sight of those critical health safety missions.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be withdrawn.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DURBIN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DURBIN moves that the House concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment numbered 164.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

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

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

I would like to take just a moment of my time. I have no speakers and intend to yield back as soon as I finish, but I want to say to the chairman of this committee that it has been a real pleasure. We paralleled each other in our careers in Congress on most of the committees that we have served on, but particularly, when we would up as chairman and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies, we took on an extremely important responsibility. That is, to promulgate and to help promote the best agricultural system, most productive agricultural system anywhere in the world. I think we have taken that responsibility very seriously, in the face of the fact that only 2.2 percent of our entire population is involved in the business of producing the kind of agricultural products that we consume here in the United States today.

Unfortunately, that has led us to forget our agricultural roots. So it is easy to criticize agricultural programs, particularly when money gets tight, because we are fat and happy with the kind of nourishment that we get every day so we take it for granted that we really do not get milk from cows. It comes from a supermarket. Anything we want, we go to the market.

There are folks still down there, still producing it from the ground. And it is the use of a natural resource.

These programs that are promulgated have helped develop this great system. So when Members find us reluctant to do away with them in the sense of being economically sound and helping the taxpayers, it is a responsibility we have to, first of all, make sure that those programs serve agriculture, because they also serve the taxpayers and the people of this United States of America, the best-fed, the best-dressed and the best-housed people in the entire world. That responsibility we do not take lightly. So we fight for these programs.

I know, it is very popular to kill off so-called outdated, unneeded programs. But that is a determination that we have to make, when we understand what the program does. And I think that we have done an excellent job, and the chairman has done on outstanding job.

I want to comment on the gentleman from Texas, who was my first chairman. I learned a good lesson from him, because he was most gracious. When I first came here in 1980, we talked about the Wool Act at the time, because it was up for renewal. I will never forget his comment.

He said, "when you have something to say," and I launched into this thing, because I was very happy that I was so knowledgeable about the wool program and so few people understood it, even where mohair is. As a matter of fact, one member says, "Where in the heck does mohair come from?" So I thought I would kid him a little bit and I said, "Well, it comes from a little mo that you shave in the dark of the moon," something like that.

I saw that he was taking me seriously, and I retracted it and said, "No, it comes from a hair goat called an angora goat."

But the best thing the chairman taught me was, "Don't stand up there and talk too long so, when you see my gavel come across my chin, shut up."

I have never forgotten those words. It is the best advice I have ever gotten. So I am going to do this.

I thank all my colleagues for their great cooperation. It has been great working with them.

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

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks. I want to echo what he had to say about the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. I hope that every Appropriations Committee chairman and ranking minority member have the good fortune of having a chairman of an authorizing committee as cooperative

and friendly as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] has been.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I will second that any time.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I would like to clarify what this motion is about, because I am going to ask for a rollcall vote on it.

This motion, which I have made, the effect of it will be to clarify that no funds are available for the crop year 1994 honey program as the House intended it. We will adopt the Senate clarifying language to that effect and to eliminate any language officially establishing any floor for any agency affected by this appropriation in terms of the hiring of personnel.

Those are the two things accomplished by this motion. I will be asking for a rollcall on it as soon as we have finished.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his kindnesses and cooperation and the great privilege to serve with him.

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

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2493, a bill providing appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and related agencies for fiscal year 1994.

I would like to commend Chairman DURBIN, the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee's ranking Republican member, Mr. SKEEN, and the balance of the House delegation for the fine job they performed under difficult circumstances.

I am pleased with the provisions of the report that deal with the child nutrition and adult nutrition programs under the authorizing jurisdiction of the Committee on Education and Labor.

But I did want to particularly express my thanks to the House conferees for securing the deletion of a series of Senate-added amendments to the bill which sought to set forth permanent stipulations to the appropriations provided to a number of the nutrition programs under the authorizing jurisdiction of the Committee on Education and Labor. I also want to assure Chairman DURBIN that we will address the issues posed by the stipulations as we reauthorize these and other nutrition programs next year, and that I will certainly seek his counsel on those issues.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply troubled by the prospect that programs important to agriculture are being unfairly singled out for reactionary slash and burn cuts without regard to the merits at issue. This type of congressional action is demonstrated in the vote last week by the other body to end the Wool and Mohair Program retroactively.

I want to share with my colleagues just one example of what this would do in my State of North Dakota. The Dean and Paula Swenson family in Walcott, ND, went to their local bank last spring and borrowed operating capital using their sheep and goat herd and their expected wool payment as collateral. If last week's vote in the other body is to stand, the value of the Swenson's herd will be reduced by $50,000 overnight. The value of an angora goat in North Dakota will drop from $45 to $10 immediately upon Congress pulling the rug out from under this family that is pursuing a farming business plan based on a program Congress said would be there.

Mr. Speaker, people like the Swensons become victims when we engage in budget cutting by anecdote and press release. Far too often we fail to make the connection between our actions on this floor and the people's lives who are directly, and in this case, immediately affected.

If it is the will of the Congress to end the Wool and Mohair Program, then it will be ended. But let us at least phase out the program so that those who operated by the rules have a chance to diversify their operations and find new sources of income.

I ask my colleagues to please not disregard the human dimension of this vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All debate having been concluded, the question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

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

Mr. DURBIN. 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 430, nays 0, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 481]

YEAS—430

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Bacchus (FL)
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Becerra
Bellenson
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blackwell
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Byrne
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Derrick
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
Hilliard
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
Lazio
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
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
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
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
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—3

Chapman McDade Washington

□ 1526

Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. SWIFT changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. HEFNER and Mr. HAYES changed their vote from "present" to "yea."

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM DATA AND TABLES REFLECTING CONFERENCE AGREEMENT ON H.R. 2493

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, there has been some question on earmarks under the Agricultural Conservation Program. The appropriations process has always tried to not earmark this account since the funds are distributed under a needs formula. I would point out that, again this year, the conference agreement was specific in not earmarking funds for this program.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I will insert the tables which reflect the conference agreement on H.R. 2493, the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and related agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1994. These tables include the fiscal year 1993 supplementals that have been enacted to date.

Agriculture, Rural Development, Food & Drug Administration, & Related Agencies (H.R. 2493)

	FY 1993 Enacted	FY 1994 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
TITLE I - AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS						
Production, Processing, and Marketing						
Office of the Secretary	2,282,000	2,295,000	2,320,000	2,295,000	2,308,000	+26,000
Office of the Deputy Secretary	543,000	546,000	553,000	546,000	550,000	+7,000
Office of Budget and Program Analysis	5,756,000	5,781,000	5,954,000	5,781,000	5,881,000	+125,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration	596,000	798,000	808,000	798,000	803,000	+207,000
Rental payments (USDA)	50,503,000	135,503,000	135,503,000	135,503,000	135,503,000	+85,000,000
Building operations and maintenance	25,700,000	25,264,000	.....	.....	.....	-25,700,000
Advisory committees (USDA)	952,000	940,000	940,000	940,000	940,000	-12,000
Hazardous waste management	16,000,000	15,802,000	15,802,000	15,802,000	15,802,000	-198,000
Departmental administration	25,014,000	26,960,000	26,301,000	25,960,000	26,301,000	+1,287,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations	1,307,000	1,317,000	1,333,000	1,317,000	1,325,000	+18,000
Office of Public Affairs	8,925,000	8,963,000	8,629,000	8,510,000	8,570,000	-355,000
Intergovernmental affairs	468,000	472,000	478,000	472,000	475,000	+7,000
Total, Office of Public Affairs	9,393,000	9,435,000	9,107,000	8,982,000	9,045,000	-348,000
Office of the Inspector General	62,786,000	63,127,000	65,932,000	64,872,000	65,530,000	+2,744,000
Office of the General Counsel	24,554,000	24,735,000	26,149,000	25,835,000	25,992,000	+1,438,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Economics	580,000	582,000	589,000	582,000	586,000	+6,000
Economic Research Service	58,720,000	50,824,000	57,702,000	51,219,000	55,219,000	-3,501,000
National Agricultural Statistics Service	81,004,000	81,458,000	82,069,000	81,458,000	81,764,000	+760,000
World Agricultural Outlook Board	2,367,000	2,550,000	2,582,000	2,550,000	2,566,000	+199,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Science and Education	560,000	562,000	569,000	562,000	566,000	+6,000
Alternative Agricultural Research and Commercialization	7,250,000	19,752,000	7,250,000	12,000,000	9,000,000	+1,750,000
Agricultural Research Service	658,379,000	665,168,000	688,805,000	680,165,000	692,469,000	+34,090,000
Human Nutrition Information Service	10,788,000	10,757,000	.....	.....	.....	-10,788,000
Reappropriation	.....	2,222,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
Special fund	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	.....
Buildings and facilities	34,514,000	24,283,000	29,387,000	32,788,000	32,743,000	-1,771,000
Total, Agricultural Research Service	706,181,000	704,930,000	720,692,000	715,453,000	727,712,000	+21,531,000
Cooperative State Research Service	430,143,000	423,734,000	428,586,000	443,652,000	453,736,000	+23,593,000
Buildings and facilities	52,101,000	.....	37,750,000	56,874,000	56,874,000	+4,773,000
Extension Service	428,428,000	425,937,000	429,175,000	433,828,000	434,582,000	+6,154,000
National Agricultural Library	17,715,000	17,693,000	17,682,000	18,155,000	18,155,000	+440,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Marketing and Inspection Services	550,000	682,000	691,000	682,000	687,000	+137,000
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service:						
Salaries and expenses	349,538,000	342,333,000	347,582,000	352,193,000	348,104,000	-1,434,000
Special fund, user fees	83,362,000	90,328,000	91,460,000	91,460,000	91,460,000	+8,098,000
Subtotal	432,900,000	432,661,000	439,042,000	443,653,000	439,564,000	+6,664,000
Buildings and facilities	10,400,000	10,145,000	10,145,000	10,145,000	10,145,000	-255,000
Total, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	443,300,000	442,806,000	449,187,000	453,798,000	449,709,000	+6,409,000
Food Safety and Inspection Service	493,867,000	408,756,000	516,738,000	516,738,000	516,738,000	+22,871,000
New user fees	.....	(104,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(+1,000,000)
Federal Grain Inspection Service	11,397,000	4,627,000	11,554,000	11,509,000	11,532,000	+135,000
New user fees	.....	(6,882,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....
Inspection and Weighing Services (limitation on administrative expenses, from fees collected)	(42,784,000)	(42,784,000)	(42,784,000)	(42,784,000)	(42,784,000)	.....
Agricultural Cooperative Service	.....	.....	.....	5,708,000	.....	.....
New user fees	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Agricultural Marketing Service:						
Marketing Services	56,221,000	50,235,000	61,614,000	56,887,000	61,614,000	+5,393,000
New user fees	.....	(6,152,000)	(4,452,000)	(4,452,000)	(4,452,000)	(+4,452,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses, from fees collected)	(55,953,000)	(55,953,000)	(55,953,000)	(55,953,000)	(55,953,000)	.....
Agricultural Cooperative Service	5,640,000	5,218,000	.....	.....	.....	-5,640,000
New user fees	.....	(450,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....
Funds for strengthening markets, income, and supply (transfer from section 32)	10,309,000	10,670,000	10,309,000	10,670,000	10,309,000	.....
Payments to States and possessions	1,250,000	1,235,000	1,735,000	1,300,000	1,735,000	+485,000
Total, Agricultural Marketing Service	73,420,000	67,358,000	73,658,000	68,857,000	73,658,000	+238,000
Packers and Stockyards Administration	11,996,000	12,052,000	12,194,000	12,052,000	12,123,000	+127,000
Total, Production, Processing, and Marketing	3,044,965,000	2,976,806,000	3,139,370,000	3,174,308,000	3,195,187,000	+150,222,000
Farm Income Stabilization						
Office of the Under Secretary for International Affairs and Commodity Programs	551,000	556,000	563,000	556,000	560,000	+9,000

Agriculture, Rural Development, Food & Drug Administration, & Related Agencies (H.R. 2493), continued

	FY 1993 Enacted	FY 1994 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service:						
Salaries and expenses	724,926,000		730,842,000	730,842,000	730,842,000	+5,916,000
(Transfer from export loans)	(589,000)		(589,000)	(589,000)	(589,000)	
(Transfer from P.L. 480)	(1,036,000)		(1,036,000)	(1,036,000)	(1,036,000)	
Total, salaries and expenses	(726,551,000)		(732,467,000)	(732,467,000)	(732,467,000)	(+5,916,000)
Dairy indemnity program	5,000	5,000				-5,000
Total, Farm Income Stabilization	(727,107,000)	(561,000)	(733,030,000)	(733,023,000)	(733,027,000)	(+5,920,000)
CORPORATIONS						
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation:						
Administrative and operating expenses	309,948,000	202,311,000	290,116,000	290,116,000	290,116,000	-19,832,000
Federal crop insurance corporation fund	285,794,000	247,737,000	235,794,000	235,794,000	235,794,000	-50,000,000
Total, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation	595,742,000	450,048,000	525,910,000	525,910,000	525,910,000	-69,832,000
Commodity Credit Corporation:						
Reimbursement for net realized losses	9,200,000,000	20,896,614,000	18,000,000,000	18,000,000,000	18,000,000,000	+8,800,000,000
Hazardous waste (limitation on administrative expenses)	(3,000,000)	(4,000,000)	(4,000,000)	(4,000,000)	(4,000,000)	(+1,000,000)
Disaster payments	1,350,000,000					-1,350,000,000
Borrowing authority		900,000,000		900,000,000	900,000,000	+900,000,000
Total, Corporations	11,145,742,000	22,246,662,000	18,525,910,000	19,425,910,000	19,425,910,000	+8,280,168,000
Total, title I, Agricultural Programs	14,916,189,000	25,224,029,000	22,396,685,000	23,331,616,000	23,352,499,000	+8,436,310,000
(By transfer)	(1,625,000)		(1,625,000)	(1,625,000)	(1,625,000)	
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(101,737,000)	(102,737,000)	(102,737,000)	(102,737,000)	(102,737,000)	(+1,000,000)
TITLE II - CONSERVATION PROGRAMS						
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment	563,000	571,000	578,000	571,000	575,000	+12,000
Soil Conservation Service:						
Conservation operations	576,539,000		588,262,000	593,835,000	591,049,000	+14,510,000
River basin surveys and investigations	13,251,000		13,482,000	13,482,000	13,482,000	+231,000
Watershed planning	9,545,000		9,721,000	10,921,000	10,921,000	+1,376,000
Watershed and flood prevention operations	291,594,000	148,096,000	228,915,000	258,615,000	241,965,000	-49,629,000
Resource conservation and development	32,516,000	5,756,000	32,945,000	35,000,000	32,945,000	+429,000
Great Plains conservation program	25,271,000	16,105,000	25,658,000	25,658,000	25,658,000	+387,000
Total, Soil Conservation Service	948,716,000	169,957,000	898,983,000	937,511,000	916,020,000	-32,696,000
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service:						
Agricultural conservation program	194,435,000	148,538,000	194,650,000	194,650,000	194,650,000	+215,000
Water quality incentives program	(15,000,000)		(15,000,000)	(22,000,000)	(18,500,000)	(+3,500,000)
Forestry incentives program	12,446,000	11,362,000	12,820,000	12,820,000	12,820,000	+374,000
Water bank program	18,620,000	16,918,000	18,620,000		8,000,000	-10,620,000
Emergency conservation program	33,000,000	2,726,000	10,000,000			-33,000,000
Colorado River Basin salinity control program	13,783,000	8,394,000	13,783,000	13,783,000	13,783,000	
Conservation reserve program	1,578,517,000	1,755,541,000	1,743,274,000	1,743,274,000	1,743,274,000	+164,757,000
Wetlands reserve program		370,260,000	44,450,000	70,000,000	66,675,000	+66,675,000
Total, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service	1,850,801,000	2,313,739,000	2,037,597,000	2,034,527,000	2,039,202,000	+188,401,000
Total, title II, Conservation Programs	2,800,080,000	2,484,267,000	2,937,158,000	2,972,609,000	2,955,797,000	+155,717,000
TITLE III - FARMERS HOME AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS						
Office of the Under Secretary for Small Community and Rural Development	572,000	576,000	583,000	576,000	580,000	+8,000
Rural Development Administration:						
Salaries and expenses	5,200,000	8,052,000				-5,200,000
Loan administrative expenses:						
RDIF (by transfer)	(21,755,000)	(26,716,000)				(-21,755,000)
RDLF (by transfer)	(524,000)	(2,471,000)				(-524,000)
Total, salaries and expenses	(27,479,000)	(37,239,000)				(-27,479,000)
Farm Service Agency:						
Salaries and expenses		1,574,413,000				
Loan administrative expenses:						
RHIF (by transfer)		(349,256,000)				
ACIF (by transfer)		(261,158,000)				
RDIF (by transfer)		(27,213,000)				
Self-Help HLDF (by transfer)		(14,000)				
CCC Export Loans (by transfer)		(601,000)				
P.L. 480 (by transfer)		(1,025,000)				
Total, salaries and expenses		(2,213,680,000)				

Agriculture, Rural Development, Food & Drug Administration, & Related Agencies (H.R. 2493), continued

	FY 1993 Enacted	FY 1994 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Farmers Home Administration:						
Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account:						
Loan authorizations:						
Low-income housing (sec. 502)	(1,245,000,000)	(1,855,079,000)	(1,750,000,000)	(1,750,000,000)	(1,750,000,000)	(+505,000,000)
Unsubsidized direct	(50,000,000)	.....	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	.....
Unsubsidized guaranteed	(579,500,000)	(677,041,000)	(750,000,000)	(750,000,000)	(750,000,000)	(+170,500,000)
Housing repair (sec. 504)	(26,330,000)	(41,811,000)	(35,000,000)	(35,000,000)	(35,000,000)	(+8,670,000)
Farm labor (sec. 514)	(16,300,000)	(15,814,000)	(16,300,000)	(16,300,000)	(16,300,000)	.....
Rental housing (sec. 515)	(573,900,000)	(540,107,000)	(573,900,000)	(540,107,000)	(540,107,000)	(-33,793,000)
Site loans (sec. 524)	(600,000)	(609,000)	(600,000)	(600,000)	(600,000)	.....
Credit sales of acquired property	(187,000,000)	(166,863,000)	(166,863,000)	(150,000,000)	(133,000,000)	(-54,000,000)
Total, Loan authorizations	(2,678,630,000)	(3,297,324,000)	(3,342,663,000)	(3,292,007,000)	(3,275,007,000)	(+596,377,000)
Loan subsidies:						
Single family (sec. 502):						
Direct	238,332,000	371,387,000	350,350,000	350,350,000	350,350,000	+112,018,000
Unsubsidized direct	3,785,000	.....	3,785,000	3,785,000	3,785,000	.....
Unsubsidized guaranteed	10,672,000	11,103,000	12,225,000	12,300,000	12,225,000	+1,553,000
Housing repair (sec. 504)	10,533,000	16,331,000	13,671,000	13,671,000	13,671,000	+3,138,000
Farm labor (sec. 514)	8,029,000	8,144,000	8,394,000	8,394,000	8,394,000	+365,000
Rental housing (sec. 515)	287,930,000	309,967,000	311,972,000	309,967,000	309,967,000	+22,037,000
Credit sales of acquired property	21,468,000	25,397,000	25,397,000	22,830,000	20,242,000	-1,226,000
Total, Loan subsidies	580,749,000	742,329,000	725,794,000	721,297,000	718,634,000	+137,885,000
RHIF expenses:						
Salaries and expenses	404,746,000	349,255,000	374,255,000	374,255,000	374,255,000	-30,491,000
Administrative expenses	22,265,000	21,906,000	21,906,000	21,906,000	21,906,000	-359,000
Total, RHIF expenses	427,011,000	371,161,000	396,161,000	396,161,000	396,161,000	-30,850,000
Rental assistance:						
(Sec. 521)	392,186,000	411,683,000	411,683,000	464,655,000	440,854,000	+48,668,000
(Sec. 502(c)(5)(D))	11,800,000	5,840,000	5,840,000	11,210,000	5,840,000	-5,960,000
Total, Rental assistance	403,986,000	417,523,000	417,523,000	475,865,000	446,694,000	+42,708,000
Total, Rural Housing Insurance Fund	1,411,746,000	1,531,013,000	1,539,478,000	1,593,323,000	1,561,489,000	+149,743,000
(Loan authorization)	(2,678,630,000)	(3,297,324,000)	(3,342,663,000)	(3,292,007,000)	(3,275,007,000)	(+596,377,000)
Rural rental assistance payments (voucher program)	.....	75,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	+25,000,000
Self-Help Housing Land Development Fund:						
Loan authorization	(500,000)	(622,000)	(622,000)	(622,000)	(622,000)	(+122,000)
Loan subsidy	22,000	23,000	23,000	23,000	23,000	+1,000
Administrative expenses	21,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	-7,000
Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account:						
Loan authorizations:						
Farm ownership loans:						
Direct	(66,750,000)	(78,081,000)	(78,081,000)	(122,000,000)	(78,081,000)	(+11,331,000)
Guaranteed	(488,750,000)	(556,543,000)	(556,543,000)	(556,543,000)	(556,543,000)	(+67,793,000)
Subtotal	(555,500,000)	(634,624,000)	(634,624,000)	(678,543,000)	(634,624,000)	(+79,124,000)
Operating loans:						
Direct	(725,626,000)	(796,252,000)	(700,000,000)	(796,252,000)	(700,000,000)	(-25,626,000)
Guaranteed unsubsidized	(1,500,000,000)	(3,507,032,000)	(1,800,000,000)	(3,000,000,000)	(1,800,000,000)	(+300,000,000)
Guaranteed subsidized	(238,354,000)	(420,350,000)	(250,000,000)	(250,000,000)	(250,000,000)	(+11,646,000)
Subtotal	(2,463,980,000)	(4,723,634,000)	(2,750,000,000)	(4,046,252,000)	(2,750,000,000)	(+286,020,000)
Soil and water loans:						
Direct	(9,337,000)	(2,897,000)	(2,897,000)	(2,897,000)	(2,897,000)	(-6,440,000)
Guaranteed	(1,415,000)	(2,012,000)	(2,012,000)	(1,415,000)	(1,415,000)	.....
Subtotal	(10,752,000)	(4,909,000)	(4,909,000)	(4,312,000)	(4,312,000)	(-6,440,000)
Indian tribe land acquisition loans	(1,000,000)	(1,163,000)	(1,163,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	.....
Emergency disaster loans	(138,924,000)	(119,731,000)	(100,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(-38,924,000)
Watershed and flood prevention	(4,000,000)	(4,108,000)	(4,000,000)	(4,000,000)	(4,000,000)	.....
Resource conservation loans	(600,000)	(616,000)	(600,000)	(600,000)	(600,000)	.....
Credit sales of acquired property	(88,000,000)	(147,566,000)	(147,566,000)	(100,000,000)	(123,783,000)	(+35,783,000)
Total, Loan authorizations	(3,262,756,000)	(5,636,351,000)	(3,642,862,000)	(4,934,707,000)	(3,618,319,000)	(+355,563,000)
Loan subsidies:						
Farm ownership:						
Direct	10,706,000	13,210,000	13,210,000	20,637,000	13,210,000	+2,504,000
Guaranteed	20,576,000	20,870,000	20,870,000	20,870,000	20,870,000	+294,000
Farm operating:						
Direct	109,530,000	92,438,000	81,200,000	84,626,000	81,200,000	-28,330,000
Guaranteed unsubsidized	18,150,000	18,409,000	9,360,000	15,747,000	9,360,000	-8,790,000
Guaranteed subsidized	15,350,000	49,509,000	29,425,000	29,445,000	29,425,000	+14,075,000

Agriculture, Rural Development, Food & Drug Administration, & Related Agencies (H.R. 2493), continued

	FY 1993 Enacted	FY 1994 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Soil and water loans:						
Direct	1,740,000	463,000	463,000	463,000	463,000	-1,277,000
Guaranteed	43,000	43,000	43,000	31,000	31,000	-12,000
Indian tribe land acquisition	226,000	229,000	229,000	197,000	197,000	-29,000
Emergency disaster	36,266,000	31,202,000	26,060,000	26,060,000	26,060,000	-10,206,000
Credit sales of acquired property	18,894,000	22,725,000	22,405,000	15,400,000	18,903,000	+9,000
Negative subsidies	.....	-761,000	-761,000	-761,000	-761,000	-761,000
Total, Loan subsidies	231,481,000	248,337,000	202,504,000	212,715,000	198,958,000	-32,523,000
ACIF expenses:						
Salaries and expenses	215,712,000	261,158,000	261,158,000	261,158,000	261,158,000	+45,446,000
Administrative expenses	14,467,000	14,234,000	14,234,000	14,234,000	14,234,000	-233,000
Total, ACIF expenses	230,179,000	275,392,000	275,392,000	275,392,000	275,392,000	+45,213,000
Total, Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund	461,660,000	523,729,000	477,896,000	488,107,000	474,350,000	+12,690,000
(Loan authorization)	(3,262,756,000)	(5,636,351,000)	(3,642,862,000)	(4,934,707,000)	(3,618,319,000)	(+355,563,000)
Rural Development Insurance Fund Program Account:						
Loan authorizations:						
Water and sewer facility loans:						
Direct	(850,000,000)	(868,386,000)	(800,000,000)	(868,386,000)	(834,193,000)	(-15,807,000)
Guaranteed	(35,000,000)	(35,500,000)	(35,000,000)	(35,500,000)	(35,250,000)	(+250,000)
Subtotal	(885,000,000)	(903,886,000)	(835,000,000)	(903,886,000)	(869,443,000)	(-15,557,000)
Community facility loans:						
Direct	(100,000,000)	(388,303,000)	(250,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(225,000,000)	(+125,000,000)
Guaranteed	(100,000,000)	(75,000,000)	(75,000,000)	(75,000,000)	(75,000,000)	(-25,000,000)
Subtotal	(200,000,000)	(463,303,000)	(325,000,000)	(275,000,000)	(300,000,000)	(+100,000,000)
Industrial development loans: Guaranteed	(200,000,000)	(298,762,000)	(298,762,000)	(200,000,000)	(249,381,000)	(+49,381,000)
Total, loan authorizations	(1,285,000,000)	(1,665,951,000)	(1,458,762,000)	(1,378,886,000)	(1,418,824,000)	(+133,824,000)
Loan subsidies:						
Water and sewer: Direct	122,903,000	120,532,000	111,040,000	120,532,000	115,786,000	-7,117,000
Community facility:						
Direct	8,410,000	37,510,000	24,125,000	19,320,000	21,723,000	+13,313,000
Guaranteed	.....	3,803,000	3,803,000	3,803,000	3,803,000	+3,803,000
Industrial development	10,850,000	2,778,000	2,778,000	1,860,000	2,319,000	-8,531,000
Total, Loan subsidies	142,163,000	164,623,000	141,746,000	145,515,000	143,631,000	+1,468,000
RDIF expenses:						
Salaries and expenses	57,294,000	53,940,000	57,294,000	57,294,000	57,294,000	.....
Administratives expenses	914,000	900,000	900,000	900,000	900,000	-14,000
Total, RDIF expenses	58,208,000	54,840,000	58,194,000	58,194,000	58,194,000	-14,000
Total, Rural Development Insurance Fund	200,371,000	219,463,000	199,940,000	203,709,000	201,825,000	+1,454,000
(Loan authorization)	(1,285,000,000)	(1,665,951,000)	(1,458,762,000)	(1,378,886,000)	(1,418,824,000)	(+133,824,000)
Rural Development Loan Fund Program Account:						
(Loan authorization)	(32,500,000)	(174,164,000)	(100,000,000)	(150,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(+67,500,000)
Loan subsidy	18,616,000	97,532,000	56,000,000	84,000,000	56,000,000	+37,384,000
RDLF expenses:						
Salaries and expenses	524,000	2,476,000	1,476,000	1,476,000	1,476,000	+952,000
Administratives expenses	5,000	.....	5,000	5,000	5,000	.....
Total, RDLF expenses	529,000	2,476,000	1,481,000	1,481,000	1,481,000	+952,000
Total, Rural Development Loan Fund	19,145,000	100,008,000	57,481,000	85,481,000	57,481,000	+38,336,000
(Loan authorization)	(32,500,000)	(174,164,000)	(100,000,000)	(150,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(+67,500,000)
Agricultural Resource Conservation Demonstration Program Account:						
(Loan authorization)	(10,000,000)	(6,799,000)	.....	(6,799,000)	(6,799,000)	(-3,201,000)
Loan subsidy	3,644,000	3,599,000	.....	3,599,000	3,599,000	-45,000
Alcohol Fuels Credit Guarantee Program Account:						
(Loan authorization)	(30,000,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-30,000,000)
Loan subsidy	9,000,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-9,000,000
Administrative expenses	100,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-100,000
State mediation grants	3,000,000	2,963,000	2,963,000	4,000,000	3,000,000	.....
Rural water and waste disposal grants	425,000,000	535,571,000	450,000,000	535,571,000	500,000,000	+75,000,000
Very low-income housing repair grants	27,500,000	30,679,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	-2,500,000
Rural housing for domestic farm labor	11,000,000	11,157,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	.....
Mutual and self-help housing	12,750,000	12,932,000	12,750,000	12,750,000	12,750,000	.....
Supervisory and technical assistance grants	2,500,000	2,536,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	.....
Rural community fire protection grants	3,500,000	3,550,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	.....

Agriculture, Rural Development, Food & Drug Administration, & Related Agencies (H.R. 2493), continued

	FY 1993 Enacted	FY 1994 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Rural housing preservation grants	23,000,000	23,329,000	23,000,000	23,000,000	23,000,000	.....
Compensation for construction defects	500,000	508,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	.....
Rural development grants	20,750,000	51,046,000	35,000,000	50,000,000	42,500,000	+21,750,000
Solid waste management grants	3,000,000	3,081,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	.....
Emergency community water assistance grants	60,000,000	10,143,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	-50,000,000
Outreach for socially disadvantaged farmers	.....	9,876,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	+3,000,000
Subtotal, grants and payments	592,500,000	697,371,000	582,213,000	683,821,000	639,750,000	+47,250,000
Office of the Administrator	600,000	.....	600,000	600,000	600,000	.....
Salaries and expenses	8,802,000	.....	35,552,000	35,552,000	35,552,000	+26,750,000
Loan administrative expenses:						
RHIF (by transfer)	(404,746,000)	.....	(374,255,000)	(374,255,000)	(374,255,000)	(-30,491,000)
ACIF (by transfer)	(215,712,000)	.....	(261,158,000)	(261,158,000)	(261,158,000)	(+45,446,000)
RDIF (by transfer)	(35,539,000)	.....	(57,294,000)	(57,294,000)	(57,294,000)	(+21,755,000)
RDLF (by transfer)	.....	.....	(1,476,000)	(1,476,000)	(1,476,000)	(+1,476,000)
Self-Help HLDF (by transfer)	(21,000)	.....	(14,000)	(14,000)	(14,000)	(-7,000)
AFCG (by transfer)	(100,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-100,000)
Total, salaries and expenses	(664,920,000)	.....	(729,749,000)	(729,749,000)	(729,749,000)	(+64,829,000)
Total, Farmers Home Administration	2,707,611,000	3,150,220,000	2,918,197,000	3,119,229,000	2,999,683,000	+292,072,000
(By transfer)	(656,118,000)	.....	(694,197,000)	(694,197,000)	(694,197,000)	(+38,079,000)
(Loan authorization)	(7,299,386,000)	(10,781,211,000)	(8,544,909,000)	(9,763,021,000)	(8,419,571,000)	(+1,120,185,000)
Rural Electrification Administration:						
Rural Electrification and Telephone Loans Program Account:						
Loan authorizations:						
Direct loans:						
Electric 5%	(625,035,000)	(24,690,000)	(125,000,000)	(125,000,000)	(125,000,000)	(-500,035,000)
Telephone 5%	(239,250,000)	(25,000,000)	(125,000,000)	(75,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(-139,250,000)
Subtotal	(864,285,000)	(49,690,000)	(250,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(225,000,000)	(-639,285,000)
Treasury rate:						
Electric	.....	(592,604,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....
Telephone	.....	(236,287,000)	(198,000,000)	(198,000,000)	(198,000,000)	(+198,000,000)
Subtotal	.....	(828,891,000)	(198,000,000)	(198,000,000)	(198,000,000)	(+198,000,000)
Muni-rate:						
Electric	.....	.....	(600,000,000)	(600,000,000)	(600,000,000)	(+600,000,000)
Telephone	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Subtotal	.....	.....	(600,000,000)	(600,000,000)	(600,000,000)	(+600,000,000)
FFB loans:						
Electric, regular	(813,450,000)	(803,376,000)	(300,000,000)	(300,000,000)	(300,000,000)	(-513,450,000)
Electric, repriced	.....	.....	(513,000,000)	(513,000,000)	(513,000,000)	(+513,000,000)
Telephone	(119,625,000)	(118,143,000)	(120,000,000)	(120,000,000)	(120,000,000)	(+375,000)
Subtotal	(933,075,000)	(921,519,000)	(933,000,000)	(933,000,000)	(933,000,000)	(-75,000)
Total, Loan authorizations	(1,797,360,000)	(1,800,100,000)	(1,981,000,000)	(1,931,000,000)	(1,956,000,000)	(+158,640,000)
Loan subsidies:						
Direct loans:						
Electric 5%	117,319,000	4,030,000	20,150,000	20,375,000	20,375,000	-96,944,000
Telephone 5%	43,950,000	3,223,000	16,115,000	9,668,000	12,891,000	-31,059,000
Treasury rate:						
Electric	.....	533,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
Telephone	.....	47,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	+40,000
Muni-rate, electric	.....	.....	46,020,000	46,020,000	46,020,000	+46,020,000
FFB loans, regular electric	35,388,000	.....	11,100,000	3,090,000	3,090,000	-32,298,000
FFB loans, telephone	.....	.....	84,000	.....	.....	.....
Total, Loan subsidies	196,657,000	7,833,000	93,509,000	79,193,000	82,416,000	-114,241,000
RETRF salaries and expenses	29,163,000	29,442,000	29,982,000	29,982,000	29,982,000	+819,000
Total, Rural Electrification and Telephone Loans Program Account	225,820,000	37,275,000	123,491,000	109,175,000	112,398,000	-113,422,000
(Loan authorization)	(1,797,360,000)	(1,800,100,000)	(1,981,000,000)	(1,931,000,000)	(1,956,000,000)	(+158,640,000)
Rural Telephone Bank Program Account:						
Direct loans (limitation on obligations)	(177,045,000)	(199,847,000)	(199,847,000)	(199,847,000)	(199,847,000)	(+22,802,000)
Direct loan subsidy	35,000	40,000	40,000	3,118,000	3,118,000	+3,083,000
RTB salaries and expenses	8,632,000	8,794,000	8,794,000	8,794,000	8,794,000	+162,000
Distance Learning and Medical Link Programs	5,000,000	5,071,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	+5,000,000
Rural Economic Development Loans Program Account:						
Direct loans (limitation on obligations)	(12,389,000)	(13,025,000)	(13,025,000)	(13,025,000)	(13,025,000)	(+636,000)
Direct subsidy	3,423,000	3,381,000	3,381,000	3,423,000	3,423,000	.....
Office of the Administrator	243,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-243,000

Agriculture, Rural Development, Food & Drug Administration, & Related Agencies (H.R. 2493), continued

	FY 1993 Enacted	FY 1994 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Salaries and expenses:						
Electric and telephone loans (by transfer)	(29,163,000)	(29,442,000)	(29,982,000)	(29,982,000)	(29,982,000)	(+819,000)
Rural telephone bank (by transfer)	(8,632,000)	(8,794,000)	(8,794,000)	(8,794,000)	(8,794,000)	(+162,000)
Subtotal	(37,795,000)	(38,236,000)	(38,776,000)	(38,776,000)	(38,776,000)	(+981,000)
Total, Rural Electrification Administration	243,153,000	54,561,000	145,706,000	134,510,000	137,733,000	-105,420,000
(By transfer)	(37,795,000)	(38,236,000)	(38,776,000)	(38,776,000)	(38,776,000)	(+981,000)
(Loan authorization)	(1,797,360,000)	(1,800,100,000)	(1,981,000,000)	(1,931,000,000)	(1,956,000,000)	(+158,640,000)
(Limitation on obligations)	(189,434,000)	(212,872,000)	(212,872,000)	(212,872,000)	(212,872,000)	(+23,438,000)
Total, title III, Rural Development Programs	2,956,536,000	4,787,822,000	3,064,486,000	3,254,315,000	3,137,996,000	+181,460,000
(By transfer)	(716,192,000)	(706,690,000)	(732,973,000)	(732,973,000)	(732,973,000)	(+16,781,000)
(Loan authorization)	(9,096,746,000)	(12,581,311,000)	(10,525,909,000)	(11,694,021,000)	(10,375,571,000)	(+1,278,825,000)
(Limitation on obligations)	(189,434,000)	(212,872,000)	(212,872,000)	(212,872,000)	(212,872,000)	(+23,438,000)
TITLE IV - DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS						
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Food and Consumer Services	542,000	547,000	554,000	547,000	551,000	+9,000
Food and Nutrition Service:						
Child nutrition programs	2,536,098,000	2,845,044,000	2,727,022,000	2,727,022,000	2,727,022,000	+190,924,000
Discretionary item	.....	3,700,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
Transfer from section 32	4,290,455,000	4,710,185,000	4,770,109,000	4,770,109,000	4,770,109,000	+479,654,000
Total, Child nutrition programs	6,826,553,000	7,558,929,000	7,497,131,000	7,497,131,000	7,497,131,000	+670,578,000
Special milk program	14,898,000	20,277,000	20,277,000	20,277,000	20,277,000	+5,379,000
Special supplemental food program for women, infants, and children (WIC)	2,860,000,000	3,287,220,000	3,210,000,000	3,213,500,000	3,210,000,000	+350,000,000
Commodity supplemental food program	94,500,000	93,330,000	104,500,000	104,500,000	104,500,000	+10,000,000
Food stamp program:						
Expenses	24,564,357,000	29,545,655,000	24,545,655,000	24,545,655,000	24,545,655,000	-18,702,000
Reserve	2,500,000,000	.....	2,500,000,000	2,500,000,000	2,500,000,000	.....
Nutrition assistance for Puerto Rico	1,040,175,000	1,091,000,000	1,078,528,000	1,078,528,000	1,078,528,000	+38,353,000
Cattle tick eradication	10,825,000	.....	12,472,000	12,472,000	12,472,000	+1,647,000
Total, Food stamp program	28,115,357,000	30,636,655,000	28,136,655,000	28,136,655,000	28,136,655,000	+21,298,000
Food donations programs for selected groups:						
Needy family program	81,601,000	68,641,000	68,641,000	68,641,000	68,641,000	-12,960,000
Elderly feeding program	142,912,000	141,142,000	150,000,000	150,000,000	150,000,000	+7,088,000
Subtotal	224,513,000	209,783,000	218,641,000	218,641,000	218,641,000	-5,872,000
Soup kitchens	32,000,000	31,604,000	40,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000	+8,000,000
Total, Food donations programs	256,513,000	241,387,000	258,641,000	258,641,000	258,641,000	+2,128,000
The emergency food assistance program	45,000,000	45,643,000	40,000,000	42,500,000	40,000,000	-5,000,000
Commodity purchases - TEFAP	120,000,000	161,714,000	80,000,000	107,500,000	80,000,000	-40,000,000
Total, The emergency food assistance program	165,000,000	207,357,000	120,000,000	150,000,000	120,000,000	-45,000,000
Food program administration	103,535,000	103,898,000	107,767,000	107,767,000	107,767,000	+4,232,000
Human Nutrition Information Service	-2,250,000	.....	.....	10,864,000	.....	+2,250,000
Reappropriation	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total, Food and Nutrition Service	38,434,106,000	42,149,053,000	39,454,971,000	39,499,335,000	39,454,971,000	+1,020,865,000
Total, title IV, Domestic Food Programs	38,434,648,000	42,149,600,000	39,455,525,000	39,499,882,000	39,455,522,000	+1,020,874,000
TITLE V - FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS						
Foreign Agricultural Service	110,023,000	99,838,000	117,812,000	110,284,000	118,027,000	+8,004,000
CCC computer facility	.....	7,905,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
Office of International Cooperation and Development	7,247,000	7,252,000	.....	.....	.....	-7,247,000
Scientific activities overseas (foreign currency program) (limitation on administrative expenses)	(1,062,000)	(1,062,000)	(1,062,000)	.....	(1,062,000)	.....
Total, Foreign Agricultural Service	117,270,000	114,995,000	117,812,000	110,284,000	118,027,000	+757,000
General Sales Manager:						
Salaries and expenses	.....	4,713,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
(Transfer from Commodity Credit Corporation)	(4,668,000)	.....	(4,866,000)	(4,866,000)	(4,866,000)	(+198,000)
(Transfer from export loans)	(2,731,000)	(2,792,000)	(2,792,000)	(2,792,000)	(2,792,000)	(+61,000)
(Transfer from P.L. 480)	(1,467,000)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(+33,000)
Total, General Sales Manager	(8,866,000)	(9,005,000)	(9,158,000)	(9,158,000)	(9,158,000)	(+292,000)

Agriculture, Rural Development, Food & Drug Administration, & Related Agencies (H.R. 2493), continued

	FY 1993 Enacted	FY 1994 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Public Law 480 Program Account:						
Title I - Credit sales:						
Program level	(555,276,000)	(496,373,000)	(496,373,000)	(540,445,000)	(496,373,000)	(-58,903,000)
Direct loans	(509,996,000)	(450,446,000)	(450,446,000)	(490,184,000)	(450,446,000)	(-59,550,000)
Ocean freight differential	45,280,000	45,927,000	45,927,000	50,261,000	45,927,000	+647,000
Title II - Commodities for disposition abroad:						
Program level	(810,000,000)	(821,570,000)	(821,570,000)	(821,570,000)	(821,570,000)	(+11,570,000)
Appropriation	810,000,000	821,570,000	821,570,000	821,570,000	821,570,000	+11,570,000
Title III - Commodity grants:						
Program level	(333,594,000)	(280,083,000)	(280,083,000)	(280,083,000)	(280,083,000)	(-53,511,000)
Appropriation	333,594,000	280,083,000	280,083,000	280,083,000	280,083,000	-53,511,000
Loan subsidies	342,003,000	346,889,000	346,889,000	377,490,000	346,889,000	+4,886,000
Debt restructuring	40,000,000	32,171,000	.....	.....	.....	-40,000,000
Salaries and expenses:						
General Sales Manager	1,467,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	+33,000
ASCS	1,036,000	1,025,000	1,036,000	1,036,000	1,036,000	.....
Subtotal	2,503,000	2,525,000	2,536,000	2,536,000	2,536,000	+33,000
Total, Public Law 480:						
Program level	(1,698,870,000)	(1,598,026,000)	(1,598,026,000)	(1,642,098,000)	(1,598,026,000)	(-100,844,000)
Appropriation	1,573,380,000	1,529,165,000	1,497,005,000	1,531,940,000	1,497,005,000	-76,375,000
CCC Export Loans Program Account:						
Loan guarantees:						
Short-term export credit	(5,000,000,000)	(5,000,000,000)	(5,000,000,000)	(5,000,000,000)	(5,000,000,000)	.....
Intermediate export credit	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	.....
Emerging democracies export credit	(200,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(200,000,000)	.....
Loan subsidy	388,170,000	403,238,000	403,238,000	403,238,000	403,238,000	+15,068,000
Salaries and expenses (Export Loans):						
General Sales Manager	2,731,000	2,792,000	2,792,000	2,792,000	2,792,000	+61,000
ASCS	589,000	601,000	589,000	589,000	589,000	.....
Total, CCC Export Loans Program Account	391,490,000	406,631,000	406,619,000	406,619,000	406,619,000	+15,129,000
Office of International Cooperation and Development	.....	.....	.....	7,697,000	.....	.....
Scientific activities overseas (foreign currency program) (limitation on administrative expenses)	.....	.....	.....	(1,062,000)	.....	.....
Total, title V, International Programs	2,082,140,000	2,055,504,000	2,021,436,000	2,056,540,000	2,021,651,000	-60,489,000
(By transfer)	(8,866,000)	(4,292,000)	(9,158,000)	(9,158,000)	(9,158,000)	(+292,000)
TITLE VI - RELATED AGENCIES AND FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION						
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES						
Food and Drug Administration						
Salaries and expenses	746,035,000	613,339,000	813,339,000	638,339,000	813,339,000	+67,304,000
(By transfer)	(3,000,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-3,000,000)
Prescription drug user fee act	(36,000,000)	(54,000,000)	(54,000,000)	(54,000,000)	(54,000,000)	(+18,000,000)
New user fees	.....	(200,000,000)	.....	(175,000,000)	.....	.....
Total, salaries and expenses	(785,035,000)	(867,339,000)	(867,339,000)	(867,339,000)	(867,339,000)	(+82,304,000)
Buildings and facilities	8,350,000	8,350,000	8,350,000	8,350,000	8,350,000	.....
Rental payments	25,612,000	48,575,000	48,575,000	48,575,000	48,575,000	+22,963,000
Total, Food and Drug Administration	779,997,000	670,264,000	870,264,000	695,264,000	870,264,000	+90,267,000
DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY						
Financial Management Service: Payments to the farm credit system financial assistance corporation	84,614,000	62,696,000	62,696,000	62,696,000	62,696,000	-21,918,000
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
Commodity Futures Trading Commission	47,300,000	47,485,000	47,485,000	47,485,000	47,485,000	+185,000
Farm Credit Administration (limitation on administrative expenses)	(39,908,000)	(41,683,000)	(40,426,000)	(40,426,000)	(40,426,000)	(+518,000)
Farm Credit System Assistance Board (limitation on administrative expenses)	(809,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-809,000)
Total, title VI, Related Agencies and Food and Drug Administration	911,911,000	780,445,000	980,445,000	805,445,000	980,445,000	+68,534,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(40,717,000)	(41,683,000)	(40,426,000)	(40,426,000)	(40,426,000)	(-291,000)

Agriculture, Rural Development, Food & Drug Administration, & Related Agencies (H.R. 2493), continued

	FY 1993 Enacted	FY 1994 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Grand total:						
New budget (obligational) authority	62,101,504,000	77,481,667,000	70,855,735,000	71,920,407,000	71,903,910,000	+9,802,406,000
Appropriations	(62,101,504,000)	(77,479,445,000)	(70,855,735,000)	(71,920,407,000)	(71,903,910,000)	(+9,802,406,000)
Reappropriation	.....	(2,222,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....
(By transfer)	(729,683,000)	(710,982,000)	(743,756,000)	(743,756,000)	(743,756,000)	(+14,073,000)
(Loan authorization)	(14,796,746,000)	(18,281,311,000)	(16,225,909,000)	(17,394,021,000)	(16,075,571,000)	(+1,278,825,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(143,516,000)	(145,482,000)	(144,225,000)	(144,225,000)	(144,225,000)	(+709,000)
(Limitation on obligations)	(189,434,000)	(212,872,000)	(212,872,000)	(212,872,000)	(212,872,000)	(+23,438,000)
Title I - Agricultural programs	14,916,189,000	25,224,029,000	22,396,685,000	23,331,616,000	23,352,499,000	+8,436,310,000
Title II - Conservation programs	2,800,080,000	2,484,267,000	2,937,158,000	2,972,609,000	2,955,797,000	+155,717,000
Title III - Farmers Home and Rural development programs	2,956,536,000	4,787,822,000	3,064,486,000	3,254,315,000	3,137,996,000	+181,460,000
Title IV - Domestic food programs	38,434,648,000	42,149,600,000	39,455,525,000	39,499,882,000	39,455,522,000	+1,020,874,000
Title V - Foreign assistance and related programs	2,082,140,000	2,055,504,000	2,021,436,000	2,056,540,000	2,021,651,000	-60,489,000
Title VI - Related agencies and Food and Drug Administration	911,911,000	780,445,000	980,445,000	805,445,000	980,445,000	+68,534,000
Total, new budget (obligational) authority	62,101,504,000	77,481,667,000	70,855,735,000	71,920,407,000	71,903,910,000	+9,802,406,000

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to proceed out of order for 1 minute.)

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent to speak out of order in order to ascertain the schedule for the rest of the day and for the upcoming week from the majority leader.

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

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

We will not have further votes today. There will not be votes on tomorrow.

On Monday, October 4, the House will meet at 12 noon, but there will not be legislative business.

On Tuesday, October 5, the House will meet at noon to take up two bills on suspension. Recorded votes will be postponed until the end of legislative business. H.R. 618, the Government Securities Reform Act of 1993, and H.R. 2659, Organ and Bone Morrow Transplantation Amendments of 1993. Votes can be expected to occur on that day between 4 and 7 p.m.

On Wednesday, October 6, and Thursday, October 7, the House will meet at 10, take up H.R. 2351, Arts, Humanities, and Museums Amendments of 1993, modified open rule, 1 hour of debate; H.R. 1845, National Biological Survey Act of 1993, open rule, 1 hour of debate; H.R. 2151, Maritime Security and Competitiveness Act of 1993, subject to a rule; and H.R. 1804, Goals 2000: Educate America Act, subject to a rule.

And we might also expect that the unemployment compensation extension might be brought up.

Friday, October 8, the House will meet at 10, but there will not be legislative business.

Conference reports on appropriations bills are expected, as they become available. Conference reports, obviously, may be brought up at any time. Any further program will be announced later.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader.

If I understand correctly, there will not be votes before 4 o'clock on Tuesday; is that correct?

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, that is correct.

Mr. WALKER. And that the unemployment bill, I think a couple of Members have some questions on that, but just for my understanding, the unemployment bill would not be brought up until the Wednesday-Thursday timeframe; is that right? It would not occur on Tuesday?

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, that is correct.

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

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

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

As the majority leader knows, the extension of benefits expires on Saturday, October 2. I know that the original unemployment extension was scheduled for this afternoon.

My question to the majority leader is, What is the reason for the delay? And why are we waiting until Wednesday to deal on something which is obviously a pressing problem today?

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, as the gentleman knows, there is a requirement that this matter be paid for under our budget rule. There have been a number of ideas brought up in the committee, as I understand it, to pay for it.

□ 1530

Many of them were unattractive and unpopular. There was a continuing amount of concern about the way the committee finally resolved the matter. There was an attempt by Members here, and maybe even Members on the other side, to find a more amenable way to do this.

Mr. SANTORUM. I thank the gentleman.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE MAJORITY LEADER REGARDING OCTOBER SCHEDULE

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to announce to the Members that available in the Cloakroom on both sides and sent generally to the membership is the October 1993 schedule, which I would like to make Members aware of.

In that month what we are anticipating is votes on Friday, October 1; no votes on Monday, October 4; no votes on Friday, October 8; and no votes on October 11, which is Columbus Day; but votes every other day in the month, including Mondays and Fridays.

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

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

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman said there would be votes on October 1.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I meant to say no votes, I am sorry.

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

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman, it is my understanding, then, that there would be votes on Monday, the 18th; Friday, the 22d; Monday, the 25th; and Friday, the 29th. Is that correct? We anticipate 5-day weeks for voting the last 2 weeks of October?

Mr. GEPHARDT. That is correct.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman will continue to yield further, has the majority leadership made any decisions at this point with regard to November, as to whether or not we may be proceeding toward the adjournment of the House by Thanksgiving?

Mr. GEPHARDT. We are consulting today and will be the early part of next week with the gentleman's leadership and leadership on both sides in the Senate, and with the administration officials that are involved, to try to come as early next week as we can with more definitive information for Members about the schedule for the rest of the year.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman will yield further, these 5-day weeks that are anticipated here are in some sense, maybe, aiming toward an early, rather than a later, adjournment?

Mr. GEPHARDT. It should lead one to cautious optimism about trying to complete our business at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. WALKER. There was talk, if the gentleman will yield further, about having at least 1 of these weeks in October be a reform week that would include lobbying reform and campaign reform, and some of us had hoped congressional reform.

Is that scheduled for 1 of those 2 weeks that we have 5-day sessions?

Mr. GEPHARDT. There is an intent, as the gentleman says, to have a reform period where we consider a variety of reform measures. We do not know definitively whether or not it will be in 1 of those 2 weeks in October. We are aiming to get that period as quickly as possible.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1993

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADD RUSSIA TO LIST OF BENEFICIARY DEVELOPING COUNTRIES UNDER THE GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 103–142)

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 Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

To the Congress of the United States:

I am writing to inform you of my intent to add Russia to the list of beneficiary developing countries under the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP). The GSP program offers duty-free access to the U.S. market and is authorized by the Trade Act of 1974.

I have carefully considered the criteria identified in sections 501 and 502 of the Trade Act of 1974. In light of these criteria, and particularly Russia's level of development and initiation of economic reforms, I have determined that it is appropriate to extend GSP benefits to Russia.

This notice is submitted in accordance with section 502(a)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974.

W.J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 30, 1993.*

NOTICE OF CONTINUATION OF HAITIAN EMERGENCY BEYOND OCTOBER 4, 1993—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 103–143)

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 Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the Federal Register and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice, stating that the Haitian emergency is to continue in effect beyond October 4, 1993, to the Federal Register for publication.

The crisis between the United States and Haiti that led to the declaration on October 4, 1991, of a national emergency has not been resolved. While substantial progress has been made toward restoring democracy pursuant to United Nations Security Council Resolution 861, all necessary conditions to that restoration have not yet been met. Multilateral sanctions have been suspended but not terminated. Political conditions in Haiti continue, therefore, to be of considerable concern to the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to retain the authority to apply economic sanctions to ensure the restoration and security of the democratically elected Government of Haiti.

W.J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 30, 1993.*

NAFTA, HELPING A NEW GENERATION OF AMERICANS MEET ITS INTERNATIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in favor of the NAFTA treaty. In doing so, I speak for hope and against fear, I speak for change and against the status quo, and I speak in favor of stepping toward the future and against clinging to the past.

It is on our shoulders, the new generation of leadership, to pass this treaty. Our predecessors' focus of their entire generation was the cold war. That generation told their people what risks they faced in hiding from the challenges of that time, and then made the tough choices that were necessary to prevail, and so should we.

Now, as has been said before, the torch has been passed to a new generation, a generation whose international responsibility is not to secure borders but to open markets to our products. The wealth, the health, and the vitality of our people depends on us.

Every generation is tested in its own unique way. The cold war generation did not fail in their test, and under the leadership of President Clinton, neither shall we in ours. Our predecessors established NATO. We should establish NAFTA.

ADDING UP CLINTON'S CUTS

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I urge every Member of the body to read Ann Devroy's column today about how the White House is finagling the numbers with regard to the White House staff. They have cut the Office of Drug Policy czar from the $76 million in its forfeiture fund down to $28 million, when drugs are ravaging the streets. There are people in this body who know people who have been involved in the drug problem, and yet the drug problem is spreading throughout this country. Mr. Bennett and others try to do something about it. They have literally cut it back.

I, for one, am not critical of the White House for hiring more people. If they need more people, I am prepared to vote to give them more people to do the necessary job.

□ 1010

But for them to pretend that they cut the staff by 25 percent and cut the budget by 25 percent is unethical and it is basically a lie.

We literally, and the American people should know, and this body should know, we have no drug policy in this Clinton administration. They have not told the truth about how they are reducing the numbers.

It is time to be honest in dealing with the Congress and, more importantly, honest in dealing with the American people.

It is a disgrace. I urge my colleagues to read this story.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 30, 1993]

ADDING UP CLINTON'S CUTS

(By Ann Devroy)

The White House plans to announce today that it has met President Clinton's campaign promise to reduce its staff by 25 percent, but behind that number is an entirely different story: What taxpayers will get is not less spending on White House staff but less spending on White House anti-drug efforts.

Clinton, both in his campaign and in the early weeks of his presidency, promised to cut the White House staff by 25 percent. The pledge became a symbol of his overall goal to reduce and reorganize government. If everyone else in America and the government tightened their belts, he said, so too would he.

What the cuts have become, instead, is a struggle to make the numbers come out right, a study in creative definitions of what constitutes the White House staff, and a flurry of pink slips sent to career workers—not the political aides many people think make up the White House staff.

Item: Figures provided by the White House to congressional committees that oversee the White House budget show increases in spending on the White House office staff, the vice president's staff, the Office of Administration, the domestic policy office and the National Security Council. Two other arms of the White House, the Office of Management and Budget and the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative, show slight increases as well.

Where the major saving occurs is in the Office of National Drug Control Policy, where $76 million in its "forfeiture fund" has been reduced to $28 million, and staff—all career workers in the anti-drug field—has been reduced from 112 to 25 for a total saving of nearly $60 million. The forfeiture fund represents money the drug office sends to other government agencies with direct drug control duties, such as the Customs Service or the Drug Enforcement Administration.

It was unclear yesterday whether the forfeiture funds that were cut were just shifted to some other anti-drug agency. And Congress is in the midst of forcing the White House to reconsider staffing levels at the drug control policy office.

Asked if Clinton's White House staff cut did not result primarily in a cut in spending on drug control, Roy Neel, deputy chief of staff in charge of implementing the cut, said, "I won't dispute that."

Item: The next largest spending reduction, eliminating the Council on Environmental Quality, accounts for a saving of about $2.5 million. Congress has refused the White House request to kill the council and has added funds to keep it running, so it is likely that some of that saving will not be realized.

Item: The third highest saving comes from eliminating the National Space Council, for about $1.6 million. Although the move does not produce much in saved funds, the White House says, it meets Clinton's pledge to cut staff size.

The White House had pledged to cut 350 people, going from 1,394 "White House staff" to 1,044 by Oct. 1, the opening of the new fiscal year.

Killing the space council eliminates 44 of those jobs, according to White House figures supplied to Congress. But 39 of those 44 people do not actually work at the White House or even in the government. They serve on an advisory council that meets a few times a year; that is the "job" the Clinton team is eliminating in this category.

Asked about such methodology—including in its staff body count someone who attends a meeting in Washington on space policy a few times a year—Neel said: "It is a body. We counted it in our baseline and we counted it as a cut. Let's not get into a baseline argument again."

Item: White House figures show the elimination of 47 jobs in the Office of Administration, all of them career workers such as accountants, secretaries and budget analysts. But the office still costs more this year than last.

Asked about reports that part-timers were hired to do the work or that some of it was contracted out—which would not reduce costs, but might help reduce the full-time body count—officials acknowledged some that part-time workers had been hired.

That office, however, has come under repeated criticism for sloppy administrative work, including a recent General Accounting Office report citing backdating of paychecks, retroactive raises and other accounting missteps. It also has been criticized for mishandling procurement for computers and telephone service—all as the White House zeroed in on its experienced workers for major layoffs.

Item: The White House made the correspondence unit the first target of cuts, laying off longtime workers early in the Clinton tenure at the same time the president was getting huge masses of mail—thousands more letters than President George Bush had received. White House officials said that the office, like others, had to be reduced to save staff, and that volunteers would take over.

But in a letter to Rep. Ernest J. Istook Jr. (R-Okla.), who had posed questions to the White House about staff reduction, Patsy Thomasson, director of the administration office, says the office has entered "into a contract for processing the backlog of mail." Such contracting-out is reflected in the overall White House budget, but not in the White House staff numbers because contractors do not count as staff.

Item. The baseline. Clinton's pledge was translated after the election into a reduction of what the White House defined as the White House staff The new administration excluded in its official count the Office of Management and Budget and the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative, both organized by law within the Executive Office of the President, and counted by previous administrations. This made the job reduction task easier because it resulted in lowering by 176 the net number of positions that had to be eliminated.

The Clinton team also used peak Election Day staffing figures for the Bush baseline, not staff figures on October 1 of Bush's term. Using peak figures as a reference point makes the goal easier.

Some Clinton aides acknowledge, on the deepest of background, that the staff cut has become what one called "the quintessential Washington game." An unrealistic pledge, made by a candidate without knowledge of the White House operation, must now be kept because of its symbolism and because otherwise Republicans in Congress would make an issue out of it.

One senior aide, asked by a reporter if the president regrets having made the pledge and having his staff struggle to produce some reasonable approximation of the goal, said, "Off the record?"

When the reporter said "No," the official replied: "No. The president promised a leaner, smaller staff and that is what he has produced."

These are funding levels for 1993 and Clinton administration requests for fiscal 1994 for offices in the Executive Office of the President.

WHITE HOUSE COSTS

[Figures in millions, ranked by change from fiscal year 1993]

	1993 appropriation	1994 request	Change (rounded)
White House Office	$35.39	$38.91	$3.53
Office of Policy Development	3.77	5.12	1.35
Office of the U.S. Trade Representative	19.99	20.62	0.62
National Security Council	6.12	6.65	0.53
Office of Management and Budget	52.98	53.48	0.50
Office of Administration	24.44	24.85	0.41
Executive Residence at the White House	7.60	7.93	0.33
Special Assistance to the President	3.15	3.27	0.12
Residence of the Vice President	0.32	0.32	.....
Unanticipated needs	1.00	1.00	.....
President's compensation	0.25	0.25	.....
Office of Federal Procurement Policy	3.06	3.06	.....
Council of Economic Advisers	3.43	3.42	−0.01
National Critical Materials Council	0.24	0.00	−0.24
Office of Science and Technology Policy	6.23	5.17	−1.06
National Space Council	1.59	0.00	−1.59
Council on Environmental Quality	2.56	0.00	−2.56
Office of National Drug Control Policy	93.35	33.80	−59.55
Salaries and expenses	17.35	5.80	−11.55
Forfeiture fund	76.00	28.00	−48.00

Source: White House figures provided to the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service and general government.

□ 1540

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

A SAD DAY FOR ATF

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

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, today, the Department of the Treasury released its report on the actions taken by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms outside Waco at the Branch Davidian complex. There have been many conflicting statements about what occurred before and during ATF's raid on February 28, and I am hopeful that this investigative report will provide some answers.

On April 22, 1993, the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Oversight, which I chair, held a hearing on ATF's budget request and questioned Director Higgins about the entire Waco operation. At that time, it was clear from available documents that the operation was not well planned or safely executed. Further, ATF agents were reporting to me privately that public statements by ATF officials were not providing a complete or accurate picture of what had occurred.

In followup to the hearing and the agents' reports, I contacted Treasury Secretary Bentsen to determine: First, if ATF could have executed the arrest warrant for Mr. Koresh outside the compound; second, what were the facts surrounding when and how Mr. Koresh became aware of ATF's raid; third, why ATF proceeded when the element of surprise was lost; fourth, whether ATF attempted to alter or destroy records; and fifth, if ATF followed all procedures and policies throughout the Branch Davidian investigation and operation.

The report released today clearly shows that this raid was poorly handled, particularly since the element of surprise was gone. Some of the gung ho men within ATF decided to go ahead—and lives were lost unnecessarily. The capable ATF Agency must shoulder its responsibilities.

Most regrettable of all, however, is the fact that top ATF officials have not been forthcoming in their response. The ATF now suffers from the lack of cooperation. It is a sad day for ATF.

WORDS OF A PATRIOT, JOHN LANGELOTH LOEB, JR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share with my colleagues the words of a true American patriot. Last February, the Honorable John Loeb, Jr., was honored by the Sons of the American Revolution with their Distinguished Patriot Award.

Mr. Loeb is indeed a distinguished patriot. Furthermore, he is a remarkable man who left an indelible mark on many aspects of our society. A successful businessman, he has always found time to serve our Nation and he is a man of vision. In a variety of capacities, Mr. Loeb made contributions to our foreign policy, to the protection of our environment, to enhancing educational opportunity, to access to health care, and to the strength of our artistic heritage.

When he received the Distinguished Patriot Award, Mr. Loeb took the opportunity to reflect on the true meaning of patriotism and the unique qualities that make ours such a special Nation. His words were a source of inspiration for those who were present when he was honored, and I encourage all of my colleagues to read them and to contemplate their meaning.

I submit the text of Mr. Loeb's remarks to be printed in the RECORD in their entirety.

THE ANATOMY OF PATRIOTISM

(By Hon. John L. Loeb, Jr.)

I am very happy that funds for this dinner will go to scholarships for young women as well as that very unique American history museum, the Fraunces Tavern Museum at Broad and Pearl Streets. I have a particular affection for that museum because, in one of the galleries, hangs a picture of my grandmother, Adeline Moses Loeb, my Grandma Moses. She was a member of the DAR, a Daughter of the American Revolution, and traced her roots to Colonial times. Her stories of her ancestors inspired my love of American history. She married my grandfather—at that time a recent arrival to these shores—who became successful in business. During our childhood, they frequently bickered over the question of which was more important, money or family.

Of course, we knew.

From 1776 until modern times, a member of my family has served in the United States Armed Forces in every war. They held public office, pioneered in business and nurtured talent in many fields. They demonstrated and transmitted from generation to generation a spirit which I consider part of my heritage.

In their love of this land, my family shared an emotion which has been widely felt with particular intensity in this country since the time of the founding fathers—patriotism. American patriotism must be an almost instinctive response to a land so blessed. Who could not be attached to and awed by a country so vast in its continental sweep, so endowed with natural wondrous beauty? Who could not be devoted to and protective of a nation whose government was entrusted to its citizens and where life, liberty and even the pursuit of happiness was their birthright?

Patriotism does not require daring physical deeds and sacrifice in the defense of the nation or services performed in the glare of public attention. You don't have to be another Nathan Hale or Daniel Webster to be a patriot. In the truest sense, patriotism, to me, is expressed in the daily lives of ordinary men and women whose conduct as citizens is governed by their belief in and practice of the ideals and traditions that are the glory of American democracy: men and women who believe in freedom not only for themselves but for their neighbors, who seek opportunity without denying it to others, who understand that democracy requires tolerance.

Unhappily, patriotism has sometimes been invoked to camouflage bigotry: by the Know-Nothings of the 1840's by the Ku Klux Klan, by the apostles of McCarthyism after World War II and by the extreme Religious Right today. Almost every minority in America has at some period been subjected to intolerance. Yet compared to the rest of the world (consider the seemingly "tribal" ethnic conflicts tearing apart the Middle East, Yugoslavia, the former Soviet Union, Africa, Northern Ireland, to name a few) America's experiment in diversity and tolerance has succeeded beyond anybody's wildest dreams.

The anatomy of patriotism is complex. Patriotism might be difficult to sustain in a people as diverse as we are. We are after all a nation of immigrants and we have all been immigrants. Each of us has pride in our special heritage as well as great love of America. Even in the 18th century of founding fathers knew that a spirit of tolerance and freedom was crucial—no, indispensable—to preserve the unity and purpose of the new nation. That is why, for example, they took the revolutionary and historic step of separating church from state.

President George Washington, whose birthday we celebrate tonight, often gave voice to these same sentiments of tolerance and liberty. I would like to read to you part of a letter that he wrote to the Jewish congregation of Newport, Rhode Island, on August 17, 1790:

"The citizens of the United States of America have a right to applaud themselves for having given to mankind examples of an enlarged and liberal policy, a policy worthy of imitation. All possess alike liberty of conscience and immunities of citizenship . . . Happily the government of the United States which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance, requires only that they who live under its protection should comport themselves as good citizens."

So let us, in the words of George Washington, always "comport ourselves as good citizens." By so doing we sustain the spirit of patriotism that you, the Sons of the Revolution and the Daughters of the Cincinnati, have done so much to encourage and enhance and which is such a source of American strength.

A SALUTE FOR CAUSE

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute, as earlier this month, we conducted our traditional observance of Labor Day, our annual recognition of the working men and women of America. Now that the Congress has reconvened, I did not want any more time to pass without extending a particular salute to an organization headquartered in Prince Georges County, part of my Fifth Congressional District of Maryland.

The organization is CAUSE [The Mechanical Contractors and Unions Seal of Excellence], whose offices are located in Lanham, MD. CAUSE is the Washington area's cooperative organization of union mechanical contractors, the two labor unions who represent the contractors' employees—Steamfitters Local Union 602 and Plumbers Local Union 5—and the contractors' regional association, the Mechanical Contractors D.C. Association.

CAUSE has helped to solidify and advance an already enviable record in labor-management relations in the Washington area's mechanical contracting industry. Relations in this metropolitan region have been outstanding for the past century. It is a record of labor-management harmony unmatched anywhere else in the United States.

CAUSE's objective is to continue this cooperation and even strengthen it. When this happens, everyone wins—the consumers of Metropolitan Washington, the contractors who are employers and their employees—the skilled craftsmen who make up the membership of the steamfitter and plumber unions.

Mr. Speaker, union and management work through CAUSE as partners to promote even better labor relations, which in turn produces a better job, delivered on time and within budget, always with a strong commitment to excellence and productivity.

Representatives of management and the two labor unions signed a memorandum of understanding in 1984 pledging to:

First, eliminate strikes, lockouts, or any other kind of work stoppages.

Second, work together to produce the best quality installation for the money.

Third, avoid overtime except when necessary for productivity.

Fourth, prohibit all unnecessary and inefficient work practices.

Fifth, avoid work disputes through preassignment conferences, with any difference being resolved before the project starts.

From this labor-management, cooperation have come specific results. For example, the number of manhours worked by craftsmen in the mechanical contracting industry in the Washington area show an increase in the period from 1984, the year CAUSE was established, through 1992 despite the national recession.

Mr. Speaker, all of us have just returned from special Labor Day ceremonies in our States and congressional districts. I am both pleased and proud to add this Labor Day recognition to CAUSE in my own district and to the men and women of the mechanical contracting industry, Steamfitters Local Union No. 602 and Plumber Local Union 5 who have made CAUSE the success story that it is.

All of us who live and work in Metropolitan Washington are better off because of this success. For this reason, I know you will join me in this special salute.

INTENSE REGRET AT HOUSE'S FAILURE TO PASS UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION EXTENSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my intense regret that the House has decided in the last few minutes not to deal with extending unemployment compensation benefits. To the many people in America who have been unemployed for months, and months, and months, and in some States like Connecticut are without much hope of employment in the near future, extending these benefits was very, very important to them. And while I appreciate that we will come back next week and retroactively extend these benefits, I can tell my colleagues all they have to do is call their own State Department of Labor and confirm that failing to extend them in a timely fashion will cost our State Departments of Labor thousands and thousands of dollars, maybe hundreds of thousands of dollars. And the complexity of the retroactivity is a far, far bigger problem than we here on the floor ever design to acknowledge.

I had a Department of Labor official stop me 10 days ago and say, "Look, whatever you do, please do it in a timely fashion. If you are not going to extend, tell us. If you are going to extend them, do it on time."

It is really a crime that we are not dealing with this bill, and we are going to waste the taxpayers' dollars with the administrative complexities and problems that we are going to create, because some people want to save the welfare benefits of noncitizens or aliens. This is simply wrong. And I stand here tonight regretting that the House has been unable to go ahead and pass an extended benefit bill that I personally support, and that Republicans have been strongly behind moving forward.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentlewoman for her comments, and I think it is very, very interesting, and the people of this country should understand, that the Democrat leadership has refused to let us vote on this bill today because they want to continue to pay welfare benefits out of the Treasury to aliens. And the American people do not support that.

This bill had at least one portion of it which was a constructive reform that would restrict the payment of welfare benefits to aliens. So I want to commend the gentlewoman from Connecticut for pointing out to this body, and also pointing this out to the country.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. I think it is important for people to understand that there were two sources of funding in this. One source of funding was supposed to come from the reduced number of people who would need benefits because we were going to do a better job of placement assistance. Now we could have done that a long time ago, and maybe that will yield the resources that we are anticipating. But one has to say that that is at the very least an optimistic estimate, and those funds may or may not materialize. And if they do not, we simply run up the deficit.

The only solid part of the funding for this bill was the section that required American citizens who bring over alien relatives and take responsibility for them for 3 years, to extend that to 5 years to take economic responsibility for someone you bring over for 5 years. Because what is happening is that many older people are coming over, and after 3 years they are ending up on SSI. That is the disability payment system.

So the 5-year extension is not a real hardship. The great majority are independent after 3 years. But I think it is a responsibility that I think we should be legitimately asking of people who bring noncitizen relatives to America.

So it is a legitimate funding source. It was the only scorable funding source, and it is really unfortunate that we are going to delay its passage.

Mr. ARCHER. If the gentlewoman will yield further, I agree completely, and the American people agree. The American people desperately want reform of welfare payments to aliens. I hear that over and over again in my town meetings. And here the first step to reforming that is being held back by the Democrat leadership because some of their Members want these welfare payments to continue.

This body should understand precisely why we did not get to vote on that bill today, and I think that is unfortunate And I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. I thank my colleague. All those unemployed are going to feel the consequences of the decision tonight, and every State government is going to waste thousands of dollars trying to make up for the difficulties and the problems that we have created through this delay.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE JACKSON E. BETTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OXLEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, during the August recess a former Member of this House of Representatives passed away. Jackson E. Betts of my hometown of Findlay, OH, died at the age of 89, and I wanted to take a few minutes to recognize Jack's great public service to his constituents and to the State of Ohio, and indeed to the Nation.

He was a former prosecuting attorney in our home county of Hancock. He was a member of the State legislature, the Ohio House of Representatives, and actually served as the speaker of the house there for one term before he was elected to the Congress.

He came to the Congress and served 22 distinguished years here. He was a member of the Ways and Means Committee, and when Jack decided to retire in 1972, had he come back for the next Congress in 1973 he would have been the ranking Republican on the Committee on Ways and Means.

I have a personal interest in bringing this to the Members' attention, because Jack was not only a longtime family friend, but he was a mentor to me. I had the distinct opportunity to work for Jack one summer here in 1965 when I was a junior at Miami University and Jack allowed me to work for him as an intern for about 8 weeks in the summer of 1965. And I suspect that that was one of the major reasons why when the time came I chose to run for the U.S. House and to follow in his footsteps.

Jack Betts in many, many ways represented what is best about public service in our country, a very unassuming, a very modest individual, but well liked by everyone.

I think it gives a good idea, Mr. Speaker, about how well regarded Jack was that when the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct was

first constituted, the so-called ethics committee, Jack Betts was an appointee from the Republican side. And that I think gives an indication of what kind of an individual he was and how well respected Jack was.

There are very few Members left today in the House who served with Jack, just a handful. But those who did, and many of them have statements I am going to be making a part of the RECORD, had a very sincere interest in making certain that Jack was remembered.

□ 1550

I have so many fond remembrances of Jack and his surviving spouse, Martha.

That summer when I worked here, they decided on their anniversary that they would take me and a fellow intern who was working for Bill McCulloch out to the ballgame. We went out to the ball park to watch the then-Washington Senators play. That was their idea of celebrating their anniversary. I will never forget the opportunity we had to be with them then.

After Jack's distinguished career here, in which he served with former Presidents Ford and Bush, he was actually on the Committee on Ways and Means with President Bush, he came back to Findlay, OH, became a part-time acting municipal judge. I had the distinct pleasure of practicing law before Jack on at least two occasions there in Findlay, and he became very active again in the Rotary Club and in his church and really became, I guess, the quintessential legislator who serves with great distinction here in Washington and then returns to his home roots.

I know he enjoyed his retirement very much. During that time I had more than one occasion to ask for his sage advice, both political and official. Every time, Jack was so kind and open with his ability to dissect an issue and talk about an issue and how important it was to his district and to my district.

Our districts in many ways were the same; we represented the same counties, particularly Hancock County, Richland County, Hardin County, Marion County, and we were very much aware of what went on back there politically. The conservative nature of the district, I think, is a constant source of strength to me, and I know it was to Jack.

So we will all miss him very much.

I again thank the Chair for his indulgence and want to particularly recognize the great service that Jack Betts gave in so many years of public life. We are always proud of saying we are from Findlay, OH; I know that Jack's family and Jack himself will very much respect the honor that we gave him this afternoon.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this time to pay tribute to the late Jackson E. Betts who died at his home in Findlay, OH, on August 13, 1993.

Jackson Betts graduated from Findlay High School in 1922, earned his B.A. from Kenyon College in 1926 and his law degree from Yale Law School in 1929. In addition, he was awarded honorary law degrees from Kenyon College, Heidelberg College, Ohio Northern University, and the University of Findlay.

Jackson Betts' distinguished career, which spanned five decades, began in 1931 when he served as special counsel for the State attorney general and ended with his retirement from this body in 1972. After serving as Hancock County prosecutor from 1933 through 1936, Jack Betts was elected to the Ohio House of Representatives where he was chairman of the Ohio House Judiciary Committee from 1993 through 1944 and speaker of the Ohio House in 1945 and 1946. He is recalled by many who knew him during those years as an able parliamentarian and wonderful speaker. He always had time for everyone and was a mentor for many younger members.

After serving so ably in the Ohio legislature, Jack Betts was elected to represent the former Eighth Congressional District of Ohio which includes Hancock, Hardin, Wyandot, Marion, Crawford, and Richland Counties. From 1951 to 1972 he amassed a list of accomplishments of which anyone could be proud. He was the House Republican whip for both the Ohio Delegation and the midwest region. He was first appointed to the Banking and Currency Committee, and in 1959 was named to the Ways and Means Committee. At his retirement, he was the second ranking Republican on Ways and Means. In addition, he was an original member of the House Ethics Committee, becoming the ranking Republican. Jack Betts was appointed to this committee because of his uncompromised personal ethics and untarnished reputation.

During his tenure in Congress, Jack Betts was a prime sponsor of revenue sharing legislation. His philosophy was that it would bring tax dollars back to his district, of which he was so proud. He objected to heavy handed Census Bureau requirements that forced people to answer personal questions. These objections prompted a cartoon, which hung on his wall, showing a Census Bureau worker calling through a shower curtain "Is anyone in there with you?" Jack Betts argued that the Constitution stated that the census was for the purpose of redistricting only. While his legislation was never enacted, answering census questions was made voluntary.

Another accomplishment of Jack Betts was the expansion of rural mail delivery. His efforts resulted in increased frequency, making mail delivery more convenient.

After his retirement from this body in 1972, Jack Betts was able to spend more time at home with his family. He loved gardening, woodworking, walking, and swimming. Jack remained active in the community, teaching at the University of Findlay and serving as a substitute municipal judge. He was a member of the Trinity Episcopal Church in Findlay, the Valley of Toledo Scottish Rite, Honorary 33d Degree, the Mason, the Valley of Toledo Zenobia, the Knights of Pythias, the Odd Fellows Lodge, the Findlay Rotary, the Sons of the American Revolution, and the American, Ohio, and Findlay Bar Associations.

During his retirement years, jack also found time to author a book entitled "A View From the Back Bench," which was published in 1986.

Mr. Speaker, Jack Betts is remembered by so many for his ability, integrity, compassion, and humility. Former U.S. Representative Clarence Brown said, "Having the honor to serve in Congress with Jack, I can attest to both his personal integrity and humility. He was held in genuine personal respect and affection by all who had the opportunity to get to know him. Jack understood the highly intricate material of the tax issues with which he dealt in the House Ways and Means Committee and was always willing to patiently share that knowledge with those less familiar with that speciality. He was not given to double talk or duplicity of any kind. But he was never offensive about forcing his views on others. The art of legislative success is the ability to disagree without being disagreeable—that was Jack Betts. And Jack always retained a sense of humor about himself and public service—vital to the personality balance of any politician. While he eschewed the title Honorable, he took public service seriously as both an honor and an honorable profession. All of us who knew him are better for the experience." Jack Betts daughter, Nancy Betts Bowman, recalled how her father loved to give Capitol tours to visiting constituents. She said "He never got over the awe and respect of just being in the Capitol."

Former Representative Charlie Vanik recalled that "Betts was a powerful force for unity among the Ohio delegation. He excelled in the art of gentle persuasion. He was always kind, helpful, and deferential. Jack held a high respect for the views held by others, yet he never strayed from his conservative Republican roots."

Mr. Speaker, many others, including former Presidents Gerald Ford and George Bush, have paid tribute to Jackson Betts and I would like to include their statements with mine.

Jack Betts' career and the manner in which he conducted it stand as an example for all in public life. His family—his wife Martha, daughter Nancy, his three grandchildren, two brothers, Richard A. Betts and Dr. Thomas F. Betts—should be proud of this remarkable American. And I am proud that I can call him my mentor and my friend.

STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT GEORGE BUSH

I had the privilege of serving with Jack Betts in the Congress and working closely with him on the Ways and Means Committee. He was a public servant in the finest sense and, more important, a true friend. Jack was also a mentor, who taught me a lot about service to country, loyalty, and just plain decency. He was a very good man, and he is dearly missed by all whose lives he touched.

STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT GERALD FORD

Congressman Jackson Betts was a longtime, very good friend who had a superb record in the U.S. House of Representatives. I had great admiration for his excellent political/legislative record.

[From the Courier, Findley OH, Aug. 16, 1993]

JACKSON BETTS

One of Hancock County's most distinguished sons has left us.

Jackson E. Betts was a statesman, pure and simple.

He represented a quality of character and spirit of public service that was rare, even in his day. He faithfully served his country, his state, and his nation in elected public office. He never lost an election.

He was respected and admired by his constituents, his neighbors, his friends, and his colleagues. He walked gracefully with U.S. presidents, cabinet members, congressional leaders, ambassadors, and yet he kept his common touch. He truly loved Hancock County and the people of his district. He respected them and viewed public service in their behalf a public trust. His modesty was a large part of his charm.

The man's character was eloquently recognized when the U.S. House of Representatives created its ethics committee. He was so admired and trusted that he was named by his Republican Party colleagues as their unanimous choice as the senior ranking member of their party to serve. He was Mr. Integrity.

Jackson Betts first served in elected office as Hancock County prosecutor. He then was elected to serve as this county's representative in the General Assembly. He was elected by his fellow legislators as speaker of the Ohio House of Representatives. From there he went on to serve 11 terms in the U.S. House of Representatives, becoming the second-ranking Republican member of the powerful House Ways and Means Committee.

His full record has been chronicled elsewhere; the quality of his service is what deserves special tribute.

Jackson E. Betts left a record of uncompromising dedication to public life. It was his life. He loved his family, he loved the law, he loved people, he loved his country. He found fulfilling expression of these feelings in honorably serving the public offices to which he was elected.

His friendly, unassuming manner was his hallmark.

He walked tall among us. He was the epitome of an honest, sincere public servant. All who knew Jackson Betts join in mourning his losses. But we rejoice in our remembrances of his days among us. We join in honoring a life that was rich, rich, rich.

Farewell to an American Patriot!

JACK BETTS: 1904–1993—FORMER U.S. REPRESENTATIVE, STATE LEGISLATOR DEAD AT 89

Jackson E. Betts, Hancock County's congressman for 21 years and a former speaker of the Ohio House, died at 10:03 a.m. Friday at the emergency department at Blanchard Valley Hospital. He was 89.

The Findlay native's local, state and federal political career spanned five decades, from 1931 through 1972. He also was a longtime attorney.

A Republican, he was U.S. representative for Ohio's former 8th Congressional District for 11 terms—from 1951 through 1972, when he retired from the job.

Earlier, he was a member of the Ohio House of Representatives from 1937 through 1946. He was chairman of the Ohio House Judiciary Committee from 1939 through 1944, and served as speaker of the Ohio House in 1945 and 1946.

He also was Hancock County prosecutor from 1933 through 1936, and had been a special counsel for the state attorney general's office in 1931.

"Jack" Betts was born May 26, 1904 in Findlay to John E. and Elizabeth (Fisher) Betts. He married Martha Neeley on June 12, 1934, and she survives at 3309 Briarcliff Drive.

Also surviving is a daughter, Mrs. David (Nancy L.) Bowman, Buffalo, N.Y.; three grandchildren; and two brothers, Richard A. of Findlay; and Dr. Thomas F. of Deshler.

As a member of Congress, Mr. Betts was not often in the national limelight. He preferred to be a team player and referred to himself as a "back bencher." In fact, a book that he wrote about his memories of Washington, Ohio and local politics was titled, "A View From The Back Bench." The book was published in 1986.

Republicans were at a disadvantage through most of his tenure in the U.S. House. During his 21 years there, Republicans were the majority party for two years. But Mr. Betts did hold some powerful positions in the U.S. House and had a hand in some notable legislation.

He served on the House Ways and Means Committee from 1959 through 1972, and was the second-ranking Republican on that panel when he retired. He also was a member of the original House ethics committee—the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct—and was the ranking minority member of that panel during his last term.

He also served on the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, and the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He was named House Republican Whip for both the Ohio congressional delegation and the Midwest Region in 1960. He served in both capacities for several years, then was Midwest Region Whip for three sessions of Congress.

Mr. Betts was a prime sponsor of revenue-sharing legislation. He also succeeded in expanding rural mail delivery. One of his most publicized legislative endeavors was his sponsorship in 1969 of a bill to stop the Census Bureau from requiring people to answer personal questions on Census forms. The legislation didn't make it through Congress. The Census Bureau, however, voluntarily made some of the changes sought by Mr. Betts—some questions on Census forms could be answered voluntarily.

While a congressman, he was a delegate to the NATO Parliamentary Conference held in Paris in November 1958. Mr. Betts also was a member of the Board of Visitors for the United States Military Academy in 1957. From 1960 through 1962, he was a member of the Board of Visitors for the United States Naval Academy.

The seven-county congressional district that Mr. Betts represented at the time he retired from Congress no longer exists—it was eliminated during redistricting. The district included Hancock, Erie, Crawford, Huron, Richland, Seneca and Wyandot counties.

After leaving Congress, he rejoined the Findlay law firm Betts and Betts, with his brother, Richard. He also taught government classes at the University of Findlay. In 1980 he was honored by the Ohio State Bar Association for his 50 years of law practice.

He was inducted into the Ohio Elks Association Hall of Fame in 1981, for distinguishing himself in his profession. He was a longtime member of Findlay BPOE 75.

He was a 1922 graduate of Findlay High School. He received a bachelor's degree cum laude from Kenyon College in 1926, and earned his law degree from Yale Law School in 1929. He was a member of Delta Tau Delta fraternity.

Mr. Betts received honorary law degrees from Kenyon College, Heidelberg College, Tiffin; Ohio Northern University, Ada; and the University of Findlay.

He was a member of Trinity Episcopal Church, Findlay, and was an active vestryman and lay reader in the church. He also was a member of Valley of Toledo Scottish Rite, where he held an honorary 33rd degree; Free & Accepted Masons 227; Valley of Toledo Zenobia; Knights of Pythias 85; and Odd Fellows Lodge.

Mr. Betts was an honorary member of Findlay Rotary Club, having served as its president in 1948–49. He also was a member of Sons of the American Revolution.

A funeral service will be held at 1 p.m. Wednesday at Trinity Episcopal Church, the Rev. Elden Smith officiating. Burial will be in Maple Grove Cemetery.

Visitation will be held from 2–4 and 7–9 p.m. Tuesday at Coldren-Crates Funeral Home, where Masonic rites will be held at 10 a.m. Wednesday.

Memorials may be made to Trinity Episcopal Church, to Kenyon College, or to a charity of the donor's choice.

BETTS IS MOURNED BY COLLEAGUES, FRIENDS

(By Jim Maurer)

Former Congressman Jackson Betts was fondly remembered Friday as a man who sparked a young boy's interest in government, and as a man who was admired by his peers for his hard work and dedication.

Betts, 89, of Findlay, died Friday morning at Blanchard Valley Hospital.

U.S. Rep. Michael G. Oxley, R-Findlay, said the Oxley and Betts families were longtime friends. Oxley remembered a trip he made to Washington, D.C. as a fourth grader, when Betts took him around to meet other members of the U.S. Congress.

Oxley also served as an intern in Betts' congressional office in 1965 while a junior at Miami University, Oxford. It was that experience which "sparked my desire to succeed him in Congress. I'll miss him very much," Oxley said.

"I never heard anyone say a bad word about him," Stozich said of Betts.

Local political figures also lauded Betts on Friday.

"Jack Betts, by his integrity and devotion to public service, was a continual inspiration to us in local politics. We will miss him, but we will not forget his legacy." said Ralph Russo, chairman of the Hancock County Republican Central Committee.

Charles E. "Pete" Oman, retired longtime clerk of Hancock County Common Pleas Court, who was involved in various local Republican activities over the years, said, "Certainly the community has lost one of its great political and government leaders. He was an everyday person with all people and was respected by many. He was calm and quiet, yet a knowledgeable man."

Marvin E. Monroe said he was "shocked" to hear the news of Betts' death. He had known Betts for a long time and called him "my dearest friend." Monroe served as administrative assistant for Betts.

Former President Gerald R. Ford, who served with Betts in the U.S. Congress from 1961 until Betts retired in 1972, issued a statement saying, "Congressman Jackson Betts was a longtime, very good friend who had a superb record in the U.S. House of Representatives. I had great admiration for his excellent political/legislative record."

John P. Stozich, a state legislator from Findlay from 1983–1991 before being named director of the Ohio Department of Industrial Relations, said he admired Betts and credits the former congressman with encouraging Stozich to seek a post in the state Legislature.

Stozich said one of the greatest compliments he received during his tenure in the

Legislature was from constituents "who told me 'you're just like Jack Betts was,'" because of his accessibility to the public.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, our former colleague, Jackson E. Betts, served with us in the House for a period of 22 years. Upon his retirement he was the second ranking member on the Ways and Means Committee.

During his service in the House of Representatives, he established an outstanding record. His capacity for loyalty and love of his country was known to all of the Members serving with him, and in every position he held, either private or public, he achieved distinction. His service in all of his assignments was marked by a high sense of conscience and duty.

Since I have been a Member of Congress, I have served with some 2,000 Members in the House and in the U.S. Senate. Jackson Betts was an outstanding Member of Congress and he was concerned about the people in this country. He believed that our children are our greatest asset and that they must be educated.

I recall, Mr. Speaker, that he always had a large bowl of buckeyes sitting on a small table in a waiting room and all of his visitors, upon leaving, would take a buckeye—just for good luck and for the Buckeye State of Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, I was sorry to hear of the death of my friend, Jackson Betts. I want to extend my deepest sympathy to the members of his family.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker. I rise to join those who have come to honor the memory of our former colleague, Jackson Betts. I was saddened to learn of the passing of Jack on August 13. He was an outstanding Congressman, who represented the people of the old Eighth District of Ohio well.

Although I came to the House of Representatives just 2 years before Jack's retirement, I knew him to be a dedicated and able lawmaker. He was a true friend to all who had the honor of serving with him.

Mr. Speaker, my former administrative assistant, Kenneth L. Black, who recently retired after over 30 years of service in the House, was the administrative assistant to Jack Betts during his last term in office. Ken also has fond memories of Jack that he has shared with me.

Jack Betts led a life that was full of accomplishments. The people of northern Ohio benefited greatly from Jack's 22 years of representation of them.

I would like to extend my deepest sympathy to Jack's fine family.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I was very sorry to learn while Congress was recessed for the summer, our good friend and former colleague, Jackson Betts of Ohio, has passed away. He and Martha were such a happy team during his tenure, when he served with such distinction on the Ways and Means Committee.

I met him first when I was but a staff member here on the Hill and it was Jack's very nature to be so friendly and accommodating to all those with whom he came in contact, regardless of whether they had equal status as a Member or served the institution of the House in some less important way.

Jack Betts was one of those bona fide conservatives of the old school and it was so appropriate that he should have served our party with such distinction as a member of the tax-writing committee of the House. He never lost sight of his roots back in Findlay, Ohio, and that conservative constituency he represented for over 20 years.

I can remember the regrets when we heard in the Cloakroom on that day when he announced that he would not run again. Here was one great fellow who was leaving voluntarily when he seemed to be so young and energetic and in the prime of his life. We hated to see him go at that time, but we know from his friends that he really enjoyed his life of retirement.

We just wanted to be numbered among those who considered Jack Betts to be one of the finest members ever to have served in the House and our life has been enriched simply by having known him. We extend to Martha and the members of his family our profound sympathy.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, on August 13, a distinguished former Member of this body, Jackson Betts, passed away at the age of 89. Jack Betts was a fine lawyer, a conscientious Member of Congress, and a good friend, and he will be deeply missed by those who knew him.

Jack Betts, a Yale lawyer who still remembered his roots, was privileged to represent the Eighth Congressional District of Ohio in the House of Representatives, a district which included his home town of Findlay, where he had been born in 1904. After a career as a prosecuting attorney and a State legislator, including 2 years as speaker of the Ohio House of Representatives, he came to Congress in 1951, and shortly was placed on the Ways and Means Committee, where his expertise on tax issues was a great help to all of us.

I came to know Jack Betts best in his capacity as ranking minority member on the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, on which I also sat. Service on the Ethics Committee is one of the most difficult tasks faced by a Member of Congress, but Jack handled this great responsibility with evenhandedness and aplomb. His experience as a prosecutor helped him keep the rights of the individual in balance with the needs of this great institution, and Jack Betts never let these duties overwhelm him.

In 1972, a combination of weariness and redistricting led Jack to retire. Upon his departure, I took over Jack's assignment as ranking member of the Committee on Standards, but I could not really replace him and his leadership, and during my service there, I tried to live up to the standard that Jack Betts had set.

All too many Members of Congress remain in the Washington area when their careers end. Jack Betts, however, never forgot who had sent him to Washington, and he spent his remaining years back home in Findlay, the town he loved. jack enjoyed an extremely productive retirement, and he was always giving back to the community. He taught college and sat as a local judge in Findlay, and he remained a highly respected local figure until his death. I was saddened to hear of his passing, but I and the others who served with Jack Betts will always take inspiration from his memory.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, Jackson Betts will be remembered by those who served with him in this Chamber as a gentleman and an outstanding Congressman.

His enemy was big government, as might be expected of a Member who referred to himself as a country Congressman.

He used his senior position on the Ways and Means Committee to fight higher taxes for big government.

One symbol of the big government which he opposed was the census.

He was in strong opposition to the expansion of the census questionnaire to include such topics as toilets, television sets, shared bathrooms, and income from alimony. He felt those subjects had nothing whatsoever to do with the census which was designed by the Nation's Founding Fathers to take the count of the Nation's population for the purpose of reapportioning Congress. He wanted the Census Bureau to ask only the same questions as those in the first census.

Big government was too big to defeat in this battle, although he was successful in repealing a section of the law which provided a jail term for those who refused to answer census questions.

He was first elected to Congress in 1950 and served for 22 years. Prior to moving to Congress, he won elections as Hancock County prosecuting attorney, and to the Ohio House of Representatives. He served as speaker of the Ohio House of Representatives in 1945 and 1946.

It was the symbol of his enemy—the census—which led to the end of the congressional career of Jackson Betts. The Ohio congressional reapportionment that followed the 1970 census eliminated his district, and he decided against running for reelection.

Jackson Betts will be remembered as a Member who served his Nation and his northern Ohio constituents well for over two decades. We extend our sympathy to his wife of almost 60 years, Martha.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order this evening.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

UPDATE ON NAFTA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I am here once again this afternoon to talk about the proposed North American Free-Trade Agreement.

To be honest, Mr. Speaker, the longer this debate goes on and the more I listen to the arguments of the people in favor of this treaty, I cannot help but think of the story of those two brothers who went up to the wilds of Canada

to hunt moose. They hunted for a week, and each of them bagged one moose. When the pilot landed in order to take them home, he saw the gear and the moose and said, "I can't pull you guys out of here with all that stuff; the load would be too heavy." One of the brothers said, "I don't understand. Last year each of us bagged a moose and the pilot loaded everything."

On reflection, the pilot said, "Well, I guess if you did it last year, we can do it again this year." So they loaded the plane. It moved slowly across the lake over the trees toward the mountains, but it was too heavy and crashed into the mountains.

Luckily, no one was hurt. As they crawled out of the wreckage, one of the brothers asked, "Where are we?" And the other brother looked around and said, "Oh, we are about a mile farther than we got last year."

The point is the brothers did not give the pilot all the information he needed, and the plane crashed. And as far as I can see, NAFTA supporters are conveniently ignoring some simple truths because they know that the public, if it knows all the facts, the agreement will crash. But it is too late, because the public has already caught on to them. They know NAFTA is bad for America, and they are lining up against it.

It is a bad deal for workers in America and in Mexico, was put together by the corporate elite on both sides of the border, and is not in our interests to move forward.

The public knows that Mexico has lax environmental laws, virtually no health and safety laws enforced; corrupt judicial system, and a minimum wage that pays 58 cents an hour, beckoning American companies to move across the borders.

This ad and others like it by the Mexican Government are running in trade publications all across the country, or had been running until this April. If you cannot read it, I will read it for you. It says, "I can't find a good, loyal worker for a dollar an hour within a thousand miles of here." The ad goes to say, "Come down to Mexico, where wages and benefits are less than $1 an hour, where you can save $15,000 per worker if you locate down here." Then it gives you a number to call.

We called the number, and of course we found out that they are flooded with calls. Companies are not going to stay in this country when they can pay 50 cents an hour or $1 an hour or $2 an hour and not have to worry about tariffs, not have to worry about nationalization problems, not have to worry about labor standards, not have to worry about environmental standards. They are going, they are poised to go.

It does not take a genius to figure out that if you are going to give companies this choice, they are going to make it and they are going to leave.

But that is not really why I am here talking tonight. I want to talk about NAFTA with a different angle, a different approach. Last week I talked about some of the information that NAFTA supporters do not like to talk about. I talked specifically about how corrupt the Mexican political system is and about how Mexico's society is rife with restrictions on freedom and marked by violations of human rights. And I talked about how justice is denied, how poverty is enforced by an agreement between government, government-run labor and business, and how persons and property are not safe in Mexico.

I mentioned, for instance, that in the past 5 years 52 members of the opposition political party in Mexico had been killed. Imagine how we would react if 52 opposition leaders had been assassinated since 1988.

I talked about how 26 journalists had been killed in Mexico since 1988, like Manuel Buendia, who had been an outspoken critic for 38 years, fighting political corruption in Mexico, fatally shot four times while entering a garage near his office.

I could go on and on and on and talk about the corruption that is rife. These are the facts, Mr. Speaker. And if the people of Mexico cannot trust their own government to do right by them, then how can we trust them to keep their word?

Supporters of NAFTA say, "Oh, no, the system in Mexico has changed. That might have happened before, but it doesn't happen anymore. There is no corruption in Mexico anymore." And I say tell that to Father Romo, a Catholic priest, a member of the Center for Human Rights in Chiapas, Mexico.

Earlier today he came into my office to tell me a story and met with some other Members of Congress, about two world farmers. One night not long ago, these two farmers were minding their own business, when the Mexican state police burst into their home, without a warrant, arbitrarily arrested them and put them in jail.

They stayed in jail until a few days later when the two were dragged from their prison cells in the middle of the night, dragged down to a nearby river, tortured by state police, nearly drowned, and forced to sign confessions for crimes they did not commit.

Again, I was told this story just today. That is just what has always happened in Mexico and what is happening today. It is no wonder that Amnesty International, a recognized, respected human rights organization, cited Mexico for widespread use of torture by law enforcement agents.

□ 1600

It is a monument to the violation of human rights. If that story is not enough for you, you should have been in my office earlier in the week when I met with a constituent of mine named John Winterhalter who lives with his wife and two sons in Romeo, MI. John is a business agent for Machinists Local 48 in Warren, MI. Last Tuesday, John was in southern California at a conference. Last Tuesday about 40 trade unionists took time out from the conference and took a bus stop to Mexico to tour one of the maquiladora facilities at Tijuana.

For those of you who are not aware of it, these are huge facilities, 80 percent of them owned by American corporations. They pay anywhere between 58 cents an hour and $1½ an hour. They have polluted the environment down there. They have kept people in low wages without decent working conditions. It is a deplorable situation that we have engaged in through our corporations since the late 1960's.

The group included a Maryland State legislator named John Jeffries, who is the Chair of the Maryland General Assembly black caucus.

As I pointed out last week, these trade unionists were in Tijuana for not more than a few hours when they were detained by police for over 3½ hours. The group was detained in a fenced area. They were isolated and were not allowed to make phone calls, not even to the American consulate. Every person on the bus was asked to show identification, including addresses and ages. At first they were not told why they were being detained. Then they were told they needed a special visa to enter the maquiladora zone, even though no such requirement exists in Mexican law.

Then they were told their violation was simply discussing internal working conditions with Mexican workers. That is understandable, because they are treated like dogs, exposed to pollution, and they work under horrendous conditions.

About 80 percent of the corporations down there, as I mention, are American.

Before releasing these machinists, the Mexican police admitted that they detained the bus at the request of the maquiladora factory which was Carlyle Plastics, which is headquartered in Boston, MA.

The situation in this maquiladora zone is just one example of what we can expect to find throughout Mexico if NAFTA is passed.

Workers in Mexico are not free, and to pretend that they are, as some of the great newspapers in our country and editorial writers to fantasize that they are is complete hogwash. The audacity for them to get up and to write and to speak and to criticize us who are making this fight, when 26 of their own journalists have been murdered since 1988. Have they no sense of responsibility to their own?

The workers in Mexico are not free. The bottom line is you cannot have free trade with a country that is not free.

Mario Vargas Lose, the great Peruvian writer, candidate for President in Peru, winner of many distinguished international awards for writing, wrote that Mexico is the perfect dictatorship because it has the guise of democracy, but they do not let people participate.

Anyone concerned about the lives and the future of workers in the United States, Canada, or Mexico, should not ignore the ugly reality of Mexico's policies today. NAFTA supporters claim that Mexico has changed the political system, but it is clear that they have not. It is clear they have just gone on with their corrupt ways.

I think of that fact. It goes a long way toward explaining this newspaper story that appeared in the San Diego Union Tribune of September 16.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, San Diego is on the border of Mexico.

The headline reads, "Asylum Pleas Flood INS. Huge Surge In Mexican Applications Causes Concern, May Imperil NAFTA."

The story says that officials of the Immigration and Naturalization Service said yesterday that they were staggered when they recently noticed a worrisome and unexpected trend, the explosion in the number of Mexicans seeking asylum here, based on claims that they fear political persecution in their homeland.

"Last year 614 Mexicans requested political asylum. Already this year this number has reached 5,400 and now coming in at a rate of 1,000 a month," said Gregg Beyer, who oversees this asylum program.

Mr. Speaker, if Mexico is supposedly doing such a good job of cleaning up its act and reforming its political system, why are so many fleeing the country? Would you not expect them to stay and work at home?

And is it their fault? The Mexican people are not the problem. They are honest. They are hard working. They want and deserve the same thing that families in Michigan and all across America want and deserve, but they are suffering under a political system that makes them suspicious of authority in spite of their own honesty, a system that asks them to have hope for the future, but then dashes that hope at every turn, at the bargaining table, in judicial hearings, in attempts to clean up their polluted environment.

No, Mr. Speaker, the Mexican people are not the problem. They are good. They are skilled. They are productive. They want changes for their families like we do.

The enemy is the decades of entrenchment that have corrupted a single party system and officials who would allow that corruption to poison nearly every element in public life. It is an enemy that can only be defeated by decades of contentious reform.

Thankfully, there are people in Mexico like Father Romo who are trying to reform the judicial system, trying to improve human rights, trying to organize independent labor unions so that workers' standards of living can rise.

There are those who claim that Mexico's stability depends on NAFTA. They are dead wrong. To the contrary, NAFTA will lock into place the people who are now in charge and policies that exploit their own people. It institutionalizes and codifies the injustice that is crippling Mexico today and it will accelerate the economic damage that is being done to Mexico, the United States, and Canada today.

Now, when the countries of Europe launched an effort to build an economic unified market, they developed certain standards of democracy. They developed certain standards to reach in terms of standard of living before a country could join. Portugal, Spain, Greece, and now Turkey have had to increase their standards to meet the European standard in democratization, in the standard of living. They have worked in the European community for 45 years to put this together. They have spent over the last 4 years $100 billion getting ready for it.

We, on the other hand, are trying to do this in 3 years with a situation that clearly spells out the difference in our economies. Our wage differential with Mexico is anywhere from 8 to 12 to 1, depending on who you read or believe. In Europe, it is like 2 or 3 or 4 to 1.

We have got a long way to go, but we must do what we can to bridge our gaps. This agreement will not do it.

Our future is linked to the people of Mexico, but we must be on the side of those who are fighting for democratic reform and for a decent standard of living, for the people on both sides of the border.

My bottom line on Mexican trade is this. If we are going to have an agreement with Mexico, it should be one that raises their standard to our levels, not lowers our standards to their level. Only then can we compete on the quality of the product and not on the misery and the suffering of the people.

Too many people in this country have fought hard at the bargaining table for labor union rights, for consumer rights, for protection of our air, our water and our land, to throw all that away on an agreement that was conceived and trying to implement in 2 to 3 years with a Government that has not treated its people fairly or democratically.

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues today to look at all these important questions, the wage question, the environmental question, the human rights question. They are all part of what makes this agreement critical to our future, but lacking in its substance to make the difference that we all desire.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], who has been a stalwart on this issue.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Macomb County, MI, for the leadership he has shown. There is no one in this House of Representatives who has done more to defeat NAFTA. There is no one in this entire Congress who has worked harder on this as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] has said, we need to look at who are the winners in NAFTA and who are the losers in NAFTA, who gains from NAFTA, who will be hurt in NAFTA.

It is clear that the people that gain from NAFTA are basically three groups: the Mexican Government, and the 36 families who control 50 percent of the wealth in Mexico, those 36 families are the big winners in NAFTA. Those 36 families run the government. Those 36 families are the reason for the corruption in Mexico, of many of the political deaths and problems in Mexico, the fact that it is a society with some very, very wealthy people and the rest of society, almost the entire rest of society is very, very poor. They gain from NAFTA in a big, big way.

The second group of people who benefit from NAFTA are American lobbyists. There are literally hundreds of people lobbying for NAFTA in this U.S. Congress who are paid by the Mexican Government.

□ 1610

The Mexican Government has spent at least, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] said, and my friend, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK], and the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] who have joined us here today are saying the Mexican Government has spent already at least $30 million to convince us in Congress that NAFTA is a great thing for the American people. Never in history has a foreign government spent that kind of money, or a foreign interest spent that kind of money, to convince the elected officials in another country that they should do something for the good of that country.

Those lobbyists have produced things like this, a very slick North American free trade kind of set of brochures. Something was dropped off at my office about an hour and a half ago, although it is dropped off, it seems, at least once a day, something like this. They also have this very slick, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK] and I were talking a minute ago wishing that we had the money to produce things like this: "Partners in Trade in North American Free Trade Zone," more kind of material, propaganda, to convince us.

They also dropped off, and I will not read the name of the lobbying firm, but they also dropped off a statement required to be filed with any material they send out saying that such and

such a lobbyist located at such and such an address in Washington has registered as a foreign agent pursuant to the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 with the Department of Justice, FARA, as an agent of the Mexican Embassy free-trade office.

In this country, when people are hired that are American citizens to lobby against American interests on behalf of foreign governments, we used to call that treason. Today we simply call it business as usual.

The third group that is a big gainer from NAFTA is corporate America. The top people in corporate America, the big stockholders, they will make money from NAFTA because they will go and hire Mexicans at low wages, evade environmental laws, run around labor laws, child labor laws, other kinds of occupational safety laws, avoid them, be able to make products cheaper, still sell them to American consumers at the same prices which they have already done according to what has happened in the last 10 years in Mexico.

Briefly, the major two losers under this agreement are American workers who, not only have lost 500,000 jobs to Mexico, but also have had their wages depressed because employer, after employer, after employer in this country are saying now, and will continue to say in a more accelerated way, Hey, if you don't give back a dollar an hour, we are just going to pull up stakes and move to Mexico. So, American workers that have been fortunate enough not to lose their jobs often are having their wages depressed, or at least stagnated, because of the threat of the NAFTA and threat of going to Mexico.

The other major loser in NAFTA is simply the American taxpayer. This is a $50 billion new Government program. We cannot on this House floor sometimes pass a $2 billion program to extend unemployment corporation benefits to our people. We could not because of opposition of a lot of people that are for NAFTA, could not just pass a $16 billion program for public works to stimulate the economy for job training, for education for our workers. Instead we want to pass a $50 billion program for Mexico so that we can build more bridges and highways, and clean up the environment along the border, and lose tariff dollars and all the kinds of things that Mexico, that this trade agreement with Mexico, is going to cost us.

A $50 billion new program is one of the hoaxes of NAFTA that we are going to put on the American people. We have got to say no to this NAFTA.

I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] for yielding.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and, before I yield to my colleague from Connecticut, if I could suggest, you know, the other side will argue, you know, well, this is going to cost $50 or $40 billion for road repairs and bridge repairs so we can move the commodities by the improved infrastructure. It is going to cost money to clean up the environment along the border, as the gentleman mentioned. It is going to cost money to retrain our workers. They readily agree it is going to cost tens of billions of dollars, but then they say, But you don't have to worry about that because the products that we will be making here and selling to Mexicans will make up for that.

What the fallacy in that argument is is that the trade that we do with Mexico does not reach the Mexican consumer. If we look at the $5 billion trade surplus that we have with Mexico today, 85 percent of it, 85 percent of it, is either parts made here, shipped across the border for assemblage, brought right back over here the next day or the next week to be sold here. Never gets into the consumer's hands in Mexico. That is 64 percent of what happens. The other 20 to 21 percent, or 24 percent, goes to the construction of new factories or equipment in those factories, so, when we look at that number about how trade has increased, we have got to look at what they are talking about, and it is basically our jobs that are being exported.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield before the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] talks, some people have characterized that as industrial tourism where American products go down to Mexico, and we call that an export so that Mexican workers, underpaid, in terrible work conditions, with no environmental regulations, can assemble that. So, those parts just go to Mexico sort of as tourists for a few days until they are shipped back to the United States so that we lose jobs, American companies make more money at the expense of Mexican workers, do not pass those savings on to American consumers, and the Mexican workers lose, American workers lose.

It is simply a bad deal.

Mr. BONIOR. One other point: the numbers game. We are going to hear a lot about the numbers game. Here is how it is going to create jobs. Let me give my colleagues an example of how they are misusing the numbers, the opposite side.

A factory in upstate New York makes typewriters. They decide they can make them for a lot cheaper, so they go down to Mexico and make them instead of paying their workers $12, $14, $15 an hour. They go down there, and they pay them a buck an hour. While they are in New York there are maybe 3,000 workers who feed into that factory from small shops. The factories then move down to Mexico so they are feeding Mexico with these parts out of these small shops. Our Government counts those 3,000 workers as job creators because of the new trade with Mexico. That is how crazy and absurd this all gets in terms of the numbers being used against us

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] who has been just a tiger on this issue.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague and the majority whip for yielding to me at this time and I also for being a part of this debate with other of my colleagues on the floor this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank him for his calm and reasoned voice in this tumultuous debate on NAFTA. Few issues that we address here provoke such passion and are the targets of such distortion.

Through all of the strident rhetoric we have been fortunate to have the measured tones of Mr. BONIOR bring reason to the debate. His regular special orders have been a source of excellent information on NAFTA, and I applaud him for his outstanding efforts.

One of the largely unexamined issues regarding NAFTA has been the costs associated with implementing the agreement. I don't need to remind those in this Chamber and those watching these proceedings that we have recently been through a grueling fight to reduce the budget deficit by nearly $500 billion over 5 years. We fought hard for each dollar of the $255 billion in cuts contained in this agreement.

This is a critical point because in order to maintain those cuts, and keep our commitment to deficit reduction, we cannot pay for any new programs unless we cut existing ones. Yet NAFTA represents a host of new costs and revenue losses to the Federal government that could jeopardize the fragile progress we are making on reducing the deficit.

First, there are the lost revenues. Estimates are that the total number of lost tariffs to the U.S. Government is between $2 billion and $3 billion annually—nearly enough to pay for the entire Head Start Program.

Other losses, less easy to calculate, include lost corporate tax revenues as United States businesses move to Mexico, attracted by the tremendously lower wages and benefits they are able to pay Mexican workers and the lax environmental standards with which they have to comply.

Another potential loss will be income tax revenues. Unemployed workers can't pay income tax, and hundreds of thousands of workers will lose their jobs as a result of NAFTA no matter whose economic model you use. This cannot be dismissed simply as idle speculation, either. In testimony before the House Budget Committee, the former Premier of British Columbia said that, as a result of the Canada-United States Free-Trade Agreement and the transfer of Canadian jobs to

the United States and Mexico, "The tax base in many * * * Canadian towns and cities has eroded, resulting in jeopardized municipal and social services."

That should be a sobering message to those of us who have seen Federal aid in this country to cities and towns in our districts shrink tremendously over the past decade, helping push towns like Bridgeport in my State of Connecticut into bankruptcy.

A tragic sidelight of all this is that many small towns in rural America may simply wither and die. For example, the NAFTA agreement will hit the apparel and textile industries especially hard, according to a recent article in the Journal of Interamerican Studies. These are two of the largest manufacturing industries in the United States, with combined employment of almost 2 million workers, many of them women and minorities. And for many rural communities the local textile or apparel plant is the primary employer. Yet NAFTA could result in the loss of half the total employment in the apparel industry in the first 5 years.

How do we calculate this loss—the cost of moving much of rural America to this country's economic outskirts?

But suppose we can at least help the workers displaced as apparel and textile mills close and manufacturing jobs are moved to Mexico. Estimates are that between 112,000 and more than half a million Americans could lose their jobs. Consider that after the United States-Canada Free-Trade Agreement—an agreement between two relatively similar countries—Canada lost 23 percent of all its manufacturing employment—more than 460,000 jobs, with 65 percent of the plants that closed shutting their doors permanently.

First, there will be the costs of unemployment assistance. Shortly we will begin to debate a bill to extend unemployment benefits here at home where many States are still suffering from the recession. In Connecticut alone, we have lost more than 180,000 jobs over the past 4 years, and unemployment benefits are necessary just to keep hardworking men and women going from day to day.

Just today, Mr. Speaker, I received a note from seven people in my district opposing NAFTA. Ranging in age from 37 to 72, they are, for the first time in their lives, unemployed. We will have to help them, and many more like them, under NAFTA.

So far we have spent $6.2 billion in fiscal year 1993 and fiscal year 1994, and a new bill will commit us to another $1.1 billion. Consider the additional funds we will have to spend as both skilled and semi-skilled workers lose their jobs to the lure of low Mexican wages.

Second, many promises have been made to retrain workers who have lost their jobs because of NAFTA. Worker retraining is expensive and will require substantial Federal investment—nearly $1.7 billion according to Clinton administration estimates and $2 billion for 1994 alone according to the Congressional Budget Office.

The European Community has raised massive funds to help individuals hurt by European economic integration—spending about $2.5 billion each year on education and training.

These are not all the costs by any means. There are the costs of the massive environmental cleanup necessary, estimated at about $3 billion; $15 to $20 billion for building the border infrastructure according to our Commerce Secretary; and money required by border States including Texas which has said it will request $10 billion from the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford this NAFTA now. We have a fragile economy, just recovering from a devastating recession. We have millions unemployed. We have a huge budget deficit. Neither my State, nor the other 50 States in this country, nor the hard working men and women of the United States can afford this NAFTA.

□ 1620

Mr. BONIOR. Reclaiming my time, there was a study done under the Bush administration and the Commerce Department that was reported in the National Journal, a very respected publication in this town, that was kept under wraps. We have never seen it. But that study indicated that we will lose 40 percent of our auto, steel, apparel, and textile jobs. Forty percent.

That will not only devastate those people and those families, but those whole communities that depend upon those jobs. So the gentlewoman is absolutely correct.

Before I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK], my good friend who has been a real champion for workers, I would like to add a little flavor. So people know that this is not a Democratic issue, we have Republicans and Independents on the House floor who feel strongly about this issue.

Before I yield to my friend from California, I will yield to my friend from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS]. That shows you the geographical distribution of opposition to NAFTA.

Mr. SANDERS. I want to thank the whip for yielding, and to say to him personally that the leadership role that he is playing now in standing up for the average working person in this country is what the American people are crying out for and are demanding this Congress begin to do. The reason that our institution is held in so low esteem is people perceive, quite correctly, that this institution time after time comes out on the side of the wealthy and the powerful, and we ignore the millions of people who are unemployed, who are seeing their standard of living decline. It is about time that some of us, and it is nice to see a Republican ally here, and it is nice to see at least one Member of the leadership, begin to stand up forcefully on the issue, that we come together and protect the American workers.

I will be brief. What I want to say is that I think the issue of NAFTA should be placed within the context of what is happening in the American economy today.

There is a huge story out there which CBS is not reporting, which is not discussed terribly often in this institution or in the White House. And let me be very frank and tell you what it is. That is that day by day, the United States of America is evolving into a Third World economy, run by an oligarchic elite. That may sound strong to some people. I think that is the reality.

What NAFTA is about is an acceleration of that process. What has been going on in this country is that today we rank 13th in the world in terms of the wages and benefits our workers receive. Twenty years ago we were No. 1. What the NAFTA process is about is saying to American workers, you are making seven bucks an hour now, you are making eight bucks an hour now. Do you think that is good? Why do you think that you deserve eight dollars an hour, when there are people in Mexico who are working for a minimum wage of 58 cents an hour, working for a buck an hour, for two bucks an hour? What makes you think you deserve eight dollars an hour?

You are getting health care benefits. Health care benefits? In Mexico they do not get health care benefits. Start taking a cut.

So instead of us looking to Europe, to Germany, where workers are now working 35 hours a week, where workers make 25 percent more than our workers, what we are doing is looking to Mexico, where very, very desperate people are being forced to work for starvation wages.

That is what this whole process is about. It is not to raise the wages of the workers in Mexico; it is to lower our wages, to force us to compete against a very, very desperate people.

Let me simply conclude, and I have to admit there is an irony here, and I know the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is familiar with this issue. You remember some years ago when the U.S. Government was pouring millions and millions of dollars into the war against the people of Nicaragua and supporting the Contras. The fight that Mr. Reagan and his friends were fighting was a fight for democracy. Remember that?

Nicaragua was just not democratic enough for Mr. Reagan. We had to kill 30,000 people there.

Lo and behold, we do not hear much about the issue of democracy as we attempt to merge our economy with Mexico. It is widely known that President

Salinas was elected in an undemocratic election. There was massive vote fraud. It is widely known that virtually every state election that takes place in Mexico is fraudulent.

Where are the front page stories on the New York Times? Gee, I must have missed them.

I guess in Nicaragua we were concerned, but not in Mexico. You have, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] just mentioned a moment ago, a Mexican economy and government run by 25 or 30 extremely wealthy people. You have a government that has not lost an election since the 1920's. Everybody knows why they do not lose elections; because they are all fraudulent.

Let me conclude by simply saying this: If NAFTA passes, and many of us are working day and night to see that it does not, it will simply accelerate the process by which our working people become poorer and our multinationals and wealthy people become wealthier. For the sake of the vast majority of our people, the Members of this body have got to come together and defeat this NAFTA.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] for his eloquent and passionate remarks and his fight for justice on this issue.

I yield now to my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], a member of the Republican leadership.

□ 1630

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

I have to say that following the remarks of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS], I guess it can truly be illustrated that a number of us oppose this ill-constructed agreement for different reasons, because I have to take exception to my colleague with respect to the Reagan government and the Reagan policy, which I think brought freedom to the four nations of Central America, which were military dictatorships.

When I became a Member of Congress in 1980, Nicaragua, in Salvador and Honduras and Guatemala, and the gentleman, the leader, a member of the Democrat leadership knows that we have had differences of opinion on this issue, but I think that it is important to look to the common ground on the issue before us, which is NAFTA, and particularly, to look to the facts upon which this agreement is based.

Those facts, which the gentleman has described, with respect to the phony figures, the $40 billion figure that we consistently hear from Mr. Kantor, which is a figure that gives smoke and mirrors a bad name.

I wrote a letter to Mr. Kantor about halfway through this ongoing debate, and on the Republican side, we have held now some 6 debates in the Research Committee on NAFTA, with the strongest proponents and the strongest opponents. And it was my understanding that about 34.7 percent of these components were, of the $40 billion in exports to Mexico—exports to Mexico—that are touted by Mr. Kantor, about 34 percent of those exports are in reality simply components that are made in the United States, shipped to Mexico for completion or for assembly with other components, and then put on a bus, doing a U-turn, never reaching the Mexican market, coming right back to the same Americans who made them for sale.

That means that if this little podium I am standing at right now, if you took this and made it in Washington, DC, for $100, shipped it to Tijuana on a bus to be sanded and varnished for $10 and then put it back on the same bus and took it back here to Washington, DC, to sell to the U.S. Congress, when this podium on the bus crossed the international line at Tijuana, Mr. Kantor would call this a $100 export to Mexico. After being sanded and varnished for $10, put back on the bus and sent back to Washington, DC, it would be called a $110 export from Mexico to the United States.

My question to one of his assistants was, "Why don't we just waggle the bus on the international border five times and we can make Mexico our biggest trading partner?"

So that is absolutely a phony statistic. It is not a true export.

If you pull that out, as the gentleman has suggested, out of the $40 billion, you see that you have over 50 percent of the so-called exports to Mexico represented in capital goods. And what are those capital goods?

The capital goods are the equipment, the machinery, the tooling that is being shipped south as plants leave the United States and go to Mexico.

Mr. BONIOR. They are high-technology plants, too.

Mr. HUNTER. Absolutely. I want to address the high-technology aspect, if I can for 1 minute. They are high-technology plants.

An experiment was done, I think it is ironic that the NAFTA opponents, Democrat and Republican, who oppose NAFTA have the most respect for the productivity of the Mexican worker.

Mr. BONIOR. The Mexican workers are very productive.

Mr. HUNTER. They are very productive. And the Ford plant at Hermosillo has shown that when they have good training and when they have good equipment, which they are being given, and they have good middle level management, they turn out a high quality product for a very low hourly wage.'

So the Hermosillo plant, Ford plant, ranks 6 out of 46 auto assembly plants in North America, according to J.D. Powers & Associates. And yet the workers are working for about $2.38 an hour. There is no reason these experiments, having been done by the Big Three, there is no reason why a much larger piece of America's auto manufacturing base will not move to Mexico unless we protect American workers and, I might add, American business.

I thought that Henry Ford made a great statement in the 1930's when he was asked, why are you paying your people so much? It is a Depression. You could get by with a lot less.

And he said, "I pay my workers well because I want them to be able to buy my products."

I think there are a lot of conservative Republican American businessmen, Republican and Democrat businessmen, who realize that.

This advertisement that the whip has to his right, "Where can I find good workers for a buck an hour? Yes, you can, in Yucatan," by the Mexican Government, is the politics of abandonment.

We have had some bitter fights between labor and management, between liberals and conservatives, between Democrats and Republicans. But we have managed to weather those battles. We have managed to build a middle class in America.

My answer to NAFTA is, why do we not make America investment-friendly?

I might say that I have had some discussions with the majority whip and a number of people on the other side of the aisle to talk about making America investment-friendly and business-friendly. But the answer is not to go to Mexico.

I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY].

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, many people acknowledge that the NAFTA agreement will result in a loss of low-skilled American jobs. But they argue that in the long run, it will create more high-skilled jobs in America and a strengthened economy.

A number of my constituents have raised this issue with me. I would like the gentleman's response.

Mr. BONIOR. First of all, let me say that the perception that the only jobs that will be going to Mexico are low-skilled, low-paying jobs is erroneous. What is going on right now, Harley Shakin, a professor at the University of California who has written extensively about Mexican-United States relations, industrial relations, in particular, and who has written several books and is a known expert on this, has indicated that we are shipping high-technology plants down to Mexico at an accelerated rate.

The Hermosillo auto plant that the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] mentioned was just one of them. There are many others, high-technology facilities, that are going to take good-paying jobs from America.

I have a number of my constituents who work in the auto industry. In fact, I have one of the highest percentages of auto workers of any place in the country. I have seen whole sections of auto plants, whole plants in my district move down to Mexico and good-paying jobs leave this country to be established there, high-technology jobs.

Then, of course, they pay very low wages down there. But as we have mentioned, they are very good in high productivity.

The other part of the gentlewoman's question deserves an answer. And that is, they will be able to purchase products here, because they will be making wages that will enable them to purchase American consumer products. And we will be able to produce those products for the Mexican market.

The fallacy with that argument is that the Mexican Government has had, in collusion with the government-run labor unions, has had, and businesses, has had a policy of low wages. Wages for Mexican workers are lower now than they were in 1979, real wages, lower than they were in 1979.

They had an upturn in 1987, because they were at the depth of their recession/depression. And they had nowhere to go.

If you devalued the peso, their wages, which will eventually happen very soon, were much, much lower.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I would add that not only have wages gone down in Mexico, the major thrust of the pro-NAFTA people is wages are going to go up in Mexico. The middle class is going to grow. They are going to buy our cars. They are going to buy all of our products.

But the fact is, they can barely afford to buy a spark plug, let alone a car. The issue is wages.

Since 1980, wages dropped 32 percent in Mexico. They have gone down 32 percent since 1980. At the same time, productivity per worker in Mexico has gone up 40 percent.

In a free society, as wages go up, so does productivity. They shadow one another within a point or two.

But in Mexico, because of what the majority whip, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] has said, and what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK] and others have said, and the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] over the last few months, is that wages are kept down by the Government.

There will be no middle class formed under the Free Trade Agreement the way it is negotiated now. Mexican workers are not paid enough. Their wages will not go up. They will produce more and more and compete, and frankly, take American jobs. And we are all the losers, except for the wealthy families in Mexico and the large corporate interests in this country that have exploited workers all along in Mexico.

□ 1640

Mr. BONIOR. I thank my colleagues.

Just to reemphasize the number that the gentleman has mentioned, 32 percent in wages has declined since 1979. Those are not just numbers we are picking out of the air. Those are numbers that came from the Mexican Government's National Institute of Statistics, and corroborated by our own Bureau of Labor Statistics.

I yield again to my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK].

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, again, it is a pleasure to join my colleagues from California, Vermont, Ohio, and, of course, Michigan as we once again come to the House floor in our united opposition to NAFTA.

Throughout the weeks we have discussed NAFTA and our reasons to oppose it. We have spoken a lot of Europe, and what has happened over there. Now they have the European Community, their free trading bloc, if you will. But you have to look back at the history of the European free trading bloc. You have to go back to about 1956, when they started what was then called the Common Market, as I knew it as I was growing up in northern Michigan. That was 1956, and probably some 35, 37 years later they have evolved into this European Community, a free trading bloc.

When we saw that, there has been this rush to adopt this so-called North American Free Trade Agreement. If we look at the European Community and what they have learned over 40 years, however, almost 40 years now, it is much of what the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] said. You do not abandon your own workers, you do not abandon your standard of living, you do not abandon your good-paying jobs.

What has the European Community said to the Eastern bloc countries as they have applied for application into this large European trading bloc. Those Eastern bloc countries, like Hungary, former Czechoslovakia, which is now the Republic of Slovakia, and the Czech Republic, Poland and Austria? What did they say? They said to them, "Once you raise your standard of living, once you raise the wages of your workers, once you have more political stability in your country, and when you have or begin your environmental clean-up, we will then consider you for application into our trading bloc."

But we have not done that. We have said to Canada, and we have a free trade agreement, and we had for some time, "Your culture is similar to ours. Your economy is similar to ours. Your environmental concerns, especially with the Great Lakes, are very similar to ours." Therefore, we have a free trade agreement with Canada.

"Why, then, would we bring in Mexico, where the average wage is less than $1? Why would we bring them in when they have horrendous environmental problems, as the gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER] said last week when he testified they were dumping 50-million gallons of raw sewage into southern California from Tijuana? Why would we allow that country to become a trading block with us?

Mr. BONIOR. I would say to the gentleman on that point, it is absolutely amazing to me. It shows us the insensitivity of the Mexican Government. Here they are in the process of trying to convince us, okay, that they are going to clean up their act on the environment, and they are dumping 30-million gallons of raw sewage, as I understand it, into San Diego, into the waters, into the area that is represented so very well by the gentleman from California, BOB FILNER.

It is that type of insensitivity. And when we look at the side agreements on the environment, even the person from Mexico who negotiated that agreement, the Secretary of Commerce, I think his name is Mr. Serra Puche, he has said it is basically a meaningless—and I am paraphrasing—endeavor, because the process is so long and complicated and drawn out that it will never reach a final solution.

In fact, if the gentleman will bear with me a second, I will read him exactly what he said:

"The time frame of the process makes it very improbable that the stage of sanctions could be reached."

He defended what he called an exceedingly long dispute resolution process of the NAFTA agreement, so in essence, he is telling his own folks that, "Don't worry about it. The process is too long. We won't have to do the clean-ups that are mandated under the agreement we have."

Mr. STUPAK. If the gentleman will yield further, we should really learn from the Europeans. Their system has evolved over 40 years. It appears to be a fair and just trading bloc. We should learn from them, that as countries increase their economy, clean up their environment, and bring further stability to their government, then and only then should they be allowed to be a free-trading partner with us.

We should share in the production and the consumption of goods, and the only way we can do that is if we have an equal or closely similar economy. So as the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] said, we should not abandon our economy, we should not abandon our standard of living, we should not abandon the working men and women of this country by entering into a free-trade agreement with Mexico which would only lower our standard of living and lower the wages for the working men and women of this country.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his contribution. I think he makes an excellent point in terms of how the Euorpeans have handled this in a much more complicated situation, because of all the different countries and the different standards and wages, but how they have corralled, embraced and brought into their system this divergence, and made them toe the line on two very basic points: democratization and economic stability.

I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR], who has been a real champion on this issue, as well.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] for his great leadership in these efforts. It is a pleasure to join late this afternoon with my colleagues, the gentleman from the State of Michigan, BART STUPAK, the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. BROWN, and also the gentlewoman from New York, Ms. MALONEY, new Members of this body who really have made a tremendous difference in this debate, because their election last November and their entry into this legislative chamber has meant that the whole dynamic of this debate has shifted, and it really says to me that voting does make a difference and that the American people can reflect their will.

With over 100 new Members here, the dynamic is certainly different than it was over the last 2 years. I want to especially thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] for his wholehearted efforts to try to shape something that will be good for all of the people of this continent.

Tonight I guess I am rather troubled in coming here to the floor, because we have been following the votes on this very closely. Tonight I wanted to talk a little bit about the lobbying that is going on behind closed doors, that is not written up a lot, but we know is happening. I wanted to talk about that tonight, as well as the statement that was made by a woman that our women's delegation met with last May, a woman from Mexico that we had the great opportunity to meet, who really begged of us that we find some alternative to this proposed agreement that she said should focus on the continent, but an agreement for development, for equity, for fairness, and for employment and decent wages.

This particular NAFTA will not do that. The gentleman from Michigan has eloquently, this evening, pointed out many reasons why. I guess what bothers me at this point is that the House's delay in sending the legislation to us as it attempts, behind closed doors, to sway Members, we now know tonight we would win this vote if it were held now, but there is tremendous lobbying going on behind closed doors, particularly, and I am going to single out the industries that are now sort of, where the votes hang in the balance with them.

I really do not think this agreement should be about any one industry, about any one State. We ought to be doing exactly what this representative from Mexico said, seeking what is right for all people of the continent, something that is fair, something that is equitable, something that helps people raise their standard of living.

I have watched as some of the interests in this agreement, and I represent part of the flat glass industry of the United States, watched that industry in particular participate in these discussions, interested largely in itself. Of course, we are interested in the jobs associated with that industry, but is it the proper position for the flat glass industry that if it achieves all that it wants for itself, that its interest should only be as narrow as itself? Or should its interest rather be the standard of living of the United States, the future hope for democracy in Mexico, and the benefit for all people of the continent? I would hope its interests would be broader than its own narrow shareholders' interests.

I look at the sugar industry, particularly the sugar beet industry, where I know some of the phone calls being made to Members in this Chamber and in the other body are coming. I say to myself, "It is important to be fair to that industry, but is that industry's interest only as narrow as its own pocketbook? Or are the people who work in that industry, the shareholders in that industry, the farmers in that industry, don't they have a larger interest than only themselves? Could they possibly have an interest in this country and in the continent, and trying to be what is right in the long term? Or are they only there for their own narrow self-interest?"

Or I look at the wheat industry, particularly the durum wheat growers of our country. If we did everything we could do for them in this agreement, would they then change their vote, simply because their own narrow interests had been satisfied?

□ 1650

Or are we here to do something more for the people of our country and the people of this continent? Or how about the citrus industry?

Mr. BONIOR. If the gentlewoman will just yield on wheat, because that is an important issue, and I think there are those of us in the Chamber who are interested in this issue as well. I happen to have a lot of sugar beet farmers in my district, and I have told them specifically: "Do not sell out the rest of the workers in this country for a deal on this issue."

There are a lot of issues that are of concern to them that come before this Congress. We have to stand together, those of us who believe in justice, and a fair price and a fair wage for people.

I want to tell people about and talk a little bit about the wheat that the gentlewoman just mentioned, because what the administration is going to try to do, or what the negotiators are going to try to do, is they are going to try to have side agreements to the side agreements, because they could not get a deal on wheat or sugar. And they are going to say to these particular representatives who represent those areas of the country that we will do a separate letter.

But I want to illustrate how dangerous that is and what a trap that is. We people were not happy with the African-Canadian trade agreement. And what happened was during those negotiations we producers were worried that the Canadian wheat would flood into the United States markets while Canada was allowed to retain many of the restrictions on imported wheat. In an exchange of letters with the Committee on Ways and Means in July, the then U.S. Trade Representative at that time, Clayton Yeutter, suggested an understanding had been reached whereby Canada would voluntarily limit its wheat exports to the United States as a condition for retaining its own import restrictions. The USTR solution sounded good on paper, as did others like it, such as on wheat prices and subsidization of wheat by the Canadian Government.

But what sounds good on paper does not always turn out to be good in practice. United States imports of Canadian wheat have skyrocketed, skyrocketed since 1988, in spite of these understandings, leaving a number of wheat producers in North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, and Montana on the verge of bankruptcy.

These side agreements to side agreements are nothing but a shield to get votes, and they do not work. They historically have not worked. And I would caution my friends in both parties to be leery of deals of this nature.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman for that clarification. And also to move on to one other industry where we know lobbying is going on very intensely by the White House and their paid emissaries, that is, the citrus industry. I would say to people in our country involved in that industry is your obligation only to the narrow interests of your industry and your own part of the United States, or is your obligation to the future of this continent, to our people in this country, to the people of Canada, to the people of Mexico to try to shape an agreement that goes beyond whatever your own narrow self-interests might be, and to the public interest, and to a continental accord that has the hope of raising standards of living?

I am troubled by what I see happening with the amount of money that is being spent by the U.S.-NAFTA group. They have to file their lobbying disclosure forms with the Clerk of the House. Thank God we have some of those lobbying laws in place. But the amount of money that is being spent by the people who wish to move this through, and it is happening behind closed doors for the most part.

Mr. BONIOR. It is unprecedented, unprecedented.

Ms. KAPTUR. It is absolutely unprecedented. I am looking here at just one of the publications that has come out. My goodness, I have never been able to afford anything this expensive, multicolored brochure, in all of the years I have been in public life, and this is being produced by the Government of Mexico, which is supported by the 3 dozen corporations that literally own that country. To see that this kind of money is being spent to influence public opinion, or this particular publication here that the Embassy of Mexico has sent out, hiring some of the most well-known publications firms here in Washington.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank my colleagues for participating today, the gentlewoman from New York, Mrs. MALONEY, the gentlewoman from Ohio, Ms. KAPTUR, the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. SHERROD BROWN, as well as the gentleman from California, Mr. DUNCAN HUNTER, and the gentleman from Vermont, Mr. SANDERS, and the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. BART STUPAK. I thank you for your participation, and we will continue our fight.

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.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I called this special order to declare my strong support for President Clinton's campaign finance reform package.

This package represents a historic opportunity. For 25 years, this town has danced around campaign finance reform. Now, it is time to face the music.

The President's plan is not perfect. But as Common Cause, Public Citizen, the New York Times, and the Washington Post have all pointed out, the President's plan represents a major step forward. It finally puts the public interest ahead of the special interests.

The plan would help level the playing field for challengers to compete against incumbents, who often win solely because they far outspend their opponents. Last year, despite unprecedented voter disenchantment, 96 percent of all incumbents who ran in the House of Representatives were reelected. And 90 percent of all contributions from Political Action Committees went to incumbents. This is not a coincidence. PAC's—Political Action Committees—are a legitimate source of campaign contributions, but they should not be the dominant source.

In my own race, I was outspent by a ratio of five to one. I was one of only two women this year who actually beat an incumbent.

As cochair of the freshman class task force on campaign finance reform, I am proud that the President has included all of the major reforms we recommended in our freshman reform package. The President's plan would impose an overall voluntary spending limit. It would reduce the influence of special interests by restricting total contributions from PAC's. It would provide $75,000 of public financing in the form of vouchers for campaign media to candidates who raise more than $75,000 in contributions of less than $200. That provision gives a stronger voice to the little guy who cannot make large donations.

The plan also would crack down on the stealth tactic of funneling soft money through political parties.

Many of us in the freshman class were gratified that the President included all of our positions in his outline for meaningful campaign finance reform.

To its credit, the House Democratic leadership, Speaker Foley, and majority leader DICK GEPHARDT, have been active and outspoken on this issue.

On January 5 of this year Representative SAM GEJDENSON introduced H.R. 3, the Congressional Campaign Spending Limit and Election Reform Act of 1993.

This bill is identical to the provisions of the 1992 conference report on S. 3, which passed both the House and the Senate, but was vetoed by President Bush.

H.R. 3 contains all of the principles that both the freshman class and President Clinton have called for in our respective outlines for reform.

I would like to quote the major elements of our freshman reform package:

First, overall voluntary spending limits.

Second, incentives in the form of alternative resources for candidates who accept spending limits.

Third, new restrictions on the use of soft money by barring parties from using such donations for Federal elections.

Fourth, limiting PAC contributions.

Fifth, tightening restrictions on independent expenditures.

And, last, the class called for House consideration of campaign finance reform legislation by September 30. Just last week, Speaker FOLEY pledged to the class that campaign finance reform would be considered by the House sometime before the end of October.

□ 1700

One of the problems that we confront in true campaign finance reform is how do we provide the public funding which is crucial to leveling the playing field and limiting special interest influence.

Part of the plan's funding could come from a voluntary $5 checkoff on Federal tax forms. For the average citizen the checkoff breaks down to less than 2 cents a day. The plan would ask every American, "Won't you give your 2 cents worth to clean up government forever?" And the beauty of it is, if you do not want to, you do not have to.

Funding could likewise be paid by the communication voucher approach contained in the May 7 proposal of President Clinton, Speaker FOLEY and Majority Leader GEPHARDT. This could be funded by an excise tax on all campaign contributions made to Federal candidates and federally registered tax and political parties. Contributions to these candidates, tax and political, totaled $1.5 billion during the 1991–92 election cycle. A 7 percent tax on these contributions during the 1991–92 election cycle would have raised approximately $100 million more. This would be more than enough to pay for the estimated cost of the May 7 communication vouchers.

Likewise, the communication voucher approach contained in the May 7 proposal could be funded by tightening further the repeal of the tax deduction for lobbying deductions.

The Senate Finance Committee's approach to repealing the tax deduction for lobbying would have raised substantially more revenues than the House Ways and Means Committee approach, which was adopted in the reconciliation bill.

Therefore, there may be additional revenues to be raised from the repeal of the tax deductions for lobbying that could be used to fund the communication vouchers.

At a recent meeting with business leaders in my district, one executive questioned whether campaign finance reform was really a serious concern of the American people. He insisted that reducing taxes was far more important to them; but the way campaigns are financed has a lot to do with reducing taxes. The American taxpayer will have to cough up half a trillion dollars for the S&L bailout. The S&L crisis was caused by reckless deregulation of the S&L's adopted by many Members of Congress whose campaigns were financed by S&L's. Now the American taxpayer is picking up the whopping tab.

I am proud that the President's plan was modeled in part after New York

City's campaign finance law, which I coauthored as a member of the New York City Council. That law was recently hailed by the chairman of the New York Public Interest Research Group, or NYPIRG, as the toughest and best campaign finance law in the nation.

Last fall the voters issued a mandate for change, a mandate for us in Congress to do more than protect our chances for re-election. Mr. Speaker, I hope they did not vote in vain.

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for arranging the special order and for allowing me to join with them. Today I rise to support the campaign finance reform proposals offered by my freshman Democratic colleagues.

When my colleagues began work on reforms in general we first turned our attention to comprehensive campaign finance reform. As new Members fresh off the campaign trail, we have unique insights into the handicaps that the current system places on challengers. As we consider various reform proposals in this Congress, we need to make sure that the changes we make give us a more competitive system. True campaign finance reform will level the playing field and allow for rigorous debate of the issues.

We need to reduce the length and cost of elections. Too much of our current electoral politics center around television time and sound bites. Candidates without the ability to televise themselves face a critical disadvantage. While this handicap may aid incumbents, it poorly serves the public. Sound bites and slogans, the briefest and most perfunctory distillation of off the cuff thought, drown our reasoned discussion of the issues. We need to reverse this process, which values pictures over words, and looks over quality of the candidates.

Moreover, the current system encourages incumbents to make fundraising one of their top priorities. Policy considerations necessarily suffer as a consequence. We should not stint the good of the Nation in the need to raise funds for our expensive process of election.

We also need to reduce the influence of special interests that currently dominate the process. Whether it is PAC contributions, or a board of directors who get together and sign checks, the effect is the same. The interests of the few often prevail at the expense of all Americans, those with a special interest prevail over the general public interest.

Special interest money however it arrives turns campaigns into contests of fund raising skills instead of a healthy and informative debate of ideas and principles. If we intend to restore Americans' faith in government, we must begin by restoring confidence in the process that gives us our Congress. Comprehensive campaign finance reform is a vital step towards that goal.

I strongly support the proposals in the freshmen Democratic reform package, which include, overall voluntary spending limits on campaigns, alternative resources for candidates who accept these spending limits, PAC restrictions, elimination of soft money, and restrictions on independent expenditures by wealthy candidates.

Elections determine the future of our Nation. This package of reforms will help level the playing field and improve the quality of our political campaigns.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, today, I join my freshman colleagues in supporting the President's proposals for comprehensive campaign reform.

Campaign finance reform is vital. An increasingly impatient public wants and deserves reform of the electoral system.

The public sees Washington as a place where special interests get special treatment—where lawmakers are too dependent on special interests for help in getting elected to make good policy decisions.

During my campaign for Congress, I pledged to make the system fairer, more open and more responsive to the public. I pledged to support reform that would give all Americans a real say in the legislative process. Curbing the influence of big money, special interest lobbyists must be a part of any reform efforts.

Campaign reform must also encompass reform of the electoral process. Real reform must create a level playing field for incumbents and challengers.

New PAC restrictions must also be accompanied by public resources for House candidates. Without such only the wealthy or well-connected will be viable candidates.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join you and my freshman colleagues in the House in supporting comprehensive campaign reform legislation that restores integrity and confidence in our electoral system. I look forward to working with the President to create a reform package that will address the needs of the American people.

THE TRUTH ABOUT NAFTA: MORE JOBS FOR AMERICANS

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this special order to talk specifically about the North American Free-Trade Agreement, an issue that those of you who have been following the debate over the past few minutes are probably maybe a little tired of the issue which the American people and our colleagues will be hearing about pretty regularly over the next several weeks, coming up to a vote which we anticipate will take place shortly before Thanksgiving.

Clearly, while I did not hear the statements that were made earlier from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, I think it is very important for us to take a few minutes to talk about the benefits of the North American Free-Trade Agreement. I feel very strongly about that, and to open up this debate I would like to call on my very dear friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN] who has been a very active Member of our effort to implement the North American Free-Trade Agreement and is now going to present to us a statement which he has been working on for the past several weeks.

I will say that I have had the privilege of looking at that statement ahead of time, and it is a brilliant one. I commend it to my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN].

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from California, who has taken such great leadership in this debate concerning the North American Free-Trade Agreement. This is one of the most crucial issues that will be coming before this Congress in this decade.

With the exception of the Clinton budget plan, no issue has generated more passion than the North American Free-Trade Agreement [NAFTA]. On balance, NAFTA is in the best short-term and long-term interest of the United States. It will bring many benefits to American consumers and workers. Above all, NAFTA will create jobs. That seems to be the issue that is forgotten in all the smoke, all the passion, all the emotion, all the raw heat that we have heard on these matters.

All the negative effects that opponents of NAFTA predict if the agreement is passed—specifically, American businesses moving to Mexico for cheaper labor—have already happened and can continue to happen even if NAFTA is defeated.

That is the irony of this discussion. Nowhere do they talk about what can be solved with NAFTA that cannot be solved without NAFTA.

The positive aspects of NAFTA—creating American jobs, eliminating Mexican tariffs and cleaning up the environment—will happen only if NAFTA is passed.

Here are the specific reasons I believe NAFTA deserves your support as the citizens out there and our support in this Chamber on both sides of the aisle.

How will NAFTA create American jobs? NAFTA will establish the largest market in the world. Every $1 billion in American exports accounts for approximately 19,600 American jobs related to that $1 billion. On average, export jobs pay 12 to 17 percent more than other, nonexport-based jobs.

United States exports to Mexico have tripled to $40 billion since 1986, when Mexico began lowering its tariffs on American products upon joining the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, known to most of us as GATT. United States trade with Mexico has gone from a $5.7 billion deficit in 1987 to a surplus of over $5 billion in 1992.

Mexican tariffs are 2½ times higher than ours—an average of 10 percent compared to our average of 4 percent. NAFTA would eventually eliminate all tariffs over the next 15 years which will dramatically increase our ability to export to Mexico. Because United States

tariffs are so low, Mexican companies already have access to our markets.

Over half of all Mexican exports enter the United States duty-free. It has been estimated that by 1995 NAFTA should increase United States employment by 200,000 jobs. Rest assured that if we do not take advantage of this opportunity, the Japanese and Germans will—with lasting adverse consequences for American prosperity and hundreds of thousands of jobs all over this Nation.

Will NAFTA lead to an increase in American companies going to Mexico? If a company wants to move to Mexico—for whatever reason—it can do so whether NAFTA is ratified or not.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, if I can reclaim my time momentarily, I would like my colleague to underscore once again that item that he referred to about Japan. I think that is a very important point which needs to be made once again. We so often hear from people who are virulent opponents of Japan's trade policy, and I agree with the fact that they have barriers that prevent us from being able to sell United States manufactured goods. The criticism that is so often leveled is they are somehow likening the situation between Japan and Mexico, and the fact of the matter is Mexico is reducing its tariff barriers to zero, so that we will be in a position to sell our goods there. I wish my friend would underscore that once again.

Mr. HORN. If Japan reduces its tariff barriers to zero, let alone its non-tariff barriers, we would not have a balance of payments deficit with Japan. The fact is Korea imports over half its rice from California. Japan might well do it, except the Japanese majority party wants to protect the farmers in their country. That is not unknown to our country or their country, but the fact is that our Nation is a Nation whose opportunities for its people has been based on the expansion of trade.

The American clipper ships plied every sea in the world. We opened up Japan. We opened up China. Now we are talking about the beginning of what could become a hemispheric common market. We seek to start with Canada, the United States, and Mexico, which even then will be the world's largest common market.

□ 1710

Some American firms have come back from Mexico. But the fact is NAFTA has been made a stalking-horse, a straw man, whatever one wants to call it, for a lot of other ills that have nothing to do with the North American Free-Trade Agreement.

Mexican law has required many companies, for example automobile manufacturers, that want to sell in Mexico to produce in Mexico, or face prohibitively high tariffs. NAFTA removes these reasons for relocating an American business to Mexico. Indeed, American automakers estimate that sales of American-made cars to Mexico will go from 1,000 to 60,000 in the first year after NAFTA is passed when Mexico lowers its tariffs and ends other restrictive practices.

That means jobs by the thousands for American workers in Detroit and elsewhere in the United States.

Do companies locate plants solely because of lower wages? Decisions to locate plants are determined not only on wage levels, but also on such factors as productivity, infrastructure, proximity to markets, education, training, technology, and communications. If such decisions were based solely on wages, then India, Bangladesh, and Haiti, as has often been said, would have full employment. United States workers are more productive than Mexican workers, not because Mexican workers cannot be as productive as American workers, but the fact is United States workers are better educated and better trained. Someday Mexican workers will be as well trained, and that is a hope for Mexico as well.

Will American industries be overwhelmed by a flood of products from Mexico? NAFTA provides protections to prevent import surges that could threaten the viability and health of an American industry. These import surge protections allow us to place the tariff back on a product for a period of 3 years. Tariffs on both sides are scheduled to be gradually eliminated over 15 years. Combined with the protection against import surges, there will be ample time for businesses to adjust.

How will NAFTA affect the environment? Unquestionably, the environment along the United States-Mexico border is a mess—but this has absolutely nothing to do with NAFTA since NAFTA does not currently exist, and you cannot blame an agreement for the sewage in the water, and the toxic pollution that is going on along the Mexican-United States border. If NAFTA is rejected, the environment will not be improved along that border, or anywhere else in Mexico. It will be an even greater mess. Conditions will become worse if Mexico has no incentive to improve the environment. We need an incentive for Mexico.

Under NAFTA, the United States and Mexico have committed that their laws and standards will provide high levels of environmental protection and they have committed to effectively enforce those laws. That is why reputable environmental groups support NAFTA.

Supporters include the National Audobon Society, World Wildlife Fund, Natural Resources Defense Council, Environmental Defense Fund, and Conservation International. These groups represent over 7 million environmentalists.

On September 21, 1993, Stewart Hudson of the National Wildlife Federation testified before the Subcommittee on Trade of the House Committee on Ways and Means. He stated that the real purpose of the environmental groups that oppose NAFTA was not concern for the environment but rather the desire to kill trade between America and Mexico. His testimony deserves to be quoted at length.

He said that two things must be remembered about the environment and NAFTA:

> First, a fair and objective reading of the NAFTA leaves you with one uncompromising conclusion: the environment is far better off with this NAFTA than without. Two, those who want to kill NAFTA are hiding behind the environment.

Mr. Hudson stressed that NAFTA unquestionably improves food safety standards, improves pollution standards, and protects international environmental agreements.

Asking how any environmentalist could oppose NAFTA, Mr. Hudson explained:

> The answer is simple: The environmental critics of NAFTA, those who will forever be holding out for more—even at the expense of making progress on the environment in dealing with problems of concern to all of us—are out to kill trade. It's kind of like an Olympics where the bar keeps getting raised higher and higher * * * that's the game that's being played. Make no mistake about it.

He went on to say that it was a diversion to talk about rejecting this NAFTA in favor of a better NAFTA.

> No amount of fine-tuning or renegotiation will ever satisfy these opponents of NAFTA. The bar will continue to be raised because the goal is to kill NAFTA, not to find new ways of breathing life back into it.

Mr. Hudson's testimony should be read by anyone who has been led to believe that NAFTA is bad for the environment.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield for a quick question to follow up on that?

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

Mr. DREIER. It seems to me that it is very natural that one would conclude that, as an economy improves, the demand for improvement of environmental standards will follow. In fact, if one looks at the worst environmental conditions on the face of the earth, they are in Third World societies where people are so impoverished they are not in a position to insist on improved environmental standards.

Mr. HORN. Exactly. You cannot develop an infrastructure to correct environmental deficiencies unless you have substantial resources which derive from an economy that works. You need an economy which provides a satisfactory income for its workers and fellow citizens, and then has a sufficient surplus to invest in order to turn around the abuses of the environment within that economy.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. HORN. I thank the gentleman from California for his contribution on that.

So that it may reach a wider audience, I ask that Mr. Hudson's statement before the Trade Subcommittee of the House Committee on Ways and Means on September 21, 1993 be entered into the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The conclusion is clear: The North American Free-Trade Agreement is good for the environment.

How will NAFTA affect illegal immigration? Each night, we are being flooded with several thousand illegal immigrants from Mexico and other countries who come across our borders, not simply our southwestern border, or our southeastern borders, but also our northern border, and recently we all read about boats of Chinese crammed in, coming in on the East Coast and the West Coast. With rare exception there is absolutely nothing in NAFTA that is likely to lead to an increase of illegal immigration in the short term.

In the long term, Mexican economic growth will certainly lessen the pressure on the population to illegally enter the United States to look for work.

Turn down NAFTA, and there will not only be thousands more illegal immigrants every night. There might well be tens of thousands every night.

How will NAFTA affect California? California will greatly benefit if NAFTA is passed. Mexico is already our third largest export market. Exports from California to Mexico grew from $2.2 billion in 1987 to $6.5 billion in 1992. In particular, industries which are traditional California strengths—aerospace, computers, transportation, construction, electronics, and others—will benefit from NAFTA.

NAFTA is a small, but essential element in helping to rebuild California's prosperity which has been hit so hard by the recession and defense cutbacks.

How will NAFTA affect Hispanic-Americans? As the natural bridge between America and Mexico, Hispanic-Americans will have many more opportunities for economic success with NAFTA than without. Increased trade between America and Mexico will help Hispanic-Americans and therefore all Americans.

Why? Because NAFTA will mean jobs. Those will be jobs in America for Americans—whether your ancestry is that of an Hispanic-American, an African-American, an Asian-American, an American Indian American, or even, as I am, a German-Irish-American. It is ourselves, our children, our grandchildren, and those yet to come, who will benefit from this treaty in both the short and the long run.

Some critics of NAFTA have crossed the line between opposition to a trade agreement and bigotry against Hispanics.

NAFTA has been caught up in some of the passion against illegal immigration. The two issues are completely separate. I have a two-decade track record of opposing illegal immigration and supporting tough measures to stop illegal immigration. But illegal immigration should be opposed from all countries, not just Mexico. It should be opposed because it is, by definition, illegal, not because many of the illegal immigrants happen to be Hispanic. The United States admits more legal immigrants than all the rest of the world combined. Many legal immigrants wait for years to come to America. Illegal immigration is simply not fair.

We need to keep this debate focused on NAFTA as a trade agreement, and I call on the critics of NAFTA not to cross the line between opposition to a trade agreement and bigotry, and to refrain from the heated rhetoric that fans the flames of ethnic resentment.

We have all heard many specific criticisms of NAFTA. It is time to separate fact from fiction:

Recently most of the specific criticisms have come from Ross Perot and Pat Choate in their book, "Save Your Job, Save Our Country, Why NAFTA Must Be Stopped—Now."

Mr. Perot and I agree on many important issues: The need to cut spending and balance the budget, campaign finance reform, term limits, law and order, illegal immigration, ensuring congressional accountability by changing the discharge petition process, just to name some of the most critical. However, on NAFTA, Mr. Perot and I disagree as to what the agreement does and what the effects will be.

The following are some specific criticisms that have been raised by Mr. Perot and other critics of NAFTA.

Myth: NAFTA will put at risk up to 5.9 million American jobs that would be lured to Mexico by lower wages.

What are the facts? Reputable economists on the right and the left have correctly characterized this claim in Mr. Perot's book as an extreme exaggeration. Where does this 5.9 million jobs at risk figure come from? Industries in which wages account for more than 20 percent of the value of the output are assumed to be at risk.

These industries include aerospace, medical equipment, and sonar equipment in which there is simply no danger of job loss to Mexico. It also includes many industries such as bakeries and wood pulp mills where there is no competition from Mexico.

Mr. Perot's book also selectively quotes the testimony before Congress of former Secretary of Labor Lynn Martin that NAFTA will cost 150,000 American jobs. What Secretary Martin actually said was that NAFTA will create 325,000 jobs—a net increase of 175,000 over those jobs lost.

Those who exaggerate potential job losses do not discuss American job gains from NAFTA. Recently, 283 top economists of all political views—including 12 winners of the Nobel Prize in economics—signed a statement supporting NAFTA They agreed that America will gain many more jobs than we might lose.

The economists said, "the assertions that NAFTA will spur an exodus of U.S. jobs to Mexico are without basis." These job gains will be precisely in the areas in which America and California will most benefit. These job gains are the strongest reason for supporting NAFTA.

Myth: NAFTA will undermine American sovereignty because it sets up a system of binational and trinational panels to resolve disputes.

What are the facts? NAFTA gives American businesses definable and enforceable legal rights when they sell to Mexico or operate in Mexico. Our businesses have not had these rights before. What the dispute resolution process does is let an American company that has been treated unfairly in a Mexican court appeal to a neutral United States-Mexican panel. Obviously, a Mexican company that felt it had been mistreated in an American court could do the same.

The binational and trinational panels cannot change our laws. Only Congress can do that. If America should disagree with the ruling of an independent panel it could choose to simply do nothing. This would give Mexico or Canada the right to retaliate by withdrawing trade concessions—just as we would have the right to retaliate against them. This is a right we demanded to ensure that Mexico and Canada keep their word.

We have nothing to fear from the dispute resolution process if we keep our word, which we obviously will.

Myth: NAFTA will undermine truck safety.

What are the facts? No provision of NAFTA exempts Canadian or Mexican vehicles or drivers from United States environmental, safety, or vehicle standards. Our country made it clear that the trucking standards of each American State would apply to all Canadian and Mexican trucks and their drivers. These standards will be enforced with the same stringency applied to U.S. operators.

Myth: NAFTA will allow low-wage truckers to enter the United States trucking business.

What are the facts? NAFTA allows U.S. trucking firms to enter the protected Mexican market for the first time. The United States-Mexican trucking trade is estimated as $3 billion or more annually. Three years after the adoption of NAFTA, Mexican and United States nationals may engage in cross-border truck service—but only in border States. Mexicans already can engage in this cross-border traffic in a limited fashion now—without NAFTA. NAFTA levels the playing

field, so we can get into it. Mexican nationals may not carry American domestic cargo traffic from point-to-point within the United States. They can only engage in point-to-point cross-border traffic, in other words, hauling from Mexico to the United States and taking a load back to Mexico. But they cannot haul goods from Chihuahua, Mexico, to the Port of Long Beach or the Port of Los Angeles, leave the load, then make new hauls of new goods and drop them off at any other point in the United States before finally taking a load to Mexico. The trucks have to go back across the border before they can drop the load picked up at the Port of Long Beach or the Port of Los Angeles.

Still another myth: NAFTA will undermine food safety standards. If they cannot scare you with unsafe, drive anywhere trucks, they will scare you with food.

What are the facts? NAFTA does not set standards, and certainly could not require the United States to adopt food safety standards lower than those we already have. And anyone that has dealt with the Food and Drug Administration knows that the standards are very high in this country, and they are not about to be changed.

NAFTA explicitly states that each party to the agreement can maintain higher standards than the international minimum. Our standards are set. They will continue to be set by the U.S. Congress and the various State legislatures. Claims that NAFTA will allow Mexican vegetables sprayed with DDT to be imported into the United States are simply untrue.

The truth does not seem to affect some in this debate. Apparently some people feel, as Goebels did under Hitler, "if you say it long enough, eventually people will believe it because so many people seem to be saying it." The question is, what are the facts?

□ 1730

United States regulatory agencies will continue to vigorously monitor food imports, not simply from Mexico, but from 180 other countries in the world.

Still another myth: NAFTA will undermine the Buy American Act and State and local legislation that mandates purchasing American-made products and services.

What are the facts? As to the latter, the NAFTA government procurement provisions do not apply to State and local governments. Therefore, NAFTA cannot possibly undermine and buy-local laws [NAFTA article 1001].

As for the Federal level, NAFTA does open up competition for construction and services, but the Davis-Bacon Act, which has been on the books for 61 years, has mandated the payment of prevailing wages on Federal construction projects, and that would still apply, and it would end any lower wage advantage that a Mexican construction firm might think it has. American construction and engineering firms are the best in the world.

And NAFTA will open up the market to those firms and other similar firms. Those firms strongly support NAFTA, because their expertise is in demand in Mexico. The Government procurement provisions of NAFTA will open up vast opportunities for American firms to sell goods and services and provide services in both Mexico and Canada.

Still another myth: Mexicans are too poor to buy United States goods.

There is no question, the Mexican economy has some real problems. There are some very poor people in Mexico, just as there are some very poor people in parts of the United States. But what are the facts?

Our recent trade experience with Mexico simply disproves this myth. Mexico is a growing market of 90 million consumers, 3 times the size of the population of California, as well as businesses and government. Seventy cents of every dollar Mexico spends on foreign products is spent on goods from the United States. Let me repeat that, Mr. Speaker: "Seventy cents of every dollar that Mexico spends on foreign products is spent on goods from the United States."

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I would simply like to ask my friend, who has chosen to reiterate it, to underscore the fact that the average Mexican expends quite a bit more on goods from the United States than the average Japanese citizen, the average Korean citizen. And those very wealthy Western Europeans do not spend as much as the average Mexican spends on United States goods.

Am I correct in concluding that?

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is absolutely correct, and he has, with great clairvoyance, moved to my next paragraph.

On a simple per capita basis, which includes purchases by individuals, government, businesses, even tourists, Mexicans buy $450 of American goods annually, on a per capita basis. That does not mean every Mexican buys $450 of American goods. Some are going to buy much more. But when you divide 90 million people into the amount that we are selling and exporting to Mexico, the figure is $450 per capita.

Figured on exactly the same basis, this is more than is bought per capita by the Japanese, who purchase $385 per person of American goods; by the Germans, who purchase $326 per person of American goods; or by the British, who purchase $395 per person of American goods. All of these countries have much higher average incomes than do those who live in Mexico, but Mexico is proving increasingly to be our best customer.

Still another myth: We are not really exporting finished goods to Mexico. We are sending component parts, which are then fashioned into various completed products for sale back to the United States.

I have probably heard that one 75 times.

What are the facts? Some of our exports are components, just as Mexico also exports some components to us for finally being assembled here.

As estimated 22 percent of all United States exports to Mexico were components for assembly in Mexico and resale back to the United States. This is down from an estimated 32 percent, down 10 points, since 1987. If components were all we export, then we would not have a trade surplus with Mexico—remember over $5 million trade surplus—unless one thinks that Mexico would buy components, turn them into finished products, and then sell the finished products back to us for less than they paid for the original components.

Further, 83 percent of the growth in United States exports to Mexico in the last 5 years has been products for consumption in the Mexican market, not for reexport.

The facts simply do not support this myth about American trade with Mexico.

Still another myth: Then we are told that we are not really exporting goods to Mexico; instead American companies are using these goods to set up plants in Mexico which will take jobs from Americans.

What are the facts? Capital goods—goods used in the production of other goods and services, such as machinery, machine tools, telecommunications equipment, planes, railroad cars and so on—are 33 percent of our exports to Mexico. Capital goods are 39 percent of all U.S. exports to the world.

Critics of NAFTA need to be reminded that exporting capital equipment is good, not bad, for the United States of America.

I wish we had many more sales of capital equipment. We once led the world in exports of capital equipment. Japan has increasingly come up; Germany has increasingly come up. High technologically oriented industrial nations develop and sell capital equipment because they are backing ideas and innovation.

Mexico needs equipment to produce goods for its own growing market. We want plants in Mexico to buy American equipment. For many years, the United States, as I noted, was the world leader in the manufacture of capital equipment. Then in the 1970's, we were clobbered by Japan, Germany, Italy, and Great Britain. Now our manufacturing base is coming back, and to strengthen that base, we need to be able to export capital equipment.

As I also noted previously, our exports to Mexico have more than tripled

in recent years, from $12 billion in 1986 to over $40 billion in 1992, not even a decade. In 6 short years we have increased our exports to Mexico from $12 to $40 billion.

We have gone from that $5 billion trade deficit in 1986 to that $5 billion trade surplus in 1992. NAFTA would continue this progress, create even more high-paying export jobs in the United States.

Moreover, imports from Mexico, which have grown from $17 billion in 1986 to $35 billion in 1992, also create jobs, since Americans import, distribute and sell those products. This means more choices and lower prices for American consumers, a very often neglected group.

We do not want to go back to the Smoot-Hawley tariffs of the Depression days, which simply erected higher tariffs and kept out the products of the rest of the world. In turn, other nations kept out our products. It meant we did not get out of the Depression until the coming of the Second World War.

Logic says we should go for the agreement and seize the opportunity presented by NAFTA. Because only by passing NAFTA will we know for sure if the benefits expected by supporters of NAFTA will actually materialize. Let us imagine that the critics of NAFTA are right, or even only partially right, and NAFTA turns out to be bad for America.

Well, then we can simply cancel the agreement. We have canceled other agreements, and we will cancel this agreement. It is that simple.

NAFTA is an agreement and only an agreement enacted by legislation, passed by the United States Congress. It could be canceled unilaterally by the American Congress with 6 months' notice, or it could be modified by agreement of the three countries: Canada, Mexico, and the United States.

In other words, we run a far, far greater risk if we reject NAFTA now than if we approve NAFTA now.

The campaign against NAFTA has largely been waged on myths, rather than on facts. NAFTA has become a lightning rod for all the fears and misconceptions of the left and the right.

□ 1740

What an irony. Some activists on the far left have joined hands with some activists on the far right who would crush unions and environmental protections in this country. If trade with a less developed country such as Mexico is bad for America, why do we have a $5 billion trade surplus, rather than a trade deficit? Why has trade increased so dramatically in the last 6 to 7 years, to the benefit of hundreds of thousands of American workers? Remember, 19,600 jobs in America are connected with every $1 billion of goods that we export.

NAFTA will increase these benefits for Americans by further lowering Mexican tariffs, and by ultimately eliminating them. This will enable us to export even more to Mexico, which will create tens of thousands of American jobs.

American workers are still the most productive workers in the world. Every survey shows that. We can compete with and surpass the workers of any other country.

We have a great deal to gain from increased trade. With NAFTA we have much to gain and little to fear from a country with an economy one-twentieth of the size of our own.

That is why this agreement—a joint product of a Republican administration and a Democratic administration—is a good deal for America. That is why this agreement is supported by most economists, most businesses, major environmental groups, the Democratic Speaker of the House, the Democratic majority leader of the Senate, a majority of Republicans in the House and Senate, and all six living Presidents of the United States from both parties.

It is also in accord with the vision of two earlier Presidents, Franklin Delano Roosevelt and John Fitzgerald Kennedy, who had the vision to promote better relations between America and the nations to our south.

That is what the Good Neighbor Policy and the Alliance for Progress were all about. They saw—as this agreement will create—a hemisphere of free nations, free markets, and free people. Democratic and competitive, free of paternalism.

The North American Free-Trade Agreement is right for America.

The North American Free-Trade Agreement means jobs for Americans.

It deserves our wholehearted support.

I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from California, for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following testimony for the RECORD:

TESTIMONY OF STEWART J. HUDSON ON BEHALF OF NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION

Good morning, Mr. Chairman. I am Stewart J. Hudson, Legislative Representative for the International Programs Division of the National Wildlife Federation. The Federation is the nation's largest private conservation organization, dedicated to the wise management of natural resources and protection of the global environment.

The National Wildlife Federation, along with a majority of the nation's leading environmental and conservation organizations, wholeheartedly supports the NAFTA and we urge Congress to approve this vitally important agreement. My organization firmly believes the environment is far better off with the NAFTA package than without it. This position is also shared by the National Audubon Society, the World Wildlife Fund, the Natural Resources Defense Council, the Environmental Defense Fund, and Conservation International, groups which, together with outs, represent over 7.5 million members in this country and abroad who will be working in every Congressional district to see this agreement passed.

Our decision to support the NAFTA and its environmental agreements is the result of thousands of hours of work, and intense pressure from our members and the Congress to assure that NAFTA would include a strong environmental component. At the beginning of the debate over NAFTA, a debate which has spanned nearly three years, trade and environmental concerns were thought to be unlinkable. As a result of our efforts, environmental concerns are clearly one of the pillars of this agreement.

Here are a few examples:

The NAFTA itself provides for protection and strengthening of the highest food safety, environmental, and consumer standards. These standards are protected at the federal, state, and local level. NAFTA does not force these standards downward. When a higher standard is challenged, the standard is presumed valid, and the challenging party bears the burden of proving it a violation of the NAFTA.

In addition, NAFTA denies countries the ability to lower pollution standards to attract business. Article 1114 of the NAFTA is clear on this point and is unprecedented in any trade or investment agreement. In addition, the Commission on Environmental Cooperation will have the power to investigate and even levy penalties when a country ignores its pollution laws.

In yet another unprecedented provision, NAFTA protects international environmental agreements which rely on trade measures for their enforcement.

The Agreement on Environmental Cooperation, which establishes the North American Commission on Environmental Cooperation, will make lax enforcement of environmental laws in the NAFTA territory actionable through monetary penalties and trade sanctions.

* * * * *

Claim: Our laws to keep wildlife from being abused in trade remain in jeopardy.

Facts: Prohibitions on the illegal trade in wildlife and endangered species are *explicitly* protected under NAFTA Article 104. That provision assures that the CITES Convention (controlling trade in threatened and endangered plants and animals), along with the Basel Convention (Hazardous Waste Trade), and the Montreal Protocol (which protects the ozone layer), will all take precedence over a conflicting NAFTA Article. The allegation that wildlife protection will be endangered by the NAFTA is without foundation.

Claim: Laws such as those to protect dolphins and turtles during harvesting of tuna and shrimp are disallowed.

Facts: None of the U.S.'s environmental laws are disallowed under NAFTA, despite the allegations made by environmentalists who criticize trade. Conservation laws that are non-discriminatory have been successfully defended by the U.S. government for some time and, under the NAFTA, can be successfully defended from challenge. To claim that they are "disallowed" by the NAFTA is intentionally misleading.

Claim: States would have to weaken their laws too, and they can't defend their laws when challenged.

Facts: NAFTA does *not* require a federal government to pre-empt sub-federal laws in order to conform with the obligations of the treaty. NAFTA simply holds the federal government responsible for defending any inconsistency between a country's NAFTA obligations and a sub-federal law. NAFTA does *not* require states to weaken laws and in fact states are allowed to set standards that may, in some cases, exceed even their own federal government's standards.

Moreover, states and local governments are not the kind of defenseless victims portrayed by this allegation. In the event that

a state law is challenged, the U.S. government takes responsibility for defense of legitimate sub-federal standards. The U.S. practice is also to include states as full participants in any panel proceeding that would involve their laws. As stated by the United States Trade Representative, Mickey Kantor, in recent correspondence with chairman of the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment of the House Committee on Energy and Commerce, Henry Waxman, "In the case of the NAFTA—as we have done in connection with the Canada Free Trade Agreement—we would expect state representatives to be full participants in any panel proceedings concerning their laws."

Claim: Most of the environmental conventions to which the U.S. is a party are subordinated to the harsh provisions of NAFTA.

Facts: Most international environmental treaties to which the U.S. is party make no use of specific trade provisions or measures to achieve the goals of those agreements and as such are not in conflict with NAFTA. The conflict suggested by this allegation is imaginary.

Claim: This [NAFTA] is a threat to American environmental sovereignty. It is also a major step toward ending democracy in this country.

Facts: Our environmental sovereignty is far from threatened. In fact, it is safe to say that given current international trade rules, NAFTA strengthens our ability to maintain control over our environmental laws.

The environmental hold-outs on NAFTA are assuming a grave responsibility. If they are successful in convincing you to kill NAFTA, then they are honor bound to go to the border and tell the residents of the *colonias* why they eliminated $8 billion in funds for addressing the environmental horrors that afflict that area. They are honor bound to explain to Mexican citizens why they felt it necessary to trash NAFTA provisions improving their voice in environmental issues.

They should travel to Oregon and explain to small businesses like David Evans and Associates, an environmental and engineering consulting firm in Portland, that there will be no new jobs for their sheet metal workers, drill press operators, and skilled machinists because in killing NAFTA, new opportunities for their firm were wiped out.

Finally, they can explain to environmentalists why environmental issues will no longer be considered with credibility in future trade agreements.

But all of these sad scenarios, which harm the United States at least as much as Canada and Mexico, need not unfold if members of Congress prevent themselves from being distracted from the best argument in favor of NAFTA and that is the NAFTA itself.

The evidence is clear—the environment is far better off with the NAFTA than without it, and killing the NAFTA package only perpetuates the status quo. Those who want to kill NAFTA and hide behind the environment should beware that as fact replaces fiction in this debate, their constituents may wonder why they voted to eliminate all of the important benefits the NAFTA had to offer.

These groups may tell you that they are not out to kill NAFTA, that they just do not like *this* NAFTA, and that they would support a renegotiated agreement. Fortunately, most members of Congress will recognize this for the diversion it represents—no amount of fine-tuning or renegotiation will ever satisfy these opponents of NAFTA because their goal is to *kill* NAFTA, *not* find new ways of breathing life back into it.

In contrast to the defeatism exhibited by NAFTA opponents, members of Congress have a choice. If members of Congress demonstrate the same kind of commitment and leadership exhibited at the White House last week, the American public will understand and be supportive of a trade agreement that creates jobs, protects natural resources, and provides a clear direction for how best to promote sustainable development in an increasingly global environment.

We sincerely urge you to make this choice, for jobs, for the environment, and for our country.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Long Beach for providing us with what was truly one of the best statements on the North American Free-Trade Agreement. He has really touched on a wide range of the questions and concerns that have emanated from many, and I believe what he has done is, he has taken what I described as the fear versus facts theory and really focused on the facts, and taken many of the items that people have raised that have led many people to fear the implementation of a North American Free-Trade Agreement, and I commend him for what was clearly an excellent statement.

I am surrounded by three new Members of the House of Representatives. My friend from Long Beach is just one of them. Another one who is a strong supporter of the North American Free-Trade Agreement is my friend, the gentleman from Selah, WA, Mr. INSLEE. At this point I yield to Mr. INSLEE.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much. It is a pleasure to be here tonight, because it is an opportunity to come down here to the Chamber of the House and fight for American jobs. It is really clear that NAFTA is going to create what America needs. It is going to create American jobs.

I come down here to try to dispel the myth, the rumor, the smoke, the hokum, the bunkum that people are laying on, about trying to kill American jobs. NAFTA is the answer to what ails us, or part of that answer.

Let me tell you what I mean by that. There is going to be net winners when NAFTA passes and there are going to be net losers. Let me tell you who they are.

The net winners are going to be American working people, because they are going to have more jobs in this country. Let me tell you who probably is going to be the net losers, frankly, and it is time to tell the truth. The net losers are going to be the working people in Germany, in Japan, in Asia, who are our real economic competitors. Let me tell you why.

Let me tell the Members where our jobs were going in the last 10 years in this country. Some were going to Mexico, but I will tell you where they are really going, Asia. We have a $75 billion trade imbalance with Asia. We are shipping jobs every week across the Pacific, and to Europe, because we are losing markets. Let me tell you why when NAFTA passes we are going to be better than we are today, because the status quo is this.

If I may, in the ensuing battle of the charts, I have one that I think is probably the most salient fact in this argument. Today the American worker has to pay a tax, and the folks I represent do not know about that tax. It is kind of hidden. I call it the hidden Mexico tax on American workers. That is a 10-percent average tariff. If you look at this as a wall, Mexico has a 10-foot-high wall, a tax, on American workers that people in my district, in Selah, WA, a little town up in the State of Washington, have to pay to get their exports into Mexico, a 10-foot wall.

Now, we are getting snookered up in Selah, WA, because we only have a 4-foot wall, an average 4-foot tariff of Mexico exports to us. In Selah, WA, we call this getting the short end of the stick. Mexico imposes a 10-percent tax on my constituents, and we only impose a 4-percent tax on Mexican workers.

Mr. DREIER. My friend makes an excellent point. Obviously that 2½ times disparity is one which has created an advantage for those in Mexico over us, and yet due to privatization in Mexico we have still seen an increase in the flow of exports from the United States to Mexico. I think that my friend's presence here simply underscores the fact that there is bipartisanship in the support of this.

Now, my friend, the gentleman from Long Beach, Mr. HORN, talked about the fact that we have two administrations that were involved in the negotiating process. We all know that a year ago last month, since this is September 30 and not October 1, it was August of last year, President Bush initialed the North American Free-Trade Agreement, and the two side agreements that were brought forth by the Clinton administration. I am happy that my friend, the gentleman who is a proud and strong Democrat, stands here with us trying to reduce barriers.

At this point I yield to another Member of Congress, a very good friend, the gentleman from Bloomfield Township, MI [Mr. KNOLLENBERG], who is getting ready to head back there in just a few minutes, but I would like to yield some time to him to talk about his strong commitment and support toward reducing trade barriers.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I do appreciate the leadership he has shown in putting together the other side, perhaps, which I think is what the country needs, and it certainly is what this body needs. I think the gentleman from Washington [Mr. INSLEE] is right on target with his comments.

Today I would like to direct my remarks to every Member of this body

who is undecided on the issue of NAFTA.

You have heard a lot of rhetoric as to what this treaty will do and not do—some of it grounded in fact, some of it pure political theater. Your role so far has been to sift the facts from the theater and make reasoned judgments.

With this in mind, consider the central complaint of NAFTA's opponents.

I ask you, how can anyone argue that when a country lowers its tariffs, it somehow acts as an incentive for companies to locate there?

Let us test this hypothesis.

Say, for instance, that Japan lowered its tariffs and import restrictions on American-made goods tomorrow. Would we hear a giant sucking sound of United States jobs to the Orient? Of course not.

Now imagine if, 20 years ago, we entered into a NAFTA-like agreement with Japan. Would our trade balance be better than it is now? Would United States companies have a greater presence in Japan's domestic market? Would American companies be making the products that Japanese companies now make? Yes, yes and yes.

During the 1980's, Honda, Mazda, Toyota, and Nissan all moved some of their auto production to America. Why? Because they feared we would raise our tariffs on imported cars and tighten import quotas.

Anti-NAFTA logic would have us believe that lower tariffs and the removal of numerical quotas are the prime cause of job movement.

In short, the central rationale for opposing NAFTA is based on a false economic premise. Think about that next time you hear talk of the giant sucking sound.

Anyone with a cursory knowledge of economics understands that freer trade is a win-win game, and if implemented, NAFTA will create thousands of jobs here at home and improve our lackluster economy.

Unfortunately, the opponents' tactics of distortion have transformed the debate from a rational discussion into a convoluted shouting match—and right now, some would say they are winning.

The problem with NAFTA is not in the agreement itself—it is in the lack of public understanding.

Let me say this—America, as my colleagues have pointed out, has a choice. We can either grow the U.S. economy by embracing world markets, or wither under protectionism.

The defeat of NAFTA would jeopardize the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT] and slow down the movement for international free trade. This would hurt all of the world's economies.

In spite of what the critics would have you believe, by increasing trade with Mexico, NAFTA will create thousands of high-wage manufacturing and service sector jobs for American workers in America.

There is a great deal of distortion surrounding this issue. For a moment, let us talk specifics.

□ 1750

As has been pointed out, NAFTA is really about fairness. Right now, Mexican tariffs are on average four times higher than United States tariffs. NAFTA will equalize tariffs and eliminate the unfairness.

Opponents often use the strange argument that NAFTA will encourage United States businesses to leave for Mexico. But there is nothing on the lawbooks preventing U.S. companies from moving now.

If anything, the reduced Mexican tariffs and greater trade will enable more companies to stay in the United States. Companies will not have to go to Mexico to penetrate that market. And while there is going to be dislocation in some industries—as there would be anyway if we maintain the status quo—overall NAFTA will result in substantial job creation in the United States.

Furthermore, Mexican wages are not as low as NAFTA opponents suggest. By law, Mexican employers must provide year-end bonuses, double time for overtime, 20 days paid vacation per year, paid medical leave, and housing credits. In addition, it is customary to provide benefits that we are used to here, like health insurance and a transportation allowance, which is something they will have in many cases, and even grocery allowances.

In fact, as has been pointed out by my colleagues, if wages were the only criteria one looked at in determining where to go into business, Haiti and Bangladesh would be the economic powerhouses of the world.

So, despite what our good friend Ross Perot might have said, the fact is that NAFTA is a winner for the U.S. economy. It will open up a market of nearly 100 million customers or consumers, it will reduce the illegal immigration problem by making Mexico a more attractive place to stay and work, and it will help all of North America compete with Asia and Europe.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend from Bloomfield Township for his very considerable contribution to this debate. Coming from the State of Michigan where many of our Michigan colleagues are opposing NAFTA, it is great to have his words once again demonstrating the bipartisan commitment to the implementation of the North American Free-Trade Agreement.

We have heard from both sides of the aisle this evening. At this point I am happy to yield to my very good friend and fellow Californian, a member of the Committee on Ways and Means who has been working diligently to try and break down trade barriers on employment in the North American Free-Trade Agreement, my friend from Sacramento, Mr. MATSUI.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] and appreciate all of the leadership he has shown on this issue, along with other of the Members who have spoken as well. And of course I would like to particularly commend the gentleman from the State of Washington, JAY INSLEE. As a new Member he has certainly shown a lot of leadership, a lot of courage, and certainly a lot of vision that I think this country needs in terms of his support, very visible, active support on behalf of the North American Free-Trade Agreement. We certainly appreciate the fact that as a new Member of Congress he supports this legislation.

I am going to be very brief, Mr. Speaker. But I would like to make one observation. There has been so much misunderstanding about what the NAFTA or the North American Free-Trade Agreement is all about, particularly since the August recess when Members were back in their home districts or home States.

Ross Perot, for example, suggested that there is a giant sucking sound, and I am sure other Members have commented on that, of jobs being pulled from the United States to Mexico. And unfortunately that could not be further from the truth.

What NAFTA is really all about, pure and simple, is a trade agreement. It is a trade agreement in which tariffs on both sides of the border are reduced. For example, on the U.S. side of the border the average tariff is 4 percent. For every Mexican good coming into the United States, the tariff is 4 percent of the average. On the Mexican side of the border, for every United States product going into Mexico, there is a 10-percent average tariff. Mexico's tariffs are 2½ times the size of the United States tariffs. Mexico has a clear advantage.

Some have said well, we are concerned that the NAFTA will create an unbalanced playing field. Well, there is an unbalanced playing field today, and that playing field tilts to Mexico's advantage.

What the NAFTA does is to reduce these tariffs immediately, particularly on the Mexican side where the tariffs are higher, and within a period of 5, 10, and 15 years those tariffs on both sides of the border go down to zero.

To give an example of how this will create jobs rather than lose jobs in the United States, in the computer industry, in the Silicon Valley or up in Massachusetts, or in Texas, or in any other State that develops American computers, when you ship a computer down to Mexico made in the United States today there is a 20-percent tariff on that computer. As a result of that, IBM and some other companies had to move

down to Mexico, because they cannot afford a 20-percent tariff. And believe it or not, and I know that there has been a lot of misunderstanding about this, the Mexicans are a rapidly developing economy. In fact, it is one of the fastest-growing economies in the world today. They are rapidly developing a middle class. Today 26 percent of the Mexican citizens are considered middle class, and that is going to grow, and grow, and grow.

If the NAFTA passes, if the NAFTA passes, immediately that tariff goes down to 10 percent, and within a 5-year period that tariff will be zero. And that is why the CEO of Tandy Corp., the CEO of IBM, the CEO of every computer company in America has said that they will stay in the United States, create more jobs if, in fact, the NAFTA passes.

What they are really afraid of is if NAFTA fails, the Japanese, the Germans, the French, the Europeans will begin to sell their computers to the rapidly growing Mexican market.

Automobiles. I see many of my colleagues from Michigan opposing the NAFTA, and I can tell you that it is absolutely incredible that somebody from that State could oppose the NAFTA, given the facts today. Without the NAFTA there is a 20-percent tariff on U.S. automobiles made in the United States going down to Mexico. In addition to that, Mexico has a domestic-content requirement. Any automobile sold in Mexico has to have Mexican parts, Mexican laborers before it can actually be sold, and that is why only 1,000 U.S. cars a year, made in the United States, are being shipped to Mexico. And that is why you have the Chrysler Corp., GM, and Ford in Mexico today, because they want to sell cars in Mexico to the middle-class Mexican market.

And believe this or not, statistics will show it, on a per-capita basis the Mexicans are the fastest-growing purchasers of automobiles in the world. They are going to buy Japanese automobiles, French and German automobiles if we do not get into that market.

If NAFTA passes, immediately that 20-percent tariff goes down to 10 percent, and within a 10-year period it goes down to zero.

In fact, the vice president of General Motors Corp. last week stated that if the NAFTA passes, in the first year they will sell 66,000 United States automobiles, all made in the United States, to Mexico, at an additional cost to the Mexicans of $1 billion. And it will create immediately 15,000 more U.S. jobs, and all of them will be members of the United Auto Workers Union.

It is incredible that somebody from Michigan would oppose this agreement.

Let me conclude by making one final observation. To a large extent, this is not only about the NAFTA or our relations with Canada and Mexico. This issue is about Japan and about the European Continent.

I talked to a person from Britain a couple of nights ago at the British Embassy, and he was saying that if the NAFTA fails, the British are going to move down there quicker than you can ever imagine, because right now the English are the second largest investors in the Mexican market. And they really want that Mexican market. I can tell you the Japanese want Mexico not to have an agreement with the United States. They want NAFTA to fail because they want to move into that market, because it is the largest available market that is rapidly growing, 80 million people. Where else is the United States going to find a market of 80 million people over the next decade?

And Mexicans right now want to buy U.S. consumer goods. Right now they buy 20 percent of their consumer goods that they use in their house from the United States of America.

But this debate is not only about NAFTA. It is not only about Japan or Europe. This debate is about something else more fundamental, and I think that is where vision comes into play. That is where the whole notion of values on America come into play.

Do you know why we are the greatest nation, the reason why this country is so powerful, why over the last 200 years we have been a great economic power? It is because in this country we value change, because we believe change is part of the American ideology, because we believe that change makes us competitive and is what makes this country progressive.

□ 1800

To give you an example, if the opponents had their way in 1910, if the opponents were in power in 1910, we would be protecting the blacksmith and the carriage maker against the automobile. If the opponents were in power in the 1970's, we would still be listening to music on a phonograph, rather than a cassette recorder or a CD. That is what this debate is all about, those people who are afraid of change want to protect the status quo. Those people who are afraid of change are the ones who really do not want progress in this country, because they only want the few jobs they have, because they are insecure.

Those who support NAFTA are the optimists of the world. We know we can compete with the Japanese and the Germans and the Europeans, and yes, even the Mexicans.

We know that we can beat them if we are just unleashed and given their markets, because ultimately what this debate is really all about is the whole notion of what is one's view of the future in America.

I want my son to have a great opportunity, a great job in this country. Whatever that job may be will depend upon what the markets will be. It will depend upon what the new technology will be. It will depend on what the consumer wants to buy in this country, and it probably will not be a phonograph or a CD or even a VCR, because there is going to be change in the year 2000. If we do not adapt to that change, the Europeans will, the Japanese will, or even the Mexicans will. That is really what we are talking about. We are talking about something very fundamental to our country.

Are we a nation that truly believes that change is important? Are we a nation that truly believes that we are powerful and that we can compete against the rest of the world?

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for his excellent statement.

Let me just say that I interjected at one point. I wanted to underscore something that my friend, the gentleman from Sacramento, said, and that is in talking to the chief executive officer of IBM, the prospect of facing 20 percent tariffs which exist today between the United States and Mexico for computers is obviously a daunting one. The desire to reduce that to 10 percent and ultimately down to zero is something to which the industry aspires, so that we can take advantage of those 88 million consumers in Mexico in that growing market.

The fact of the matter is the chief executive officer of IBM said that if NAFTA fails, they will have no choice whatsoever other than to move operations which are presently in the United States to Mexico.

Why? Because it is essential that they take advantage of the consumer market that exists there.

So truly, NAFTA is going to be a job creator in this country as we reduce that tariff barrier which exists there.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for his leadership on this issue. I thank him for demonstrating that this clearly is a bipartisan issue, and while he and I have often disagreed on issues in the past as they have related to California, there are many who often say, "Why can't the California delegation come together?" Well, on NAFTA we are. I believe that we will have a majority of our colleagues from our State working on that.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, one argument that we will be hearing, we probably heard it just before the gentleman from Washington and the gentleman from California came up, is the issue of income. I think we should address that issue, because it is a most specious issue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota). The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] has expired.

NAFTA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. INSLEE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman from Washington yield a few minutes to me?

Mr. INSLEE. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI].

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding a few minutes.

Mr. Speaker, in terms of the issue of the wages, we will acknowledge, because it is correct, that the average Mexican wage is about one-seventh of the average wage in the United States. In other words, our wages are seven times greater than the Mexican wage. That is why there has been a lot of fear.

"Oh, my goodness, these wages, all these jobs are going to go down south."

Let me give you some empirical evidence. Back in 1985, I believe it was, I was then, as I am now, a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, on the Trade Subcommittee. We passed what was known then as the Caribbean Basin Initiative. It was an initiative to provide a free trade agreement with the Caribbean countries, Granada, Jamaica, Barbados. All these countries again had wages about one-tenth the size of the United States.

Labor leaders appeared before the Ways and Means Committee and said,

> This is going to destroy the manufacturing base in America. This will create a situation where American jobs will be sucked down to the Caribbean Basin, and all these manufacturing jobs will be put in the Caribbean Basin.

I would urge my colleagues to go to the Caribbean Basin today. There are no manufacturing jobs in the Caribbean Basin, because wages were not the component that businesses decided to use when they decided to locate in any given place.

The reason is because in manufacturing today in America, wages are only 10 percent of the total cost of manufacturing in this country, and throughout the world.

What is more important is the quality of the work force, the environment of the work force in the surrounding areas, whether there is an educational institution in the surrounding area, the kind of technology that the country or the State happens to have. These are the kinds of things that are important in the 20th and 21st centuries. These are the kinds of things that make the decision as to where people locate and where businesses go.

The whole notion of wages being critical to the decision of where IBM or Motorola or G.M. goes is absolutely ridiculous, because it is such a small component of the total cost of doing business in America today.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield briefly, if I could follow on with the line of thinking of my friend from Sacramento?

Mr. INSLEE. Certainly, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding to me.

It is a very good point that the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI] makes as we look at this wage issue.

Quite frankly, I am going to choose to take on something that was said by the distinguished majority leader as it relates to wage rates, and that is a chart I have had sitting here for the last hour. I have been meaning to focus on this, and I will very briefly.

I would like to quote the statement that was provided by the majority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], when he said:

> Mexican wages are kept artificially low because of the actions, and inactions, of the government. And they have kept these wages low to help their economy grow. And, if their wages don't rise, the downward pressure on our wages will continue.
>
> Official data from the Mexican Government tell the story best. Since 1980, real hourly compensation has fallen by 32 percent in Mexico, while manufacturing productivity has increased by more than 30 percent. Economists tell us that wages should roughly track productivity increases. Yet, Mexican workers are producing more, and getting less.

Mr. Speaker, those statements are quite frankly untrue. There is no truth whatsoever to the basis on which the majority leader outlined his opposition to the North American Free-Trade Agreement.

What I would like to do is address that question now with this particular chart that I have right here.

First, Mexican wages did skyrocket from 1979 to 1981, fueled by the 1979 oil price shock and a tremendous influx of unwise foreign lending. While the wage rate went up, the worker productivity barely budged.

When the Mexican economy collapsed, a product of the bursting of the oil bubble and also the cutoff of most foreign loans, wages plummeted to a realistic level. Under very antitrade socialist regimes, in the early 1980's Mexican wages fell dramatically from 1981 to 1986.

Real Mexican wages, Mr. Speaker, turned around under President Salinas in 1987.

Now, we have regularly listened to the critics who talk about the fact that the Mexican Government is corrupt, there is no political pluralism.

Well, quite frankly, if we look at the mid-1980's and the turnaround that began when President Miguel de la Madrid had the Mexican Government participate and join the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, as my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN], said, and then the election of President Salinas, where privatization began of the telephone industry, the banking industry, which in 1981 had been nationalized by President Jose Lopez Portillo.

When this privatization move began, we saw tremendous improvement in the economy and also an increase in wage rates as it relates to productivity.

Now, if we could focus on the chart here, we can see the orange chart here shows the actual real earnings of the Mexican worker juxtaposed to productivity.

In 1988, there was actually a decrease in the real earnings as it related to productivity, but if you look at 1989, beginning at that point there was a surge in wage rates juxtaposed to productivity, and then it goes in 1990, 1991, and in 1992.

Of course, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] has regularly talked about the fact that wage rates are much lower than the level of productivity.

□ 1810

The wage rates in Mexico far exceeded the level of productivity there, so it is very important that we dispel this rumor and look at the facts. People continue to give these untruths, which need to be addressed, and I thank my friend from Selah for yielding me this time, and I look forward to his presentation.

Mr. INSLEE. I think, you know, we have got to look at another issue, and that is wages here. You know, we are starting to hear the opponents of NAFTA start to change their tune a little bit. You know, originally they started saying, well, we will be a net loser, but I think the evidence has shown very conclusively that, when you take down their 10-foot wall, and we only take down a 4-foot wall, there is no way on this green Earth we are not going to have a net increase in jobs in this country.

But you know they have fallen back to another argument. They say, well, that the jobs that will be created here, they will be the low-paying jobs. They will not be the good-paying, high-value, expert jobs. Well, you know, sometimes you got to deal with facts once in a while, and I happen to have some.

If you look at the jobs that we gain by exports to Mexico today, and you compare the average wage, if you will, for those across industry in general, you will find that, if you look at this block, these are wages for jobs in general, and the cross-hatched are the wages created by exports to Mexico.

The fact of the matter is, even today, having to jump over the 10-foot wall, our wages, generated by exports to Mexico, are higher, and they are going to be greater, and I guess I would yield to the gentleman and ask him if that is any different on the Mexican side.

Mr. DREIER. I will tell the gentleman the situation that is very important for us to underscore is that historically, as we look at export jobs in

the United States, jobs that are created due to exports to other countries, the wage rates here in the United States for those jobs is 17 percent higher than the wage rates for products that are created for domestic consumption.

So, clearly we are going to be creating higher wage jobs right here in the United States when it comes to enhancing our chance to export to Mexico and to other countries.

Mr. INSLEE. I thank the gentleman.

You know I would like to come back, if I can. We were talking about how this relates to our competitors in Germany, and in France, and Japan, and Italy, and Singapore, and we were talking. The gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI] made an excellent point that in fact our competitors would be in the Mexican market; the Germans and the Japanese will be stealing our jobs. In fact, if we do not enter into NAFTA, and I would like to talk about that for just a moment, about maybe why the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI] said that; if you look at the barriers right now that Japan has got to our exports; or, excuse me, Mexico, they have got this 10-foot high wall, and that 10-foot high wall under NAFTA is going to be taken down brick by brick until it is zero, as will ours come down to zero. We are going to enjoy something we do not have right now. The American worker is going to enjoy a level playing field with Mexico.

What will the German worker have after NAFTA passes? The German worker will still have to crawl over the 10-foot wall, the Japanese exporter will still have to crawl over the 10-foot wall, the Singapore exporter.

Now, is there any way under those circumstances that we cannot be better off on a net basis?

Mr. DREIER. Well, my friend is absolutely correct in pointing to the fact that throughout the world there are countries which would love to see the defeat of the North American Free-Trade Agreement, and, as the gentleman knows, as we look in this country at the textile industry, for instance, they are very concerned about the prospect of the defeat of NAFTA because we would see other countries move into Mexico and immediately utilize Mexico as an export platform into the United States, and that 4-foot wall would still exist. But in many areas it is extraordinarily low, and it seems to me that we need to recognize that, if we are going to strengthen our ties with the Americas, it would behoove us to not jeopardize that relationship, encouraging them to strengthen ties with Japan, other countries in the Pacific Rim, and, as the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI] was saying, Great Britain and other countries in Western Europe.

Mr. INSLEE. I would like to compare, if we can for a minute, the Washington to the California experience.

As the gentleman knows, we have our charts, and we talk, and we hear economists bicker and argue about that, but I would like to talk for a minute about real life. I want to talk to you about somebody in real life in my life, my neighbors in Selah, WA.

My neighbors grow apples, and several years ago they got into trouble. There were economic problems for my neighbors because the apple prices were dropping because we were losing markets, the ability to sell apple products, and my next-door neighbor, they have got a little 15-acre ranch, and frankly they had some financial trouble, and then something happened about 1986, 1987, that preceded NAFTA, and that is we convinced Mexico to reduce their trade barriers against apples. They had this high wall against apples, and we, because we started to talk about NAFTA, got them to reduce that wall, and I want to tell my colleague what happened to my neighbors.

My neighbors were putting a fellow through college at the time and having financial difficulties. They started to sell apples to Mexico, and their neighbors started to sell apples to Mexico, and we went from a $50 million in the State of Washington, excuse me, $80 million sales of Washington products made by Washington workers in my State to Mexico, to over $500 million exports to Mexico in 5 years, and why did we do that? Well, it was not because I was sent to Congress. It was because we convinced Mexico to reduce their trade barriers, and does my colleague know what happened to my neighbors? They got out of financial difficulty. They put their son through college. They had a real impact, a real-life story of success, which is the preview, if the gentleman will, of NAFTA, because what is going to happen to them is going to happen to American workers across this country if we continue to get Mexico to bring down their barriers.

And let me ask the gentleman about California.

Mr. DREIER. Well, let me just say to my friend, first, if you look at the situation that existed in Washington State and throughout the entire United States, including States like Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, where we regularly hear on this floor from people who are virulent opponents of the North American Free-Trade Agreement, and look at the facts, their States have seen an increase of 100, 200, as much as 300 percent in their level of exports to Mexico since privatization began, since the economy of Mexico strengthened and since the Mexican consumer began to emerge to a position where they were able to afford United States manufactured products.

I think my friend from Long Beach would like to add to that, too.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is in an excellent example that our colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. INSLEE], has given on the expansion of the market, the enrichment of the people in his home community through opening the doors to trade. As I listen to the opponents with all sincerity and deep feeling talking about these matters, what this whole debate reminds me of is what we argued about in this Nation in the 1930's. Is the economy simply a pie and the argument is over the relative size of each slice of the pie between workers, management, and consumers, or is an economy an ever-expanding pie—if we want it to be—where new ideas become new jobs which provide the dignity and self-esteem that comes with individual economic satisfaction?

We have heard a lot in the last few days about corruption in Mexico. We heard a lot this afternoon about corruption in Mexico. One of the great themes of western civilization has been, as the economies started to develop in Europe, people started thinking about independence and freedom, getting out from being vassals under the king, or in this country, in the 19th century, organizing labor unions, getting out from the paternalistic control of management. All of that has come with economic freedom. Economic freedom has been the basis of political freedom. If we do not encourage economic freedom in Mexico, the Mexicans will never be free of the one-party system they have.

□ 1820

Mr. DREIER. If the gentleman would yield on that particular point, I would just like to ask the gentleman, since he did mention the issue of the early 1930's, one automatically thinks of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act and the fact that played a role in expanding the Great Depression.

My friend is a brillant historian. I wonder if he might talk briefly about the effect of the 1930's trade policy in the United States and the effect that it had on the United States and throughout the world.

Mr. HORN. Well, the unfortunate thing is that nations use similar policies in the wrong circumstances. When we started as a nation we had Secretary of the Treasury Alexander Hamilton's great Letter on Manufactures. Canada did exactly what we did when it started on its own course in the mid-19th century. The policy was to raise your tariff barriers to the outside would in order to protect your domestic industry, so you could develop an independent capacity to meet the needs of your people and not have to be dependent on the mother country.

Yet that policy and the policy of protecting domestic manufacturers

against competition went beyond a reasonable day. And this is what we face right now with Mexico. They have protected their industries from competition. They had a number of inefficient, command economy, State-run industries, until the recent privatization that you described very well.

Yet, we made the mistake in thinking how to get out of our own depression—which was part of a worldwide depression—that we would simply raise our tariff barriers and everything would be for the best.

But everything was not for the best. Even then we had the beginnings of a global economy. As you and I noted earlier, America has been a great trading nation. As our colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI] observed we have believed in change. We have been an optimistic people. Every foreign observer who came to these shores in the 19th century wrote about American optimism. People came here—and continue to come here—because they can start from nothing and have something as a result of hard work. And that opportunity is what we want other nations to share. Now, the Mexicans will gain from that dynamism and they will gain more freedom, as well as a better economy.

Mr. INSLEE. You spur a thought when you mention the pie. I think it bears repeating, that trade is not a zero sum game.

Mr. HORN. Right.

Mr. INSLEE. The American worker will gain through NAFTA, and the Mexican worker will gain through NAFTA. And the Japanese, German, Italian, and Singaporean worker will probably lose due to NAFTA, because they will still have to crawl and pay that 10-percent tax to get into Mexican markets.

But let me suggest, when it comes to baking pies, the Europeans are doing it pretty well right now. We ought to talk about Europe just a little bit, because of what happened in the European Community when they went through this before us.

The debate we are having today was heard in the Parliaments of Europe several years ago about whether to form a European Community. There were the opponents of the European Community who argued in Sweden and Denmark and northern Europe, the rich industrialized world, the opponents of the European Community came and said, "Don't lower our trade barriers. Don't you deal with those southern Europeans, those dastardly Spaniards. Don't deal with those Portuguese. You know, they are not as democratic as we are. They are not as industrialized as we are. And if you do," those opponents of the Community in Sweden and Germany said, "our wages will go down while theirs come up. We will meet in the middle and we will be lower."

For once, let us look at what has happened. The northern European wages have gone up faster than ours with no NAFTA. Their wages are going up faster than ours, while they are trading and have locked us out of some markets in Spain and Portugal. So have the southern Europeans. They have both gone up, while we are locked out of the European Community.

It is time for us, it seems to me, to start realizing that our competitors are going to eat our lunch if we do not start to play the same game, and that game is developing large markets, which inures to both the northern people and the southern people, like it did the Swedes and Spaniards, just like it will for the Americans and Mexicans.

Mr. HORN. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I wonder as I hear all these debates why leaders in American labor, at the national, State, and local levels, are so misleading the average worker as to the effects of the North American Free-Trade Agreement.

It seems to me we are still mired in the class warfare of the 1930's or the 19th century. And until we grow out of that, the opportunities for the American worker are being limited by their own leaders. It seems to me the whole history that you and others have described this afternoon is a good example of what expanding trade means.

As I said in the beginning, we are talking about jobs for Americans in America.

Mr. INSLEE. We have in this country, I guess we should not focus too much on Europe, but we have a history of what liberalization of Mexican trade policy does. I used one example of my neighbors that live a stone's throw from my house.

But if you look at what NAFTA does, we know what NAFTA does. We do not have to argue and listen to us beating our gums in Congress about what NAFTA is going to do. We know what it is going to do, because for the last 5 years it has been doing it. Because before 1987, here we have a chart showing the trade relationship before 1987. We had a significant deficit with Mexico. That means before 1987 we shipped our jobs south across the Mexican border, while they shipped their goods north.

In 1987 we started to see the beginnings of the NAFTA philosophy of free trade with Mexico. Because what we did is we convinced Mexico, through bipartisan efforts, to reduce their tax on American workers and to reduce their trade tariff on our exports.

What happened? We do not have to argue about what happened. We do not have to guess. We do not have to speculate. We should all come down here, all 400 of us, and look at the facts.

The fact is our exports increased. We have gained over 100,000 new jobs exporting goods to Mexico, because now we have a significant trade surplus with Mexico, over $5 billion. A trade surplus.

So all of this palaver in Congress about what NAFTA means, you just have to look. Go down there and see which way the goods are flowing. We are selling more to them than they are selling to us. And this is going to get bigger with NAFTA. It could get smaller without NAFTA.

Mr. HORN. You are absolutely correct. If the Mexican parliament hears much of this debate, they might change their mind and get out of the agreement before it is implemented.

Mr. INSLEE. I am not sure we are that persuasive.

Mr. HORN. I think they are more visionary, frankly, than some in our country who are just spreading fear and rumor for selfish political or economic purposes.

Mr. INSLEE. Let me suggest, the gentleman raises a significant point about the thinking of those opposed to NAFTA. I credit it sincere belief and do not question motivations at all in this debate. But as I hear the NAFTA argument, the NAFTA opponents, here is what I boil it down to. If you put it in a kettle and boil it down, here is what the anti-NAFTA argument is. Mexico does not have a democracy as good as ours, which is true. Mexico has lower wages than we do, which is true. Mexico stands potentially to gain some of our jobs because they have lower wages under the existing trade policy, which is true. All of these things are true today.

Tell me what the anti-NAFTA forces have come forward with and said they are going to do about that sad, sorry state of affairs. What do they suggest? What medicine do they suggest for this illness of this country? Where are they?

We have suggested a NAFTA medicine. But they want to leave the status quo alone. They think it is good enough to lose millions of American jobs, and the folks who want NAFTA believe it is not good enough.

Let me suggest one idea in democracy. They argue Mexico is not as good a democracy as we are. Frankly, I think we should be proud that nobody is as good a democracy as we are. I take pride working in this citadel of democracy.

But, you know, every country goes through progress. Look at our environmental laws 40 years ago. I love Pittsburgh now. Pittsburgh is a shining example about how you can change your environment.

Look at our labor laws 50 years ago. Progress is possible. Progress is possible, and on this, I will trust one person above anyone else. I realize he is a Democrat, but I hope you will deal with me for just a moment on this, someone who truly knows Latin American politics, who has committed his life to achieving democracy in Latin America, and that is ex-President Jimmy Carter, who has come forward

on a bipartisan basis with Presidents Bush, Ford, and Clinton in support of this treaty.

Because what he says is if you shine America on Mexico, if you trade with Mexico, there is only one possible result. No dictatorship can stand against the light of America's democracy. And the closer we are to Mexico, the more they will learn from us, frankly. And if we shut them aside into the darkness, some of their nondemocratic traditions will remain and prosper.

But what Jimmy Carter has said is lean them up against our lamp of democracy, and they will learn from us. And I want to give credit on a bipartisan basis to the Republican Party and the Republican Presidents who have made that same argument.

□ 1830

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is absolutely correct. The last six Presidents have been eloquent on this subject.

I cited earlier Franklin Delano Roosevelt's vision and John F. Kennedy's vision for a hemisphere of freedom where the economies are working. And it disappoints me when I see very sincere people, who have been worked up by this anti-NAFTA campaign, and have legitimate concerns about what has occurred in Mexico in terms of the government's treatment of labor leaders, in terms of the government's cancelling any attempt for collective bargaining. But what they want us to do is impose domestic American labor law, which provides for free collective bargaining, for rights for workers, against child labor and all these other things we know from the progressive era of this country in this century, on internal Mexican conduct.

We would resent it, as Americans, if, through NAFTA or without NAFTA, somehow Mexican internal law could be imposed on the United States. And yet, that is exactly what the opposition to this is all about.

As I said earlier, they say, "Well, not this NAFTA. We want a better NAFTA."

Well, the better NAFTA, when you peel it all away, is "We want you to impose our labor standards on the people of Mexico within Mexico." That is unheard of in any international law, any relations between nations, unless you are an occupying army. And we are not an occupying army. We do not want to be an occupying army.

So that is another thing we need to deal with and peel away. Very sincere people are correctly concerned and, yet, these same very sincere people, 10, 20 years ago, were certainly willing to make agreements with totalitarian governments. They were known as Mao Tse-tung in the People's Republic of China and Mr. Brezhnev in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. And those agreements happened to stick, even though they were made with totalitarians. And for one simple reason: Whether it is a totalitarian government and a democratic government or a democratic government and not-so-democratic government's agreement, those agreements stick when they are in the mutual self-interest of both nations. And certainly, most people, and the Presidents you cited, and certainly the eloquence of President Carter, have meant this is in the self-interest of Canada, Mexico, and the United States of America. When enacted, NAFTA will be the beginning of a hemisphere of free people and freedom in their economic system as well as in their politics.

Mr. INSLEE. I think there has been, actually, though, when you think about it, in the last administration, some ability, in fact, to, through legal method, lever Mexico toward our standards.

I think it is important for the American people to recognize that the sidebar agreements that have been achieved are unique. This is the first time we have had a hammer over Mexico to improve their environmental standards. We can punish them with a $20 million trade tariff, if they do not improve enforcement of their environmental standards. Never had it before. Do not have it now. Will not have it without NAFTA.

We have another $20 million hammer if they do not improve their child labor and worker safety standards. Do not have it now. Have never had it. Will not have it without NAFTA.

But the anti-NAFTA forces say, well, get a bigger hammer and come back. Look who has tried? A Republican President, a Democratic President, and they have fashioned some hammers for us to use.

But what do the NAFTA forces here in this Congress come back with again, 400 of us maybe, they come back and say, Well, I am a Congressman from such-and-such district. I will fashion a better agreement than the last two Presidents have not been able to fashion on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I think that is a very interesting thing for us to raise.

Last Friday, when I arrived, as my friend from Long Beach regularly does, at Los Angeles International Airport, I jumped onto La Cienega Boulevard. When I got up to the intersection of La Cienega and Stocker, there was a great big sign that said, "Not this NAFTA."

And my friend from Selah has very accurately pointed to the fact that there are many people who want to bring about major modification of this. And if you look at the amazing, rather schizophrenic coalition of people who oppose this, I would challenge anyone to try and fashion the next NAFTA, as those who oppose NAFTA say, "We all support free trade; we all want a North American Free-Trade Agreement, but not this NAFTA," I challenge those people to try and fashion an agreement which would have the support of Pat Buchanan and Jesse Jackson, Ross Perot, and Jerry Brown.

Obviously, we have put together, with this agreement, support from both sides of the aisle, two administrations, all four former Presidents.

And the point that my friend also raises, about changes that have taken place in Mexico. Those who are critics of this plan correctly point to corruption and a lack of political pluralism that has existed. But we are very pleased that is all in the history of Mexico.

If you look back to 1929, when Mr. Cardness chose to nationalize the oil industry and the institutional revolutionary party came to power, yes, they have had one-party control of that country. And we want to encourage political pluralism.

There are many people who believe that there is no political pluralism whatsoever in Mexico today. But again, they are wrong.

Since privatization began, since the Salinas presidency began to take on this bold and dynamic leadership, we have seen opposition party candidates win mayorships and governorships throughout Mexico, in fact, literally dozens of mayors who are members of the PON party, the National Action Party in Mexico, have successfully won elections. And we have seen governors of the opposition party win elections.

I am convinced that if we defeat NAFTA, the chance for this greater level of political pluralism will be stifled. And I hope very much that we will be able to see NAFTA put into place so that we can encourage freer elections and a greater level of participation in that country.

Mr. INSLEE. I think that basically what the gentleman has alluded to is that I do not think any American President who wants to try to satisfy all of our demands in this country would want to try to sell shoes to the NAFTA critics. Because any pair of oxfords would be the wrong style and any pair of pumps, any pair of tennis shoes. It is impossible to do.

We have been given a good-faith effort from two administrations, and we have achieved something that no one has ever done.

I am going to give credit, just for a moment to the Democrat that came at the tail end of this. He has achieved what no one has ever done, to achieve levers, hammers to move Mexico toward the direction we want them to go.

It is a fair statement that we are not going to forge any better bipartisan consensus to get this through the U.S. Congress.

Mr. DREIER. My friend is absolutely correct. What we need to realize is that it is this NAFTA or no NAFTA. Because as we know, I was saying earlier

here, we will see other countries, nations in the Pacific rim, specifically Japan, which will choose to locate operations in Mexico and use Mexico as an export platform into the United States.

Yet, under NAFTA, with the tough rule of origin requirements that are there, requiring 75 percent of the items used in manufacture to come from North America, the three countries involved in the NAFTA clearly it will accrue to the benefit of the United States.

Mr. INSLEE. I would just like to allude to something I read the other day that we were talking about history, in accruing to our benefit.

I think we are in the position of another civilization, another country hundreds of years ago. That was China.

China was a great culture, civilization. They had invented gunpowder. They had an advanced civilization. They were the leader in the world's civilization hundreds and hundreds of years ago.

And they became concerned about people that they considered barbarians. So what did they do? Their leadership convinced them, due to fear, the fear of what was going on around them in the world, instead of engaging in change, they decided to build a wall, a Great Wall, a world-renowned wall.

That was successful in making them feel protected from the challenges of the rest of the countries they had to deal with, and that wall let them sleep at night, while Europe continued to compete and surpass the Chinese civilization for centuries, for centuries.

This country has to accept the fact that a wall is not going to protect the American workers. But knocking down the Mexican wall will. By allowing us to get into their markets and realizing we are going to allow them fair trade, equal trade, we will succeed.

□ 1840

Heaven help us if we follow the Chinese example of hiding behind walls as the anti-NAFTA people would desire us to do. That is not the direction for this country. We will lose by hiding behind walls.

Let me say that some of our competitors are watching us carefully tonight and other nights to see if they are going to get the advantage that we could potentially turn down.

Mr. HORN. That is the ironic part that the gentleman correctly cites. Major powers all over the world hope this country will be dumb enough to turn down the North American Free-Trade Agreement. A rejection by us will give these other countries the unique opportunity to exploit opportunities which are ours achieved through diplomacy, through reasoning, and a bipartisan alliance of both major parties. If we fail, it will be a sad day for America.

Mr. INSLEE. I thank my colleague. Perhaps I can move ahead, if the gentleman will yield further.

Mr. HORN. Please do. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment, if I can, on just how I see our responsibility and my generation's responsibility in this regard.

I came here, left a small town and came here several months ago. The way I look at this situation, Mr. Speaker, is that there really is a new generation of leadership in this country. It has been said before, the torch has been passed to a new generation of leadership. Our predecessors, our fathers politically, were dominated by the cold war. They were dominated by the need to fight the cold war. Now the cold war is over, and now it is our responsibility to fight a new kind of war. That is a war to get markets, so that we can get jobs for the people we represent, and we must knock down the trade barriers in Mexico so my people, my neighbors, can export products, so they can have jobs in my home town. That is what I am here fighting to do.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that our predecessors established NATO, and it won, and we should establish NAFTA, and we will win.

AN ANALYSIS OF THE CLINTON HEALTH PLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I am going to speak on an American health plan and a German health plan, and analyze the Clinton health plan as outlined in a New York Times book entitled, "The President's Health Security Plan," and outline the alternatives the House Republicans have introduced in a bill entitled, "Affordable Health Care Now," which currently has about 120 cosponsors.

Mr. Speaker, I am fascinated with the gap between the President's speech and what I am discovering now that I am reading the plan. Let me start, though, by saying that there are many changes that need to be made in health care; that we ought to put together a bill, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] told the American Medical Association yesterday, we ought to put together a bipartisan bill that we could pass this fall on the seven major areas that we agree on.

We agree on administrative reforms, on malpractice reform, on antitrust reform, on antifraud reform, on Medicaid reform, on 100 percent deduction for the self-employed, and an insurance reform. I think in those seven areas we could actually pass a good, commonsense positive step that would help millions of people, and save several billions of dollars, and let it go ahead this fall and pass this before we adjourn for this session of Congress.

However, as I study the President's health care plan, the Clinton plan, I am astonished at how bad it is, and how fundamentally wrong it is for America. Captured in an article this morning entitled "Health Plan—Devilish Details," by Elizabeth McCaughey, she is a Fellow at the Manhattan Institute in New York. When you begin to read the details, it is remarkable.

I was trying to understand how an American President could propose a centralized bureaucratic plan which is this bad and this fundamentally wrong for Americans. I think I have found it on page 314 of a book called "Reinventing Government" by David Osborn and Ted Gabler. David Osborn is a consultant to Vice President GORE on reinventing government.

On page 314, where David Osborn and Ted Gabler are describing health care reform as they would see it, they say,

> This kind of system would share some features of the Canadian model, but its closest, although not identical, parallel is in Germany, actually in the former West Germany. The German Government steers the system.

I have been saying this for several days, that it just felt, the more I read about the Clinton plan, the more it felt like German medicine. I had assumed it had been discovered by my good friend, Senator JAY ROCKEFELLER, on one of his vacations, or the Clintons, who are very fond of Germany. However, in fact, now that I have been doing more research, I wonder if it was not originally the suggestion of Mr. Osborn which led them towards the German model.

There are several things wrong with the German model. The first is that West Germany is a very small country, about the size of Oregon, and it is a very homogenous country. Virtually everyone there is German. By contrast, we are a huge country, so complicated, enormous diversities, 260 million people, and we come from all kinds of backgrounds.

Anyone who has been to Germany can use one simple, everyday, common experience to describe the difference between German and American culture styles. In Germany there is no speed limit on most of the Autobahn, although in congested areas there is. But everyone who knows German civilization knows that if there was a speed limit imposed tomorrow morning, virtually all Germans would obey it until the next election, when they would defeat the current politicians and replace them with an antispeed-limit party.

By contrast, for most Americans, their response to speed limits is dramatically different. I think I can say, in all candor, without insulting any American who is listening, that for most Americans a speed limit is a benchmark of opportunity; that there

is an astonishing pattern virtually anywhere in this country of looking at the sign and thinking, "Now, can I go 5 miles an hour over, or 10 miles an hour?"

The difference is not just about driving, the difference goes to the core of the two cultures. Bureaucracy makes some sense in a German culture. It is no accident that Max Weber, a German, was the greatest intellectual analyzer of the bureaucratic model.

In the American civilization, however, we are not particularly good at bureaucracies. We are good at incentives, we are good at competition, we are good at individual leadership, we are good at creativity, we are good at encouraging people in their own self-interest to move in the right direction. There are many things we do very well, and I would argue, as I have on other occasions, that American civilization is the most successful integrated civilization in history; that more human beings from more backgrounds come together out of self-interest and in an enlightened way as citizens, and create greater opportunities for each other, than any civilization in the history of the human race.

But the one thing we do very, very badly is large peacetime bureaucracies. I was very struck the other night, as an illustration. I thought it was remarkably symbolic that when the President came to this very House, when he stood down here in the well to address the Nation in a joint session, or rather, up at the desk to address the Nation, with an entire country watching, with all the Members of the House and the Senate here, with the diplomats here, with the Cabinet sitting down front, when he looked up at his teleprompter, the President of the United States saw not his health care speech but his State of the Union Message.

That is right. The White House bureaucracy had put the wrong computer tape in the teleprompter, or the wrong disk, rather. The result was that the President was looking at the wrong speech.

He turned to Vice President GORE and he said, according to newspaper reports, "They have the wrong speech on the teleprompter." Vice President GORE, in the great tradition of bureaucracy, said, "No, they don't." The President pointed out, in touch with reality, "I am reading it. It is the wrong speech."

Now, I want to make this very profound and yet funny point. If an American bureaucracy as high as the White House cannot get the right speech in a teleprompter for the President of the United States to address the joint session, what level of pride and hubris would lead someone to believe that this bureaucracy will get the right CAT scan, the right MRI's, the right x ray to the right doctor in the right operating room when you and I are in there?

□ 1850

And yet, that is the essence of the Clinton plan. When you start going through this, as I will in a minute, and you read the scale of bureaucracy, the scale of centralized planning, the kind of hubris involved in thinking that a handful of people in a room in the White House could design for 260 million people their version of what they in the White House believe the rest of us should choose is astonishing. And it uses language I think to disguise rather than to disclose.

Now this is not a new phenomenon. I have to thank Bill Niskanen, a very sophisticated economist at the Cato Institute, who discovered this quote, which I think illustrates perfectly 234 years after it was written exactly the level of conceit that we are dealing with. And the word conceit comes not from me, but from Adam Smith's writing in 1759 in what I think is far and away his more important work, "The Theory of Moral Sentiments." Smith of course was the Scottish philosopher who wrote "The Wealth of Nations," the most important single description of how markets operate.

But in a book written some 17 years earlier, called "The Theory of Moral Sentiments," he outlined a general structure of how humans behave in the real world, and this is what he said, and I want you to think about this and apply it directly to the Clinton health plan:

> The man of system is apt to be very wise in his own conceit. He seems to imagine that he can arrange the different members of a great society with as much ease as the hand arranges the different pieces upon a chess board. He does not consider that the pieces upon the chess board have yet another principle of motion besides that which the hand impresses upon them. But that in the great chess board of human society, every single piece has a principle of motion of its own, although different from that which the legislature might choose to impress upon it. If those two principles coincide and act in the same direction, the game of human society will go on easily and harmoniously, and is very likely to be happy and successful. If they are opposite or different, the game will go on miserably and the society must be at all times in the highest degree of disorder.—Adam Smith, 1759.

Now let us apply it in the real world. If the Government adopts commonsense, practical, general rules that make sense to people, they will obey them. A 70-mile-an-hour speed limit on a superhighway is obeyed by dramatically more people than 20 miles an hour on a superhighway.

But if the Government starts to adopt rules and regulations that go against the very core of how people behave, people will start to find ways to cheat.

I found it fascinating that in Elizabeth McCaughey's article today she makes the point:

> A parent lying awake, worried about a child's illness and whether the gatekeeper will OK a specialist, might think about bribes or even going outside the system. The Clinton plan anticipates the problem with new criminal penalties for "payment of bribes or gratuities to influence the delivery of health services." (p. 9). Doctors, meanwhile, joke about "offshore" practices, hospital ships outside the 3-mile limit, and other ways for families to escape controls and buy the health care they want.

Now, let us look at what we are talking about. How does the Clinton plan work. It does exactly the wrong things. It establishes first of all a national health board. It sounds innocuous, but let me describe for just a few minutes, reading from the New York Times version, which is slightly different in page numbers from the White House version about the national health board.

This is what they say about the national health board, pages 44 and so on:

> The national health board which is responsible for setting national standards and overseeing the establishment and administration of the new health system by States.

In other words, the President is going to appoint people in Washington, DC, bureaucrats appointed by politicians, to oversee the health system of every State.

And here is what they will do:

> The board establishes requirements for State plans, monitors compliance with those requirements, provides technical assistance, and insures access to health care for all Americans.

Note the powerful words, "establishes requirements, monitors compliance, insures access."

They go on to say:

> The board interprets and updates the nationally guaranteed benefit package and issues regulations.

They go on to say:

> The board issues regulations concerning implementation of the national budget for health care spending and endorses the budget. The board establishes baseline budgets for alliances by allocating national spending among alliances to reflect regional variations.

Let me make it clear what this means. If you are lucky, and you are clever, and your lobbyist and your politicians have the right influence, your region gets more money. If you are unlucky, and you are unclever, and your region is politically incorrect, your region gets less money. "Allocating national spending among alliances to reflect regional variations."

You have to be totally ignorant of American history to believe that that board would become anything but a political pork barrel that will give the money to your friends and your allies and punish and starve your opponents.

"The board certifies compliance with the budget." Now what happens if you fail to meet your responsibilities? This is what the Secretary could do, the Secretary of Health and Human Services. This is one human being in a nation of 260 million people. We are now going to have a Federal health dictator.

This is what the Federal health dictator can do: "The Secretary has the authority to order the withholding of Federal health appropriations." In other words, the Federal health dictator can call your State Governor of your State and say you have failed to comply, you get no Federal money as of this date on my personal single dictatorial signature.

If the State persists in its failure, here is what the book says: "The Secretary"—and I prefer to think of it as the health dictator—"is required to take one of the following actions:" They then say:

Dissolve an existing health alliance and establish one or more regional alliances in compliance with Federal requirements. Contract with private parties or others to establish and operate regional alliances. Order regional alliances or health plans to comply. Take other steps as needed.

Now, this a grant of power to a single human being which in all of World War II was never done. Other than Lincoln's suspension of habeas corpus during the Civil War, I know of no instance ever in the history of the United States that one person was given the level of dictatorship that this plan would give to one human being.

And again, for anyone who knows American history, it is hard to imagine in a hard Presidential year, with a tough reelection, with a friend who is giving a lot of money and promises to bring an entire union or an entire corporation or an entire region, that suddenly the wrong party who gave to the wrong side's friends, that their alliance is suddenly guilty of 22 technical violations as found by Federal inspectors sent from Washington, and suddenly they are suspended, and suddenly a brand new alliance is created which just happens to be staffed by and has the money going to the President's friends. Is that impossible in the history of America, or in fact do we not have a number of occasions where power given too closely does, as Lord Acton warned, tend to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely?

But it goes further. Forget the fact that they are dissolving your insurance plan, they decide from Washington with one person making the decision what kind of plan you are allowed to buy; forget that they can take over everything that is going on in your State; forget that they can cut off all Federal aid to your State. Here is what else it says:

The Secretary of the Treasury will impose a payroll tax on all employers in the State. The payroll tax shall be sufficient to allow the Federal Government to provide health coverage to all individuals of the State, and to reimburse the Federal Government for the cost of monitoring and operating the State's system.

This is literally the Federal Government taking over all of the health care of a State, and then having the Secretary of the Treasury establish a unique payroll tax for one State.

□ 1900

Now, what if you are a politically incorrect State? What if you voted for the wrong person for Governor? What if that candidate for Governor might be about to run for President next time?

Oh, you would say, but they would never do that. That I think is a level of naivete about human nature that I think is astonishing.

Imagine one person, the health dictator, will be able wipe out your entire health program, and another person, the new tax dictator, will be able to impose a payroll tax on all the employers in the State and that payroll tax shall be sufficient to allow the Federal Government to provide health coverage to all individuals in the State and to reimburse the Federal Government for the cost of monitoring and operating the State system.

Now, that is a level of detailed intervention that we have never ever in American history seen, with power given to one particular agency.

Elizabeth McCaughey catches it correctly when she says:

The Clinton plan will make almost all Americans buy basic health coverage through the "regional alliance" where they live. Regional alliances are huge, government monopolies that will purchase basic health care for everyone in the area. The law will require you to buy basic health coverage from the limited choices offered by your alliance. It will be illegal to buy it elsewhere.

Can you imagine in America where your desire to buy better health insurance for your family is illegal? Your desire to take better care of your family is illegal? Your desire to do better, to have more security, to have greater options to improve your lot is illegal?

Elizabeth McCaughey goes on to say:

Alliance officials will negotiate benefit packages and prices with insurers and health maintenance organizations (HMOs)—groups of physicians and hospitals that provide total health care through cost-conscious methods to each consumer for a prepaid premium. Unless you now receive health care through Medicare, military or veterans benefits, or unless you or your spouse works for a large company, the law will require you to buy basic health coverage from the limited choices offered by your alliance. It will be illegal to buy it elsewhere. (Pages 13, 16, 81.)

Under the plan, the federal government will set ceilings on how much each regional alliance can spend on payments to insurers and HMOs annually. The goal is to limit private health care spending. Alliances can reject any health insurance option that would push spending through the ceiling. Fee-for-service insurance, which tends to be more costly than HMO coverage, will be the first to go.

In addition, an alliance cannot offer any plan that costs 20% more than the average price of all plans it offers. Plans with added benefits (such as Pap smears every year instead of every third year) and many fee-for-service plans will be excluded by the 20% rule. A primary goal of the Clinton plan is to eliminate a two-tier health care system, where people who can pay more for medical care will receive more.

Now, let me make a point about this. I want to see an America where everybody improves their life by getting better, by having more, by being more prosperous, by having more choices. The Clinton plan levels everyone down, to give everyone less. It tries to reduce all of us to the lowest possible denominator, and it is extraordinarily anti-small business, not only in its mandates, not only in its payroll tax increases, not only in its red tape, but from the fact that many of the small businesses it will put out of business are the small businesses, the pharmacies, doctors, and local health agencies that are not gigantic and not big national firms and will not be able to get to the Secretary of Health and Human Services or the Health Dictator, as I prefer to call that function.

Let me go on and read some more from Elizabeth McCaughey, because I think she has it exactly correct:

Annual ceilings and the 20% rule will make it virtually impossible for some alliances to offer choose-your-own-doctor health insurance. Americans have been told that they will always have the option to buy fee-for-service insurance. But the plan says that, with a waiver from the National Health Board, alliances can exclude all fee-for-service plans, effectively forcing millions of citizens to join an HMO.

Now, notice this is so typical of what we are discovering with the Clinton administration. The first speech is terrific. The second speech sounds a little strange, but not too bad, but they beg you, never read the fine print, so you are really always going to be able to buy your own insurance unless, of course, the National Health Board says you do not.

Now, that requires a level of trust in Government that I do not think Americans want to make anymore. That requires you to believe that Washington will always keep its word. That requires you to believe that seven political appointees on a board appointed by a President sitting in Washington, DC, are not going to use the power that has been given to them.

Let me go on again and quote from Elizabeth McCaughey:

Cara Walinsky of the Health Care Advisory Board and Governance Committee, which advises 800 hospitals world-wide, explains that the plan "will make it as difficult as possible for you to buy more" than the standard package.

The Clinton proposal is designed to drive doctors out of private practice. The plan has "very strong incentives built in that work against fee-for-service, not only on the consumer side, but also on the provider side," explains Ms. Walinsky. Even Drs. David Himmelstein and Steffie Woolhandler, leading proponents of a Canadian-style single-payer system, warn that the plan will "obliterate private practice."

Now, let us take a look at this. We are telling Yeltsin, more perestroika. We are telling Poland, Hungary, Ukraine, more free enterprise. And what are we telling America?

The Clinton administration wants to wipe out private practice. They want

to eliminate doctors and nurses working on their own. They want to crush everybody into large bureaucratic managed structures of thousands and thousands of people reporting to a National Health Board of politicians in Washington, which then reports to a health dictator.

Let me carry this a stage further, quoting from Elizabeth McCaughey:

Price controls will make private practice unfeasible. Americans have been told that there are no price controls. But the plan empowers alliances to set fees for doctors seeing patients on a fee-for-service basis. The plan states: "A provider may not charge or collect from a patient a fee in excess of the fee schedule adopted by an alliance."

Now, what is this? This is Government controlled markets. This is the Government stepping in to say what you can charge, what you can pay.

I find it fascinating that some of the large corporations that are endorsing this plan, what if we set up a national automobile board? What if the national automobile board decided it would set the price of cars? What if the national automobile board decided how many cars you could make by State and which factories could make which cars? And what if the national automobile board said we will only have three kinds of cars, just as they are talking about in the Clinton plan of three kinds of health insurance. You can have a big car, a medium car, or a small car. You choose which of the three sizes you want.

Why, the auto industry would go crazy. They would say that is goofy. The average American would know instinctively that does not make any sense.

But gradually over the last 30 years we have drifted into so much Government-run health care, so much red tape, so much overregulation, that we can talk now today about a system where the Government will empower an alliance to literally establish what you and your doctor negotiate and can literally set prices.

Imagine if we decided to do that for McDonald's or Wendy's and for fast food, a Government fast food board that would allow prices to be set. People would know instinctively that is un-American. Maybe it works in Germany. We know it failed in Russia. We know that centralized command bureaucracies simply do not work, and yet here we are being told that it is going to work in Washington under Clinton.

Let me go on and quote a little further from Elizabeth McCaughey:

Americans have been told that the quality of health care will not decline. Many experts believe it will. In HMOs, gatekeepers, or primary care physicians, tightly limit patient use of specialists. Physician-subscriber ratios at HMOs average 1 to 800, half the ratio of physicians to the nation's population. Under the plan, pressure on gatekeepers to curb access to specialists will increase. Ms. Walinsky predicts that above a threshold level of "reasonable quality," alliances will choose HMOs based on lowest cost, not highest quality, in order to meet federal spending limits.

She goes on to say, as I said earlier:

A parent lying awake, worried about a child's illness and whether the gatekeeper will OK a specialist, might think about bribes or even going outside the system. The Clinton Plan anticipates the problem, with new criminal penalties for "payment of bribes or gratuities to influence the delivery of health service." Doctors, meanwhile, joke about "offshore" practices, hospital ships outside the three mile limit, and other ways for families to escape controls and buy the health care they want.

Now, let me just say, many of these millionaire politicians who today are going to vote for this plan are going to be the first people to get on their private jet and leave the country to go to a hospital somewhere else if they are told that their child or their parent or their grandchild cannot get the care in the United States.

Instead of having the King of Jordan fly to the United States to get health care, we are going to start seeing health care systems set up overseas and Americans will fly to Mexico or to the Bahamas or to Bermuda or to Tokyo or somewhere else.

Then, of course, they will try to make it illegal to leave.

Elizabeth McCaughey states further: "The plan's biggest surprise"—this really struck me. I did not realize this until Elizabeth McCaughey wrote this, and I think every member of the Black and Hispanic Caucus had better read carefully what she says about this:

The plan's biggest surprise is who bears the cost of universal health coverage. The plan requires states to create health alliance regions—similar to election districts. How those alliance lines are drawn will determine which areas of the state are hit with the highest health care premiums, because they are shouldering the costs of health coverage for the inner city poor. The system promises to pit black against white, poor against rich, city against suburb.

The average treatment cost of a baby born addicted to drugs is $63,000. Because of community rating, anyone who lives in an urban alliance is going to pay high premiums, regardless of his health or behavior. Part of the premium covers his own care; part is a hidden tax to provide universal health coverage within the alliance. Some alliances will bear especially heavy social burdens, others will not. Everyone will figure out that you get more health care for your dollar or pay lower premiums in an alliance without inner city problems. The plan will be an incentive for employers to abandon cities and relocate.

Let me repeat this, and I hope every Member of the Black and Hispanic Caucuses reads this line and starts to think about what the Clinton plan is going to do to destroy jobs in the inner city.

The plan will be an incentive for employers to abandon cities and relocate.

Let me go a stage further. This is the final section by Ms. McCaughey.

Suppose a State fails to establish its regional alliance on time or to meet all Federal requirements. The plan empowers the Secretary of the Treasury to impose a payroll tax on all employers in the State. The payroll tax shall be sufficient to allow the Federal Government to provide health coverage to all individuals and to reimburse the Federal Government for the cost of monitoring and operating the State system. The plan does not set any limit on this tax. The Clinton plan is coercive. It takes personal health choices away from patients and families, and it also imposes a system of financing health care based on regional alliances that will make racial tensions fester and produce mean-spirited political struggles and lawsuits to shirk the cost of medical care for the urban poor. Members of Congress should read the 239-page draft rather than relying on what they hear and then turn their attention to alternative proposals that aim to provide universal coverage while avoiding the devastating consequences of the Clinton health plan.

Now, 26 months ago, in 1991, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] established the House Republican health task force. Long before Bill Clinton became President, Mr. Speaker, we began working on the question:

How can we fundamentally overhaul American health and make sure that every American has access, that they have choice, that they have quality and that we continue to be the finest health care system in the world while lowering the cost?

We have been meeting for 2 years and 2 months thanks to Congressman MICHEL's leadership. We have had 25 Members of the House Republican Party meeting from every relevant committee, plus key Members to represent rural America and urban America and to look at special concerns. We have produced the affordable health care now bill, Mr. Speaker, which is the most widely cosponsored health care bill in the Congress, having 117 cosponsors as of yesterday.

Affordable health care now is a bill which is based on American culture and American civilization. Unlike the Clinton plan, Mr. Speaker, it does not establish a health dictator. It does not establish a tax dictator. It does not establish a national board of 7 politically appointed bureaucrats to run all health care for 260 million Americans. Affordable health care now uses the market, personal responsibility, the traditional values that have made America great, creates individual incentive and begins the process of getting government out of the way and getting government to quit making the messes that government has created in health.

Let me run through some of the key provisions. It provides group insurance for small business based on a model in Cleveland that we know works for over 10,000 small businesses and that allows small businesses to buy health insurance by allowing them to buy in a pool so that they have much lower costs for insurance so they can afford it instead of crushing small business and killing

jobs the way the Clinton plan does. Our program lowers the cost of insurance and allows small businesses to afford it.

Second, Mr. Speaker, we allow the States to go to managed care for Medicaid and for people up to 200 percent of the poverty level thereby mopping up a number of the people who are currently uninsured by allowing the State to put them into a managed care plan based on a Medicaid model. We do so in a way that lets the Governor, such as Carroll Campbell of South Carolina, Tommy Thompson of Wisconsin, who have been making real breakthroughs in health care, continue to develop better approaches to do a better job for less money.

We eliminate preconditions so that no one ever again has to fear that they will not be able to get health insurance because they cannot afford it. We ensure portability so, if you change jobs, you can continue to get insurance. We stop the government from raising the cost of health care artificially for hospitals and doctors.

Today it is illegal under antitrust for hospitals or doctors to plan together or work together. We eliminate that, and we allow hospitals and doctors to cooperate because we know that the consumer today is paying far, far more in the cost of health care because of antitrust blocking good planning, good cooperation and good common sense. So we changed that to allow hospitals and doctors to decide who should buy the MRI, and who should buy the CAT scan, who should specialize in hearts, and who should specialize in cancer, and begin to get some voluntary rationalization of the process by local decisions made by local people looking at local conditions without getting involved in a national health bureaucracy establishing by law and enforcing by putting people in jail.

Mr. Speaker, we use systems that are already working in community health centers for the inner city and in rural health care to extend further to virtually every poor person in America access to health at a common sense, low price effort to make the doors open for everybody who needs the care in the inner city and in rural America. We know the system works because it already exists. It is not some program, as David Osborne described it, invented, brought in from Germany. It is instead, in the affordable health care now plan, an American plan based on what works in America.

We use individual incentive by developing a medical savings account, which is sometimes called a medical IRA or Medisave program that works in a way that fits Americans. It allows you to have a very high deductible catastrophic plan, say $3,000 per family, and it gives you at the beginning of the year the $3,000 so that, when you go to the doctor or you go to the pharmacist, you are using your dollars that are in your wallet to pay for your health care. If at the end of the year you have not spent the money, you can take it as a Christmas bonus, and pay income taxes, or you can roll it into a savings account, have a tax-free interest buildup, and later in life use the money, paying taxes on it, for putting your children through college, for buying a house, for what you want to, or you can roll it tax-free into buying long-term care for people who are growing older and are concerned about the long term.

It is fascinating, by the way, that President Clinton the other night admitted that more Americans than ever are living beyond 80 years of age, which will be an indication, if one thinks about it, that maybe the health system is doing some things right. You know, if the health system were so bad, how come we have so many more people living to be over 80?

What we need to do is improve upon the American health system, not destroy it with a German bureaucratic model, and let me carry you back again to the radical difference. In the medical savings accounts, which we have in the affordable health care now approach, if you save the money, if you learn this is my $3,000, and you come to believe you can have it at the end of the year, it saves on health costs at three levels:

First, because it is a first dollar cost, we know people are more likely to be frugal. Second, since you are paying cash on the spot, the doctor does not have to hire a clerk to fill out a form to send to your insurance company who has a clerk to read the form. That is two people who you save that are currently just pushing paper. In addition, since you are paying cash on the spot, they do not have to charge you the interest rate of the time value of money while waiting to get the paperwork done, and nowadays that can be 90 or 120 days, so that on a $50 item you can be paying $3 or $4 just for the interest while they wait for the money to come in and another $12 for the paperwork. And then in addition medical savings accounts, or Medisave, or a medical IRA, whichever you prefer, has the third great advantage that, not only is it your first dollar, therefore you are more frugal, not only does it save on redtape and paperwork, but it encourages preventative care.

Mr. Speaker, people come to learn, if they take care of themselves, they are in a much better position to have the money at the end of the year, and so it encourages wellness, it encourages exercise, it encourages paying attention to your diet. It does the right kind of things. I think the affordable health care now approach is exactly the right approach, and I hope every Member of Congress will compare and contrast the enormous bureaucracy, the centralized control of the Clinton plan, with what we are trying to do.

□ 1920

In a very funny way, the Clinton plan is kind of reverse perestroika. Instead of moving from centralized bureaucracy in government toward decentralization in the marketplace, the Clinton plan would move us exactly the opposite direction from where we are trying to get Russia to go. And it is ironic, because I happen to read something I agreed with, which is in creating a government that works better and costs less, which is Vice President AL GORE's report of the National Performance Review.

The very beginning starts with a quote from Clinton and GORE in putting people first. By the way, when you are listening to this quote, think about the Clinton plan and ask yourself how could somebody have written what I am about to read to you and written their big bureaucratic centralized health care plan?

> We can no longer pay more for and get less from our Government. The answer for every problem cannot always be another program or more money. It is time to radically change the way the Government operates, to shift from top-down bureaucracy to entrepreneurial government that empowers citizens and communities to change our country from the bottom-up. We must reward the people and ideas that work, and get rid of those that don't.

Now, I would ask the President and the Vice President, how can you say shift from top-down bureaucracy to entrepreneurial government, and then propose a health plan that is the exact opposite? That creates a health dictator and a tax dictator and is totally top-down? Where the power is all in Washington in a group of appointed people who will be bureaucrats appointed by the President?

It is just astonishing to me that you could have the contradictions between the Gore report, which I frankly agree with, and the Clinton health plan, which I think is astonishingly out of touch with American reality.

You know, many, many years ago, my first name is NEWT, and that is the English version of the Norwegian canute. And King Canute was a famous king whose advisors kept telling him he was wise and bright and successful in everything.

Finally one day he got sick of them telling him all these things and went down to the ocean and he said, "Waves, stop." And they didn't stop, of course. And he turned to his advisers and said, "You see, we are all limited by reality."

Well, this week, in an article entitled "The Health Plan's Financing Gap," Martin Feldstein, in the Wall Street Journal on Wednesday, reminded all of us that President Clinton may be in a way President Canute.

Feldstein goes through the health plan's analytical package and says

look, based on everything we know about how humans behave, the Clinton plan will cost a minimum of $70 billion a year more by 1997 than they are telling us, and at the same time it will reduce income to the Government, reduce tax income, by about $49 billion a year. So the effect of the two would be about $119 billion, or a $120 billion a year financing gap.

In other words, the Clinton plan will cost, according to Dr. Feldstein, the former chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers and a professor of economics at Harvard, will cost about $120 billion more in 1997, or would require an across-the-board 18-percent increase in personal tax rates. Except that that, of course, would further slow down the economy, and so you would lose money.

Now, he estimates you would have to increase marginal tax rates by 24 percent in 1997 in order to cover the Clinton gap in financing.

This was brilliantly pointed out on the Committee on Energy and Commerce by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY] during a hearing on the Clinton health plan when he pointed out that the Clinton plan projects, when it is fully phased in, that it will increase its expenditures above inflation annually by eight-tenths of 1 percent.

Let me give you the figures for around the world. That means that Germany will be growing three times faster based on the 6 years, 1985 through 1991. Germany will be increasing the cost of this plan by three times as much. The United Kingdom will be increasing the cost of its plan by five times as much. Japan will be increasing by six times as much. Canada will be increasing six times as much. Italy will be increasing seven times as much. And the U.S. historic pattern for that period is 7½ times as much.

In other words, the Clinton plan says you are not going to have to spend the money, don't worry about it, and here are our figures. Then you look in the real world, not the fantasy world of the White House plan, but the real world, and you suddenly realize that if you took the best effort anywhere in the world, in the industrial world, from 1985 to 1991, it was three times bigger an increase than the Clinton plan suggests. And if you start to apply that three times as big an increase to what the Clintons are talking about, you are beginning to have dramatic changes.

Furthermore, as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY] points out, the places that come close to the Clinton model, the gentleman says, "We are talking about systems that explicitly ration care."

Now, let us be very clear with people. "Explicitly rationed care" means if you are over 55 and you need kidney dialysis, you die. Explicitly rationed care means if you are above a certain age and need a heart bypass operation, you wait in line, and the odds are pretty good you die before the line gets to the hospital. Rationed care means if you have a particular kind of disease, you just may never have it taken care of. Explicitly rationed care means if you need a hip joint replacement at 70 years of age, you do not get it, because you are too old. It is cheaper for the State to let you stay bedridden than it is for the State to put a new hip socket in. Rationed care means in item after item after item you do not get the care.

Even with all of that, those systems have bigger increases in their annual health budget than the Clinton plan projects. Which tells us what? The Clinton plan simply is not being honest with the American people. It is simply not sharing how it will really work.

Now, I believe that we can pass two bills. I believe we could pass an immediate bill which could help people now by taking the seven items we agree on on a bypartisan basis, passing it this fall, and helping millions of people and saving billions of dollars.

I hope that next year we can start with the affordable health care now plan, working on a bipartisan basis, and design an American plan, not a German plan. I would hope that we could design a plan that emphasizes the marketplace, emphasizes individual choice, and uses incentives for people to be able to go out and get the best care they want.

We have four goals. We want to lower the cost of the system by having more competition and less paperwork, by getting the Government out of the way, and increasing entrepreneurship so new ideas and new technologies and new approaches can lower costs. Just as Wal-Mart lowers costs, just as cellular telephones lower costs, just as microwaves have come down in cost. In the private sector, with real competition, costs come down. Only in defense and health care, where the Government is messing things up, do costs go up. So first we want to lower costs.

Second, we want to design a system which, between managed care for medicine, some kind of transitional voucher for people, much like an earned income tax credit as they begin to rise, and between ensuring that everyone has 100 percent deductibility for buying insurance and that everyone has access to group insurance, that we have access, that there are no preconditions, and that no one loses their health insurance.

Third, we, unlike the Clinton plan, want to give every American a real choice, the kind of choice you have when you go to a mall and there are 200 shops. Not the kind of choice you have under the Clinton plan, where you can have any one of three, but, by the way, you cannot afford the most expensive, and even the most expensive is very limited.

Fourth, we want to ensure quality. This has been the highest value health system in the world. There is better health care here, and you can tell it by a very simple fact: If you have a truly serious illness anywhere in the world, you want to get to an American hospital. If you have a truly difficult problem, you want an American specialist.

We want to continue that tradition. We want to ensure that our children and our grandchildren have the best health care in the world, with the finest technology, with the widest range of choice. We want to ensure that they have access to it, and that they can afford it.

I think, with all sadness, that an obsolete German model of centralized bureaucracy, which is even beginning to grind down in Germany, a country the size of Oregon, if you look at the original West German plan, simply is hopelessly wrong for a continentwide America, stretching halfway across the Pacific, with 260 million people of all kinds and backgrounds, integrating themselves voluntarily by their own initiative and their own incentives.

□ 1930

I hope we can build an American plan, and I hope Members will look carefully at Affordable Health Care Now. And I hope people across the country, as they study what is happening in health care, will look at Affordable Health Care Now as an answer, not perfect, can be improved, but a beginning for a truly bipartisan bill that can truly solve the major problems that are left while maintaining all that is good in our current system.

MEASURES TO RESTRICT THE PARTICIPATION BY UNITED STATES PERSONS IN WEAPONS PROLIFERATION ACTIVITIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 103-144)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota) 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 Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 204(b) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1703(b)) and section 301 of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1631), I hereby report to the Congress that I have exercised my statutory authority to declare a national emergency and to issue an Executive order, which authorizes and directs the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to take such actions, including the promulgation of rules, regulations,

and amendments thereto, and to employ such powers granted to the President by the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, as may be necessary to continue to regulate the activities of United States persons in order to prevent their participation in activities, which could contribute to the proliferation of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons, and the means of their delivery.

These actions are necessary in view of the danger posed to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States by the continued proliferation of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons, and of the means of delivering such weapons, and in view of the need for more effective controls on activities sustaining such proliferation. In the absence of these actions, the participation of U.S. persons in activities contrary to U.S. nonproliferation objectives and policies, and which may not be adequately controlled through the exercise of the authorities conferred by the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2401 *et. seq.*), could take place without effective control, posing an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States.

The countries and regions affected by this action would include those currently identified in Supplements 4, 5, and 6 to Part 778 of Title 15 of the Code of Federal Regulations, concerning nonproliferation controls, as well as such other countries as may be of concern from time to time due to their involvement in the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, or due to the risk of their being points of diversion to proliferation activities.

It is my intention to review the appropriateness of proposing legislation to provide standing authority for these controls, and thereafter to terminate the Executive order.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 30, 1993.*

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. WASHINGTON (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of official business.

Mr. MCDADE (at the request of Mr. MICHEL) for today, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Michigan) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DELAY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SHAW, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BAKER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JOHNSON of Connecticut, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. UNSOELD) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. LOWEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOYER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OBEY, for 5 minutes, on September 30, October 4, 12, 20, 28, November 5, 8, 16, 24, December 2, 10, 13, 21, and 29.

Mr. INSLEE, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. OBEY, for 60 minutes, on October 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 13, 14, 15, 18, 19, 21, 22, 25, 26, 27, 29, November 1, 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, 12, 15, 17, 18, 19, 22, 23, 26, 29, 30, December 1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 22, 23, 24, 27, 28, 30, and 31.

Ms. NORTON, for 60 minutes, on October 5, 6, 12, 13, 19, 20, 26, 27, November 2, 3, 9, 10, 16, 17, 23, 24, December 1, 7, 8, 14, 15, 21, 22, 28, and 29.

Mr. PICKLE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. INSLEE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. RICHARDSON, for 60 minutes each day, on October 5 and 6.

Mr. STARK, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Michigan) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CRANE.
Mr. DUNCAN.
Mr. CLINGER.
Ms. MOLINARI.
Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
Mr. KOLBE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. UNSOELD) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. MALONEY.
Mr. CLEMENT.
Mr. REED.
Mr. STUDDS.
Mr. JACOBS.
Mr. ANDREWS of Texas.
Mr. TUCKER in two instances.
Mr. SKELTON.
Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
Mr. PICKLE.
Mr. STRICKLAND.
Mr. BLACKWELL in two instances.
Mr. HEFNER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GINGRICH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HILLIARD.
Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
Mr. MENENDEZ in two instances.
Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
Mr. SMITH of Texas.
Mr. BERMAN.
Mr. SLATTERY.
Mrs. FOWLER.
Mr. LAZIO.
Ms. FURSE.
Mr. WELDON.
Mr. KENNEDY.
Mr. COPPERSMITH.
Mr. POSHARD.
Mr. GOODLING.
Mr. KING.
Mr. PORTER.
Mr. CLINGER.
Mr. RICHARDSON.
Mrs. UNSOELD.
Mr. TRAFICANT.
Mr. STARK.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. ROSE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 38. An act to establish the Jemez National Recreation Area in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2295. An act making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and making supplemental appropriations for such programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2608. An act to provide for the reauthorization of the collection and publication of quarterly financial statistics by the Secretary of Commerce through fiscal year 1998, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 267. Joint Resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1994, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to, accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, October 4, 1993, at noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1966. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report involving United States exports to Mexico, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1967. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Secretary's memorandum of justification for a Presidential determination to draw down DOD commodities and services, and to set aside legal restrictions on providing foreign assistance to Somalia, pursuant to Public Law 101-513, section 547(a) (104 Stat. 2019); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

69-059 O—97 Vol. 139 (Pt. 16) 24

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. NATCHER: Committee on Appropriations. A report on revised subdivision of budget totals for fiscal year 1994 (Rept. 103–271). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DINGELL: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 2659. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend programs relating to the transplantation of organs and of bone marrow; with an amendment (Rept. 103–272). 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. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. DEUTSCH):

H.R. 3191. A bill to revise the national flood insurance program to promote compliance with requirements for mandatory purchase of flood insurance, to provide assistance for mitigation activities designed to reduce damages to structures subject to flooding and shoreline erosion, and to increase the maximum coverage amounts under the program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BROWDER:

H.R. 3192. A bill to deny certain benefits to candidates for election to the House of Representatives who accept contributions in excess of certain limitations, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, and Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EVANS (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. STRICKLAND):

H.R. 3193. A bill to expand services provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs for veterans suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder [PTSD]; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 3194. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for inflation adjustments to the income threshold amounts at which 85 percent of Social Security benefits become includible in gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3195. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the income threshold amounts at which 85 percent of Social Security benefits become includible in gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. FOWLER (for herself, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. MICA, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Ms. DUNN, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. LINDER, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. BUYER, Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, Mr. KIM, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland):

H.R. 3196. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and title 39, United States Code, to provide for an open, fair, and responsive electoral process, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on House Administration, Ways and Means, and Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOLDEN (for himself and Mr. GILMAN):

H.R. 3197. A bill to redesignate the Post Office building located at 13th and Rockland Streets in Reading, PA, as the "Gus Yatron Federal Postal Facility"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KANJORSKI:

H.R. 3198. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1997, the duty on [3R-alpha(R*), 4-beta]]-4-(acetyloxy)-3-[1-[[(1,1-dimethyl ethyl) dimethylsily]oxy]ethyl]-2-azetidinone, also known as aceotoxy azetidinone; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3199. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1997, the duty on p-nitrobenzyl alcohol; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3200. A bill to renew until January 1, 1996, the previous suspension of duty on 2,2-dimethylcyclopropylcarboxamide, also known as D-carboxamide; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MINK (for herself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. BYRNE, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. COLEMAN, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DELUGO, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GILMAN, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MINETA, Mr. NADLER, Mr. OWENS, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TUCKER, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. WASHINGTON, Ms. WATERS, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 3201. A bill to establish comprehensive early childhood education programs, early childhood education staff development programs, model Federal Government early childhood education programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MOAKLEY:

H.R. 3202. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on film of polymers of propylene; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 3203. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of bone mass measurements and an annual screening mammography under part B of the Medicare program, and to make permanent the coverage of certain osteoporosis drugs under part B of such program; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RICHARDSON:

H.R. 3204. A bill to transfer a parcel of land to the Taos Pueblo Indians of New Mexico; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, and Ms. HARMAN);

H.R. 3205. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to create a deficit reduction account and to reduce the discretionary spending limits, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Rules.

By Mr. STRICKLAND (for himself and Mr. MANN):

H.R. 3206. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to allow personnel at correctional facilities to qualify to receive certain benefits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYDEN:

H.R. 3207. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the training of health professions students with respect to the identification and referral of victims of domestic violence; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DERRICK:

H.R. 3208. A bill to establish a common market to bind together the countries of North America, Central America, and South America in a common commitment to promote democracy and mutually beneficial economic development; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA (for himself, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FROST, Ms. FURSE, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HAMBURG, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MINETA, Mrs. MINK, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OLVER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PARKER, Mr. PASTOR, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. ROSE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SABO, Mr. SKEEN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. STOKES, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, and Mr. WAXMAN):

H.J. Res. 271. Joint resolution designating November of each year as "National American Indian Heritage Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOYER (for himself, Mr. WELDON, Mr. VALENTINE, and Mr. BOEHLERT):

H.J. Res. 272. Joint resolution designating October 29, 1993, as "National Firefighters Day"; to the Committee on Post office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H. Con. Res. 157. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress commemorating the heroism and lifetime achievements of the late General James H. "Jimmy" Doolittle, who died on September 27, 1993; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KLUG (for himself, Mr. PENNY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. CAMP, Mr. COX, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. WALKER):

H. Res. 266. Resolution requiring the appropriate committees of the House to report legislation to transfer certain functions of the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII:

Mr. GINGRICH introduced a bill (H.R. 3209) for the relief of Kevin and Nancy Weiss;

which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 3: Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 39: Mr. PASTOR, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin, and Mr. HILLIARD.

H.R. 145: Mr. MCHALE.

H.R. 216: Mr. QUINN.

H.R. 322: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SWETT, Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin, Mr. CLYBURN, and Mr. DURBIN.

H.R. 509: Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 546: Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. PARKER, Mr. TANNER, and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 963: Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 972: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey.

H.R. 979: Mr. BREWSTER.

H.R. 1009: Mr. QUINN.

H.R. 1012: Mr. SANDERS and Mr. SANGMEISTER.

H.R. 1080: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.

H.R. 1164: Mr. REYNOLDS and Mr. SLATTERY.

H.R. 1203: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. HYDE, and Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 1353: Mr. KIM, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. EWING, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. GINGRICH, Ms. DUNN, Mr. HYDE, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. WALKER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. CRANE, Mr. BALLENGER, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, and Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming.

H.R. 1529: Mr. SUNDQUIST.

H.R. 1552: Ms. SCHENK.

H.R. 1627: Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. BUYER, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DELAY, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. GOSS, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. HOKE, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. HYDE, Mr. KASICH, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. KYL, Ms. LAMBERT, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. LEACH, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. MICA, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. PETRI, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. PORTER, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. REGULA, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. TALENT, Mr. TANNER, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. THORNTON, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. VOLKMER, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. WILSON, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. ORTON, Mr. BROWN of California, and Mr. INSLEE.

H.R. 2092: Ms. BYRNE, Mr. BEVILL, and Mr. BRYANT.

H.R. 2119: Mrs. SCHROEDER.

H.R. 2331: Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin.

H.R. 2444: Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. PARKER, Mr. SCHAEFER, and Mr. PACKARD.

H.R. 2589: Mr. MINETA.

H.R. 2609: Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FROST, Mr. FAWELL, and Ms. DANNER.

H.R. 2623: Mr. ROBERTS and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 2638: Mr. BRYANT and Mr. REYNOLDS.

H.R. 2663: Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. FROST, Mr. RICHARDSON, and Ms. LONG.

H.R. 2706: Mr. BEILENSON and Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 2735: Mr. BAESLER.

H.R. 2787: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 2838: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 2866: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DE LUGO, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. BARLOW, and Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H.R. 2872: Mr. EMERSON and Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 2873: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. COOPER, Mr. BROWN of California, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 2884: Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona.

H.R. 2912: Mr. MCCRERY and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 2921: Mr. SCOTT.

H.R. 2959: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. LEVY, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. MCCANDLESS, and Mr. ZELIFF.

H.R. 2968: Mr. HUTTO, Mr. KINGSTON, Ms. SHEPHERD, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 3031: Ms. MOLINARI.

H.R. 3065: Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. GEKAS, and Mr. COX.

H.R. 3127: Mr. HEFLEY and Mr. CONDIT.

H.R. 3135: Mr. GOSS.

H.R. 3159: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Mr. BONIOR.

H.J. Res. 22: Mr. HUFFINGTON.

H.J. Res. 38: Mr. COBLE.

H.J. Res. 61: Mr. SPENCE, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. COMBEST, and Mr. MCKEON.

H.J. Res. 106: Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. SHAYS, and Mrs. UNSOELD.

H.J. Res. 113: Mr. COBLE.

H.J. Res. 131: Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. WYNN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. HILLIARD.

H.J. Res. 148: Mr. NADLER and Mr. SMITH of Oregon.

H.J. Res. 165: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. PICKETT, and Mr. CRAPO.

H.J. Res. 178: Mr. WYNN, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ROSE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. REGULA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. KING, Mr. LEVY, Mr. QUINN, and Mr. SOLOMON.

H.J. Res. 206: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. DIXON, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. VOLKMER.

H.J. Res. 218: Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. WELDON, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MINETA, Mr. ROEMER, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. KING, Mr. HOKE, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. FISH, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. HYDE, Mr. CRANE, Mr. COBLE, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. TALENT, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. ROTH, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. HORN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. DREIER, Mr. STARK, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. KIM, Mr. QUINN, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SKEEN, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. HOYER, Mr. WILSON, Mrs. MINK, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. MEEK, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. SAWYER, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. PASTOR.

H.J. Res. 260: Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. GORDON, Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. FROST, Mr. WYNN, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.J. Res. 262: Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mrs. VUCANOVICH.

H. Con. Res. 49: Mr. SANTORUM.

H. Con. Res. 61: Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. QUINN, Ms. LOWEY, Mr. MANTON, Mr. COYNE, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H. Con. Res. 100: Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. SHEPHERD, and Mr. SAXTON.

H. Con. Res. 107: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. SCHENK, Mr. DEAL, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. VOLKMER, and Mr. SWIFT.

H. Con. Res. 124: Mr. GLICKMAN.

H. Con. Res. 147: Ms. PELOSI, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. INSLEE.

H. Res. 32: Mr. CRAMER.

H. Res. 225: Mr. CRAPO, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. PETRI, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mr. SCHIFF.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXVII the following discharge petitions were filed:

Petition 1, May 11, 1993, by Mr. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON on H.R. 493 has been signed by the following Members: Gerald B.H. Solomon, Mel Hancock, Jim Bunning, Bob Stump, Jim Saxton, Stephen E. Buyer, Don Young, David L. Hobson, Charles T. Canady, Deborah Pryce, John A. Boehner, Rob Portman, Ernest J. Istook, Jr., Toby Roth, E. Clay Shaw, Jr., John Linder, Sam Johnson, Richard H. Baker, Tillie K. Fowler, Philip M. Crane, Michael Huffington, Martin R. Hoke, Peter G. Torkildsen, Howard P. "Buck" McKeon, Wally Herger, Michael D. Crapo, Peter Hoekstra, Jennifer Dunn, Carlos J. Moorhead, Jim Kolbe, Bill Baker, Randy "Duke" Cunningham, Rick Lazio, James M. Talent, Michael A. "Mac" Collins, Jack Quinn, Christopher Cox, Dana Rohrabacher, John T. Doolittle, James C. Greenwood, David A. Levy, Peter T. King, Donald A. Manzullo, Peter Blute, Terry Everett, Cass Ballenger, Cliff Stearns, Bob Goodlatte, Rod Grams, Michael N. Castle, Michael Bilirakis, David Dreier, Rick Santorum, Stephen Horn, Porter J. Goss, Robert S. Walker, Edward R. Royce, Alfred A. (Al) McCandless, Ken Calvert, Robert H. Michel, Jim Ramstad, Doug Bereuter, Fred Upton, James V. Hansen, Nancy L. Johnson, John J. Duncan, Jr., James M. Inhofe, Bill Paxon, Olympia J. Snowe, Harris W. Fawell, Thomas W. Ewing, Dan Miller, Bill Barrett, Charles H. Taylor, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Richard K. Armey, Dick Zimmer, Don Sunquist, Thomas J. Bliley, Jr., Roscoe G. Bartlett, John L. Mica, Jack Fields, Jim Nussle, Nathan Deal, Jay Kim, Helen Delich Bentley, Spencer T. Bachus III, Martin T. Meehan, Jim Bacchus, William H. Zeliff, Jr., Ronald K. Machtley, Dan Schaefer, Wayne Allard, George W. Gekas, W.J. (Billy) Tauzin, Tom Lewis, Ron Packard, and Dean A. Gallo.

Petition 3, July 1, 1993, by Mr. BILL MCCOLLUM on House Joint Resolution 38 has been signed by the following Members: Bill McCollum, Michael Huffington, Y. Tim Hutchinson, James M. Inhofe, Porter J. Goss, Cass Ballenger, Jack Quinn, John T. Doolittle, Jennifer Dunn, Rod Grams, John Linder, Ernest J. Istook, Jr., Dick Zimmer, Richard W. Pombo, Thomas W. Ewing, Bill Barrett, Craig Thomas, Mel Hancock, Charles H. Taylor, Paul E. Gillmor, Rick Lazio, Charles T. Canady, Howard P. "Buck" McKeon, James M. Talent, Joe Knollenberg, Jay Dickey, Terry Everett, Jack Kingston, Bob Stump, Bob Inglis, Elton Gallegly, Bill Baker, Stephen Horn, James V. Hansen, Dana Rohrabacher, Peter G. Torkildsen, Wayne Allard, Jim Ramstad, Nick Smith, Bob Goodlatte, Michael Bilirakis, Ken Calvert, Michael A. "Mac" Collins, Arthur

Ravenel, Jr., Jim Lightfoot, Sam Johnson, Howard Coble, Gerald B.H. Solomon, Tillie K. Fowler, Jim McCrery, Stephen Buyer, Deborah Pryce, William H. Zeliff, Jr., Robert K. Dornan, Lincoln Diaz-Balart, Richard K. Armey, Martin R. Hoke, Rob Portman, Peter Blute, Scott L. Klug, Henry Bonilla, John L. Mica, Peter Hoekstra, James C. Greenwood, Jack Fields, Jim Nussle, Nathan Deal, Jay Kim, Jim Kolbe, Spencer T. Bachus, Martin T. Meehan, Edward R. Royce, Philip M. Crane, Scott McInnis, Doug Bereuter, Cliff Stearns, Dan Miller, Don Johnson, Lamar Smith, Ron Packard, Ronald K. Machtley, Dan Schaefer, Rick Santorum, Bill Paxon, J. Alex McMillan, Charles Wilson, Newt Gingrich, Dean A. Gallo, David Minge, Don Sundquist, Michael D. Crapo, Bob Franks, Robert F. (Bob) Smith, Donald A. Manzullo, George W. Gekas, Jim Saxton, Christopher Cox, and Roscoe G. Bartlett.

Petition 4, September 23, 1993, by Mr. HOEKSTRA on House Joint Resolution 9 has been signed by the following Members: Peter Hoekstra, Joe Barton, Fred Upton, Bob Goodlatte, Tom DeLay, Thomas W. Ewing, Bob Inglis, Edward R. Royce, Tillie K. Fowler, Martin R. Hoke, Richard K. Armey, Bill Archer, Jack Kingston, Michael A. "Mac" Collins, Dan Burton, Rob Portman, J. Dennis Hastert, Howard P. "Buck" McKeon, Thomas J. Bliley, Jr., Dick Zimmer, John Linder, Scott McInnis, Jack Quinn, Cass Ballenger, Joe Knollenberg, Spencer T. Bachus, Bill Emerson, Peter G. Torkildsen, Christopher Cox, John A. Boehner, Michael D. Crapo, Scott L. Klug, Jim Bunning, Deborah Pryce, David L. Hobson, Bill Baker, Richard W. Pombo, Stephen E. Buyer, Ken Calvert, Henry Bonilla, Roscoe G. Bartlett, James M. Inhofe, Donald A. Manzullo, Sam Johnson, Bob Livingston, Wally Herger, William H. Zeliff, Jr., Jennifer Dunn, Ronald K. Machtley, Dan Schaefer, Bill Paxon, Wayne Allard, Jim Ramstad, Don Sundquist, Charles T. Canady, Michael Bilirakis, Michael Huffington, Y. Tim Hutchinson, Bill McCollum, George W. Gekas, Ron Packard, W.J. (Billy) Tauzin, James A. Hayes, Porter J. Goss, Bob Stump, Gerald B.H. Solomon, John L. Mica, and Dean A. Gallo.

Petition 5, September 28, 1993, by Mr. STEARNS on House Resolution 156 has been signed by the following Members: Cliff Steans, Ronald K. Machtley, Dan Schaefer, Bill Paxon, Wayne Allard, Jim Bunning, Jim Ramstad, Charles T. Canady, Dana Rohrabacher, Randy "Duke" Cunningham, Sam Johnson, Barbara F. Vucanovich, John J. Duncan, Jr., Howard Coble, William H. Zeliff, Jr., Michael Huffington, Michael A. "Mac" Collins, Michael D. Crapo, Bill Baker, Y. Tim Hutchinson, Donald A. Manzullo, James M. Inhofe, Tillie K. Fowler, Bill McCollum, Dan Burton, Rob Portman, George W. Gekas, Thomas W. Ewing, Ron Packard, Christopher Cox, Bill Emerson, Wayne T. Gilchrist, Tom Lewis, Porter J. Goss, Bob Stump, Michael Bilirakis, Gerald B.H. Solomon, and John L. Mica.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII:

60. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the citizens of the United States of America, relative to: 1 Repeal Income Tax; 1(A) Abolish the Internal Revenue Service; 2 Replace Income Tax With Imports; Excise & Duties; 2(A) Restore State Sovereignty; 3 Repeal the "Federal" Reserve Act; 3(A) Prosecute all Federal Reserve Board of Governors including Alan Greenspan and its stockholders; which was referred jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.