HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Tuesday, October 5, 1993*

The House met at 12 noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 5, 1993.

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

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

PRAYER

The Reverend Leslie Klingensmith, Westminster Presbyterian Church, Alexandria, VA, offered the following prayer:

Most Holy and Almighty God, we ask that You be with the leaders of our Nation as they make decisions that affect our future. We thank You for the freedoms that we have as Americans, and we ask You to help all Americans and all people remember their responsibilities to one another. Help our country's leaders to work together to bring about peace and justice. Although we as individuals and as a nation all too often forget You and Your will for the world, we thank You for never forgetting us and for the unending mercy that You have shown us.

We pray on this glorious day in the name of Your Son and our Redeemer, Jesus Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Pledge of Allegiance will be given by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOLLENBERG].

Mr. KNOLLENBERG led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 3123. An act to improve the electric and telephone loan programs carried out under the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2445. An act making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, and

H.R. 2446. An act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 2445) entitled "An act making appropriations for energy and water development 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. JOHNSTON, Mr. BYRD, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. SASSER, Mr. DECONCINI, Mr. REID, Mr. KERREY, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. GORTON, and Mr. MCCONNELL, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 2446) entitled "An act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense 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. SASSER, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. REID, Mr. KOHL, Mr. BYRD, Mr. GORTON, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. MCCONNELL, and Mr. HATFIELD, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the resolution (S. Con. Res. 4) entitled "Concurrent resolution to authorize printing of 'Senators of the United States: A Historical Bibliography,' as prepared by the Office of the Secretary of the Senate."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the resolution (S. Con. Res. 5) entitled "Concurrent resolution to authorize printing of 'Guide to Research Collections of Former United States Senators' as prepared by the Office of the Secretary of the Senate."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the resolution (S. Con. Res. 6) entitled "Concurrent resolution to authorize printing of 'Senate Election, Expulsion, and Censure Cases,' as prepared by the Office of the Secretary of the Senate."

PERMISSION TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT TONIGHT TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT 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 that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight, October 5, 1993, to file a conference report on 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.

Mr. Speaker, this request has been cleared with the minority.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to make a parliamentary inquiry under my reservation.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I would like to inquire under my reservation: In the event that unanimous consent is not granted, will this have to be sent back to the Committee on Rules?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is just a request to file. It would not have to be sent back.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. So it would not have to go back to the Rules Committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It would not go back to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, let me just say that any time I can send additional work back to the Rules Committee because of the procedures that they have followed in sending closed rules to this floor week after week, in violation of minority rights, I will do so.

However, since this does not have to go back to the Rules Committee, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

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

There was no objection.

SITUATION IN SOMALIA: LET US DECLARE VICTORY AND SAFELY WITHDRAW

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in July I introduced a resolution calling for withdrawal of our troops from Somalia. I introduced that resolution 3½ months ago because our mission had become clouded in Somalia and our role was undefined.

What do we say, Mr. Speaker, to the families of the 12 dead servicemen? What do we say to the families of the four servicemen who were killed a couple of weeks ago? What do we say to the Americans who have lost their lives? How do you explain why they died in Somalia?

We went to Somalia back 9 months ago for the right reasons: to feed people, to help people. We as an American people can be proud of what we did in Somalia. We can be proud of the people we helped and the lives we saved.

But today, Mr. Speaker, we should declare victory because we did what was right in Somalia and we should pull out as quickly as we can safely withdraw.

REPUBLICAN LEADERS STAND BEHIND PRESIDENT CLINTON ON SOMALIA

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the tragedy and the deaths in the recent 48 hours in Somalia, the Republican leadership, while understanding and maintaining that we must debate the Somalia issue, long-range policy issue, stands strongly behind President Clinton in what must now be his two major goals; one, to bring the perpetrators to justice; second, to secure the safety of the American troops remaining in Somalia.

DEFICIT REDUCTION LOCK BOX

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

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, October 1, 1993, was New Year's Day, so to speak. It was New Year's Day of the new fiscal year. And, like all New Year's, I propose to the Congress to make a New Year's resolution: Lock away all spending cuts for deficit reduction.

There is a growing frustration among Members that cuts we make in the appropriations bills are not real cuts. The money we think we cut from programs is later spent when an appropriations bill goes to conference. In fact, often times, the overall spending in a conference report is actually higher than the House- or Senate-passed bill.

Mr. Speaker, this is a ridiculous practice, and it must be stopped.

This New Year's Day of the fiscal year, my colleagues, CHARLES SCHUMER, CHET EDWARDS, JANE HARMAN, and I introduced a bill called the deficit reduction lock box. That bill will guarantee that the deficit will be reduced when Congress approves spending cuts. The lock box is an air tight budget measure that ends the game of phantom spending cuts.

Mr. Speaker, I request the support of the Members of this House for the deficit reduction lock box.

WITHDRAW UNITED STATES TROOPS FROM SOMALIA NOW

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

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, the President had better get his foreign policy act together before Somalia becomes another Vietnam.

Last December, I warned that failure of our new Commander in Chief to stick to the original mission of humanitarian aid for Somalia would inevitably lead to the United States getting bogged down in a prolonged and deadly operation.

Now, 10 months later, American GI's are dying in a bloodbath and the President is sending more GI's to Somalia this very day.

Why, Mr. Speaker? Why let the Somalis drag more dead GI's by ropes through the streets of Mogadishu, kicking and spitting on them? Why let the Somalis take more American hostages?

What, pray tell, is our national interest in escalating United States military involvement in Somalia?

Mr. Speaker, to expand our mission in Somalia and commit more troops is the height of foreign policy folly.

I urge my colleagues to join me as a cosponsor of House Resolution 239, which calls for the President to withdraw all United States Armed Forces from Somalia immediately.

THE WACO TRAGEDY

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

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Oversight, our committee conducted the first hearing that reviewed the operations of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms in the ill-fated Waco incident. In that hearing, I asked Director Higgins repeatedly why his agency would proceed with their raid when they knew the element of surprise had been lost. Despite my repeated query, Mr. Higgins, apparently under direction from his Treasury Department superiors, continued to evade the question, repeatedly exhorting our committee to wait for the results of the internal investigation.

The results are now in and, unfortunately, they confirm our worst fears: The ATF knew they had lost the element of surprise but went in anyway, with the disastrous consequences with which we are all too familiar.

When the goal of a particular operation ceases to be the suppression of crime and the detention of the perpetrators, and when it becomes getting good publicity and exciting video, we have gone seriously astray. I cannot say with certainty that the people in charge in Waco were merely "playing to the media," but it is clear to me that this had a huge influence on their actions.

We have had a tremendous explosion of syndicated television shows that track law enforcement officers on actual busts of criminals. Hollywood has realized that there is a large audience for these kinds of gritty, sensational shows, and many law enforcement groups have realized that their exposure on these shows leads to good publicity and, often, bigger budgets.

The downside to this is that we may now be seeing a few groups who have in the glare of the spotlights lost sight of their real mission. I suspect that that is what happened in Waco.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the members of the news media, the producers of these shows, the law enforcement community, we politicians who oversee much of this process and the citizens who ultimately suffer from this will all take a hard look at ourselves and consider the role we may be playing, unwittingly or not, in perpetuating this tragic practice. If nothing else, let the memory of those innocent children in Waco spur us to do at least this much.

□ 1210

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH IN SOMALIA

(Mr. WELDON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, enough is enough. Twelve more Americans dead, hundreds of Americans, including one of my constituents injured, six American POW's. Downed airmen paraded through the streets of Mogadishu, while their tormenters kick them and chant anti-American slogans.

As I have said on this floor repeatedly, let us get out of Somalia today, not in 6 months or a year. Our troops should not be used to fulfill the grand delusions of U.N. bureaucrats. We are bogged down in an urban guerrilla nightmare.

Just last week in a resolution that I labeled a CYA sham, this House requested that the President tell us what our mission is by October 15, 10 months after we went in.

Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, if we do not have a clear mission after 10 months, another 2 weeks will not matter.

So today, I am introducing a resolution to get all our forces out and bring our troops home from Somalia by November 15. I am also initiating a discharge petition to bring this bill to the floor immediately.

Mr. Speaker, enough is enough. We have done our part. We have fed the starving masses. We have stopped starvation and saved thousands of lives. It is time to bring our troops home.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would like to inform our guests that they cannot participate in this debate by applauding or even making any comments, so we ask for your indulgence and your respect for the House.

THE QUAGMIRE OF SOMALIA

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

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, it is a truism to say that you can get out of a quagmire by getting further and deeper into it. That is exactly what it appears will happen if we deploy further troops to Somalia. We are in a quagmire, and we will not get out of that quagmire by getting further and deeper into it.

Starting this summer in July, I have been speaking from this well, from this floor, urging the President to get our troops home. The original mission in Somalia has been accomplished and it was done laudably and honorably and done very well. That mission of feeding the starving people of Somalia is behind us.

The next mission, which I must remind everyone is being directed by the United Nations, not by U.S. commanders, but by U.N. commanders, it was the United Nations that sent the U.S. troops into battle yesterday that claimed 12 lives and injured 78, left our forces undefended for 6 hours, is nation-building and government-creating. That mission is a quagmire.

Mr. Speaker, the quicker we can get our people home, the better.

TIME TO BRING TROOPS HOME FROM SOMALIA

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

Mr. ZELIFF. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned about President Clinton's decision to send hundreds of additional United States troops to Somalia.

Yesterday, I, along with millions of Americans, watched the results of our current policy in the horrible images being broadcast from that country.

At least 12 U.S. soldiers are dead and 78 are wounded from this past weekend's fighting.

The bodies of American soldiers killed in action were being literally dragged through the streets by cheering Somalis.

And CWO Michael Durant, a New Hampshire native and a neighbor of mine from Berlin, NH, was being interviewed by his Somali captors about the mortality of his mission.

The events of the last few days should encourage the President not to place any more Americans unnecessarily in harm's way. We have not clearly defined our objectives or our mission, and we should not escalate this conflict.

Our original humanitarian goal to feed the starving people was legitimate. To now insist on continuing an ineffective U.N. police action makes no sense at all.

As far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, the humanitarian mission in Somalia is over. It is time for us to bring our troops home.

BREAST CANCER AWARENESS IS THEME OF OCTOBER PROMOTION

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

Mr. HUTTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join the efforts promoting breast cancer awareness during October and comment on this issue as an element of health care reform.

By now, most of us should know that 182,000 American women will be diagnosed with breast cancer this year and over 40,000 women will be fatally affected. Although many women survive the cancer, they may still suffer long-term physical and emotional pain.

One component of health care reform which enjoys bipartisan support is preventive care. Preventive services not only save lives, but also reduce health care spending. While breast cancer may not be fully prevented, it can be detected early enough, through regular screening mammography, to be effectively treated. Early detection can further help minimize the physical and emotional impact of the cancer.

As the Congress embarks on health care reform, I urge all of my colleagues to give special attention to breast cancer and the advances made in detecting and treating this disease. Despite what method of reform you may support, please remember that screening mammography fulfills both reform goals—saving health care dollars, and more importantly, saving lives.

1993 YOUTH HEALTH REPORT CARD REVEALS ALARMINGLY POOR GRADES

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

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was Child Health Day 1993. The American Health Foundation of Valhalla, NY, organized a number of events to commemorate it, including the release of the 1993 Youth Health Report Card.

The overall grade on that report card is an alarming C−. Out of a total of 64 categories of health indicators, F's were given in 4, D's in 18, C's in 32, B's in 6, and A's in only 4. Performance is particularly weak in the areas of teen pregnancies, prenatal care, child abuse, blood lead levels in children, cases of syphilis and AIDS, and intentional injuries by suicide, homicide, and firearms in those aged 10 to 19 years old.

These grades are unacceptable. While reform of our national health care system should be a step in the right direction toward improving these scores, our approach to solving this problem must be multifaceted. As Dr. Ernst Wynder, president of the American Health Foundation, pointed out, poverty, neglect, abuse, family disintegration, education failure, violence, and crime are all pieces of the child health puzzle.

I urge all of my colleagues to join this year's recipients of the Child Health Day Award, Senator TOM HARKIN and Marian Wright Edelman, president of the Children's Defense Fund, in the search for innovative and comprehensive solutions to this pressing problem.

GO, ATLANTA BRAVES

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, not to speak about a crisis on foreign soil, or NAFTA, or even health care.

I rise today to speak about Justice, David Justice, and the rest of America's team, the Atlanta Braves. This great team from the great city of Atlanta, with the leadership of Bobby Cox and Terry Pendleton: with Nixon and Blauser setting the table; with the power of Gant, McGriff, and Justice; and with baseball's best pitching staff. This great team has inspired Atlanta

to believe that by working hard and working together anything is possible.

Tomorrow, tomorrow, tomorrow, the best team in baseball will travel to the city of brotherly love. I say to my friends in Philadelphia, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BLACKWELL], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOGLIETTA] and my other Philadelphia colleagues—get ready. The Braves do not come seeking love, but victory. And they will prevail.

Today I rise to cheer a team that came from 10 games back, that won 104 games, that won the National League West—the Atlanta Braves.

Go Braves, go Braves, go Braves.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would thank the gentleman for not putting on the cap or doing any chopping.

INTRODUCTION OF CHILDREN'S EDUCATION OPPORTUNITY ACT

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the second in a series of welfare reform initiatives. This is the Children's Education Opportunity Act, often referred to as learnfare.

This legislation, which has been introduced in the Senate by Senator DON NICKLES, permits each State to implement incentives for school attendance. Specifically, a State would be permitted to withhold a portion of welfare funds if school age children in a welfare dependent family are not attending school.

Education is critical if poor children are going to have a brighter future.

This legislation is consistent with my philosophy that the States should be given much more control over the administration and design of welfare programs. My own State of Michigan, under the leadership of Gov. John Engler, has been at the forefront of welfare reform.

This learnfare proposal follows my introduction in August of comprehensive public housing rent reform. My rent reform legislation restructures Federal rent formulas to encourage and reward residents who work.

Reform of our Nation's welfare system is critical. I ask my colleagues to cosponsor both learnfare and rent reform.

CANCEL HALLOWEEN THIS YEAR

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I think we could probably cancel Halloween this year, because there is no horror show that could equal those awful photographs coming out of Somalia this weekend.

I was one of the people who hated going in because I said it is so easy to go in and so hard to come out, but we do know that we have done a great job delivering food in the rural area.

We also know that there is no way we can do nationbuilding with tanks. Even if the United Nations wants us to do nationbuilding with tanks, it will not work.

□ 1220

I think the time has come to say that we have done what we went to do, and we must come home, and I hope we learned a tremendous lesson, that we do not get called into the former Yugoslavia, or other places, under the idea that we can just run in and run out.

BRING OUR TROOPS HOME FROM SOMALIA NOW

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, we need to get out of Somalia immediately. We do not need any studies. We do not need any reassessments. We do not need any delays. We need to bring our troops home now.

Instead, Mr. Speaker, the President is increasing our presence there. This is a bad mistake. There is no threat to our national security there. There is no vital U.S. interest there.

I certainly feel sorry for those who are suffering, but apparently the Somalian people do not want us there.

In 1963, Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy said:

> We must face the fact that the U.S. is neither omnipotent, nor omniscient, that we are only 6 percent of the world's population, that we cannot impose our will upon the other 94 percent, that we cannot right every wrong or reverse each adversity, and that, therefore, there cannot be an American solution to every world problem.

Mr. Speaker, we do not have either the financial resources or the manpower to solve the problems in Somalia. We should get our troops out of there now, and the sooner the better.

OCTOBER IS NATIONAL BREAST CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

(Ms. SHEPHERD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SHEPHERD. Mr. Speaker, we are all too familiar with the tragedy of breast cancer as we are with the sluggish track record of Federal breast cancer research and education efforts. Despite this past neglect, we are beginning to see many signs of hope.

At the University of Utah federally funded researchers under the leadership of Dr. Ray White have isolated the genes that, when damaged, are responsible for the growth of life-threatening tumors. Now with additional funds from the Jon M. Huntsman family, University of Utah researchers will be able to bring the fruits of their labor directly into clinics to help women fight breast cancer and win.

Still, we have a long way to go. One in nine women in the United States are diagnosed with breast cancer. Too often they avoid or do not have access to the routine checkups that identify the disease before it has the power to kill. Designating October 1993 "National Breast Cancer Awareness Month" is important. It helps women across the country take responsibility for their health and their future. I commend my colleagues for making breast cancer a national priority in October, and urge them to continue to make it a priority throughout the year.

GET OUR TROOPS OUT OF SOMALIA

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

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, the Clinton administration has advocated control of our troops in Somalia to the United Nations, and they are in harm's way. Mr. Speaker, we should have learned from the Vietnam war that fighting in foreign lands without a clear mission, without a clear plan and without public approval is a bad idea. I hope that President Clinton understands this very simple lesson. If he does, he will pull American troops out of Somalia.

Let us make it clear. We all support our troops wherever they are deployed around the world, but, Mr. Speaker, the mission was to define a mission, accomplish a mission, and get out. We did that in the Gulf war, and we did it in Panama. Our clear plan was to feed the starving. That we have done. Now we must get out.

Mr. Speaker, the President needs to change his doctrine. He has been traveling around this country advocating new, and expensive and expansive new social programs, and he needs to come back to Washington, spend some time on foreign policy and get our troops out of Somalia.

SAY NO TO NAFTA

(Miss COLLINS of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Miss COLLINS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, as the House this week considers another extension of emergency unemployment benefits to American

workers, it raises for me the fear that if this Congress passes NAFTA, future votes on unemployment benefits will become more frequent. Thousands and thousands of American jobs have already been lost to Mexico. Compound those losses with a weak economy, defense conversion, worker retraining, and the growth of the working poor, it becomes clear that Americans and the American economy will be further harmed by NAFTA.

Just yesterday the Census Bureau reported that the number of Americans living in poverty rose for the 3rd consecutive year, while median income remained stagnant. With this sobering statistic in mind, we must evaluate NAFTA guided by one principle—will it provide a great benefit to our people? Let us look at this issue. The pro-NAFTA forces argue that increased exports will create jobs on top of jobs. I have my doubts. The facts say that many of those exports are materials going into United States owned factories in Mexico that will in turn ship a finished product back to the United States although these United States supplies sent to Mexico are classified as exports, where are the benefits? I question whether new American jobs will be created under this scenario. It is all an illusion.

The bottom line is many of us were elected on the promise of jobs and putting people first. It is about time we honored that promise without smoke and mirrors. Just say no to NAFTA.

NEW REVELATIONS IN THE RON BROWN AFFAIR

(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, there have been some new revelations in the Ron Brown affair. I think most of my colleagues know that Ron Brown is the Secretary of Commerce and he has been accused of wrongdoing. He has been accused that he may have taken $700,000 in payoffs from the Vietnamese Government in order to use his influence to normalize relations with that government even though we have not had a full accounting of our POW/MIA's.

Now, tonight, when we have special orders, I am going to go through the entire chronology of events that took place in this debacle, or this alleged debacle, with these new revelations. I think the President should have a complete investigation of the Ron Brown affair. It should not be swept under the rug, and I hope all of my colleagues who are concerned about this, both Democrat and Republican, will be watching special orders tonight.

APPOINT MAJORITY OF CONFEREES WHO OPPOSE COLLIDER

(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, the House of Representatives will have the opportunity in the next few days to save American Taxpayers well over $8 billion by terminating the superconducting super collider.

Earlier this year, 280 Members of the House voted against further spending on the SSC. The cost of this project has already tripled, and it is less than 20 percent complete. Overwhelming majorities on both sides of the political aisle in the House have said enough is enough, it's time to pull the plug on the SSC.

This week the House will decide whether to stand behind that overwhelming vote. The Speaker will appoint conferees for the energy and water appropriations bill. Over 120 members have signed a letter to the Speaker asking that he appoint a majority of limited conferees for this question who supported the position of the House.

While this would be a break from the tradition that only the Appropriations Subcommittee members serve on the conference, I believe it is time to reform a process that makes it too difficult to cut projects that Congress has said it doesn't want.

House rule 10, clause 6(f) states that the Speaker "shall appoint no less than a majority of members who * * * supported the House position" and "include the principal proponents of the major provisions of the bill."

Mr. Speaker, I hope you do so.

OUT OF SOMALIA NOW

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, what is going on in Somalia? Why are we still there? Why are American troops getting killed for no apparent reason?

When we first went in under President Bush, we had a clearly defined mission: Feed the starving.

Now, this humanitarian mission has turned into a quagmire.

We try to chase down a Somali warlord because a U.N. Commander says we must. We turn the Somali people against us, and American troops get killed. This is complete nonsense.

Mr. Speaker, when is the President going to act with decisiveness, and pull our soldiers out of there?

I realize the President wanted to concentrate on the economy like a laserbeam. But by ignoring foreign affairs, and by failing to define our mission in Somalia, the President has far too often put our troops in harms way.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the President to exert some real leadership and get our troops out of Somalia.

□ 1230

YOUTH HEALTH REPORT CARD

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

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the American Health Foundation issued the 1993 Youth Health Report Card. The report card compares children's health indicators from 1980, 1985, and 1990 and sets goals for the year 1995. While some areas showed slight improvements over the 12 year period, the overall health of U.S. children scored only a C-minus.

The report card indicated that large numbers of children, 40 to 60 percent, are not completely immunized. Child abuse and neglect is still a huge problem and getting worse. In addition, many children are subjected to poor nutrition, substance abuse and lack of physical activity, all of which leads to numerous diseases and conditions.

We can do better, Mr. Speaker. We must do better. No issue is more important than the health and well-being of our children.

If we fail to be involved in improving our children's health, the costs down the road will be enormous in terms of their future well being and expenditures associated in addressing their health needs. The neglect of our children affects all of us.

As a result, I have introduced the children's health care resolution which expresses the sense of Congress that any health care reform include the special needs of children, emphasize preventative care, and address the uninsured status of many children.

This is an important issue. Cosponsor the children's health care resolution.

UNITED STATES INVOLVEMENT IN SOMALIA

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

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, like all Americans, I have grave concern for the safety of United States forces—the men and women of our military in Somalia.

The original mission of United States Armed Forces in Somalia was to provide humanitarian assistance, not to become involved in a war. The administration has not defined the compelling national interest to justify a continued American presence in Somalia. The commitment to put American men and women in harm's way is a far different and greater commitment than providing humanitarian assistance.

Mr. Speaker, 20 Americans have been killed to date in Somalia. Before more Americans are killed in the streets of Mogadishu, it is time for them to come home.

While this has been a United Nations' operation, men and women of the United States military have shouldered

most of the responsibilities. The United States can't build a nation for the people of Somalia.

Mr. Speaker, U.S. troops have been in Somalia since Christmas 1992. They have made a considerable effort to get food and medicine to the people who need it. It is now up to the people of Somalia. Bring our troops home—now.

SOMALIA

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, what has happened with our mission in Somalia? It seems to me in the last few months it has become horribly muddled. The original goal, which I though I understood, was to open routes and feed starving people.

Well, we have fed the people now. Why are we still there? Is it so we can hunt a fugitive warlord? Is it to create a new police state? What is it going to take to get Clinton to bring our troops home? Will it take more dead Americans being dragged through the streets of Somalia? Will that do it?

We should not risk the lives of even one more American soldier. We have had enough of this.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I am introducing legislation that would insist on bringing our troops home by cutting off the funding for this operation. We need our troops out of there. We need them out of there now, and if Clinton will not do it, we must.

SOMALIA

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, can we trust this administration? Let us look at Somalia. We have been waiting for 10 months for a plan. Where is the focus? Is it U.N. control, is it nation building, or is it just to put U.S. lives at risk?

It tore me up as a POW from Vietnam to see that POW tortured the way he was. And he was tortured, you could see it. And it tore me up to see those bodies dragged down the streets with ropes around their hands. How do we know they were dead when those guys caught them? We do not.

The Department of Defense says now we can fix everything with four tanks. It is a total lack of focus. The totals for America are 23 dead, 75 wounded, 5 missing, and at least 1 captured.

Now, let us switch to the year 1961, the place Vietnam, the second year of that involvement. The totals were 11 dead and 3 wounded. Look where we went.

Mr. Speaker, is this the beginning of a repeat performance? We need U.S. leadership. Let us get out of Somalia or get a plan.

MORE FATALITIES IN SOMALIA

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

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Speaker, one of my families back in Wisconsin got the phone call Sunday night. Their son had been killed in an attack on a United States helicopter in Somalia.

Why, Mr. Speaker? What is the mission of the United States military in Somalia?

I supported the original humanitarian relief mission, but I do no support the idea that we should be the beat cop for the United Nations, chasing a two-bit punk from village to marketplace all across the country.

Listen to this. In the last year we have spent $1.5 billion on the military mission but only $167 million on the relief mission. We have accomplished the defined humanitarian mission. A year later we do not have a defined military mission.

Bring our soldiers home, Mr. President. I do not want another phone call to another one of my families in Wisconsin.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The Chair would tell Members that they cannot address the President of the United States directly. They should address the Chair, and that message will be delivered to the President.

THE MISSION IN SOMALIA

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

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, we have been in Somalia almost 8 months longer than we originally were told we were going to be. The reason was because we listened to the interventionists and the adventurists in the Congress.

We had a vote here on May 25 before this Congress which set a date certain for us to get out. We in this Congress have the power within our hands to move out of Somalia, and we have got to use that power.

The Republican leadership came into the well here this morning and said, "Oh, we are with the President in Somalia." Where is the Republican leadership? We do not find them anywhere. The leadership is here speaking out this morning. Those are the people we are following.

Look at the Secretary of State. He says we have got to stabilize the country in Somalia before we get out, as though that were possible. The chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee says we cannot leave because it would harm United States and United Nations credibility. The President says we are putting in more troops, but we are not expanding the conflict. Yes, we believe that. Right.

It is about time we listened to the American people. Enough is enough. No more American prisoners; no more dead soldiers being dragged through the streets of Mogadishu; no more bodies being displayed and mutilated.

Mr. Speaker, the time is now. We are going to leave.

RECOGNIZING OCTOBER AS BREAST CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, during this month of October, millions of women will be reminded to take care of their health and their lives. This month is National Breast Cancer Awareness Month.

A decade ago, I discovered I had breast cancer, a disease for which there was no cure. Ten years later there still is no cure and breast cancer continues to frighten women and men of all ages. In 1993, 182,000 women and 1,000 men will have to come to terms with this devastating disease.

It is the responsibility of this Congress and every Member to get the word out to citizens about preventive measures and early detection of breast cancer. This month and next, I will be hosting Breast Cancer Public Education Fairs in my own State of Nevada designed to educate women on breast self-examination and mammography, as well as the status of legislation in the Halls of Congress.

I encourage all of my colleagues to reach out to the women, men, and families in their districts on this important issue. I truly believe we can save lives if we all work together.

TIME TO WITHDRAW FORCES FROM SOMALIA

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

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to add my voice to the many who question the continued involvement of United States forces in Somalia. Mr. Speaker we have gone far beyond the point of diminishing returns on this policy. It is time to say enough is enough. Yesterday newscasts placed the number of U.S. casualties at 16. We cannot continue to ask our soldiers to stay in Somalia with these risks and an undefined mission without a clear timetable for final withdrawal. The brave soldiers we sent to Somalia have

for the most part met our humanitarian goals. Our American forces have made a heroic effort in the face of a constantly changing mission. I will admit that I had strong doubts about sending our troops to Somalia in the first place with an unclear mission. But I wonder * * * if in advance of this mission everyone had known our U.S. forces would be reduced to chasing a dangerous rebel warlord through the streets of Mogadishu * * * if the mission would have been supported. The bottom line is this—our troops have done their job and their safety should be our first concern. It is time to get them out—before it is too late.

□ 1240

LEAVE SOMALIA MISSION TO UNITED NATIONS

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

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart over yesterday's events in Somalia.

In June, I sent a letter to the President asking him to remove our troops since our humanitarian goals had changed to disarming Mogadishu.

Now, our goal is to establish democratic institutions in a nation that has never known true democracy.

We are caught in an open-ended, poorly defined mission in Somalia for which there is no public mandate. We only have to go back to Vietnam to see the pitfalls of such a strategy.

If Vietnam taught us anything, it is that getting involved in another nation's internal troubles is dangerous. It is worse when the intervention is ill-defined and unappreciated.

The solution is not to send even more troops. It is to recover the hostages, get out, and leave the mission to the United Nations.

Finally, I say to my colleagues, we can no longer stand by while Americans are being taken hostage, killed, and their bodies mutilated. It is time to assert our own authority.

Chief Warrant Officer Durant, our prayers are with you, along with the families of the dead and wounded. They are also with the troops who are on their way to Somalia, and their families. Let us hope it will be a short trip.

SOMALIAN CRIMES MUST NOT GO UNPUNISHED

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

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, I was one of the first Members of the Congress to call for the withdrawal of American troops from Somalia.

Recently, this House and the Congress expressed its will relating to the Somalia issue. I can even temporarily accept the weak compromise that I personally view as unsatisfactory.

What I cannot accept is the wanton and savage murder of 12 more Americans. Americans sent to maintain peace.

What this Congress cannot accept is the brutal killing and acts of armed aggression against U.S. peacekeeping forces.

Our Nation sought peace. The armed Somalis have declared war. We went to save their dying children, now they parade the slain bodies of our youth.

No American leader or civilized nation should rest until these and other savage murders are punished. Even if United States forces leave Somalia, the world must know that these acts of murder and war will be avenged.

We urge the President and Secretary of Defense to take what ever means, force, or actions necessary to bring these international murderers to justice.

These crimes must not go unpunished.

GET UNITED STATES TROOPS OUT OF SOMALIA

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, last week the House responded to the Gephardt-Gilman resolution calling on the President to report to Congress by October 15 on his policy goals in Somalia—and to seek congressional authorization by November 15 for continued deployment of United States forces there.

Tragically, new United States casualties in Somalia sharply underscore the futility of our Somalia military operations. We cannot afford to wait any longer for the President to explain why our forces are being sent to bleed and die in Somalia.

Nor can we afford to wait a month beyond that to vote on this critical issue. Today I am calling on the President to send up his report promptly—so that the Congress can act as soon thereafter as possible to pull our forces out of the sinkhole that Somalia has become and let us get them out now.

OPEN RULE NEEDED ON HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton wants openness and bipartisan cooperation on health care reform. I share the President's wishes.

That's why I am introducing legislation today to express the sense of the House that health care reform should be brought to the floor under an open rule.

The American people want an open and forthright debate. They do not want to see health care reform crafted in secret in the dead of the night.

But a fresh breeze is blowing, Mr. Speaker. With the passage of the bill to make discharge petitions open to public scrutiny, the Congress has begun to change the way business is done in Washington.

Now we have another chance for change. My bill will ensure that every Member of the Congress will be able to amend whatever health care bill is brought before this body. I already have over 60 bipartisan original cosponsors.

The American people want choices. They do not want to be coerced into accepting health reform which denies our citizens the right to obtain their current health plan without being taxed for this privilege. This Congress needs open and fair debate.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor the Baker resolution for an open rule on health care reform.

TIME TO BRING AMERICANS HOME FROM SOMALIA

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

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. Speaker, last winter, the President sent United States troops under United States command to Somalia to help save the country from famine and starvation.

Getting food and supplies through to the people that needed it. That was our goal.

Our troops did the job. That job is done. Our troops should come home.

We did not send them there to become a permanent U.N. force under U.N. command.

We did not send them there to participate in a U.N. experiment in nation building—whatever that means.

Our men and women are in grave danger over there. This isn't just fun and games. Today, there are reports of U.S. troops being captured and being held hostage by a warlord and his thugs. Several days ago, a soldier from Fort Campbell, KY, was shot down and captured.

Our job is done—but our people are still standing in harm's way for no good reason that I can see.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to bring them all home.

SOMALIANS UNGRATEFUL FOR AMERICAN HELP

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

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, King Lear knew nothing about ingratitude. He

should have been watching television this weekend, to see the ugly spectacle of American troops killed, their bodies being dragged through the streets of Somalia by children; a people ungrateful for the fact that we sent our young men and women there to feed them and to protect them from poverty.

If ever there was an ugly picture of ingratitude carried to its extreme, it is the pictures we saw on television this weekend. It is time to bring those troops home and to understand that this kind of ingratitude ought not be rewarded with any continued United States presence in Somalia.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE ROBERT H. MICHEL

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

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure I speak for all Members of the House of Representatives when I say it was with great regret that I learned of the decision of our good friend and colleague, House Republican leader, BOB MICHEL, not to run for reelection in 1994.

BOB certainly deserves the right to step down and take it easy after almost 40 years of fighting for his fellow citizens in this Chamber. But the Nation, the citizens of the 18th Illinois Congressional District, and this House of Representatives will suffer the loss of BOB MICHEL.

Against the advice of many of his friends, he dropped out of night law school to run in 1956 for the seat being vacated by the man he was serving as administrative assistant, Harold Velde. It was the seat once held by another outstanding Illinois legislator, Everett McKinley Dirksen. And for the 4 years I taught at Bradley University in Peoria, "Uncle BOB" was my congressman.

As a combat infantryman, he fought for his country in World War II, seeing combat in France, Belgium, and Germany. In one of this country's greatest wartime struggles—the Battle of the Bulge—he was cut down by German machinegun bullets. Besides being awarded the Purple Heart, he also earned the Bronze Star and four battle stars.

BOB succeeded another Illinois Member, Leslie Arends, in 1975 as House minority whip, and 6 years later his Republican colleagues elected him as House minority leader, a post he still holds.

Just as he had fought for his country on the bloody field of war, he fought for his Nation on the sometimes stormy floor of the House. Those of a different political persuasion will tell you they disagreed with BOB on countless arguments before this body, but none will deny BOB MICHEL is an outstanding leader and Member—a good man—a man of his word.

We look forward to another year of work under the leadership of BOB MICHEL. We certainly do not look forward to the day he steps down and leaves the Chamber a lesser body by his departure.

ADVANCED SOLID ROCKET MOTOR

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of this body for the past 13 years, I have never witnessed a sorrier example of congressional waste and pork-barrel spending than on the Advanced Solid Rocket Motor [ASRM] Program.

This body has voted several times over the past 2 years to kill the ASRM by overwhelming margins, yet somehow, the ASRM, always manages to survive—courtesy of the joint appropriations conference.

It is turning out to be a farce. The House voted, overwhelmingly last July in favor of an amendment by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG]—379 voted in favor of termination. Only 43 supported retaining ASRM.

Yet, somehow, last Friday, the conferees felt compelled to ignore the will of the House and to continue funding ASRM to the tune of $157.5 million. This is an outrage.

If this body does not have enough courage to kill the ASRM, a blatant pork-barrel program, we can never hope to put a dent in the Federal debt.

The point remains—there is no reason to build an expensive and redundant rocket motor. The existing boosters are working just fine.

It is clear, Mr. Speaker, we must send the conferees back to do the job we asked them to—I urge my colleagues to support a motion to recommit when the VA/HUD conference report comes before the House. Let us drive a stake through the heart of the ASRM once and for all.

□ 1250

DON'T VIETNAMIZE SOMALIA

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, the calls in the last 36 hours to my office have been overwhelming: People are understandably upset about the horror in Somalia and concerned that the White House does not know what's going on. The response from the administration to the death of U.S. soldiers has been unacceptable. The sickening images of our young men's bodies dragged through the streets and the haunting face of an American held hostage have been riveting and distressing. The danger that this administration will Vietnamize Somalia is very real. Our troops have no clear mission; the chain of command is blurred; the rules of engagement are unclear. Now Americans are dying and being taken captive. Sending another handful of troops and a few pieces of military machinery to that troubled region only provides more targets for the warlords and violence-mongers. It is time to bring all Americans home from our humanitarian mission to Somalia. It is not time to risk another Vietnam.

RETIREMENT OF MINORITY LEADER BOB MICHEL

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

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the U.S. House of Representatives learned that one of its great Members will be departing at the end of this Congress.

The retirement of BOB MICHEL will mean the loss of a great voice who has often been a source of strength and true leadership in the many challenging times that this Nation has faced since he came to the Congress in 1956.

For more than 37 years BOB has provided his Illinois constituency with solid representation in the House of Representatives and since 1981 he has kept the House Republicans working together for the good of the Nation and the good of the party as our Republican leader.

His candor, his decency, and his willingness to work with Members on both sides of the aisle are recognized by both Democrats and Republicans and when he steps down he will be missed. Fortunately for the next 14 very crucial months, BOB MICHEL will still be our Republican leader.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with him during his remaining tenure for the betterment of our Nation and the good of our country.

THE PRESIDENT'S HEALTH REFORM PLAN

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

Mr. LAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the White House has announced that it underestimated, by $16 billion, the costs of subsidizing small businesses who, under the President's health reform plan, will be required to provide health insurance for those employees who are not fired because of this new mandate.

The health sector comprises fully one-seventh of our total economy—$900 billion each year—and this one component of the President's reform proposal is now estimated to cost $421 billion over the first 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, we must be honest with our constituents. As we work to craft a compromise reform plan, it is only fair and reasonable to ask three fundamental questions: How much will reform cost; how will it be financed; and who will pay? Unfortunately, we are still waiting for the answers to these questions from the President.

In the case of mandates to businesses, it is also fair to ask whether in the fevor to provide health security, we don't take away job security.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents know the truth in the old adage, "There's no such thing as a free lunch."

TAKE MATTERS IN SOMALIA INTO OUR OWN HANDS, THEN GET OUT

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I would first like to express my sympathies to the families of the American troops who have been killed, wounded, and captured in Somalia. All Americans share your loss and are grateful for the service of your sons.

In spite of my reservations over this situation, I have tried to give President Clinton, like President Bush before him, a fair opportunity to handle this situation. I have become increasingly unsettled, however, by the mounting casualties that have occurred as this mission changed from one of humanitarian relief led by the United States to nation-building led by the United Nations. Clearly, this mission has gone astray with terrible consequences.

I believe that President Clinton must present Congress immediately with a plan for settling matters with Mr. Aideed, obtaining the release of all Americans held against their will in Somalia and withdrawing our troops from an entanglement that is not in our vital national interest.

Throughout this operation, I have felt it important not to politicize this operation. We should not play partisan games with American lives. However, from the debate last week, it is clear that Democrats and Republicans share the same concerns of the American people over this situation. Americans are dying in Somalia while they have no clear battle plan, direction, or long-term strategy.

It is apparent we need to relearn painful lessons of sending our troops abroad only when it in the clear national interest, and providing them with clear objectives and overwhelming force to accomplish their missions. It is a matter we will deal with again and again in the post-cold-war world.

UNITED STATES FOR THE UNITED STATES NOT THE UNITED NATIONS

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

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the other body's Appropriations Committee recently stated what many Americans have been thinking * * *. "I do not see in front of this chamber the U.N. Flag," he said. "I have never saluted the U.N. flag. I salute Old Glory, the American flag."

Mr. Speaker, why are we still in Somalia? Is it to chase down a two-bit Somali war lord? Is it to follow the lead of a U.N. commander who has no idea of what he is doing? Is it to ensure that every single Somalian citizen curses the United States?

When we first went over there, we had a clear mission, to feed the hungry. That mission has been accomplished. Now it is time to get out. We have all seen the gruesome photos of the murdered American soldier. Why was he killed and why does he have to die?

If the President cannot come up with a good answer to these questions, and I do not think he can, he needs to pull our troops out of this faraway country. We have done our duty. Now we must get out.

APPOINTMENT OF AN INDEPENDENT COUNSEL

(Mr. GEKAS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, there are allegations of wrongdoing swirling around the President's Cabinet and allegations of wrongdoing as to the White House itself in the Travelgate situation. In previous administrations, there would be a hue and cry immediately for the appointment of an independent counsel to look into allegations of wrongdoing wherever it may have appeared to grow. But we do not have an independent counsel statute in front of us now.

Yet, we have passed it out of the Committee on the Judiciary. It is itself hovering around someplace in the Capitol. The House leadership has not seen fit to bring it up for a debate before the House.

We need an independent counsel, one that would have the right to look into the wrongdoing of Members of Congress as well as members of the Cabinet or people in the staff at the White House. We ask the House leadership to act immediately to bring the matter to the House for debate.

SOMALIA

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, sending more American soldiers to Somalia is absolutely insane. Somalia is not worth one American life.

This is not just President Clinton who is making this mistake. This is not President Clinton or a partisan issue. This is also part of President Bush's cockamamie idea about a new world order.

We should not be sending our troops all over the world. And if we do have to send them, because it is in the interest of the United States, they should be under American command. We should never send our boys to risk their lives and be under the command of the United Nations or any other foreigners who do not care about them and can see the bodies of our troops being dragged through the dust of some African village and not care as much as we do.

It is time to bring these people home. They have put their lives on the line for us.

Let us applaud our military. It was well-meaning, but it was not a good thing to keep them there after those people got fed in the first place.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2446, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2446) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense 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.

□ 1300

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is like the previous issue I raised. This would not be sent, Mr. Speaker, to the Committee on Rules if I objected, is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise the Member that it would not necessarily go to the Committee on Rules, since the Appropriations Committee has authorized a motion to that effect.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Further reserving the right to object, let me just say that the Committee on Rules of this House continues to send restrictive and closed rules to this body which eliminates the possibility of the minority to express itself in the form of amendments trying to correct legislation that we think is in error, so any time I can send something back to the

Committee on Rules so they will have to do additional work, I would like to do so.

Mr. Speaker, in this particular case, since it will not involve going back to the Committee on Rules, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

The Chair hears none, and without objection, appoints the following conferees: Mr. HEFNER, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mrs. MEEK, MESSRS. DICKS, DIXON, FAZIO, HOYER, COLEMAN, and NATCHER, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. HOBSON, and Mr. MCDADE.

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 5, 1993.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5 of Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on Monday, October 4, 1993 at 3:35 p.m. and said to contain a message from the President wherein he reports under section 8 (b) of the Fishermen's Protective Act (Pelly Amendment) that he has directed the development of a list of potential sanctions against Norway.

With great respect, I am

Sincerely yours,

DONNALD K. ANDERSON,
Clerk.

POTENTIAL SANCTIONS AGAINST NORWEGIAN IMPORTS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 93-146)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, without objection, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

On August 5, 1993, the Secretary of Commerce certified that Norway's resumption of commercial harvesting of minke whales has diminished the effectiveness of the International Whaling Commission (IWC). The IWC acted to continue the moratorium on all commercial whaling at its most recent meeting last spring. Despite this action, Norway has recommenced commercial whaling of the Northeastern Atlantic minke, noting that it has lodged an objection to the moratorium. This letter constitutes my report to the Congress pursuant to section 8(b) of the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967, as amended (Pelly Amendment) (22 U.S.C. 1978(a)).

The United States is deeply opposed to commercial whaling: the United States does not engage in commercial whaling, and the United States does not allow the import of whale meat or whale products. While some native Alaskans engage in narrowly circumscribed subsistence whaling, this is approved by the IWC through a quota for "aboriginal whaling." The United States also firmly supports the proposed whale sanctuary in the Antarctic.

The United States has an equally strong commitment to science-based international solutions to global conservation problems. The United States recognizes that not every country agrees with our position against commercial whaling. The issue at hand is the absence of a credible, agreed management and monitoring regime that would ensure that commercial whaling is kept within a science-based limit.

I believe that Norway's action is serious enough to justify sanctions as authorized by the Pelly amendment. Therefore, I have directed that a list of potential sanctions, including a list of Norwegian seafood products that could be the subject of import prohibitions, be developed. Because the primary interest of the United States in this matter is protecting the integrity of the IWC and its conservation regime, I believe our objectives can best be achieved by delaying the implementation of sanctions until we have exhausted all good faith efforts to persuade Norway to follow agreed conservation measures. It is my sincere hope that Norway will agree to and comply with such measures so that sanctions become unnecessary.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 4, 1993.*

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken at the end of legislative business today.

GOVERNMENT SECURITIES REFORM ACT OF 1993

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 618) to extend and revise rulemaking authority with respect to government securities under the Federal securities laws, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 618

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Government Securities Reform Act of 1993".

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934

SEC. 101. EXTENSION OF GOVERNMENT SECURITIES RULEMAKING AUTHORITY.

Section 15C of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o-5) is amended by striking subsection (g).

SEC. 102. TRANSACTION RECORDS.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Section 15C(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o-5(d)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) GOVERNMENT SECURITIES TRADE RECONSTRUCTION.—

"(A) FURNISHING RECORDS.—Every government securities broker and government securities dealer shall furnish to the Commission on request such records of government securities transactions, including records of the date and time of execution of trades, as the Commission may require to reconstruct trading in the course of a particular inquiry or investigation being conducted by the Commission. In requiring information pursuant to this paragraph, the Commission shall specify the information required, the period for which it is required, the time and date on which the information must be furnished, and whether the information is to be furnished directly to the Commission, to the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, or to an appropriate regulatory agency or self-regulatory organization with responsibility for examining the government securities broker or government securities dealer. The Commission may require that such information be furnished in machine readable form notwithstanding any limitation in subparagraph (B).

"(B) LIMITATION; CONSTRUCTION.—The Commission shall not utilize its authority under this paragraph to develop regular reporting requirements, except that the Commission may require information to be furnished under this paragraph as frequently as necessary for particular inquiries or investigations. This paragraph shall not be construed as requiring, or as authorizing the Commission to require, any government securities broker or government securities dealer to obtain or maintain any information for purposes of this paragraph which is not otherwise maintained by such broker or dealer in accordance with any other provision of law or usual and customary business practice. The Commission shall, where feasible, avoid requiring any information to be furnished under this paragraph that the Commission may obtain from the Federal Reserve Bank of New York.

"(C) PROCEDURES FOR REQUIRING INFORMATION.—At the time the Commission requests any information pursuant to subparagraph (A) with respect to any government securities broker or government securities dealer for which the Commission is not the appropriate regulatory agency, the Commission shall notify the appropriate regulatory agency for such government securities broker or government securities dealer and, upon request, furnish to the appropriate regulatory agency any information supplied to the Commission.

"(D) CONSULTATION.—Within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this paragraph,

and annually thereafter, or upon the request of any other appropriate regulatory agency, the Commission shall consult with the other appropriate regulatory agencies to determine the availability of records that may be required to be furnished under this paragraph and, for those records available directly from the other appropriate regulatory agencies, to develop a procedure for furnishing such records expeditiously upon the Commission's request.

"(E) EXCLUSION FOR EXAMINATION REPORTS.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed so as to permit the Commission to require any government securities broker or government securities dealer to obtain, maintain, or furnish any examination report of any appropriate regulatory agency other than the Commission or any supervisory recommendations or analysis contained in any such examination report.

"(F) AUTHORITY TO LIMIT DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commission and the appropriate regulatory agencies shall not be compelled to disclose any information required or obtained under this paragraph. Nothing in this paragraph shall authorize the Commission or any appropriate regulatory agency to withhold information from Congress, or prevent the Commission or any appropriate regulatory agency from complying with a request for information from any other Federal department or agency requesting information for purposes within the scope of its jurisdiction, or from complying with an order of a court of the United States in an action brought by the United States, the Commission, or the appropriate regulatory agency. For purposes of section 552 of title 5, United States Code, this subparagraph shall be considered a statute described in subsection (b)(3)(B) of such section 552.".

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(1) Section 15C(a)(4) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o–5(a)(4)) is amended by inserting ", other than subsection (d)(3)," after "subsection (a), (b), or (d) of this section".

(2) Section 15C(f)(2) of such Act is amended—

(A) in the first sentence, by inserting ", other than subsection (d)(3)", after "threatened violation of the provisions of this section"; and

(B) in the second sentence, by inserting "(except subsection (d)(3))" after "other than this section".

SEC. 103. LARGE POSITION REPORTING.

Section 15C of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o–5) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (h); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsection:

"(f) LARGE POSITION REPORTING.—

"(1) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary may adopt rules to require specified persons holding, maintaining, or controlling large positions in to-be-issued or recently issued Treasury securities to file such reports regarding such positions as the Secretary determines to be necessary or appropriate for the purpose of monitoring the impact in the Treasury securities market of concentrations of positions in Treasury securities and for the purpose of otherwise assisting the Commission in the enforcement of this title. Reports required under this subsection shall be filed with the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, acting as agent for the Secretary, and shall be provided by that Federal Reserve Bank to the Commission on a timely basis.

"(2) RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS.—Rules under this subsection may require persons holding, maintaining, or controlling large positions in Treasury securities to make and keep for prescribed periods such records as the Secretary determines are necessary or appropriate to ensure that such persons can comply with reporting requirements under this subsection.

"(3) AGGREGATION RULES.—Rules under this subsection—

"(A) may prescribe the manner in which positions and accounts shall be aggregated for the purpose of this subsection, including aggregation on the basis of common ownership or control; and

"(B) may define which persons (individually or as a group) hold, maintain, or control large positions.

"(4) DEFINITIONAL AUTHORITY; DETERMINATION OF REPORTING THRESHOLD.—

"(A) In prescribing rules under this subsection, the Secretary may, consistent with the purpose of this subsection, define terms used in this subsection that are not otherwise defined in section 3 of this title.

"(B) Rules under this subsection shall specify—

"(i) the minimum size of positions subject to reporting under this subsection, taking into account the purposes of this subsection and the potential for price distortions or other anomalies resulting from large positions;

"(ii) the types of positions (which may include financing arrangements) to be reported;

"(iii) the securities to be covered; and

"(iv) the form and manner in which reports shall be transmitted, which may include transmission in machine readable form.

"(5) LIMITATION ON DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary and the Commission shall not be compelled to disclose any information required to be kept or reported under this subsection. Nothing in this subsection shall authorize the Secretary or the Commission to withhold information from Congress, or prevent the Secretary or the Commission from complying with a request for information from any other Federal department or agency requesting information for purposes within the scope of its jurisdiction, or from complying with an order of a court of the United States in an action brought by the United States, the Secretary, or the Commission. For purposes of section 552 of title 5, United States Code, this paragraph shall be considered a statute described in subsection (b)(3)(B) of such section 552.".

SEC. 104. AUTHORITY OF THE COMMISSION TO REGULATE TRANSACTIONS IN EXEMPTED SECURITIES.

(a) PREVENTION OF FRAUDULENT AND MANIPULATIVE ACTS AND PRACTICES.—Section 15(c)(2) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o(c)(2)) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(A)" after "(2)";

(2) by striking "fictitious quotation, and no municipal securities dealer" and inserting the following:

"fictitious quotation.

"(B) No municipal securities dealer";

(3) by striking "fictitious quotation. The Commission shall" and inserting the following:

"fictitious quotation.

"(C) No government securities broker or government securities dealer shall make use of the mails or any means or instrumentality of interstate commerce to effect any transaction in, or induce or attempt to induce the purchase or sale of, any government security in connection with which such government securities broker or government securities dealer engages in any fraudulent, deceptive, or manipulative act or practice, or makes any fictitious quotation.

"(D) The Commission shall"; and

(4) by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"(E) The Commission shall, prior to adopting any rule or regulation under subparagraph (C), consult with and consider the views of the Secretary of the Treasury and each appropriate regulatory agency. If the Secretary of the Treasury or any appropriate regulatory agency comments in writing on a proposed rule or regulation of the Commission under such subparagraph (C) that has been published for comment, the Commission shall respond in writing to such written comment before adopting the proposed rule.".

(b) FRAUDULENT AND MANIPULATIVE DEVICES AND CONTRIVANCES.—Section 15(c)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o(c)(1)) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(A)" after "(c)(1)";

(2) by striking "contrivance, and no municipal securities dealer" and inserting the following:

"contrivance.

"(B) No municipal securities dealer";

(3) by striking "contrivance. The Commission shall" and inserting the following:

"contrivance.

"(C) No government securities broker or government securities dealer shall make use of the mails or any means or instrumentality of interstate commerce to effect any transaction in, or to induce or attempt to induce the purchase or sale of, any government security by means of any manipulative, deceptive, or other fraudulent device or contrivance.

"(D) The Commission shall"; and

(4) by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"(E) The Commission shall, prior to adopting any rule or regulation under subparagraph (C), consult with and consider the views of the Secretary of the Treasury and each appropriate regulatory agency. If the Secretary of the Treasury or any appropriate regulatory agency comments in writing on a proposed rule or regulation of the Commission under such subparagraph (C) that has been published for comment, the Commission shall respond in writing to such written comment before adopting the proposed rule.".

SEC. 105. BROKER/DEALER SUPERVISION RESPONSIBILITIES.

Section 15C of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o-5) is amended by inserting after subsection (f) (as added by section 103 of this Act) the following new subsection:

"(g) POLICIES AND PROCEDURES TO PREVENT AND DETECT VIOLATIONS.—Every government securities broker and government securities dealer shall establish, maintain, and enforce written policies and procedures reasonably designed, taking into consideration the nature of such person's business, to prevent and detect in connection with the purchase or sale of government securities, insofar as practicable, fraud and manipulation in violation of this title and the rules and regulations thereunder and violations of such other provisions of this title and the rules and regulations thereunder as the appropriate regulatory agency for such government securities broker or government securities dealer shall designate by rule.".

SEC. 106. SALES PRACTICE RULEMAKING AUTHORITY.

(a) RULES FOR FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.—Section 15C(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o–5(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (3), (4), (5), and (6) as paragraphs (4), (5), (6), and (7), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

"(3) SALES PRACTICE RULES.—(A) With respect to any financial institution that has filed notice as a government securities broker or government securities dealer or that is required to file notice under subsection (a)(1)(B) of this section, the appropriate regulatory agency for such government securities broker or government securities dealer may issue such rules with respect to transactions in government securities as may be necessary to prevent fraudulent and manipulative acts and practices and to promote just and equitable principles of trade.

"(B) Each appropriate regulatory agency shall consult with the other appropriate regulatory agencies for the purpose of ensuring the consistency of the rules prescribed by such agencies under this paragraph. The appropriate regulatory agencies shall consult with and consider the views of the Secretary and the Commission with respect to the impact of such rules on the operations of the market for government securities, consistency with analogous rules of self-regulatory organizations, and the enforcement and administration of such rules. The consultation required by this paragraph shall be conducted prior to the appropriate regulatory agency adopting a rule under this paragraph, unless the appropriate regulatory agency determines that an emergency exists requiring expeditious and summary action and publishes its reasons therefor. If the Secretary or the Commission comments in writing to the appropriate regulatory agency on a proposed rule that has been published for comment, the appropriate regulatory agency shall respond in writing to such written comment before adopting the rule.".

(b) RULES BY REGISTERED SECURITIES ASSOCIATIONS.—

(1) REMOVAL OF LIMITATIONS ON AUTHORITY.—(A) Section 15A of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o–3) is amended—

(i) by striking subsections (f)(1) and (f)(2); and

(ii) by redesignating subsection (f)(3) as subsection (f).

(B) Section 15A(g) of such Act is amended—

(i) by striking "exempted securities" in paragraph (3)(D) and inserting "municipal securities";

(ii) by striking paragraph (4); and

(iii) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (4).

(2) OVERSIGHT OF REGISTERED SECURITIES ASSOCIATIONS.—Section 19 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78s) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b), by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(5) The Commission shall consult with and consider the views of the Secretary of the Treasury prior to approving a proposed rule change filed by a registered securities association that primarily concerns conduct related to transactions in government securities, except where the Commission determines that an emergency exists requiring expeditious or summary action and publishes its reasons therefor. If the Secretary comments in writing to the Commission on such proposed rule change that has been published for comment, the Commission shall respond in writing to such written comment before approving the proposed rule change.";

(B) in subsection (c), by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(5) Before adopting a rule to amend a rule of a registered securities association that primarily concerns conduct related to transactions in government securities, the Commission shall consult with and consider the views of the Secretary, except where the Commission determines that an emergency exists requiring expeditious or summary action and publishes its reasons therefor. If the Secretary comments in writing to the Commission on such proposed rule change that has been published for comment, the Commission shall respond in writing to such written comment before approving the proposed rule change.".

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—

(A) Section 3(a)(12)(B)(ii) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)(12)(B)(ii)) is amended by striking "15, 15A (other than subsection (g)(3)), and 17A" and inserting "15 and 17A".

(B) Section 15(b)(7) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 78o(b)(7)) is amended by inserting "or government securities broker or government securities dealer registered (or required to register) under section 15C(a)(1)(A)" after "No registered broker or dealer".

SEC. 107. MARKET INFORMATION.

Section 23(b)(4) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78w) is amended—

(1) by striking subparagraphs (C), (D), and (H);

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (E), (F), and (G) as subparagraphs (C), (D), and (E), respectively;

(3) by redesignating subparagraphs (I), (J), and (K) as subparagraphs (F), (G), and (H), respectively;

(4) by striking "and" at the end of such redesignated subparagraph (G);

(5) by striking the period at the end of such redesignated subparagraph (H) and inserting "; and"; and

(6) by inserting after such redesignated subparagraph (H) the following new subparagraph:

"(I) the steps that have been taken and the progress that has been made in promoting the timely public dissemination and availability for analytical purposes (on a fair, reasonable, and nondiscriminatory basis) of information concerning government securities transactions and quotations, and its recommendations, if any, for legislation to assure timely dissemination of (i) information on transactions in regularly traded government securities sufficient to permit the determination of the prevailing market price for such securities, and (ii) reports of the highest published bids and lowest published offers for government securities (including the size at which persons are willing to trade with respect to such bids and offers).".

SEC. 108. STUDY OF REGULATORY SYSTEM FOR GOVERNMENT SECURITIES.

(a) JOINT STUDY.—The Secretary of the Treasury, the Securities and Exchange Commission, and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall—

(1) evaluate the effectiveness of any rules promulgated or amended after October 1, 1991, pursuant to section 15C of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 or any amendment made by this title, and any national securities association rule changes applicable principally to government securities transactions approved after October 1, 1991, in carrying out the purposes of such Act;

(2) evaluate the effectiveness of surveillance and enforcement with respect to government securities, and the impact on such surveillance and enforcement of defects in any available audit trails with respect to transactions in such securities; and

(3) submit to the Congress, not later than March 31, 1998, any recommendations they may consider appropriate concerning—

(A) the regulation of government securities brokers and government securities dealers,

(B) the dissemination of information concerning quotations for and transactions in government securities,

(C) the prevention of sales practice abuses in connection with transactions in government securities, and

(D) such other matters as they consider appropriate.

(b) GAO STUDY.—The Comptroller General shall—

(1) conduct a study of the effectiveness of regulation of government securities brokers and government securities dealers pursuant to section 15C of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and the effectiveness of the amendments made by this title; and

(2) submit to the Congress, not later than March 31, 1997, the Comptroller General's recommendations for change, if any, or such other recommendations as the Comptroller General considers appropriate.

(c) TREASURY STUDY.—The Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Securities and Exchange Commission, shall—

(1) conduct a study of—

(A) the identity and nature of the business of government securities brokers and government securities dealers that are registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission under section 15C of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934; and

(B) the continuing need for, and regulatory and financial consequences of, a separate regulatory system for such government securities brokers and government securities dealers; and

(2) submit to the Congress, not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary's recommendations for change, if any, or such other recommendations as the Secretary considers appropriate.

SEC. 109. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO DEFINITIONS.—Section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (34)(G) (relating to the definition of appropriate regulatory agency), by amending clauses (ii), (iii), and (iv) to read as follows:

"(ii) the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, in the case of a State member bank of the Federal Reserve System, a foreign bank, an uninsured State branch or State agency of a foreign bank, a commercial lending company owned or controlled by a foreign bank (as such terms are used in the International Banking Act of 1978), or a corporation organized or having an agreement with the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System pursuant to section 25 or section 25A of the Federal Reserve Act;

"(iii) the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, in the case of a bank insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (other than a member of the Federal Reserve System or a Federal savings bank) or an insured State branch of a foreign bank (as such terms are used in the International Banking Act of 1978);

"(iv) the Director of the Office of Thrift Supervision, in the case of a savings association (as defined in section 3(b) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act) the deposits of which are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation;";

(2) by amending paragraph (46) (relating to the definition of financial institution) to read as follows:

"(46) The term 'financial institution' means—

"(A) a bank (as defined in paragraph (6) of this subsection);

"(B) a foreign bank (as such term is used in the International Banking Act of 1978); and

"(C) a savings association (as defined in section 3(b) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act) the deposits of which are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation."; and

(3) by redesignating paragraph (51) (as added by section 204 of the International Securities Enforcement Cooperation Act of 1990) as paragraph (52).

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE OF BROKER/DEALER REGISTRATION.—

(1) GOVERNMENT SECURITIES BROKERS AND DEALERS.—Section 15C(a)(2)(ii) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o–5(a)(2)(ii)) is amended by inserting before "The Commission may extend" the following: "The order granting registration shall not be effective until such government securities broker or government securities dealer has become a member of a national securities exchange registered under section 6 of this title, or a securities association registered under section 15A of this title, unless the Commission has exempted such government securities broker or government securities dealer, by rule or order, from such membership.".

(2) OTHER BROKERS AND DEALERS.—Section 15(b)(1)(B) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 78o(b)(1)(B)) is amended by inserting before "The Commission

may extend" the following: "The order granting registration shall not be effective until such broker or dealer has become a member of a registered securities association, or until such broker or dealer has become a member of a national securities exchange if such broker or dealer effects transactions solely on that exchange, unless the Commission has exempted such broker or dealer, by rule or order, from such membership.".

(c) INFORMATION SHARING.—Section 15C(d)(2) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(2) Information received by an appropriate regulatory agency, the Secretary, or the Commission from or with respect to any government securities broker, government securities dealer, any person associated with a government securities broker or government securities dealer, or any other person subject to this section or rules promulgated thereunder, may be made available by the Secretary or the recipient agency to the Commission, the Secretary, the Department of Justice, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, any appropriate regulatory agency, any self-regulatory organization, or any Federal Reserve Bank.".

SEC. 110. OFFERINGS OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT SECURITIES.

Section 15(c) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(7) In connection with any bid for or purchase of a government security related to an offering of government securities by or on behalf of an issuer, no government securities broker, government securities dealer, or bidder for or purchaser of securities in such offering shall knowingly or willfully make any false or misleading written statement or omit any fact necessary to make any written statement made not misleading.".

SEC. 111. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No provision of, or amendment made by, this title may be construed—

(1) to govern the initial issuance of any public debt obligation, or

(2) to grant any authority to (or extend any authority of) the Securities and Exchange Commission, any appropriate regulatory agency, or a self-regulatory organization—

(A) to prescribe any procedure, term, or condition of such initial issuance,

(B) to promulgate any rule or regulation governing such initial issuance, or

(C) to otherwise regulate in any manner such initial issuance.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) of this section shall not apply to the amendment made by section 110 of this Act.

(c) PUBLIC DEBT OBLIGATION.—For purposes of this section, the term "public debt obligation" means an obligation subject to the public debt limit established in section 3101 of title 31, United States Code.

TITLE II—REPORTS ON PUBLIC DEBT

SEC. 201. ANNUAL REPORT ON PUBLIC DEBT.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—Subchapter II of chapter 31 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§3130. Annual public debt report

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—On or before June 1 of each calendar year after 1993, the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit a report to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate on—

"(1) the Treasury's public debt activities, and

"(2) the operations of the Federal Financing Bank.

"(b) REQUIRED INFORMATION ON PUBLIC DEBT ACTIVITIES.—Each report submitted under subsection (a) shall include the following information:

"(1) A table showing the following information with respect to the total public debt:

"(A) The past levels of such debt and the projected levels of such debt as of the close of the current fiscal year and as of the close of the next 5 fiscal years under the most recent current services baseline projection of the executive branch.

"(B) The past debt to GDP ratios and the projected debt to GDP ratios as of the close of the current fiscal year and as of the close of the next 5 fiscal years under such most recent current services baseline projection.

"(2) A table showing the following information with respect to the net public debt:

"(A) The past levels of such debt and the projected levels of such debt as of the close of the current fiscal year and as of the close of the next 5 fiscal years under the most recent current services baseline projection of the executive branch.

"(B) The past debt to GDP ratios and the projected debt to GDP ratios as of the close of the current fiscal year and as of the close of the next 5 fiscal years under such most recent current services baseline projection.

"(C) The interest cost on such debt for prior fiscal years and the projected interest cost on such debt for the current fiscal year and for the next 5 fiscal years under such most recent current services baseline projection.

"(D) The interest cost to outlay ratios for prior fiscal years and the projected interest cost to outlay ratios for the current fiscal year and for the next 5 fiscal years under such most recent current services baseline projection.

"(3) A table showing the maturity distribution of the net public debt as of the time the report is submitted and for prior years, and an explanation of the overall financing strategy used in determining the distribution of maturities when issuing public debt obligations.

"(4) A table showing the following information as of the time the report is submitted and for prior years:

"(A) A description of the various categories of the holders of public debt obligations.

"(B) The portions of the total public debt held by each of such categories.

"(5) A table showing the relationship of federally assisted borrowing to total Federal borrowing as of the time the report is submitted and for prior years.

"(6) A table showing the annual principal and interest payments which would be required to amortize in equal annual payments the level (as of the time the report is submitted) of the net public debt over the longest remaining term to maturity of any obligation which is a part of such debt.

"(c) REQUIRED INFORMATION ON FEDERAL FINANCING BANK.—Each report submitted under subsection (a) shall include (but not be limited to) information on the financial operations of the Federal Financing Bank, including loan payments and prepayments, and on the levels and categories of the lending activities of the Federal Financing Bank, for the current fiscal year and for prior fiscal years.

"(d) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The Secretary of the Treasury may include in any report submitted under subsection (a) such recommendations to improve the issuance and sale of public debt obligations (and with respect to other matters) as he may deem advisable.

"(e) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) CURRENT FISCAL YEAR.—The term 'current fiscal year' means the fiscal year ending in the calendar year in which the report is submitted.

"(2) TOTAL PUBLIC DEBT.—The term 'total public debt' means the total amount of the obligations subject to the public debt limit established in section 3101 of this title.

"(3) NET PUBLIC DEBT.—The term 'net public debt' means the portion of the total public debt which is held by the public.

"(4) DEBT TO GDP RATIO.—The term 'debt to GDP ratio' means the percentage obtained by dividing the level of the total public debt or net public debt, as the case may be, by the gross domestic product.

"(5) INTEREST COST TO OUTLAY RATIO.—The term 'interest cost to outlay ratio' means, with respect to any fiscal year, the percentage obtained by dividing the interest cost for such fiscal year on the net public debt by the total amount of Federal outlays for such fiscal year."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for subchapter II of chapter 31 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"3130. Annual public debt report."

SEC. 202. TREASURY AUCTION REFORMS.

(a) ABILITY TO SUBMIT COMPUTER TENDERS IN TREASURY AUCTIONS.—By the end of 1995, any bidder shall be permitted to submit a computer-generated tender to any automated auction system established by the Secretary of the Treasury for the sale upon issuance of securities issued by the Secretary if the bidder—

(1) meets the minimum creditworthiness standard established by the Secretary; and

(2) agrees to comply with regulations and procedures applicable to the automated system and the sale upon issuance of securities issued by the Secretary.

(b) PROHIBITION ON FAVORED PLAYERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—No government securities broker or government securities dealer may receive any advantage, favorable treatment, or other benefit, in connection with the purchase upon issuance of securities issued by the Secretary of the Treasury, which is not generally available to other government securities brokers or government securities dealers under the regulations governing the sale upon issuance of securities issued by the Secretary of the Treasury.

(2) EXCEPTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury may grant an exception to the application of paragraph (1) if—

(i) the Secretary determines that any advantage, favorable treatment, or other benefit referred to in such paragraph is necessary and appropriate and in the public interest; and

(ii) the grant of the exception is designed to minimize any anticompetitive effect.

(B) ANNUAL REPORT.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall submit an annual report to the Congress describing any exception granted by the Secretary under subparagraph (A) during the year covered by the report and the basis upon which the exception was granted.

(c) MEETINGS OF TREASURY BORROWING ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—

(1) OPEN MEETINGS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), any meeting of the Treasury Borrowing Advisory Committee of the Public Securities Association (hereafter in this subsection referred to as the "advisory committee"), or any successor to the advisory committee, shall be open to the public.

(B) EXCEPTION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply with respect to any part of any meeting of the advisory committee in which the advisory committee—

(i) discusses and debates the issues presented to the advisory committee by the Secretary of the Treasury; or

(ii) makes recommendations to the Secretary.

(2) MINUTES OF EACH MEETING.—The detailed minutes required to be maintained under section 10(c) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act for any meeting by the advisory committee shall be made available to the public within 3 business days of the date of the meeting.

(3) PROHIBITION ON RECEIPT OF GRATUITIES OR EXPENSES BY ANY OFFICER OR EMPLOYEE OF THE BOARD OR DEPARTMENT.—In connection with any meeting of the advisory committee, no officer or employee of the Department of the Treasury, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, or any Federal reserve bank may accept any gratuity, consideration, expense of any sort, or any other thing of value from any advisory committee described in subsection (c), any member of such committee, or any other person.

(4) PROHIBITION ON OUTSIDE DISCUSSIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), a member of the advisory committee may not discuss any part of any discussion, debate, or recommendation at a meeting of the advisory committee which occurs while such meeting is closed to the public (in accordance with paragraph (1)(B)) with, or disclose the contents of such discussion, debate, or recommendation to, anyone other than—

(i) another member of the advisory committee who is present at the meeting; or

(ii) an officer or employee of the Department of the Treasury.

(B) APPLICABLE PERIOD OF PROHIBITION.—The prohibition contained in subparagraph (A) on discussions and disclosures of any discussion, debate, or recommendation at a meeting of the advisory committee shall cease to apply—

(i) with respect to any discussion, debate, or recommendation which relates to the securities to be auctioned in a midquarter refunding by the Secretary of the Treasury, at the time the Secretary makes a public announcement of the refunding; and

(ii) with respect to any other discussion, debate, or recommendation at the meeting, at the time the Secretary releases the minutes of the meeting in accordance with paragraph (2).

(C) REMOVAL FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR VIOLATIONS OF THIS PARAGRAPH.—In addition to any penalty or enforcement action to which a person who violates a provision of this paragraph may be subject under any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Treasury shall—

(i) remove a member of the advisory committee who violates a provision of this paragraph from the advisory committee and permanently bar such person from serving as a member of the advisory committee; and

(ii) prohibit any director, officer, or employee of the firm of which the member referred to in clause (i) is a director, officer, or employee (at the time the member is removed from the advisory committee) from serving as a member of the advisory committee at any time during the 10-year period beginning on the date of such removal.

(d) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

(1) REPORT REQUIRED.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall submit an annual report to the Congress containing the following information with respect to material violations or suspected material violations of regulations of the Secretary relating to auctions and other offerings of securities upon the issuance of such securities by the Secretary:

(A) The number of inquiries begun by the Secretary during the year covered by the report regarding such material violations or suspected material violations by any participant in the auction system or any director, officer, or employee of any such participant and the number of inquiries regarding any such violations or suspected violations which remained open at the end of such year.

(B) A brief description of the nature of the violations.

(C) A brief description of any action taken by the Secretary during such year with respect to any such violation, including any referrals made to the Attorney General, the Securities and Exchange Commission, any other law enforcement agency, and any Federal banking agency (as defined in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act).

(2) DELAY IN DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION IN CERTAIN CASES.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall not be required to include in a report under paragraph (1) any information the disclosure of which could jeopardize an investigation by an agency described in paragraph (1)(C) for so long as such disclosure could jeopardize the investigation.

SEC. 203. REPORT ON TREASURY MODIFICATIONS TO AUCTION PROCESS.

The Secretary of the Treasury shall report to the Congress concerning significant modifications to the auction process for issuing United States Treasury obligations at the time such changes are implemented.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FIELDS] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, today the House is taking up consideration of legislation aimed at reforming regulations of the Government securities market. All investors and taxpayers have a stake in the regulation of the most important financial market that we have, the $4.5 trillion market for the U.S. Government's debt. This market provides the fuel for the Nation's fiscal engine, establishes a benchmark for interest rates throughout the global economy, and is used by the Federal Reserve to carry out monetary policy.

The Government securities market is also vitally important to a wide range of investors, including State and local governments, pension funds, mutual funds, securities firms, insurance companies, banks, and individual investors.

Two years ago, shocking revelations of wrongdoing by Salomon Brothers in connection with several Treasury auctions dramatically underscored the consequences of relying on an antiquated system of clubby informal regulation to guide this important market. Subsequent SEC investigations revealed a wide range of violations of the Federal securities laws, including the submission of false bids at nine separate Treasury auctions, failures to supervise, fictitious tax trades, and numerous books and records violations. Under the terms of the settlement reached by the SEC and Salomon Brothers, the firm agreed to pay fines and forfeitures totaling $290 million, and to establish a claims fund to compensate those damaged by its actions. This represents the third largest monetary penalty in history ever levied for violations of Federal securities laws, and is exceeded in size only by the fines and penalties levied against Drexel Burnham and Michael Milken for their illegal activities.

The most disturbing possibility raised by Salomon Brothers scandal was the possibility that sophisticated and unscrupulous operators might be able to manipulate the market for the U.S. Government's securities by effectively cornering the market for a particular Treasury issue, generating a short squeeze, and profiting from the artificially inflated prices that would result. Such a development, if left unchecked, would have a most devastating effect on the public's confidence in the fairness and integrity of the Government securities market.

Unfortunately, the shocking revelations of wrongdoing by Salomon Brothers were not an isolated incident. They were soon followed by disclosures that 98 securities firms and banks were culpable for inflating customer orders and maintaining false books in connection with sales of the securities of various Government-sponsored enterprises. These firms reached a settlement with regulators that involved monetary penalties approximating $100,000 per firm and an agreement to cease further violations.

These abuses, in turn, were followed by reports of abuses associated with noncompetitive bidding for Treasury securities, evidence of prearranged trades aimed at generating fictitious tax losses, and revelations that convicted swindler Steven Wymer used the Government market as the vehicle for carrying out a series of ripoffs of nearly 100 local and State governments. Today, Government investigations into these areas, as well as broad-ranging investigations into other instances of possible market manipulation or antitrust violations, are continuing.

I believe that Salomon Brothers and related scandals have amply demonstrated the need for comprehensive reforms in the regulation of the Government securities market. That is why in January of this year I joined with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FIELDS], the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN], the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SYNAR], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], and the gentleman from California [Mr. MOORHEAD] in introducing H.R. 618, the Government Securities Reform Act of 1993. This broad legislative reform package we believe gets at the heart of the problems which have been identified in the marketplace.

Mr. Speaker, I will return briefly to outlining the details in the legislation, but I would like to note that we were able to successfully bring to closure the product which we bring to the floor here today only by the cooperation between Democrats and Republicans on our committee, and similarly, cooperation between the Committee on Ways and Means, among the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, and the Committee on Energy and

Commerce, in producing this fine product. I want to compliment all involved in the process.

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, with the cooperation of the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Banking, brings before the House important legislation to enhance the integrity and efficiency of the market in U.S. Government securities. I strongly urge passage of this bill.

The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized under chapter 31 of title 31, United States Code, to issue Treasury securities and to prescribe terms and conditions for their issuance and sale. The Secretary may issue bonds under 31 U.S.C. 3102, notes under 31 U.S.C. 3103, and certificates of indebtedness and Treasury bills under 31 U.S.C. 3104. Under 31 U.S.C. 3121, the Secretary may prescribe the form of such securities and the terms and conditions for the issuance and sale of the securities. Treasury auction rules are issued under this authority.

Compliance and enforcement responsibility for the auction rules rests with the Treasury. The Treasury may bar or suspend a firm from auctions, and the Treasury reserves the right to reject bids in auctions. However, securities fraud is the enforcement responsibility of the SEC and the Justice Department.

Congress passed the Government Securities Act of 1986—the GSA—to close then-existing gaps in the regulation of market participants that had been highlighted by the failure of certain previously unregulated Government securities dealers, involving substantial losses for investors and, in some cases, fraudulent activity in the market for repurchase agreements.

Prior to the enactment of the GSA, some Government securities brokers and dealers were not registered with or regulated by any Federal Government agency. The GSA required this group of brokers and dealers to register with the SEC. In addition, the GSA granted the Treasury limited rulemaking authority over all Government securities brokers and dealers, including financial institutions engaged in this business. Under the GSA, the Treasury has promulgated regulations concerning financial responsibility, protection of investor securities and funds, recordkeeping, reporting, and auditing of Government securities brokers and dealers. The Treasury also was given responsibility for the development of regulations related to the custody of Government securities held by depository institutions. The GSA required the SEC and the Federal Reserve Board to promulgate rules establishing the procedures and forms to be used by Government securities brokers and dealers for the registration and notice process.

In promulgating the regulations, the Treasury was required to consult with the SEC and the Federal Reserve Board. As a result of these consultations and the Treasury's analysis, most of the SEC regulations—for example, customer protection, recordkeeping, reports, and audits—that applied to registered brokers and dealers were, with limited exceptions, adopted for firms registered pursuant to the GSA. Enforcement authority for these rules rests with the SEC and the SRO's or with financial institution regulators, depending on the entity.

Treasury's rulemaking authority under the GSA expired on October 1, 1991. Before both Houses of Congress had voted to renew that authority, Salomon Brothers admitted various violations involving fraudulent Treasury auctions bids and market squeezes, and improprieties involving 98 bank and broker-dealer selling group members in GSE securities were disclosed, triggering intense scrutiny of the market for Government securities.

Against this backdrop, the Treasury, SEC, and the Federal Reserve issued a "Joint Report on the Government Securities Market" in January 1992 that outlined a number of administrative and regulatory changes voluntarily undertaken by the agencies to improve the fairness and efficiency of the market. The Joint Report also made certain legislative recommendations that are embodied in H.R. 618.

Title I of H.R. 618 includes the legislation reported by the Committee on Energy and Commerce. This legislation amends the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934—Exchange Act—to provide the SEC, Treasury, and appropriate regulatory agencies—as defined in Section 3(a)(34)(G) of the Exchange Act—with expanded authority to monitor the Government securities market, detect and prosecute fraudulent or manipulative activities, permit all registered securities associations or appropriate regulatory agencies to establish and enforce sales practice regulations in this market, and monitor the public availability of market information. In addition, the legislation requires Government securities brokers and dealers to develop and enforce internal controls aimed at preventing and detecting fraud and manipulation in connection with the purchase or sale of Government securities. It also would permanently reauthorize the Treasury's rulemaking authority under Section 15C of the Exchange Act.

Title II includes amendments to title 31, United States Code agreed to between the Committee on Ways and Means, Treasury, and the Banking Committee with respect to: First, annual reports to Ways and Means on the Treasury's public debt activities; second, reports to Congress on significant changes in the auction process; and third, modest Treasury auction and Treasury Borrowing Advisory Committee reforms.

I am inserting in the RECORD following my remarks the exchange of letters between our committees.

The administration supports House passage of this bill. I urge the support of my colleagues.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, September 23, 1993.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce, Washington, DC.

DEAR JOHN: During the 102nd Congress, on June 24, 1992, the Committee on Ways and Means approved an amendment which we asked to have included in H.R. 3927, the Government Securities Reform Act, a bill which had been ordered reported by your Committee.

That amendment would have made it an explicit violation of the law to make false or misleading written statements to an issuer of Government securities in connection with the primary issuance of such securities, and would have required certain reports by Treasury concerning its public debt operations and changes in the Treasury debt auction process.

It is my understanding that H.R. 618, recently ordered reported by your Committee, represents the successor legislation to H.R. 3927 for the 103rd Congress. The amendment approved previously by the Committee on Ways and Means continues to be relevant to H.R. 618. It is also my understanding that you may ask to place H.R. 618 on the suspension calendar when it is reported from your Committee. I would respectfully request that the amendment approved by the Committee on Ways and Means and the provisions of your bills be merged, and that the new bill be placed on the suspension calendar.

I look forward to working with you on these and other matters of mutual interest.

Sincerely,

DAN ROSTENKOWSKI,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, September 30, 1993.

Hon. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, Washington, DC.

DEAR DAN: I am writing with reference to your letter of September 13, 1993 to me concerning H.R. 618, the Government Securities Reform Act of 1993.

I want to thank your Committee for your great courtesy and cooperation in working with us to facilitate the processing of this legislation through the development of a friendly amendment. The fair and efficient operation of the U.S. government securities market is of great global import. This market must absorb efficiently the enormous amounts of Treasury securities made necessary by the massive borrowing requirements of the U.S. Government. This market must also serve the needs of the Federal Reserve in conducting open market operations, the Federal Reserve's most important monetary policy tool.

The liquidity and pricing efficiency of the market provide incalculable benefits to other financial markets in the United States and worldwide by providing a continuous benchmark for interest rates on dollar-denominated instruments across the maturity spectrum. I appreciate your recognition of these matters and therefore the need to move forward expeditiously on this legislation. Pursuant to our agreement, H.R. 618 has been scheduled for consideration on the suspension calendar on Tuesday, October 5, 1993.

In closing, I look forward to working with you and your Committee in achieving prompt enactment of H.R. 618, and in assuring the continued integrity and efficiency of the U.S. government securities market.

Sincerely,

JOHN D. DINGELL,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING,
FINANCE AND URBAN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, September 27, 1993.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is with reference to H.R. 618, the Government Securities Reform Act of 1993, ordered reported by your Committee on September 21, 1993.

H.R. 618 contains various amendments to the Government Securities Act of 1986. Generally, the Secretary of the Treasury is given

rulemaking authority and the financial institutions regulatory agencies are given enforcement authority under the Government Securities Act for government securities brokers and government securities dealers that are financial institutions (as defined in section 3(a)(46) of the Securities Exchange Act). The amendments to the Government Securities Act contained in H.R. 618 make some changes to this general scheme.

Under Section 3 of H.R. 618, the Securities and Exchange Commission (the "Commission") may obtain records of government securities transactions directly from financial institutions as the Commission may require to reconstruct trading in the course of a particular surveillance inquiry or enforcement investigation being conducted by the Commission. As stated in your Committee report, we have agreed that requests of records from financial institutions must be authorized by the full Commission, the director of any division of the Commission, or the head of any regional office of the Commission. Section 3 also requires the Commission to consult with the financial institutions regulatory agencies regarding the availability of records that may be required to be furnished on an annual basis or upon request, as well as to notify the regulatory agencies whenever the Commission requests records from a government securities broker or dealer that is a financial institution.

The Commission's rulemaking authority under Sections 15(c) (1) and (2) of the Exchange Act is extended to all government securities brokers and dealers by Section 5 of H.R. 618. The Commission currently has such authority with respect to municipal securities brokers and dealers that are financial institutions. The Commission's new rulemaking authority extends to insured depository institutions in this particular instances because of the importance of having uniform antimanipulation and antifraud rules that apply to all government securities brokers and dealers. However, in recognition of the regulatory and enforcement authority of the financial institutions regulators over government securities brokers and dealers that are financial institutions, the Committee report reflects our intention that the Commission must consult with and respond in writing to any written comments of such regulators and the Secretary of the Treasury when promulgating antifraud and antimanipulation rules.

Under clause (1)(d)(1) of Rule X of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs has jurisdiction over banks and banking, including the government securities activities of banks. Pursuant to extensive discussions with your Committee with regard to the provisions of H.R. 618 that fall within this Committee's jurisdiction, and in the interests of expediting consideration of this bill by the House, the Banking Committee will not request a sequential referral of H.R. 618. This action is taken without any prejudice to this Committee's jurisdiction, or its intent to request that Banking Committee Members be named as conferees on the legislation.

I appreciate the cooperative and thoughtful spirit in which you have worked with the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs on the legislative and report language of H.R. 618. I look forward to continuing to work with your Committee in that same spirit.

Sincerely,

HENRY B. GONZALEZ,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, October 4, 1993.

Hon. HENRY B. GONZALEZ,
Chairman, Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, Washington, DC.

DEAR HENRY: I am writing with reference to your letter of September 27, 1993 to me concerning H.R. 618, the Government Securities Reform Act of 1993. H.R. 618 represents the response of this Committee to scandals in the government securities market that have threatened to shake public confidence in the fairness and integrity of that market.

As you know, the Committee on Ways and Means has legislative jurisdiction over the bonded debt of the United States pursuant to clause 1(v)(5), Rule X of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, which authority includes jurisdiction over the issuance of Federal debt obligations and the process by which such obligations are issued by the Treasury. The Committee on Energy and Commerce has legislative jurisdiction over securities and exchanges, including the secondary trading market in U.S. government securities, pursuant to clause 1(h)(13), Rule X of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives. Under that authority, this Committee wrote the Government Securities Act of 1986 (GSA), Public Law No. 99-571.[1]

I want to thank your Committee for working with us to facilitate the processing of H.R. 618 through the development of a friendly amendment. The fair and efficient operation of the U.S. govenment securities market is of great global import. This market must absorb efficiently the enormous amounts of Treasury securities made necessary by the massive borrowing requirements of the U.S. Government. This market must also serve the needs of the Federal Reserve in conducting open market operations, the Federal Reserve's most important monetary policy tool.

The liquidity and pricing efficiency of the market provide incalculable benefits to other financial markets in the United States and worldwide by providing a continuous benchmark for interest rates on dollar-denominated instruments across the maturity spectrum. While I am unable under the Rules to agree with your broad assertion of legislative jurisdiction over the government securities activities of banks, I appreciate your Committee's strong interest in the integrity and efficiency of this market as a result of your jurisdiction over banks and Federal monetary policy pursuant to clause 1(d)(1), Rule X of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, and I pledge my continuing cooperation on these and other matters of mutual interest. Pursuant to our agreement, H.R. 618 has been scheduled for consideration on the suspension calendar on Tuesday, October 5, 1993.

Sincerely,

JOHN D. DINGELL,
Chairman.

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 618, the Government Securities Reform Act of 1993. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment our chairman on his work in bringing this bill to the floor.

The purpose of the Government securities market is to finance the national debt at the lowest possible cost. Public confidence in the integrity of the market is essential. It was to help preserve that confidence that Congress enacted the Government Securities Act of 1986, and for the same reason we act today.

The GSA established a Federal system for regulating the Government securities market, including previously unregulated brokers and dealers, in order to protect investors and to ensure the maintenance of a fair, honest, and liquid market.

In that bill, the Department of the Treasury was instructed to adopt rules to prevent fraudulent and manipulative acts and practices. Its efforts have been successful for the most part. Treasury's rulemaking authority, however, sunset on October 1, 1991.

I believe it is incumbent upon Congress to remedy the situation in which the Treasury Department is without authority to regulate its own marketplace. Our legislation does this by reauthorizing the Treasury Department to adopt rules as necessary.

In 1987, Treasury, the Federal Reserve, and the GAO examined the Government securities market and concluded that brokers and dealers should make more quotation information available. Increasing the amount of information available to the public makes financial markets more efficient without any risk to their safety.

In testimony at our hearings during both the 102d and 103d Congresses, many witnesses agreed that additional disclosure would help. They urged us, however, to allow private industry to lead the development of market information systems. Our committee agreed, and H.R. 618 preserves the incentives for the industry itself to promote modernization and innovation.

The 1986 act did not give Treasury authority to enact sales practice rules. It also restricted the NASD from applying its already existing sales practices rules to its member Government securities dealers. Over the 7 years of operation of the Government Securities Act, it has become apparent that the removal of restrictions on sales practice regulation would be in the interest of investors. This too is accomplished in H.R. 618.

I believe that the Government has a role to play in ensuring that this critically important marketplace is not disrupted by the frauds and scandals it has endured during the last 3 years. I want to commend committee Chairman DINGELL, Chairman MARKEY of the Finance Subcommittee, and the full committee ranking Republican CARLOS MOORHEAD for their work in fashioning an appropriate response to the need to update the oversight regulations of

[1] Congress passed the GSA to close then-existing gaps in the regulation of market participants that had been highlighted by the failure of certain previously unregulated government securities dealers, involving losses for investors and, in some cases, fraudulent activity in the market for repurchase agreements. Brokers and dealers (including financial institutions) in the secondary market for government securities are regulated under the authority of the GSA.

this important market. I urge my colleagues to vote for this legislation.

□ 1310

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

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ], chairman of the full Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, with whom the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on Ways and Means worked very closely over the last several months in crafting legislation.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak in favor of this legislation. I regret, however, that unnecessary jurisdictional maneuvering last year has delayed passage of this bill for over a year. Our cooperation this year demonstrates what can be accomplished when committees learn to respect each others concerns.

However, H.R. 618 contains several important long term reforms to the Government securities auction process. These reforms will break the stranglehold of the primary dealer cartel, and bring equitable bidding to the Government securities auction process. By ending the preferential treatment of big investment houses, these provisions will increase competition and lower the cost of financing the Government's debt.

The first provision guarantees that any bidder who meets a minimum creditworthiness standard will be eligible to participate in the new automated auction system. Currently, only the primary dealers are allowed to participate in the new automated system. This gives them an unfair competitive advantage.

The second provision prohibits the Treasury Department from giving an auction bidder any advantage, favorable treatment, or other benefit. Only reasonable and necessary exceptions in the public interest would be allowed. The favored treatment historically given to the primary dealers for no valid reason would be stopped once and for all.

Third, the activities of the secretive Treasury Advisory Borrowing Committee will be pried open to the public.

The part having to do with the Federal Reserve Board, which is critical, is a part which we generated in legislation last year and it forms an integral part of this legislation.

Generally, all meetings are open, except for those where the committee deliberates and reports to the Treasury. The minutes of these meetings must be available to the public within 3 business days. Also, committee members are strictly prohibited from divulging the contents of the committee's discussions. A person violating this provision will be permanently banned from the committee and the firm the person was associated with would also be banned from the committee for 10 years.

In addition, I have received assurances from the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission that committee members who violated this prohibition would be subject to liability under insider trading laws. I insert into the RECORD at this point a letter I have received from Chairman Arthur Levitt on this point.

The letter referred to is as follows:

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION,
Washington, DC, October 4, 1993.

Hon. HENRY B. GONZALEZ,
Chairman, Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I understand that you have requested a description of the prohibitions against insider trading under the federal securities laws, including the extent to which those prohibitions might apply to a member of the Treasury Borrowing Advisory Committee (the "committee") who disclosed nonpublic matters discussed at committee meetings, or engaged in securities trading based on matters learned at such meetings.

The law of insider trading has been developed through judicial and SEC decisions construing the general antifraud provisions of the federal securities laws, primarily Section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Rule 10b-5 thereunder. These provisions cover trading in "any" securities including government securities and options, but they do not cover futures trading.[1] The provisions are applicable to bids or purchases in the auction and trading in the secondary market, which includes the "when issued" trading market, as well as trading after the auction.

Under this body of law, "insider trading" refers generally to the act of purchasing or selling a security, in breach of a fiduciary duty or other relationship of trust and confidence, while in possession of material, nonpublic information relating to that security. The law prohibits such trading by corporate officers and directors and other persons having a relationship of trust and confidence with the issuer or its shareholders. The law also prohibits trading by persons who "misappropriate" (i.e., obtain or convert in breach of a duty) material, nonpublic information from sources other than the issuer. Finally, the law prohibits such persons from "tipping" (i.e., wrongfully communicating the material, nonpublic information) to other persons, and the "tippees" of such persons are also prohibited from trading or tipping.

Depending on the circumstances, a committee member who engaged in improper conduct could potentially incur insider trading liability under either a "misappropriation theory" analysis or a tipping analysis. If a committee member purchased or sold securities while in possession of material, nonpublic information that he or she learned at such meetings, liability could result under the theory that the member's trading constituted the "misappropriation" of such information.

One critical issue in such a case would be whether the committee member was subject to the type of duty arising from a relationship of trust and confidence that is required to establish liability under the law. In general, if information is communicated in a context where it is agreed or understood between the parties that the information is confidential, the courts will find the requisite duty of trust and confidence. A relevant factor in such an analysis would be the nature and scope of any procedures instituted by the Treasury Department with respect to a committee member's obligation to maintain the confidentiality of committee meetings. Although there have not been any insider trading cases involving committee members, the courts have held in similar contexts that employees (including government employees) or other types of advisers (e.g., investment bankers, lawyers) owe the type of duty of confidentiality sufficient to create liability under the misappropriation theory. As noted above, however, this description assumes that the relevant trading involves securities, as opposed to futures.

Alternatively, even if a committee member did not personally engage in securities trading, he or she could be liable under a "tipping" analysis. Liability under this theory could result if the member improperly disclosed the information to another person who engaged in securities trading. As a general matter, an individual who communicates nonpublic information in breach of a duty is liable only if he does so knowingly or recklessly.

All of the foregoing analysis assumes that the information learned by the committee member was "material" with respect to an investment decision that a reasonable investor might make in connection with such securities.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR LEVITT,
Chairman.

I have also received assurances from the Treasury Department that it will improve the diversity of the committee membership to reflect more accurately the array of participants in the Government securities market, including greater participation by minorities and women. The Treasury Department will ensure that at least one-fourth of the committee's membership turns over every 2 years, with a complete turnover every 8 years.

Finally, the Secretary must report to Congress every year on violations and suspected violations of the auction rules. The Treasury will continue its practice of referring all such violations to the SEC or Justice Department for further investigation or prosecution.

The balance of the bill contains various amendments to the Government Securities Act designed to promote stronger regulation and enforcement. The Banking Committee has worked with the Energy and Commerce Committee to ensure that the bank regulators remain the primary regulatory and enforcement authority for Government securities brokers and dealers that are depository institutions. That is those institutions that have the taxpayer guarantee of their depositors.

I insert in the RECORD at this point my letter to Chairman DINGELL outlining the agreement reached between our

[1] Section 214 of PL-546 amends Section 9 of the Commodity Exchange Act to prohibit (1) certain commodity exchange and futures association officials or employees in violation of CFTC rules from trading on the basis of non-public information obtained through special access related to the performance of their official duties and (2) any person from trading on the basis of non-public information which the person knows was obtained from such official or employee in violation of such prohibition.

committees with respect to title I of the bill.

The letter referred to is as follows:

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, FINANCE AND URBAN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC September 27, 1993.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is with reference to H.R. 618, the Government Securities Reform Act of 1993, ordered reported by your Committee on September 21, 1993.

H.R. 618 contains various amendments to the Government Securities Act of 1986. Generally, the Secretary of the Treasury is given rulemaking authority and the financial institutions regulatory agencies are given enforcement authority under the Government Securities Act for government securities brokers and government securities dealers that are financial institutions (as defined in section 3(a)(46) of the Securities Exchange Act). The amendments to the Government Securities Act contained in H.R. 618 make some changes to this general scheme.

Under section 3 of H.R. 618, the Securities and Exchange Commission (the "Commission") may obtain records of government securities transactions directly from financial institutions as the Commission may require to reconstruct trading in the course of a particular surveillance inquiry or enforcement investigation being conducted by the Commission. As stated in your Committee report we have agreed that requests of records from financial institutions must be authorized by the full Commission, the director of any division of the Commission, or the head of any regional office of the Commission. Section 3 also requires the Commission to consult with the financial institutions regulatory agencies regarding the availability of records that may be required to be furnished on an annual basis or upon request, as well as to notify the regulatory agencies whenever the Commission requests records from a government securities broker or dealer that is a financial institution.

The Commission's rulemaking authority under Sections 15(c) (1) and (2) of the Exchange Act is extended to all government securities brokers and dealers by Section 5 of H.R. 618. The Commission currently has such authority with respect to municipal securities brokers and dealers that are financial institutions. The Commission's new rulemaking authority extends to insured depository institutions in this particular instance because of the importance of having uniform antimanipulation and antifraud rules that apply to all government securities brokers and dealers. However, in recognition of the regulatory and enforcement authority of the financial institutions regulators over government securities brokers and dealers that are financial institutions, the Committee report reflects our intention that the Commission must consult with and respond in writing to any written comments of such regulators and the Secretary of the Treasury when promulgating antifraud and antimanipulation rules.

Under clause (1)(d)(1) of Rule X of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs has jurisdiction over banks and banking, including the government securities activities of banks. Pursuant to extensive discussions with your Committee with regard to the provisions of H.R. 618 that fall within this Committee's jurisdiction, and in the interests of expediting consideration of this bill by the House, the Banking Committee will not request a sequential referral of H.R. 618. This action is taken without any prejudice to this Committee's jurisdiction, or its intent to request that Banking Committee Members be named as conferees on the legislation.

I appreciate the cooperative and thoughtful spirit in which you have worked with the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs on the legislative and report language of H.R. 618. I look forward to continuing to work with your Committee in that same spirit.

Sincerely,

HENRY B. GONZALEZ,
Chairman.

The Salomon Brothers scandal will always illustrate the propensity of Wall Street to cross the line in an insatiable attempt to beat the system. The auction reforms contained in this bill are one more step to combat those who would abuse the market. I urge all Members to support passage of the bill.

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of control, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. MOORHEAD], the distinguished ranking member on the full committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi). Without objection, the gentleman from California will control the remainder of the time of the gentleman from Texas.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 618, the Government Securities Reform Act.

In response to the failure of a number of unregulated Government securities dealers between 1975 and 1985, Congress passed the Government Securities Act of 1986. For the last 3 years our committee has been working on legislation that will update the 1986 act. This legislation will change regulation in order to address problems that have become apparent in the markets since the 1986 act was passed.

When enacted into law, H.R. 618 will prevent the type of scandal we saw when Paul Mozer, a single individual, showed us that it was indeed possible to manipulate a Treasury auction.

After enactment of this bill, dealers in Government-sponsored enterprise securities will be guilty of fraud if they puff up statements of buying interest. This was once a common practice because, by saying they had more buyers than they actually did, firms got a greater share of securities to sell. H.R. 618 will put a stop to this practice.

Similarly, the authority delegated to the Department of the Treasury by this legislation will work against cherry-picking schemes and the manipulation of noncompetitive bidding practices.

For these reasons, I support this legislation. Congress took action in 1986. It must take action in 1993 and, indeed, it must continue to take action whenever necessary, to ensure a fair and reliable Government securities market.

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

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE].

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation and urge its passage. I am glad to hear the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY], as well as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ], chairman of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 618, the Government Securities Reform Act of 1993. This legislation represents an important and appropriate legislative response to the misconduct which occurred in 1991 in the primary market for Federal Government securities.

In August 1991, the Congress and the public were shocked to learn that employees at the highest levels of Salomon Brothers, one of our country's largest brokerage houses, had violated Treasury Department rules governing the issuance of Government securities. These repeated violations involved the sale of tens of billions in Government securities in an attempt to corner and squeeze the market in certain issues of Treasury debt. Such actions, left unpunished, would undermine the integrity of the entire Government securities market and threaten the issuance of the bonded debt of the United States.

Since first hearing these shocking allegations of misconduct in the Government securities market, the Oversight Subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means has worked diligently to ensure that the Government securities market continues to operate fairly and efficiently. The subcommittee held hearings on September 26, 1991, to receive testimony from Salomon Brothers, the administration, and other concerned market participants. The subcommittee's investigation revealed significant shortcomings in the manner in which Treasury securities were marketed.

On February 3, 1992, the subcommittee held additional hearings to review the administrative and legislative recommendations of the administration. On March 12, 1992, on a bipartisan basis, the subcommittee issued a report to the full Committee on Ways and Means containing several recommendations for reforming the Government securities market.

After earlier voting to approve this report, the Committee on Ways and Means marked up and approved the legislative provisions that are contained in the legislation now before the House of Representatives.

With respect to the primary market for Government securities, H.R. 618 would make it an explicit violation of Federal law to knowingly or willfully make any false or misleading written

statement in connection with the issuance of any public debt obligation. Such violations would be subject to criminal and civil penalties. This provision reflects the intent of the committee that such violations in the Government securities market should be subject to the same standard that is now applied to other securities under the antifraud and antimanipulation provisions of the Securities and Exchange Act.

Title II of H.R. 618 would also require the Secretary of the Treasury to make an annual report to the Committees on Ways and Means and the Senate Finance Committee on the Treasury's public debt activities and the operations of the Federal Financing Bank. In addition, the Secretary of the Treasury would be required to report to Congress on any reforms to the current system for issuing public debt obligations.

Mr. Speaker, these reforms, which have been developed on a bipartisan basis and which have been supported by the administration, represent a measured and meaningful response to the market manipulations uncovered in 1991. This legislation reflects the work and concerns not only of the members of the Committee on Ways and Means, but of those who serve on the committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on Banking and Urban Affairs. This legislation is the result of long and intense review. It provides meaningful protection for all parties to the Government securities market. Therefore, at this time, I urge its favorable consideration by all the Members of the House.

□ 1320

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH].

Mr. LEACH. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very thoughtful bill. It is not majestic in scope, but it is a good, solid step in the right direction.

When money is at issue, there is always the potential for corruption. In a free enterprise system, the best antidote to corruption is competition and public knowledge of what is happening.

This bill enhances competition and gives equal access to automated bidding to a lot of smaller parties who have been shut out of the automated bidding process for Treasury auctions. It also prohibits favored players, that is, giving certain participants advantage over other players, which has been the circumstance in too many instances in the past. It also improves public knowledge and increases transparency, by making it clear that meetings of the Treasury Advisory Borrowing Committee will be made public, at least the relevant information of what takes place in those meetings, on a fairly timely basis, 3 business days.

I personally think this is a positive step. It is a noncontroversial bill, in terms of the controversy. I would, however, as the ranking member of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, like to tip my hat particularly to my chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ], who worked diligently on this, and also to express my personal appreciation to the Committee on Energy and Commerce for taking into consideration the Banking Committee's views and also for moving forth in areas that I think are quite progressive and quite reasonable.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill.

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

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and that will not be long at all.

Mr. Speaker, I want to outline what is in the legislation itself.

First, it permanently extends the rulemaking authorities granted to Treasury under the Government Securities Act of 1986.

Second, it requires all Government securities brokers and dealers to furnish to the Securities and Exchange Commission upon request records of transactions in Government securities needed to reconstruct trading for surveillance or enforcement purposes.

Third, it authorizes Treasury to adopt rules requiring reporting by holders of large positions in Treasury securities in order to enhance market surveillance and enforcement efforts.

Fourth, it requires all Government securities brokers and dealers to establish and enforce strong internal controls aimed at preventing wrongdoing by their officers or employees.

Fifth, it empowers the National Association of Securities Dealers and the appropriate regulatory agencies for financial institutions to develop and enforce sales practices and other rules of fair practice for Government securities brokers and dealers.

Sixth, it makes it an explicit violation of the securities laws for any person to make false or misleading statements in connection with any bid for or purchase of a Government security.

Seventh, it supplements the SEC's basic antifraud authorities over this market by empowering it to prescribe prophylactic antifraud and antimanipulation rules for the Government securities market.

Eighth, it directs the SEC to continuously monitor the nature and adequacy of public access to market quotation and transaction information.

Ninth, it mandates joint interagency, Treasury and GAO studies of the regulatory system for Government securities, and

Tenth, it requires certain reports by Treasury concerning its public debt obligations and changes in the Treasury debt auction process, which have been worked out in cooperation, again, with the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs. Both of those committees, through the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ], have publicly stated here in this debate this afternoon their committees' approval of these provisions.

This 10-point program for reform in the marketplace response to the troubles which were identified as the Salomon Bros. scandal and began to be made public 2 and 3 years ago.

H.R. 618 represents a truly bipartisan reform package that is targeted at the specific abuses and problem areas that were uncovered by the Subcommittee on Telecommunications and Finance during its 3-year investigation of the Government securities market.

I would like to also express my appreciation to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], chairman of the full committee, and Consuela Washington of the full committee staff for their hard work and efforts and insight in the final passage of this legislation; to the distinguished ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FIELDS] and to the ranking minority member of the full committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. MOORHEAD], along with their staffs, Steve Blumenthal and Peter Rich, for their leadership and cooperation in crafting this important legislation.

I also want to express my special thanks to Treasury Undersecretary Frank Newman and his staff for their work in helping to craft this legislation, as well as to the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, Arthur Levitt, Commissioner Mary Schapiro, and to the staff of the SEC which helped so ably to bring this product to the floor today.

□ 1330

Their hard work, their technical support was invaluable in helping to bridge the differences that have previously separated the various parties interested in this legislation.

As well I want to thank our legislative counsel, Steve Pope, Mr. Howard Homooff who worked on the subcommittee staff for several years and no longer works for the Congress, but gave invaluable service.

And in conclusion as well, to the Committee on Ways and Means and to the Committee on Banking. We had some difficulties initially. We have worked them out. The legislation is clearly and palpably in the public interest. Working with the minority on each and every issue at each stage of the development of the legislation, we present to the House today, we believe, a 10-point program that will make it

highly unlikely that we will see a recurrence of the types of activities which the Salomon Bros. and 98 other firms were able to engage in the latter part of the eighties and the early part of this decade.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I would like to thank Jeff Duncan from my staff as well for all his hard work and dedication which he brought to this legislation. Without it, this legislation would not be possible.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, the National Organ Transplant Act of 1984 established the organ procurement and transplantation network to develop a national patient selection system and ensure equitable access to organs. When Congress created the National Organ Transplant Act, it emphasized the need for a national list based on the medical need of the transplant patient.

Unfortunately, the United Network for Organ Sharing [UNOS] made a decision to change that policy. Instead of providing transplants to those in dire medical need, the current organ allocation system is based on geographic location, not the medical status of the patient.

During both the subcommittee and full committee markup sessions, I withdrew amendments due to apparent lack of support that would have required that the medical status of the patient and the viability of the organ be the primary factors considered when making organ allocation decisions. Many committee members believed that before a national list could be developed, the feasibility of creating such a list based on the medical need of the patient must be examined in great detail.

In response to my concerns, this bill requires that a study be conducted on the "feasibility, fairness, and enforceability of allocating organs in the United States based solely upon the clinical need of the patient involved and the viability of the organ involved, with no consideration given to the geographic area in which the transplant is to be performed or the geographic area in which the donation of the organ is made."

While the legislation before us today does not directly address my concerns, I believe it is a step in the right direction. I have been pleased by the willingness of Health and Environment Subcommittee Chairman HENRY WAXMAN and Energy and Commerce Committee Chairman JOHN DINGELL to consider these issues and work with me in reaching a compromise on this matter.

While I am encouraged by the committee's sensitivity to my concerns, I still continue to be troubled by current policy for transplants which only considers the geographic location of the patient and not his or her medical status.

I am hopeful that once the study is complete, my concerns on organ allocation will be addressed through the regulations which the legislation requires the Health and Human Services Secretary to issue within 1 year of the enactment of this legislation.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2659, the Organ and Bone Marrow Transplantation Amendments of 1993, which reauthorizes the National Marrow Donor Program through fiscal year 1996.

I want to commend my colleague from California, Mr. WAXMAN, the chairman of the Health Subcommittee, and my colleague from Virginia, Mr. BLILEY, the ranking Republican, for their work on this legislation and their special attention to the many medical, scientific, and ethical questions that surround this program which is saving lives every day throughout our Nation and the world.

Consideration of this legislation in the House could not come at a more appropriate time, as the national marrow donor registry has just exceeded the 1 million donor mark, a remarkable achievement for a program that is just beginning its seventh year. The chairman, Mr. WAXMAN, may recall a hearing by his subcommittee a number of years ago when some medical experts predicted we would never be able to recruit more than 50,000 donors.

It is with great pride that we proved them wrong and, in fact, now have in place a national registry which grows by 20,000 to 30,000 donors every month.

There are many, many heroes who have contributed so much to the success of our program. They include my colleagues, Mr. WAXMAN and Mr. BLILEY, the members of the Energy and Commerce Committee who are now authorizing its operations for the third time, my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee, who continue to support my requests for funding of the registry's operations and for donor recruitment, education, and typing activities, and to every Member of this House who has supported this program here in Congress and back home in their congressional districts. In fact, more than 60 of my colleagues have even taken the quick and simple blood test that is required to become listed in the national registry.

Earlier this year, the chairman, Mr. WAXMAN, and his subcommittee held an extensive hearing on the National Marrow Donor Program. During that hearing, we heard many of the complex issues that surround this program and, after a good discussion, a number of positive changes have been made to improve upon the process of matching patients with donors to save lives.

I want to thank the committee for being sensitive to many of the issues surrounding donor confidentiality which we discussed with them and which protect the integrity of the program and its 1 million volunteer donors.

My colleagues will note that this legislation makes one major change to the program and that is the shift in oversight responsibilities from the National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute [NHLBI], to the Health Resources and Services Administration. Dr. Claude Lenfant, the Director of NHLBI, has devoted an extraordinary amount of his personal time on this program, for which he is to be commended. We will miss our daily working relationship with the National Institutes of Health on this program but look forward to establishing a new working relationship with HRSA, which I am sure will likewise become a stalwart champion of the program.

One of the matters which we have discussed at great length over the years, and in the committee's hearing earlier this year, is the ongoing need to increase minority representation in the national registry. As many of my colleagues know, race and ethnic background are a major factor in determining the genetic signature which is used to identify matched donors.

That is why it is so important that we continue our efforts to increase the number of minority donors to improve the chances of finding matched donors for minority patients.

The national registry was activated in 1987 and it took only a few months for us to realize that minority recruitment was not keeping pace with the general population. That is why I decided in 1990 to ask my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee to earmark specific funds for minority recruitment and testing. That year Congress approved $1.5 million for this effort, and with those funds we recruited 25,000 volunteers from minority communities; 25,000 donors may not sound like a lot until you consider that prior to those Federal funds being made available we had only recruited 16,000 minority donors in the program's first 3 years.

In fiscal year 1992, I was able to double to $3 million the amount specifically made available for minority recruitment. With those funds we added another 44,700 volunteers to the registry.

In the current year, we have increased the funding set aside for minority recruitment to $4.2 million and we expect to recruit another 70,000 donors by the end of this year. Some of these funds are being used to undertake an 11 city drive targeted specifically at African-Americans. I had the opportunity to kick off the drive in the Tampa Bay area of Florida and it is my understanding that a number of our colleagues will be joining in similar programs later this year in their home districts.

It is with such confidence that this program will succeed in energizing our communities that I convinced my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee to add an additional $3 million to the 1994 Defense appropriations bill specifically for minority recruitment. it is estimated that with the $7.7 million this would make available—compared to the $8.7 million we have made available over the past 3 years—we can add 131,000 minority donors to our rolls in the next year alone. This is a major goal when you compare this to the total of 154,000 minority donors that are in the registry today. But it is one that together we can achieve.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I want to thank every Member of the House for their support of the National Marrow Donor Program. The legislation before us reaffirms the fact that it truly has been a modern medical miracle which has brought the gift of hope and life to so many people throughout our Nation and the world. There is no greater cause and my colleagues can join me in strongly supporting this legislation to continue our work to save lives.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my grave concern regarding the current system of organ procurement and allocation for transplantation in this country.

I must begin by commending Chairman WAXMAN's Subcommittee on Health and the Environment as well as the full Committee on Energy and Commerce for the fine work they have done on H.R. 2659, the Organ and Bone Marrow Transplantation Amendments of 1993, and in investigating and responding to some of the problems of allocating organs for transplant.

Transplant candidates in the United States currently face widely disparate waiting times

for organs depending upon their geographic location, because national policy gives priority to distribution within the locality where the organ was donated, regardless of whether patients elsewhere have a greater medical need. The result is a situation where various localities have an overconcentration of patients from around the country yet a relative undersupply of organs. For example, in the Organ Procurement Organization [OPO] serving my district, the number of patients waiting for a heart transplant at any given time is 160 percent of a full year's local heart supply. Throughout the entire country, however, the number of patients waiting for transplant is only 120 percent of a full year's supply. Patients awaiting transplants cluster near the Nation's leading transplant centers, many believing that these institutions, by virtue of their reputations, can afford them a better chance of survival. While the patients may be concentrated around these centers, the organs may not.

The disparity of supply and demand harms patients who have traveled to the regional and national transplant centers by restricting their access to organs to the limited local supply. It also harms local patients by forcing them to compete with an inflated candidate population for access to limited local resources. At the same time, other areas of the country have a relative oversupply of organs and routinely transplant patients of lower medical and equitable priority than persons on the waiting list in my district.

In the May 17, 1993, issue of American Hospital Association News, Dr. Oscar Bronsther, a transplant physician and associate professor of surgery at the University of Pittsburgh Hospital, expressed that the regionalization of the allocation and procurement system has led to longer waits for transplant candidates and a doubling of the patient-mortality rate at his hospital.

According to a General Accounting Office [GAO] report released to the House Energy and Commerce Committee in April 1993, 10,000 people died waiting for organ transplants between 1988 and 1992. During that same 5-year period, the annual number of people waiting for transplants rose by 66 percent, while the number of organ donors grew by only 13 percent.

As long as this country continues to procure and allocate organs for transplantation using the current geographical-based system, which inaccurately assumes that supply and demand ratios in different parts of this country are comparable, patients will continue to die waiting for organs to be donated in their local areas. To keep pace with the national flow of patients seeking transplants, we need a regional or national allocation system based on medical and equitable criteria and unfettered by arbitrary "local" boundaries that restrict the national flow of organs.

The Committee on Energy and Commerce, in section 9 of H.R. 2659, the Organ and Bone Marrow Transplantation Amendments of 1993, requires the Secretary of Health and Human Services to conduct a study of the feasibility, fairness, and enforceability of allocating solid organs to patients based solely on the clinical need of the patient involved and the viability of the organ involved.

I would hope that if the opportunity presents itself during the conference with our colleagues in the Senate, that we seize the chance to require not just study, but also implementation, of some form of regional or national allocation system.

As one example of such an allocation system, I call to the attention of my colleagues a proposal prepared by the two transplant centers in my district, Sentara Norfolk General Hospital and Children's Hospital of the King's Daughters, which I enter into the RECORD at this time. This proposal, currently being considered by the United Network for Organ Sharing, illustrates how a workable regional or national allocation system for transplantable organs might operate.

ALLOCATION OF HEARTS FOR TRANSPLANT: ARTIFICIAL BOTTLENECKS ON THE DISTRIBUTION OF HEARTS AND A PROPOSAL FOR REDUCING NATIONAL DISPARITIES IN WAITING TIMES

August 19, 1993

(Sentara Norfolk General Hospital, Children's Hospital of The King's Daughters)

(Abstract: Heart transplant patients throughout the United States face widely disparate waiting times depending upon their geographic location. This paper contends that such disparities are inequitable and are a result of the current national policy of giving priority to distribution within the locality where the organ was donated, regardless of whether patients elsewhere have a greater medical need. We propose an alternative policy to allocate organs nationwide first on the basis of medical need, second on the basis of waiting time, and third on the basis of logistics and cost considerations. The proposed policy would ensure that the patients with the greatest medical need receive priority for hearts regardless of where they are located. Nationwide allocation as proposed in this paper would reduce the current disparities in waiting times among medically similar patients, and, where possible, would save money by reducing transportation costs.)

Sentara Norfolk General Hospital and Children's Hospital of The King's Daughters (the "Eastern Virginia Hospitals") operate a joint adult and pediatric transplantation program in eastern Virginia. The Eastern Virginia Hospitals submit this position paper regarding the effects on heart transplant patients of the arbitrary constraints on distribution imposed by current national policy giving local distribution precedence over medical need. Of particular concern to the Eastern Virginia Hospitals is the interaction between local procurement and distribution of hearts and the national movement of patients seeking transplants. These differing geographic sources of the supply of and demand for transplantable hearts create a situation whereby various localities have an overconcentration of patients from around the country yet a relative undersupply of organs obtained primarily from the local area. The disparity of supply and demand in these localities harms patients who have traveled to the regional and national transplant centers by restricting their access to organs to the limited local supply available, and harms local patients by forcing them to compete with a much larger group for access to limited local resources. To remedy this problem the Eastern Virginia Hospitals propose a nationwide allocation system based on medical and equitable criteria and unfettered by arbitrary "local" boundaries that restrict the national flow of organs.

CURRENT HEART ALLOCATION IS LOCAL FIRST, NATIONAL LAST, REGARDLESS OF NEED

The National Organ Transplant Act, 42 U.S.C. §273, *et seq.*, passed in 1984 and amended several times since then, directs the Department of Health and Human Services to contract with a third party to establish a national computer network to facilitate organ procurement, sharing, and equitable distribution.[1] The contractor selected for this task is the United Network for Organ Sharing (UNOS), which maintains a computer-based national waiting list to match patients with available organs. UNOS also establishes policies for hospitals, organ procurement organizations (OPOs), and transplant centers, to ensure that organs are effectively and safely obtained and then allocated according to medical and equitable criteria. While these policies do not themselves have the force of law, an organization's failure to comply with UNOS policies could render that organization ineligible for various Medicare reimbursements. *See* 42 U.S.C. §1320b–8. As a practical matter, members of the transplant community treat UNOS policies as mandatory. This paper focuses on UNOS allocation policies as they relate to heart transplants.

One of the central features of the UNOS policies regarding heart procurement and allocation is their dependence on a local-regional-national priority system. UNOS Policy 3.7. Hearts are distributed first within the local OPOs where they are donated. There are 69 different OPOs throughout the country, each with arbitrarily drawn service areas covering anywhere from a portion of a single metropolitan area to an entire state to a multi-state area. Within an OPO hearts are offered initially to patients who are in urgent medical need of a transplant (Status I patients) and then to patients whose conditions, although less urgent, still require transplantation for long-term survival (Status II patients). Within a given medical Status, priority is given to the patient who has been on the waiting list the longest.[2] An available heart will be offered to patients outside the OPO only if there are no suitable local recipients of any medical status. Such unused hearts are offered first to patients within 500 miles of the organ, then to patients within 1000 miles, and finally to patients anywhere in the country.

In contrast to the numerous rules regulating distribution of hearts, heart transplant patients are free to seek a transplant at any transplant center that will accept them. Individual patients often travel far from their homes to go to a preferred transplant center, or one with more lenient medical criteria for accepting transplant candidates.[3] Regardless of where patients come from, however, they will be listed on the local OPO waiting list for the transplant center where they will be treated. OPO demand for transplants thus is determined by the redistribution of patients from around the country rather than by the needs of the local population alone.

ALLOCATION METHODS MUST BE JUDGED ACCORDING TO UTILITY AND FAIRNESS

Scarce resources such as hearts for transplant can be allocated to patients in a variety of ways. Hearts can be distributed randomly, given out first come-first served, given to the patients who most urgently need the hearts, given to the patients who can benefit most from the hearts, or distributed pursuant to combinations of these methods. When evaluating any particular allocation method, however, two broad concerns must always be considered: utility and fairness.

[1] Footnotes at end of articles.

Utility as an evaluation criterion encompasses both the medical and social value of a given allocation method. Medical value is often thought of in terms of saving or prolonging a patient's life, or improving the quality of a patient's life.[4] In situations of scarcity where it is impossible to save the lives of all patients, the medical utility of an allocation method will be judged according to its ability to maximize either the number of lives saved, or the length of time added to the lives of those saved, or increase in the quality of life for those receiving transplants. When evaluating medical utility, it is important to articulate clearly the nature of the medical gains (deaths prevented in the short term vs. prolongation of lives over the long-term) be articulated clearly. Where different aspects of utility must be compared, the question becomes social or political rather than medical.

In addition to medical utility, an allocation system must also be judged according to its overall costs and benefits to society. Considerations include the relative cost of different allocation methods (such costs are often borne by the government through Medicare and Medicaid payments), economic gains to the government and society from the improved health of transplant recipients, relative incentives or disincentives to organ donation by the public in general, and the opportunity costs of spending scarce financial resources or transplants as opposed to some other worthy cause. A final aspect of utility is the susceptibility of any allocation scheme of effective implementation. No matter how beneficial a method is in theory, the method may be distorted or circumvented when applied in the real world, thus undermining any hoped-for advantages. All benefits therefore must be discounted by the relative difficulty of obtaining perfect implementation of the theoretical allocation method.

The other major area of evaluation is the equity or fairness of an allocation method. Unfortunately, there are many different views of what is equitable. One view is that in a situation of scarcity fairness is achieved best by strictly maximizing medical utility. Another view is that certain issues of fairness take precedence over strict adherence to medical utility. For example, open discrimination on the basis of race, wealth, or gender is unlikely to be acceptable from a fairness perspective, regardless of any utility gains such a system might have. Even starting from the assumption that maximization of medical utility is the primary—though not absolute—goal of an allocation system, there is still ample room for equitable considerations to influence how we structure that system. Because medicine cannot predict with certainty how long patients will live either before or after a transplant, or how much their health will improve, the transplant community is regularly faced with choosing between patients who, for practical purposes, are equivalent from a medical utility perspective. At a minimum, considerations of fairness must be available as tie-breakers in such circumstances.

Equitable concerns such as improving access to transplants for poor or minority patients therefore must be considered, and, if serious inequities are present, have the potential to take precedence over strictly medical concerns. Issues arising under the rubric of fairness include, but are not limited to, concerns over equal opportunity for all patients to receive a transplant, the notion of first come-first served, concerns over the right of local communities to utilize local resources, and concern over freedom of choice for patients with regard to where and from whom they will receive their medical treatment. Many of these concerns may not impact a comparative evaluation of two particular allocation methods, but all of these concerns must at least be considered in order to gain consensus for any allocation method.

CURRENT ALLOCATION POLICY IS MEDICALLY AND EQUITABLY UNSOUND

The present heart allocation system is objectionable because it fails adequately to coordinate the supply of hearts with the demand for heart transplants. The supply of hearts to any given OPO is primarily local, based on the deaths and organ donations of the local population. Demand for hearts within an OPO, however, can include both local and national patients. OPOs with national centers experience a relative over-demand for hearts while OPOs without national centers experience a relative under-demand. The variations in demand are not matched by variations in supply, however, because present policy allows localities to have priority for all locally procured hearts regardless of medical need, thus erecting a barrier to national redistribution of scare hearts. Fluctuating demand and static supply creates serious imbalances in the "market" for hearts.

This very phenomenon is occurring in the OPO serving central and eastern Virginia. Two of the transplant centers in central Virginia treat patients from all over the country, thus creating a great burden on local supplies of hearts. In fact, many of the national patients are intentionally transferred by the Veterans Administration from around the country to the VA transplant center in Richmond. A similar situation exists in Utah, where the VA also has a national heart transplant center. Numerous out-of-area patients are brought in for transplant, but the local supply of hearts remains constant, thus leading to difficulties in meeting the expanded demand for transplants.

The overconcentration of demand in OPOs containing national and regional transplant centers adversely affects the utility and fairness of the current allocation system. First, medical utility is hurt because a seriously ill Status I patient in an overburdened OPO will be forced to wait an extended time for transplant, even though an underburdened OPO simultaneously is transplanting a suitable heart into a Status II patient. For example, transplant centers in Florida regularly transplant Status II patients even though Status I patients in Virginia who could use the same hearts languish and die on the local waiting list. Such a result contravenes the present medical consensus that we should transplant first the patients most in need.[5] Fairness is also undermined by the current supply/demand imbalances in that medically equivalent patients regularly face widely divergent waiting times, depending upon their geographic location. Patients in overburdened OPOs wait longer and die more frequently even as available hearts are transplanted into patients who are no different from a medical perspective and who have been waiting a shorter period of time.[6]

In the past, the waiting times experienced by patients in overburdened OPOs were ameliorated by the supply of national hearts allocated through the UNOS national list. Because national hearts are allocated on the basis of waiting time, and because patients in overburdened OPOs tend to have longer waiting times than the national average, national hearts would eventually flow to patients in such OPOs, thus alleviating some of the burden. This safety valve, however, is quickly closing. UNOS policy—or at least its long-held practice—has been to encourage the consolidation of OPOs and sharing arrangements between neighboring OPOs. *See UNOS Policy 3.7.3* (procedure for inter-OPO sharing agreements). Consolidation and inter-OPO sharing has not led to any demonstrable efficiencies in organ procurement, but these procedures have increased the area in which an organ may be detained before being offered nationally. These practices have also made it more likely that the "local" waiting lists will absorb a greater percentage of available organs.[7] Fewer hearts are therefore sent on for national distribution. In addition to OPO consolidation and sharing, the overall growth in demand for transplants also swells local waiting lists, thus absorbing more hearts at the local level and causing geography to play a greater role than medical necessity in overall heart allocation. Due to these factors, the UNOS national list no longer is an effective means of redistributing hearts to where they are needed most.

The present allocation system fails to direct hearts to the patients most in need, and fails to allocate organs fairly based on waiting time rather than on geographic happenstance. As the former safety valve of the national list ceases to function, the disutility and unfairness of the present system will continue to grow. Only a system that rejects arbitrary geographic barriers to allocation can hope to satisfy the twin goals of utility and fairness.

NATIONWIDE ALLOCATION PROVIDES GREATER UTILITY AND FAIRNESS

To correct the local imbalances in supply and demand created by the present allocation system, the Eastern Virginia Hospitals propose the following alternative that would allocate hearts nationwide first on the basis of medical criteria, and then on the basis of waiting times grouped according to standard deviation from the national average waiting times for medically similar patients. A final criterion would address logistical issues; saving resources without sacrificing medical utility or fairness.

A. Description of Allocation Model

The proposed allocation model represents a move away from OPO-specific waiting lists and acceptance of a single national list for each donated heart. All heart transplant patients throughout the country would register with UNOS just as they do now. Each time a heart is donated anywhere in the country, a national list will be generated based on identical blood type, acceptable weight range, and maximum distance the recipient center is willing to travel to recover a heart. Patients on this national list will be prioritized according to present definitions for Status I (urgent need) and Status II (less urgent need) patients. Under all circumstances a Status I patient on the list will receive priority over a Status II patient on the list.

Within Status level, patients will be categorized based upon waiting-time categories defined by standard deviations from the national average waiting time of all similar patients transplanted in the previous 30 days. These waiting-time categories will be as follows:

A =3 0-day running average (TDRA) + 2 standard deviations (SDs)[8]
B = TDRA + 1 SD to TDRA + 2 SDs
C = TDRA to TDRA + 1 SD
D = TDRA - 1 SD to TDRA
E = TDRA - 2 SDs to TDRA - 1 SD
F = TDRA - 2 SDs

Waiting time for Status I patients will be calculated based only on time within Status I, as currently proposed by UNOS. Status II waiting time will include time spent in either Status I or II. Organs would be allocated first to Status IA patients, then IB, IC, etc. After all Status I patients on a given list had been transplanted, organs would then be allocated to Status IIA patients, then IIB, IIC, etc. Priority thus goes to the sickest patients who have been waiting the longest.

If there is more than one patient within a subcategory of the national list, priority will go to the patient awaiting transplant at the center closest to the donated organ.

B. Benefits of the Proposed Model

The proposed model is superior to the present allocation system in several respects. First medical utility is better served through national allocation because there is virtually no instance where an available heart will go to a Status II patient when it could have gone to a Status I patient. Whereas now the most important factors in allocation are the locations of the patient and donor, the new proposal would make medical need and waiting time the most important allocation factors. For each and every organ recovered, a national list of medically appropriate candidates would be generated, and the patient at the top of that list would receive the organ.[9] Location of recipient and donor becomes the lowest priority in the determination of allocation after blood type, weight and waiting time. Furthermore, by correctly determining the standard deviation range, the waiting time variation among all similar patients nationally would be 1–2 weeks. This would make transplants far more predictable and thus make it easier to prepare the patients and ensure their readiness for the upcoming operation.

Medical utility is further served under the proposed model by improving the ability to match patients with sensitivity to multiple antigens. Such patients are very difficult to match with an appropriate organ, and often die on the waiting list. Under the proposed model, highly sensitive patients could be exposed to as large a donor pool as logistically possible, and if their waiting times deviated significantly from the average, they would soon find themselves alone in a waiting-time category and thus would receive top priority for virtually any suitable organ in the country. By having access to such a large donor pool, the odds of finding a match for even highly sensitive patients are vastly improved.

Second, fairness is better served by the proposed system as a result of grouping patients according to standard deviations from the national average. Patients within the same medical Status who have waited longer than their peers will receive priority regardless of where they or any donors are located. This outcome promotes a notion of equity that, where all other things are roughly equal, patients should be treated on a first come-first served basis. The proposed model views this from a national perspective insofar as the support for organ transplantation is primarily a result of federal programs, and therefore all citizens throughout the country should have equal rights and benefits under such programs. The proposed system will move waiting times for all patients closer to the national average thereby creating a system where everybody bears equally the burdens of an organ shortage or benefits equally from improvements in donation rates.[10]

One issue that should be noted is that many localities feel they have a vested right in the organs donated in their area and procured by their OPO. While there is no doubt that local communities have historically favored local charities and sought to benefit those in their own back yard first, this approach is inappropriate in the area of organ allocation. Organ donations have long been viewed as an act of national charity to be given to those persons in greatest need, regardless of where they are located. The federal involvement in the area of organ transplants further demonstrates the national, rather than local, character of transplantation. In this context, organs should not be treated as a species of local property, but as donations to a national cause that were meant to be distributed fairly to all. Even though the proposed model takes a national view, however, it does not abandon localities. In fact, in many ways, the new model would help localities by assuring them access to a national supply of organs based on the genuine needs of patients. Local hospitals in currently overburdened OPOs would no longer have to compete for limited resources with large national programs in their backyards, but would instead have access to national organs on an equal basis with any other hospital in the country.

One potential cost to this system is that organs will likely be transported greater distances than under the present system. Some additional travel is the likely result of any system designed to send the organ to where it is needed most. Concomitant increases in cost would be in the service of medical need and fairness. The proposed allocation model, however, contains a substantial safeguard to assure that added transportation is not undertaken frivolously. For patients in the same Status with comparable waiting times, distance from the heart is a valid factor in determining where to send the heart. For example, if the national waiting list for a donated heart contained to Status IC patients—whose waiting times likely would differ by a week or less—the available heart would be offered to the patient closer to the donation site, thus reducing transportation costs. No heart would be flown across the country merely due to a minor difference between patients otherwise medically equivalent. Using proximity in close cases also serves medical utility in that, where reasonable, it minimizes the amount of time a donated heart spends outside the body. As the national variation in waiting times was reduced, it would become easier to direct organs to a nearby patient without sacrificing medical utility or fairness. A patient who had been passed over based upon distance probably would not have to wait long for the next heart to become available, but if that patient did continue to wait, he would soon move up to the next waiting category, thus gaining priority for the next heart regardless of whether patients in a lower waiting category were closer to the donation.

Even were transportation costs to increase somewhat under the proposed allocation model, greater attention to medical criteria and waiting time likely would decrease total costs related to transplantation by decreasing the hospital expenses that accrue while a Status I patient is waiting. (Status II patients either wait at home or require less expensive hospital care.) The proposed model would reduce the aggregate waiting time of Status I patients by ensuring that Status I patients receive nationwide priority over Status II patients. Reducing the wait of a Status I patient by several days will save far more than any added transportation expense for a long-distance heart. Furthermore, this savings will become more significant under a revamped health care system. Third-party payers for medical care increasingly are encouraging large groups of patients to contract with one or more medical centers for tertiary care. As this aspect of managed competition spreads, patients will be referred in greater numbers to cost-effective centers. Without a national allocation system, any cost benefits from high-volume centers will be lost on excessive in-hospital waiting times.

CONCLUSION

Current UNOS policy rests on the inaccurate notion that supply and demand ratios in different parts of the country are roughly comparable and, therefore, patients in different areas have comparable opportunities for obtaining needed organs. Any incidental variations in the local supply/demand profiles are theoretically solved through the national list. The consolidation of OPOs and the expansion of inter-OPO sharing arrangements has imposed a barrier to such market adjustments, however, ensuring that local surpluses never make it to national patients. Coupled with the uneven distribution of large regional and national transplant centers that draw patients from around the country into single local areas, the entire distribution scheme breaks down; organs stay close to home, patients travel around the country, and OPOs with regional or national transplant centers are faced with demand that far outstrips supply.

This is precisely the situation that now exists in the OPO serving central and eastern Virginia and in many other OPOs around the country. Until such time as UNOS or HHS overhauls the national organ distribution system to adequately supply regional and national transplant centers, patients will continue to suffer and die due to relative local shortages of hearts. A long-term solution should look to reconciling the schizophrenic nature of the present local-regional-national system, and to providing a mechanism whereby transplant patients throughout the country have an equal opportunity to receive a heart, regardless of where they are to receive their transplant. The alternative proposed by this paper would provide such equal opportunity and would make medical, rather than geographic, criteria the primary force behind organ allocation. Although this proposal is designed specifically for hearts, the general principle applies equally to all other transplantable organs and should be considered for those organs as well.

FOOTNOTES

[1] The National Organ Transplant Act requires "equitable distribution of organs." 42 U.S.C. §273(b)(1)(E) (1991), *see also* 42 U.S.C. §273(b)(3)(E) (an organ procurement organization shall have "a system to allocate donated organs equitably among transplant patients according to established medical criteria").

[2] Waiting time is currently calculated from the time a patient first registers with the UNOS national list, regardless of the patient's initial Status or any subsequent change in Status. UNOS has recently offered for public comment a policy that would credit only time spent in Status I as waiting time for Status I patients.

[3] Some patients, such as those in the VA hospital system, are not given a choice, but instead are required to relocate to one of a few VA regional transplant centers. *SEE VHA Directive 10-93-028*, Attachment C, March 11, 1993. The VA's intentional concentration of national patients in a few OPOs exacerbates the supply/demand imbalance that results from the individual movements of private patients.

[4] Quality of life is used here in a strictly medical sense: freedom from pain, improved physical ability to go about daily activities without tiring rapidly, etc. No judgment is made regarding the use to which patients will ultimately put their improved health.

For medical utility purpose, freedom from pain and improved physical ability count equally for either prince or pauper.

[5]Some doctors have occasionally suggested that transplanting healthier patients will improve overall success rates. While such claims certainly warrant consideration, current policy declares urgency of need be the primary medical criterion for sorting patients. At this time there seems to be insufficient data to challenge that criterion, and the Eastern Virginia Hospitals will accept the medical standard of urgency when proposing an alternative model.

[6]One measure of the consequences of the supply and demand imbalance is the ratio of patients who die while waiting for a transplant to patients who actually receive a transplant. The higher the ratio the greater the imbalance between supply and demand, and the greater the percentage of transplant candidates who are dying due to lack of available organs. For example, in 1992, then national ratio of deaths-while-waiting to transplants for hearts was 0.35:1, while this statistic was 1:1 for the VA transplant center in Richmond, Virginia and 0.72:1 for the Eastern Virginia hospitals. Patients seeking transplants in the OPO covering central and eastern Virginia are thus significantly worse off than the average patient throughout the country.

[7]A larger waiting list is more diverse, and therefore more likely to contain a compatible recipient for any given heart. These improved odds resulting from OPO consolidation hold true even though the ratio of the hearts procured to patients waiting remains constant.

[8]The temporal boundaries of the subcategories are subject to change based upon the eventual size of the groupings and the size of the standard deviations from average waiting time. After this model has operated for a while, standard deviations from average waiting time would decrease as patient waiting time became more uniform. Ideally, each sub-category would include only patients whose waiting times differed by a week or less.

[9]Certain patients who are otherwise medically eligible for an organ may not make it onto the waiting list if they are too far from the donor organ to make it medically reasonable to transport the organ. Hearts can remain outside of the body only for approximately four hours, making long-distance transportation difficult or impossible. Even when it is possible to transport a heart over relatively long distances, transplant surgeons may prefer to wait for a closer heart in order to minimize the time the heart spends outside the body. In any event, the proposed model leaves the individualized medical balancing of an increased donor pool versus a potentially "fresher" heart up to the transplant team and its patient.

[10]One initial step the Federal Government could take to reduce the inequities of the current allocation system would be to forbid its agencies such as the VA from transferring people from their home OPO to a different OPO when there is an available transplant center in the home OPO. By preventing the active concentration of patients in a few chosen OPOs, the government would eliminate a factor contributing significantly to the current imbalance in local supply and demand. Such a move would have the added benefit of helping veterans who are awaiting transplant. More often than not, the VA takes a veteran out of an OPO with reasonably adequate supplies of organs, and transfers the patient to an OPO facing a critical undersupply of organs. This severely damages that veteran's chances of receiving a transplant before dying.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 618, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 422) to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to ensure the efficient and fair operation of the government securities market, in order to protect investors and facilitate government borrowing at the lowest possible cost to taxpayers, and to prevent false and misleading statements in connection with offerings of government securities, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 422

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Government Securities Act Amendments of 1993".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) the liquid and efficient operation of the government securities market is essential to facilitate government borrowing at the lowest possible cost to taxpayers;

(2) the fair and honest treatment of investors will strengthen the integrity and liquidity of the government securities market;

(3) rules promulgated by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to the Government Securities Act of 1986 have worked well to protect investors from unregulated dealers and maintain the efficiency of the government securities market; and

(4) extending the authority of the Secretary and providing new authority will ensure the continued strength of the government securities market.

SEC. 3. EXTENSION OF TREASURY RULEMAKING AUTHORITY.

Section 15C of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 780–5) is amended by striking subsection (g).

SEC. 4. SALES PRACTICE RULEMAKING AUTHORITY.

(A) RULES FOR FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.—Section 15C(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 780–5(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (3), (4), (5), and (6) as paragraphs (4), (5), (6), and (7), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

"(3)(A) With respect to any financial institution that has filed notice as a government securities broker or government securities dealer or that is required to file notice under subsection (a)(1)(B), the appropriate regulatory agency for such government securities broker or government securities dealer may issue such rules and regulations with respect to transactions in government securities as may be necessary to prevent fraudulent and manipulative acts and practices and to promote just and equitable principles of trade, if the Secretary has not determined that the rule or regulation, if implemented would, or as applied does—

"(i) adversely affect the liquidity or efficiency of the market for government securities; or

"(ii) impose any burden on competition not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of this section.

"(B) The appropriate regulatory agency shall consult with and consider the views of the Secretary prior to approving or amending a rule or regulation under this paragraph, except where the appropriate regulatory agency determines that an emergency exists requiring expeditious and summary action and publishes its reasons therefor. If the Secretary comments in writing to the appropriate regulatory agency on a proposed rule or regulation that has been published for comment, the appropriate regulatory agency shall respond in writing to such written comment before approving the proposed rule or regulation.

"(C) In promulgating rules under this section, the appropriate regulatory agency shall consider the sufficiency and appropriateness of then existing laws and rules applicable to government securities brokers, government securities dealers, and persons associated with government securities brokers and government securities dealers.".

(b) RULES BY REGISTERED SECURITIES ASSOCIATIONS.—Section 15A(f)(2) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o–3(f)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking "and" at the end of subparagraph (E); and

(2) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (F) and inserting ", and (G) with respect to transactions in government securities, to prevent fraudulent and manipulative acts and practices and to promote just and equitable principles of trade.".

(c) OVERSIGHT OF REGISTERED SECURITIES ASSOCIATIONS.—Section 19 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78s) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

"(5) The Commission shall consult with and consider the views of the Secretary of the Treasury prior to approving a proposed rule filed by a registered securities association pursuant to section 15A(f)(2)(G), except where the Commission determines that an emergency exists requiring expeditious or summary action and publishes its reasons therefor. If the Secretary of the Treasury comments in writing to the Commission on a proposed rule that has been published for comment, the Commission shall respond in writing to such written comment before approving the proposed rule. The Commission may approve a rule under this paragraph if the Secretary of the Treasury has not determined that the rule, if implemented, would, or as applied does—

"(A) adversely affect the liquidity or efficiency of the market for government securities; or

"(B) impose any burden on competition not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of this section.

"(6) In approving rules filed by a registered securities association pursuant to section 15A(f)(2)(G), the Commission shall consider the sufficiency and appropriateness of then existing laws and rules applicable to government securities brokers, government securities dealers, and persons associated with government securities brokers and government securities dealers."; and

(2) in subsection (c), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(5) With respect to rules adopted pursuant to section 15A(f)(2)(G), the Commission shall consult with and consider the views of the Secretary of the Treasury before abrogating, adding to, and deleting from such rules, except where the Commission determines that an emergency exists requiring expeditious or summary action and publishes its reasons therefor.".

SEC. 5. DISCLOSURE BY GOVERNMENT SECURITIES BROKERS AND GOVERNMENT SECURITIES DEALERS WHOSE ACCOUNTS ARE NOT INSURED BY THE SECURITIES INVESTOR PROTECTION CORPORATION.

Section 15C(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o-5(a)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

"(4) No government securities broker or government securities dealer that is not a member of the Securities Investor Protection Corporation shall effect any transaction in any security in contravention of such rules as the Commission shall prescribe pursuant to this subsection to assure that its customers receive complete, accurate, and timely disclosure of the inapplicability of Securities Investor Protection Corporation coverage to their accounts.".

SEC. 6. TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.

Section 15C(d)(2) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 u.S.C. 78o-5(d)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) Information received by any appropriate regulatory agency or the Secretary from or with respect to any government securities broker or government securities dealer or with respect to any person associated with a government securities broker or a government securities dealer may be made available by the Secretary or the recipient agency to the Commission, the Secretary, any appropriate regulatory agency, any self-regulatory organization, or any Federal Reserve bank.".

SEC. 7. AMENDMENTS TO DEFINITIONS.

Section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (34)(G), by amending clauses (ii), (iii), and (iv) to read as follows:

"(ii) the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, in the case of a State member bank of the Federal Reserve System, a foreign bank, and uninsured State branch or State agency of a foreign bank, a commercial lending company owned or controlled by a foreign bank (as such terms are used in the International Banking Act of 1978), or a corporation organized or having an agreement with the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System pursuant to section 25 or section 25(a) of the Federal Reserve Act;

"(iii) the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, in the case of a bank insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (other than a member of the Federal Reserve System or a Federal savings bank) or an insured State branch of a foreign bank (as such terms are used in the International Banking Act of 1978);

"(iv) the Director of the Office of Thrift Supervision, in the case of a savings association (as defined in section 3(b) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act) the deposits of which are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation;"; and

(2) by amending paragraph (46) to read as follows:

"(46) The term 'financial institution' means—

"(A) a bank (as defined in paragraph (6));

"(B) a foreign bank (as such term is used in the International Banking Act of 1978); and

"(C) a savings association (as defined in section 3(b) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act) the deposits of which are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.".

SEC. 8. STUDY RELATING TO GOVERNMENT SECURITIES INFORMATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury, the Securities and Exchange Commission, and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of private sector efforts to disseminate government securities price and volume information, and determine whether such efforts—

(1) assure the prompt, accurate, reliable, and fair reporting, collection, processing, distribution, and publication of information with respect to quotations and transactions in government securities and the fairness and usefulness of the form and content of such information;

(2) assure that all government securities information processors may, for purposes of distribution and publication, obtain on fair and reasonable terms such information with respect to quotations for and transactions in government securities as is reported, collected, processed, or prepared for distribution or publication by any processor of such information (including self-regulatory organizations) acting in an exclusive capacity; and

(3) assure that all government securities brokers, government securities dealers, government securities information processors, and other appropriate persons may obtain on terms which are not unreasonably discriminatory such information with respect to quotations for and transactions in government securities as is published or distributed.

(b) REPORT.—A report describing any findings made under this section and any recommendations for legislation shall be submitted to Congress not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 9. OFFERINGS OF GOVERNMENT SECURITIES.

Section 15(c) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(7) In connection with any bid for or purchase of government security related to an offering of government securities by or on behalf of an issuer, no government securities broker, government securities dealer, or bidder for or purchaser of securities in such offering shall knowingly or willfully make any false or misleading written statement or omit any fact necessary to make any written statement made not misleading.".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MARKEY

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MARKEY moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill, S. 422, and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 681, as passed by the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title of the Senate bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to extend and revise rulemaking authority with respect to Government securities under the Federal securities laws, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 618) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and indicate therein extraneous material, on S. 422, the Senate bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

ORGAN AND BONE MARROW TRANSPLANTATION AMENDMENTS OF 1993

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2659) to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend programs relating to the transplantation of organs and of bone marrow, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2659

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Organ and Bone Marrow Transplantation Amendments of 1993".

SEC. 2. ORGAN PROCUREMENT ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 371(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 273(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraphs (2) and (3); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following paragraph:

"(2)(A) The Secretary may make grants to, and enter into contracts with, qualified organ procurement organizations described in subsection (b) and other public or nonprofit private entities for the purpose of—

"(i) planning and conducting programs to provide information and education to the public on the need for organ donations; and

"(ii) training individuals in requesting such donations.

"(B) In making awards of grants and contracts under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall give priority to carrying out the purpose described in such subparagraph with respect to minority populations.".

(b) REQUIREMENTS REGARDING QUALIFIED ORGAN PROCUREMENT ORGANIZATIONS.—Section 371(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 273(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking "organization for which grants may be made under subsection (a) is" and inserting "organization described in this subsection is"; and

(ii) by striking "paragraph (2)" and inserting "paragraph (3)";

(B) in subparagraph (E), by moving the subparagraph 2 ems to the left; and

(C) in subparagraph (G)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking "has a board of directors or an advisory board which" and inserting the following: "has a board of directors (or an advisory board, in the case of a hospital-based organization) which"; and

(ii) in clause (i)(II), by striking "members" and all that follows and inserting the following: "individuals who have received a transplant of an organ, individuals who are part of the family of an individual who has donated an organ,

and individuals who have been medically referred to receive a transplant of an organ (or individuals who are part of the family of individuals who have been so referred), which individuals shall in the aggregate constitute not less than ⅓ of the membership of the board and which members shall, to the extent practicable, be residents of the service area involved,"; and

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by amending the subparagraph to read as follows:

"(A)(i) With respect to each hospital or other entity in its service area that has facilities for organ donations, the organization shall have an effective agreement with the entity under which the entity identifies potential organ donors and notifies the organization, subject to clause (ii).

"(ii) The Secretary may waive the requirement of clause (i) to the extent determined by the Secretary to be necessary to promote organ donation and the equitable allocation of organs.";

(B)(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking "shall—" and inserting "shall comply with the following:";

(ii) in each of subparagraphs (B) through (K), by inserting "The organization shall" before the first word of the subparagraph;

(iii) in each of subparagraphs (B) through (I), by striking the comma at the end and inserting a period; and

(iv) in subparagraph (J), by striking ", and" and inserting a period;

(C) in subparagraph (E)—

(i) by inserting "(i)" after the subparagraph designation; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following clauses:

"(ii) The organization shall, subject to clause (iii), ensure that the system under clause (i) allocates each type of organ on the basis of a single list, maintained exclusively by the organization, of individuals who have been medically referred to a transplant center in the service area of the organization in order to receive a transplant of the type of organ with respect to which the list is maintained, and who are citizens or permanent resident aliens of the United States.

"(iii) Upon the request of the organization, the Secretary may, with respect to the service area of the organization, waive the requirement of clause (ii) regarding a single list if the Secretary determines that the waiver is necessary to ensure the equitable allocation of organs of the type involved and maximize the opportunities for successful outcomes of transplants of such organs."; and

(D) in subparagraph (H), by striking "participate" and all that follows through "372" and inserting the following: "be a member of, and abide by the rules and requirements of, the Organ Procurement and Transplantation Network established under section 372".

SEC. 3. ORGAN PROCUREMENT AND TRANSPLANTATION NETWORK.

Section 372(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 274(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking "and" after the comma at the end; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following subparagraphs:

"(B) have a board of directors composed of not more than 32 members, whose membership includes—

"(i) representatives of organ procurement organizations, transplant centers, and voluntary health associations; and

"(ii) individuals who have received a transplant of an organ, individuals who are part of the family of an individual who has donated an organ, and individuals who have been medically referred to receive a transplant of an organ (or individuals who are part of the family of individuals who have been so referred), which individuals shall in the aggregate constitute not less than ⅓ of the membership of the board; and

"(C) establish, through such board of directors, an executive committee and other committees, the chairs of which shall be selected to ensure continuity of leadership for the board."; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking "shall—" in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) and all that follows through the end of clause (i) of such subparagraph and inserting the following: "shall—

"(A) establish (in one location or through regional centers)—

"(i) with respect to each type of organ—

"(I) a national list of individuals who have been medically referred to receive a transplant of the type of organ with respect to which the list is maintained and who are citizens or permanent resident aliens of the United States (which list shall include the names of all individuals included on lists in effect under section 371(b)(3)(E)), and

"(II) a national list of individuals who have been so referred and who are in the United States but are not such citizens or such aliens, and"; and

(B)(i) in subparagraph (J), by striking "and" after the comma at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (K), by striking the period at the end and inserting a comma;

(iii) in subparagraph (L), by striking the period at the end and inserting a comma; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following subparagraphs:

"(M) establish the condition that, with respect to the type of organ involved, the list under subclause (II) of subparagraph (A)(i) may be considered in allocating an organ only if no individual on the list under subclause (I) of such subparagraph is a medically appropriate recipient for the organ,

"(N) submit to the Secretary for review and approval any change in the amount of fees imposed by the Network for the registration of individuals on the lists maintained under subparagraph (A)(i) (which change is deemed to be approved if the Secretary does not provide otherwise before the expiration of the 30-day period beginning on the date on which the change is submitted to the Secretary),

"(O) make available to the Secretary such information, books, and records regarding the Network as the Secretary may require, and

"(P) meet such criteria regarding compliance with this part as the Secretary may establish.".

SEC. 4. NATIONAL BONE MARROW DONOR REGISTRY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) TRANSFER OF PROGRAM.—Section 379(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 274k(a)) is amended in the first sentence by inserting after "Secretary" the following: ", acting through the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration,".

(2) TRANSITIONAL AND SAVINGS PROVISIONS.—

(A) With respect to amounts made available under appropriations Acts for the purpose of carrying out the program transferred pursuant to paragraph (1) from the National Institutes of Health, the transfer of the program may not be construed as affecting the availability of such amounts for such purpose.

(B) The Secretary shall ensure that, for fiscal 1994, the number of employees of the Department of Health and Human Services who are engaged in carrying out the program transferred by paragraph (1) is not less than the number of employees who were so engaged on June 28, 1993.

(b) PATIENT ADVOCACY; RECRUITMENT OF DONORS.—Section 379 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 274k) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking "establish" and all that follows and inserting the following: "establish a program for patient advocacy in accordance with subsection (j);"; and

(B) in paragraph (5), by striking "recruit" and all that follows and inserting the following: "establish a program for the recruitment of bone marrow donors in accordance with subsection (k);";

(2) by striking subsection (j); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (i) the following subsections:

"(j) PATIENT ADVOCACY.—For purposes of subsection (b)(2), a program for patient advocacy is established in accordance with this subsection if—

"(1) the program is headed by a director;

"(2) with respect to the procurement of bone marrow, the program provides that the Director is to serve as an advocate on behalf of—

"(A) individuals who are registered with the Registry to become a recipient of a transplant from a biologically unrelated donor;

"(B) the families of such individuals; and

"(C) the physicians involved;

"(3) the program provides case management services for such individuals, families, and physicians; and

"(4) the program meets such other criteria as the Secretary may establish.

"(k) RECRUITMENT OF DONORS.—For purposes of subsection (b)(5), a program for the recruitment of bone marrow donors is established in accordance with this subsection if—

"(1) in recruiting an individual to enroll in the Registry, and in each subsequent stage of the process of recruitment, the program provides to the individual information regarding the possibility that, if it is determined that it is medically inappropriate for the individual to be a donor for the patient involved, a sibling of the individual may nevertheless be a medically appropriate donor for the patient;

"(2) in the case of an individual who is enrolled with the Registry, the program provides for annual (or more frequent) informational mailings to each such individual, which mailings concern the status of the activities of the Registry;

"(3) the program provides for the training of counselors to meet individually with individuals who are so enrolled and who, pursuant to the Registry, have been requested to undergo confirmatory testing pursuant to a search for bone marrow for a particular patient;

"(4) in the case of an individual described in paragraph (3), the program provides to the individual a general description of the medical condition of the patient involved and an assessment of the possibility that the individual is a medically appropriate donor for the patient; and

"(5) the program meets such other criteria as the Secretary may establish.".

SEC. 5. STUDY BY GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 379A(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 274l(a)) is amended by striking "conduct" in the matter preceding paragraph (1) and all that follows and inserting the following: "conduct a study for the purpose of—

"(1) assessing the extent to which the program carried out under section 379 maintains the confidentiality of the identity of individuals who are enrolled with the Registry;

"(2) assessing the extent to which such individuals cooperate with the Registry when the Registry requests the individuals to undergo supplemental testing regarding the donation of bone marrow;

"(3) assessing, in the case of such individuals who have been determined to be medically appropriate donors of bone marrow for the patients involved, the extent to which such individuals are willing to make a donation of bone marrow;

"(4) assessing the extent to which activities carried out pursuant to section 379(k) provide information to the individuals involved that is sufficient for the individuals to make informed decisions regarding the donation of bone marrow;

"(5) assessing the extent to which the case management services provided under section 379(j)(3) are effective in assisting patients in receiving the transplants involved;

"(6) developing recommendations on improving the program of the Registry, including proposals to increase the number of transplants with successful outcomes while maintaining the confidentiality of the identity of the individuals authorizing the donations of bone marrow;

"(7) assessing the extent to which efforts to recruit minority individuals to enroll in the Registry have been successful;

"(8) assessing, in the case of minority individuals who have been medically referred to receive a transplant of bone marrow, the measures that should be implemented to ensure that the Registry provides for such individuals a probability of locating a biologically unrelated, medically appropriate donor that is reasonably equivalent to the probability that exists with respect to Caucasian individuals who have been so referred; and

"(9) assessing the extent to which the fees imposed by transplant centers with respect to the search for a donor of bone marrow, when considered in light of the fees imposed by the Registry, constitute a significant obstacle to individuals in obtaining a transplant of bone marrow.".

(b) DATE CERTAIN FOR SUBMISSION OF REPORT.—Section 379A(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 274l(b)) is amended by striking "1 year" and all that follows through "this part" and inserting the following: "2 years after the date of the enactment of the Organ and Bone Marrow Transplantation Amendments of 1993".

SEC. 6. TRANSFER OF PROGRAMS; MISCELLANEOUS CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 201 et seq.), as amended by the preceding provisions of this Act, is amended—

(1) by striking title XVIII;

(2)(A) by transferring sections 371 through 377 from the current placement of such sections;

(B) by redesignating such sections as sections 1801 through 1807, respectively;

(C) by inserting such sections, in the appropriate sequence, after title XVII; and

(D) by inserting before section 1801 (as so redesignated) the following:

"TITLE XVIII—TRANSPLANTATION OF ORGANS AND OF BONE MARROW

"PART A—ORGAN TRANSPLANTATION";

(3)(A) by striking section 378;

(B) by transferring sections 379 and 379A from the current placement of such sections;

(C) by redesignating such sections as sections 1811 and 1813, respectively;

(D) by inserting such sections, in the appropriate sequence, at the end of title XVIII (as so designated); and

(E) by inserting before section 1811 (as so redesignated) the following:

"PART B—NATIONAL BONE MARROW DONOR REGISTRY";

and

(4) in title III (as amended by section 2008(i)(2)(B) of Public Law 103-43)—

(A) by striking the part designations and headings for each of parts H and I; and

(B) by redesignating parts J through N as parts H through L, respectively.

(b) CROSS-REFERENCES; OTHER CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Title XVIII of the Public Health Service Act, as added by subsection (a) of this section, is amended—

(1) in section 1801(b)(3)—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by striking "section 372(b)(2)(E)" and inserting "section 1802(b)(2)(E)"; and

(B) in subparagraph (H), by striking "section 372" and inserting "section 1802";

(2) in section 1802(b)(2)(A)(i)(I), by striking "section 371(b)(3)(E)" and inserting "section 1801(b)(3)(E)";

(3) in section 1803, by striking "section 376" and inserting "section 1806";

(4) in section 1804—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking "section 372 or 373" and inserting "section 1802 or 1803";

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking "section 371(a)(1)" and inserting "section 1801(a)(1)";

(ii) by striking paragraph (2);

(iii) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2); and

(iv) in paragraph (2) (as so redesignated), by striking "section 371(a)(3)" and inserting "section 1801(a)(2)";

(C) in subsection (c), by striking "section 371 or 373" each place such term appears and inserting "section 1801 or 1803"; and

(D) in subsection (d)—

(i) in paragraph (2), by striking "section 373" and inserting "section 1803"; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following paragraph:

"(3) The term 'citizens or permanent resident aliens of the United States' means individuals who are citizens or nationals of the United States, or who are aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence in the United States (or otherwise permanently residing in the United States under color of law).";

(5) in section 1807, by striking "SEC." and all that follows through "The Comptroller General" in subsection (a) and inserting the following:

"STUDY BY GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

"SEC. 1807. (a) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General";

(6) in section 1805(3), by striking "section 372" and inserting "section 1802";

(7) in section 1811, by striking "**SEC.**" and all that follows through "The Secretary" in the first sentence in subsection (a) and inserting the following:

"NATIONAL REGISTRY

"SEC. 1811. (a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary"; and

(8) in section 1813—

(A) by striking "**SEC.**" and all that follows through "The Comptroller General" in subsection (a) and inserting the following:

"STUDY BY GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

"SEC. 1813. (a) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General"; and

(B) in subsection (a)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking "section 379" and inserting "section 1811";

(ii) in paragraph (4), by striking "section 379(k)" and inserting "section 1811(k)"; and

(iii) in paragraph (5), by striking "section 379(j)(3)" and inserting "section 1811(j)(3)".

SEC. 7. INFORMATION, EDUCATION, AND TRAINING REGARDING TRANSPLANTATION OF BONE MARROW.

Part B of title XVIII of the Public Health Service Act, as added by section 6(a) of this Act, is amended by inserting after section 1811 the following section:

"INFORMATION, EDUCATION, AND TRAINING

"SEC. 1812. (a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may make grants to, and enter into contracts with, public or nonprofit private entities for the purpose of—

"(1) planning and conducting programs to provide information and education to the public on the need for donations of bone marrow; and

"(2) training individuals in requesting such donations.

"(b) PRIORITIES IN MAKING GRANTS.—In making awards of grants and contracts under subsection (a), the Secretary shall give priority to carrying out the purpose described in such subsection with respect to minority populations.".

SEC. 8. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR NEW TITLE XVIII.

Title XVIII of the Public Health Service Act, as added by section 6(a) of this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following part:

"PART C—GENERAL PROVISIONS

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 1821. For the purpose of carrying out this title (other than section 1801(a)(1)), there are authorized to be appropriated $20,000,000 for fiscal year 1994, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1995 and 1996.".

SEC. 9. STUDY REGARDING SYSTEM FOR ALLOCATION OF ORGANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services (in this section referred to as the "Secretary") shall conduct a study for the purpose of determining the feasibility, fairness, and enforceability of allocating organs in the United States based solely upon the clinical need of the patient involved and the viability of the organ involved, with no consideration given to the geographic area in which the transplant is to be performed or the geographic area in which the donation of the organ is made.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, and to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources of the Senate, a report describing the findings made in the study required in subsection (a) and the actions taken by the Secretary to implement changes consistent with the findings.

SEC. 10. ISSUANCE OF REGULATIONS.

(a) ORGAN PROCUREMENT AND TRANSPLANTATION NETWORK.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) Not later than the expiration of the 90-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services (in this section referred to as the "Secretary") shall issue a proposed rule to establish regulations for criteria under part A of title XVIII of the Public Health Service Act (as added by section 6(a) of this Act).

(B) Not later than the expiration of the 1-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue a final rule to establish the regulations described in subparagraph (A).

(2) CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN BYLAWS AND POLICIES.—In developing regulations under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall consider the bylaws and policies of the United Network for Organ Sharing (established by contract under section 1802 of the Public Health Service Act, as redesignated by section 6(a) of this Act), as contained in the document entitled "Bylaws and Policies of the United Network for Organ Sharing".

(3) FAILURE TO ISSUE REGULATIONS BY DATE CERTAIN.—If the Secretary fails to issue a final rule under subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1) before the expiration of the period specified in such subparagraph—

(A) the proposed rule issued under subparagraph (A) of such paragraph is upon such expiration deemed to be the final rule under subparagraph (B) of such paragraph (and shall remain in effect until the Secretary issues a final rule under such subparagraph); or

(B) if no such proposed rule is issued before such expiration, the bylaws and policies specified in paragraph (2) and in effect upon such expiration are deemed to be the final rule under

paragraph (1)(B) (and shall remain in effect until the Secretary issues a final rule under such paragraph).

(b) NATIONAL BONE MARROW DONOR REGISTRY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) Not later than the expiration of the 90-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue a proposed rule to establish regulations for standards, criteria, and procedures under part B of title XVIII of the Public Health Service Act (as added by section 6(a) of this Act).

(B) Not later than the expiration of the 1-year period beginning the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue a final rule to establish the regulations described in subparagraph (A).

(2) CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN BYLAWS AND POLICIES.—In developing regulations under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall consider the bylaws and policies of the entity that operates the National Bone Marrow Donor Registry pursuant to a contract under section 1811 of the Public Health Service Act (as redesignated by section 6(a) of this Act).

(3) FAILURE TO ISSUE REGULATIONS BY DATE CERTAIN.—If the Secretary fails to issue a final rule under subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1) before the expiration of the period specified in such subparagraph—

(A) the proposed rule issued under subparagraph (A) of such paragraph is upon such expiration deemed to be the final rule under subparagraph (B) of such paragraph (and shall remain in effect until the Secretary issues a final rule under such subparagraph); or

(B) if no such proposed rule is issued before such expiration, the bylaws and policies specified in paragraph (2) and in effect upon such expiration are deemed to be the final rule under paragraph (1)(B) (and shall remain in effect until the Secretary issues a final rule under such paragraph).

SEC. 11. EFFECTIVE DATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The amendments described in this Act are made upon the date of the enactment of this Act. Except as provided in subsection (b), such amendments take effect October 1, 1993, or upon the date of the enactment of this Act, whichever occurs later.

(b) QUALIFIED ORGAN PROCUREMENT ORGANIZATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by section 2 take effect January 1, 1994. Before such date, section 371 of the Public Health Service Act, as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, continues to be in effect.

(2) ADDITIONAL PROVISION.—The amendment made by section 2(b)(2)(A) (relating to effective agreements with entities with facilities for organ donations) takes effect upon the expiration of the 180-day period beginning on the date on which a final rule takes effect under section 10(a). Before such amendment takes effect under the preceding sentence, section 371(b)(3)(A) of the Public Health Service Act, as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, continues to be in effect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WAXMAN. 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 H.R. 2659, the bill now being considered.

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

There was no objection.

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

The principal purpose of H.R. 2659 is to extend for 3 fiscal years the authorization of appropriations for the National Organ Transplant Act. That act provides statutory authority for the national procedures governing organ procurement, allocation and transplantation. Passage of this legislation is necessary to assure continuation of the national systems that facilitate the procurement and distribution of solid organs and bone marrow for transplantation. Authorized for fiscal year 1994 is $20 million.

Mr. Speaker, passage of the National Organ Transplant Act was a response to miraculous advances in medical technology. With the development of breakthrough immunosuppressive drugs, the life saving effectiveness of transplantation for patients with fatal heart, lung and liver disease dramatically improved. Kidney transplants also became more successful as new drugs improved the quality of life for thousands of patients with chronic kidney disease.

The National Organ Transplant Act provides the framework for a sound and equitable national policy on organ transplantation. Unfortunately, in recent years the gap between available donors and patients needing transplants has widened. Scientific and surgical advances have expanded the number of diseases that can be treated with transplantation. Today, almost 30,000 Americans are waiting for an organ transplant. Many will die because of the shortage of solid organs and bone marrow.

Tragically, efforts to encourage organ donation have not kept pace with demand. The number of organ donors has remained essentially flat. As the gap has widened, concerns over the equity and effectiveness of transplantation policies have increased.

A major goal of this reauthorization is to develop more successful means of promoting organ donation and reduce the gap between transplant patients and the supply of organs. To do this effectively, the legislation addresses public concerns about the fairness of the allocation process by which scarce, lifesaving organs are made available to patients in need.

For example, the legislation endorses a recommendation of the General Accounting Office and requires that most, if not all organ procurement organizations end the practice of maintaining separate, transplant center specific, patient waiting lists. The legislation also places restrictions on the transplantation of foreign nationals when U.S. citizens are waiting for a transplant. U.S. citizens and permanent residents will be given priority in the allocation process. The bill also requires the Secretary to consider a proposal that organs be allocated on the basis of patient need and organ viability rather than the geographic location in which the organ is procured.

Mr. Speaker, to expand the availability of organs for donation, the public must be confident that the system for allocating organs is fair and equitable. It is also critical that the needs of patients take precedence over the needs of individual transplant centers. These two principles are embodied in the reauthorization.

The legislation also includes a number of necessary reforms to the system for recruiting bone marrow donors and facilitating transplants. The legislation requires that patients be afforded access to case management services and that potential donors are provided more complete information about the donation process. In addition, the bill provides high priority for additional donor recruitment activities, particularly among minority communities. These initiatives will go far to increase the number of bone marrow transplants that are performed each year.

Finally, the legislation requires that the Secretary of Health and Human Services issue regulations to provide a legal foundation for the policies and procedures that control the solid organ and bone marrow procurement and transplantation systems. The Department's inability to issue final regulations has reflected an institutional abdication of responsibility to assure that donation and transplantation policies are effective, fair, and enforceable. Under the legislation the Secretary is directed to issue proposed regulations within 90 days and to finalize those regulations within 1 year.

I want to acknowledge the invaluable assistance of the full committee chairman, Mr. DINGELL, and the subcommittee's ranking minority member, Mr. BLILEY. Each was instrumental in the drafting of the bill and was personally committed to strengthening the Nation's organ transplantation system.

Mr. Speaker, passage of this reauthorization will help give renewed hope to the thousands of patients for whom organ and bone marrow donation is truly the gift of life.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am a strong supporter of both the National Organ Transplant Program and the National Bone Marrow Donor Program. To date, the Bone Marrow Program has facilitated 1,766

unrelated transplants. In 1992, 16,475 individuals received solid organ transplants as a result of the Organ Transplant Program. Twenty years ago such progress in the science of transplantation and in the quality of life of transplant patients would have been unthinkable.

However, it is clear that the pace of science has exceeded the awareness of the American people about the importance of organ donation, and particularly bone marrow donation. To date, there are more than 30,000 potential transplant patients waiting for solid organs and currently, the chances of finding a matched bone marrow donor and having a transplant are about 40 percent for nonminorities and 15 percent for African-Americans. It is essential that we make every effort to increase the number of donors.

I am a very strong supporter of the Bone Marrow Program. We should remember that this program has proven to be a great success because of the principles of volunteerism and altruism. I was very concerned about some provisions in the bill reported out of subcommittee that I felt could have led potential donors to feel inappropriately pressured into continuing their participation in the program. I am pleased that the full committee adopted the en bloc amendments I worked out with the chairman of the Health Subcommittee to address these concerns.

I also had some serious concerns about a number of changes the bill made to the Solid Organ Program which I felt could interfere with the practical operations of the program including the requirements for the single OPO wide organ list, the single OPO designation for hospitals, the board structure and the ability of the organ procurement and transplantation network to provide services to their members. Again, the en block amendment adopted by the full committee does address these concerns. While many of these changes do not go as far as I would have liked, they definitely improve the bill.

I would also like to express my appreciation to the chairman in not rushing to the floor with this bill. The compromise amendment was agreed to at the last minute and I wanted to ensure that both Members and the transplant community had sufficient time to review the legislation. This has permitted us to bring to the floor a bipartisan, noncontroversial bill.

□ 1340

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

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, we have no requests for time at the moment, but I will continue to reserve my time.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. MOORHEAD], the ranking minority member of the full Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2659. Organ and bone marrow transplants have become one of the many medical miracles of this century. Since the original Organ Transplant Act was enacted in 1984, we have seen even more advances due to the development of breakthrough drugs and the growing effectiveness of transplants for patients afflicted with fatal heart, lung, and liver diseases.

This bill provides a simple renewal of existing authorities for both the Solid Organ Program and the National Bone Marrow Transplantation Program. The bill also requires that the Secretary issue regulations establishing enforceable procedures for the procurement, allocation, and transplantation of solid organs and bone marrow. In addition, the bill requires that each hospital may only have an agreement with one organ procurement organization. This provision was of particular concern to me because it could have unnecessarily disrupted longstanding relationships that have proven highly beneficial to transplant patients. I am pleased that a waiver provision was included in the bill. The Secretary is authorized to grant waivers if she determines that the waiver is necessary to promote organ donation and to ensure the equitable allocation of organs.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today in support of H.R. 2657, the Organ and Bone Marrow Transplantation Amendments, and I would like to commend the chairman of the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment, the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN], and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY], for their support of this measure.

H.R. 2659 reauthorizes the National Organ Transplant Act through fiscal year 1996. Additionally, this measure also improves the act by expanding the National Marrow Donor Program to enhance minority-donor recruitment, and establishes a system of advocacy for bone marrow transplant patients.

Some of my colleagues may know, I have a constituent who is in desperate need of a bone marrow transplant. Jay Feinberg is a 25-year-old, who has been desperately searching for a compatible bone marrow donor since 1991.

Jay was diagnosed with chronic myelogenous leukemia in June 1991. The only potential cure for this dreadful disease is a bone marrow transplant and without such a transplant, Jay will die because chemotherapy does not alter the natural cause of this disease.

Mr. Speaker, an estimated 82,600 American children and adults are stricken each year with leukemia, aplastic anemia or other fatal blood diseases. For many, the only hope for survival is a bone marrow transplant. Nearly 70 percent cannot find a suitable transplant match within their own families. These patients need to find unrelated donors—people who have offered to give the living gift of life to a specific patient in need. As the pool of potential marrow donors increases, so do the odds of a match for the thousands of patients in need. The chance that a patient will find a matching, unrelated donor in the general population is somewhere between one in a hundred and one in a million.

Jay has continued to run blood drives and his family has tested over 35,000 people. Although a donor has not yet been found for Jay, his family continues to find donors for others.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to educate their constituents on the importance and ease of becoming a marrow donor and giving the living gift of life.

The requirements to be a marrow donor are relatively simple. To be a marrow donor, you must be between the ages of 18 and 55 and be in good health. All it takes is 10 minutes and two tablespoons of blood to join the National Marrow Donor Program registry. Those interested in becoming donors should call the National Marrow Donor Program at 1-800-654-1247.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 2659, and urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation which enhances the Organ and Bone Marrow Transplant Donor Programs.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN]. I want to thank our staffs, his staff, mine, and the staff of the chairman of the full committee, for working together to smooth the rough edges on this bill and to make a good product that we can all be proud of and support.

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

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY] for his cooperation in this legislation and for the work that our staffs have done to prepare this bill for today as a bill that all of us can join in supporting. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2659, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1350

COUNTRY MUSIC MONTH

Ms. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 102) to designate the months of October 1993 and October 1994 as "County Music Month," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Virginia?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will not object, but I simply would like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 102

Whereas country music derives its roots from the folk songs of our Nation's workers, captures the spirit of our religious hymns, reflects the sorrow and joy of our traditional ballads, and echoes the drive and soulfulness of rhythm and blues;

Whereas country music has played an integral part in our Nation's history, accompanying the growth of our Nation and reflecting the ethnic and cultural diversity of our people;

Whereas country music embodies a spirit of the American people and the deep and genuine feelings individuals experience throughout life;

Whereas the distinctively American refrains of country music have been performed for audiences throughout the world, striking a chord deep within the hearts and souls of fans everywhere; and

Whereas October 1993 and October 1994 mark, respectively, the twenty-ninth and thirtieth annual observances of Country Music Month: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the months of October 1993 and October 1994 are designated as "Country Music Month", and that the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such months with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the Senate joint resolution just considered and passed.

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

There was no objection.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION URGED TO WITHDRAW TROOPS FROM SOMALIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today for a brief period of time to talk about the outrageous situation in Somalia and the need for this body to do something more than the sham resolution we passed last week in terms of our feelings on what action we should take to bring our troops back home.

I would invite our colleagues also who are in their offices to realize that following the 5-minute special orders today, our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] will be doing a 1-hour special order, and he has invited many of us to get involved in this debate so that we can focus attention on the need for America to take action to bring our troops home.

Mr. Speaker, when President Bush first decided we were going to send our troops to Somalia, as a member of the Armed Services Committee I had reservations, reservations about committing so many troops 7,800 miles away to a mission that I was not quite sure was the responsibility of the military. But I supported him because the original mission was to secure the port, secure the airstrips, and secure the feeding centers so that people could be fed and so that the relief planes could get in and out of Somalia. And we did that. I was over in Somalia, in both Mogadishu and Baidoa, in January and February of this year, and I saw the success that our troops had had in accomplishing their missions. In fact, they did it with a great deal of pride and completeness in terms of feeding the people of Somalia.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, as we all know, for the past 8 months there have been no photographs on TV of starving people in Somalia because the American troops did their job. The problem is, Mr. Speaker, that the current administration does not know what the mission of our troops is at the current time. So for the last 8 months, since January of this year, our troops have gotten involved in a whole new operation, from going house to house and arresting people to trying to get involved in the internal conflict and the civil war that is going on inside that country.

That was not the original purpose for which we sent our troops to Somalia, and it has gotten us in a great amount of trouble, and which, as we saw this past weekend, caused 12 of our Americans to be added to the casualty list.

We have spent $2 billion in Somalia. We tell the workers in America that we have no money to extend unemployment benefits, but we spent $2 billion in going over to a country and staying there well beyond the need to stay in terms of accomplishing our objectives. And this administration and its chief spokesman on Somalia operations, Mr. Shinn, has said he could see us keeping troops in Somalia through 1994 and 1995.

It is time, Mr. Speaker, for this body to take some decisive action. We had a CYA sham vote on the defense bill last week which allowed Members to cover their butts and say that we want the President to report back to us in 2 weeks on what our missions are. If we have been there 10 months and do not know what our missions are in Somalia, then 2 weeks is not going to give us those missions. It was a sham vote and just an attempt to allow Members to have some cover.

I stood up here with our colleague, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP], and we called the vote what it was, a sham, and we at that point in time said we should be voting on an amendment to bring our troops home now. We were not given that opportunity because of the rules of this House.

Over this past weekend one of my constituents, Michael Carroll, was injured. He was shot in the shoulder in trying to go in when those two helicopters were down. He lies right now in a hospital in Germany. His parents talked to him yesterday, and let me tell the Members what Michael said to his parents, Mr. Speaker. He said he understood the reason we were there initially, but he cannot understand why the Army is not allowed to do their job right, why, when there were thousands and thousands of troops there, no one attacked them, but now that we have cut all but 4,000 to 5,000 troops, they are under constant attack. He does not understand it as someone we have asked to go to Somalia to protect what he thinks are our national interests.

Mr. Speaker, this President and this administration have got to take decisive action. We have got to get back our hostages, use whatever force is necessary, and commit whatever amount of troops it requires to get them back first of all, and then we have got to bring our troops home immediately, not 6 months from now, not in 1994 or 1995, not in January or December, but immediately, and bring those POW's as well as our troops back home to America.

This job should be handled by the Organization of African Nations or by the United Nations, not by America. We have spent too much of our taxpayers' money, we have committed too many

lives, and we have seen too much blood already shed in a situation that is not in our national interest.

Mr. Speaker, I implore our colleagues to come down and sign a discharge petition to force legislation to the floor for an up-or-down vote on bringing our troops home immediately, getting our hostages back, bringing the troops home, and stopping this craziness that is going on in committing our troops to a country that does not want them in the middle of a civil war which just sees more and more American blood being shed.

Mr. Speaker, I am submitting for inclusion in the RECORD the report of my constituent, Michael Carroll. I wish him well in the hospital, as I do all those families and all those military personnel who have been injured or killed in the line of duty in that country, and I would implore our President to take some leadership as Commander in Chief and bring our troops back home.

MICHAEL CARROLL INJURED IN SOMALIA, OCTOBER 3, 1993

Michael K. Carroll, E-4 was shot in the shoulder on Sunday, October 3, 1993, at 7:10 a.m. in Mogadishu, Somalia. He is a resident of Drexel Hill, PA. and his parents, Michael and Stephanie, live at 853 Gainsboro Road.

Michael Carroll was part of a team that was trying to secure the two crashed helicopters that were down in Mogadishu, and he and his company came under heavy fire. Michael received gunshots to the shoulder and was evacuated to Langstock Military Hospital Base. He is still there as of October 5.

He is part of the 10th Mountain Division, 214th Infantry Battalion, C-Company, out of Fort Drum.

According to his parents the bottom line was that Michael understood the reason why he was there, but he can't understand why the Army is not allowed to do their job right. For example, when there were thousands and thousands of troops there, no one attacked them. Now that the troop levels are very low, they're under constant attack. If they are there, they should be able to do the job right. If not, they should be sent home.

□ 1400

GREATER OVERSIGHT OF HMO'S IS WARRANTED

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. STARK], is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, last month, the House District of Columbia Committee held a hearing on the proposed sale of Group Health Association [GHA] to Humana. It is not the role of Congress to grant approval or disapproval of the sale. But as the President's health proposal will speed the trend toward super HMO's and other large managed care plans, and as the sale impacts over 130,000 GHA members in the Washington area, a hearing was warranted. The focus of the hearing was how we can ensure that the HMO's and other plans in which we enroll are financially sound and will provide us with high quality care.

I thought some important points were made at the hearing, points relevant to the GHA-Humana buyout and to HMO's at large.

First, with the growth of HMO's, regulator must shift from a focus on the problems of overutilization to those of underutilization. Dr. Linda Peeno, who formerly served as medical director of an HMO in Kentucky and who also performed medical reviews for Humana, identified why we must worry about underutilization by HMO's. When she began her work, her job was explained very clearly: "We take in a premium; we use about 10 to 15 to run the business, and we try to keep as much as possible of the rest. Your job is to help us do that."

Doctors and nurses are increasingly employed by insurers as medical reviewers, as was Dr. Peeno, and often paid more than $200,000 a year to do the job. But what we need are doctors in HMO's who are not afraid to stand up for patients. I plan to introduce legislation that would ensure that a physician or nurse is not fired by a health plan for advocating on behalf of their patients.

Second, State regulation of HMO's, at best, focuses on their financial solvency. Few pay attention to quality. The District of Columbia, until the morning of the hearing, lacked any regulatory authority over HMO's as insurers. The District's move to monitor HMO financial solvency is absolutely necessary. In the hearing, it was reported that 178 HMO failures occurred nationally in the 1980 to 1990 period; this is out of a maximum number of HMO's in any 1 year of 633. But while financial solvency must be ensured, consideration to issues of quality must also be heightened.

Third, the Federal Government has a system to respond to complaints about HMO quality. But, the Federal regulatory authority over HMO's is less defined than it should be and the Health Care Financing Administration [HCFA] lags in implementing the authority it has. It is time for HCFA to get on with issuing the necessary regulations. Congress needs to grant additional authority to HCFA to suspend enrollments in HMO's which have recurring quality problems.

Fourth, until governments do a better job ensuring HMO quality, we shouldn't weaken malpractice laws that try to protect abused patients. In her testimony, Dr. Peeno described two cases where patients were clearly hurt, but she identified a more insidious problem: "using my medical expertise for the financial benefit of the organization, often at great harm to patients." This may not be true in every managed care company, but to the extent it exists we must develop means to eliminate it.

But even making all the changes that the September 14 hearing suggested, I worry about the ability of regulators and consumer groups to protect against substandard care in an increasingly price-competitive world. An additional remedy might be found in legislation I recently introduced. This legislation would require Members of Congress to enroll in the least costly health plan serving their place of residence. If the health insurance plan is good enough for a Member of Congress, then I will have greater confidence that it will be good enough for our constituents.

MEXICAN GOVERNMENT REFUSES TO EXTRADITE CITIZENS TO AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss a matter that disturbs me greatly and that would outrage Americans all across this country if they only knew this sad and senseless story.

In the middle of the night just over a year ago, on September 14, 1992, a man broke into a home in southern California, abducted a helpless 4-year-old girl—an innocent child, violently attacked and sexually assaulted her in ways that are not fit to describe in this Chamber, then wrapped her in a blanket and left her for dead, tied to a tree. I know this because I have read the police report and spoken with the little girl's family.

Thank God, Mr. Speaker, this small child survived, and her parents are caring for her the best way they know how, but the dreadful odyssey this family has suffered during the last year is far from over.

Following this heinous crime the only suspect in this case, 29-year-old Serapio Zuniga Rios, fled to his native Mexico. The child's family, however, like any decent family, wanted justice.

Through great personal expense the family located Mr. Rios and began efforts through the extradition treaty between the United States and Mexico to have him returned to the United States and tried in Riverside County, CA, where the crime occurred. I am sure that at the time they believed that authorities would be eager to help. They found otherwise.

You see, Mr. Speaker, the Mexican Government does not extradite its nationals to the United States for crimes

committed on American soil, no matter how gross, willful, or malicious—even though we have an extradition treaty with that country. We have learned that there are hundreds of Mexican nationals accused of committing vicious criminal acts in this country who, with good reason, have absolutely no worry about standing trial here. You pick the crime—it doesn't matter. We can't get them.

Is this because our Government responds likewise in these cases? No, not at all. We routinely send American citizens to Mexico for crimes committed there and will, no doubt, continue to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I along with my colleagues GEORGE BROWN and KEN CALVERT, wrote to President Salinas in July, asking for his help and the cooperation of the Mexican Government in extraditing Mr. Rios. In a letter dated September 22 we received a reply from the Mexican Ambassador. In short, the Mexican Government will not extradite Mr. Rios. I offer a copy of that letter, as well as our earlier correspondence, for inclusion in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, we have reached a critical period in the development of commercial relations between the United States and Mexico. NAFTA would only increase severalfold the traffic of people and goods across the border between our two countries. But how can we enter into such a sweeping agreement as NAFTA without confidence that Mexico will have respect for the enforcement of United States law—at least for crimes committed here on our soil? Personally, I have not yet been convinced that we can.

The legal enforcement of trade agreements cannot and should not be divorced from the mutual enforcement of criminal law. It is a matter of simple human rights for the citizens of the United States.

The debate over NAFTA and the extradition treaty discussions now in progress present a prime opportunity to make real progress in pursuit of justice in the Riverside County, CA, case and, at the same time, achieve badly needed, lasting improvements in extradition policies between Mexico and the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I do not understand and cannot accept the manner in which the Rios case has been handled by Mexican authorities to date. It calls into question the honor and good faith in the broad spectrum of relations between our two countries. More specifically, it is unacceptable for the United States-Mexico extradition treaty to be interpreted as a one-way street in which the United States extradites our nationals to stand trial in Mexico, but the Government of Mexico refuses to reciprocate.

Finally, let me once again strongly urge the Mexican Government to reconsider its decision and extradite Serapio Zuniga Rios to stand trial for the heinous crime he is accused of having committed last year in Riverside County, CA. Our citizens and this small child's family deserve it.

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

Hon. CARLOS SALINAS DE GORTARI,
President, Republic of the United Mexican States, Mexico City, Mexico.

DEAR PRESIDENT SALINAS: In many ways, your government has come to represent a new age in the politics and development of our hemisphere. We also believe that your efforts to broaden and improve relations between our two countries hopefully presages a new era of cooperation and mutual respect that will benefit the peoples of both nations, and we commend your leadership.

In that vein, we wish to bring to your attention a matter of the utmost concern to us, in the hope that your government will help us achieve a resolution satisfactory to all concerned.

In the early morning hours of September 14, 1992, a man broke into a family home in Riverside County, California. That intruder kidnapped a 4-year-old girl and then raped and sodomized her at a nearby work site. After that attack, this little girl was completely enwrapped in a blanket, tied to a tree, and left to die. It was a miracle that she survived this brutal assault.

The prime suspect in this crime is a 29-year-old Mexican national, Serapio Zuniga Rios, who was in the U.S. legally at that time on a green card. He is suspected of having fled across the border into Mexico immediately after the crime occurred. We have knowledge of his current whereabouts inside Mexico.

Pursuant to the terms of the U.S.-Mexico Extradition Treaty now in effect, the U.S. Government last month formally requested the extradition of this suspect for whom a felony warrant has been issued in Riverside County, California.

Our purpose in writing is to request in the strongest terms possible that your government take immediate action to have this suspect placed in custody by the appropriate Mexican law enforcement authorities and extradited forthwith to stand trial in the U.S.

We view this situation as an opportunity for our two countries to work together in an area of concern that has, in the past, been fraught with problems for both of our governments. But as you know, new bilateral discussions on extradition and related matters have begun. Since we recognize problems have arisen under the terms of the existing U.S.-Mexico Extradition Treaty, we strongly urge you to assist us in this pending case, thus setting the stage for resolution of broader extradition policy concerns.

Certainly, both of our governments should be responsive to the needs of the other in important matters such as this. Your help in this extradition case would also be greatly appreciated by the family of the 4-year old victim, the people of California and the rest of the United States, as well as members of Congress and other U.S. Government officials.

We thank you for your assistance and look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely yours,

CLAY SHAW,
Member of Congress.
GEORGE E. BROWN, Jr.,
Member of Congress.
KEN CALVERT,
Member of Congress.

EMBAJADA DE MEXICO,
Washington, DC, September 22, 1993.

Hon. E. CLAY SHAW, Jr.,
U.S. House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SHAW, Jr.: I refer to your letter of July 22, 1993, concerning Mr. Serapio Zúñiga Ríos, who is believed to have raped a four year old girl in the United States of America.

In the regard, I wish to point out that this subject was discussed by Secretaries Christopher and Solana, and Attorneys General Reno and Carpizo during the last Mexico-U.S. Binational Meeting. At that time, the Government of Mexico restated to the U.S. Government that Mr. Zúñiga will undergo criminal proceedings in Mexico. To that end, U.S. authorities have collaborated with Mexico by providing with the information they have on the case. Moreover, on the basis of the information provided by U.S. authorities, the competent Judge for criminal matters in Mexico has already issued a warrant of arrest against Mr. Zúñiga Ríos, and the Mexican Office of the Attorney General has assigned a special task group of the Federal Judicial Police to locate and arrest Mr. Zúñiga, who is apparently in Mexico.

I deeply appreciate your interest in this matter, and I hope that this information will be satisfactory and useful for you.

Should you have any additional questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

JORGE MONTAÑO,
Ambassador.

DESIGNATING OCTOBER 1993 AND 1994 AS COUNTRY MUSIC MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TANNER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. CLEMENT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise in support of the resolution designating October 1993 and 1994, as "Country Music Month."

I would, in particular, like to thank the Post Office and Civil Service Committee for bringing this resolution to the floor today. And I thank the majority of my colleagues who joined in cosponsoring the House resolution.

As the representative of Music City, U.S.A., I can attest to the importance of country music to the lives of our fellow citizens. Music, as you know, plays an invaluable role. Not only does it celebrate the wide range of human emotions, but it also reflects the changing values of our Nation and her people through its lyrics and musical style itself.

Country music is a blend of several musical styles and, in itself, is unique to America. As the joint resolution says, country music derives its roots from the folk songs of our country's workers, captures the spirit of our religious hymns, reflects the sorrow and joy of our traditional ballads, and echoes the drive and soulfulness of rhythm and blues.

Country music has accompanied the growth of our Nation and reflects the ethnic and cultural diversity of our

people. Its current popularity is due, no doubt, to the fact that country music embodies a spirit of America and the deep and genuine feelings each of us experiences throughout our lives. Country music commemorates working life and strikes a responsive chord deep within the hearts and souls of its fans.

Country music remains rooted in the individual concerns of the common people. As my friend, Johnny Cash, once wrote "country music is the one voice that the working man has to express himself to the world." Thus, it is perhaps clear why country music is so popular in these difficult economic times.

Mr. Speaker, October 1993 and October 1994 mark respectively the 29th and 30th anniversary celebrations of country music. I am honored to be the sponsor of House Joint Resolution 106, and, again, I thank my colleagues for their support and I thank the committee for bringing the country music resolution to the floor.

CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS CONCERNING SECRETARY OF COMMERCE RON BROWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I hope all of my colleagues are paying attention to this special order tonight, because it bears on a very important issue involving a Cabinet officer of the Clinton administration, Mr. Ron Brown, the Secretary of Commerce.

There has been over the past week, and especially this weekend, a lot of news reports about Mr. Brown's activities. I watched a number of political talk shows this weekend.

□ 1410

There were a lot of gaps in the discussions about what went on during the events that took place, possibly, between Mr. Brown, Mr. Hao, and Mr. Binh Ly. So what I would like to do during this special order, for anyone who cares to pay attention, but particularly my colleagues, I would like to go through the chronology of events as laid out to me by Mr. Binh Ly, who was the gentleman who was involved in this series of events, this debacle, if you want to call it that.

I spent 2½ hours with him in my office last week, and we tape recorded his entire testimony. I gave that tape to many members of the media as well as a paper chronology of the events that took place.

In addition to the chronology of events, which I am going to go through, which take probably 15 or 20 minutes, I also have some additional information that came out this weekend regarding Mr. Brown and some things that have taken place. Bear in mind, this is a discussion between Mr. Binh Ly and myself, and it makes allegations about Mr. Brown, Secretary of Commerce Brown, that have not yet been verified but surely need investigating.

July 1992, Binh Ly, a naturalized American from South Vietnam, met with Mr. Hao through a family introduction. Mr. Hao, I will explain in a few minutes, used to be an official in the South Vietnamese Government.

After their meeting, Mr. Hao formed a corporation called the Vietnam Development Corp., and he asked Mr. Binh Ly's assistance in raising money and working with him in getting a prospectus, if you will, involving the United States and Vietnam and negotiating an end to their hostility toward one another and normalizing relations with Vietnam. That was the purpose of the Vietnam Development Corp., to start developing things in Vietnam that will get the country back on its feet.

Following the Presidential election of November 3, a package was sent on November 13 by Federal Express to Ron Brown from Mr. Hao's home by Mr. Binh Ly. Mr. Binh Ly took this package, this prospectus, if you will. He sent this to Mr. Ron Brown from Mr. Hao's home.

On November 23, about 20 days later, Mr. Hao called Binh Ly for a meeting. Hao explained that Secretary Brown had chartered a private jet, which he said cost $8,000, and he flew down to Florida to meet with Mr. Hao.

Mr. Hao, Mr. Binh Ly, a gentleman named Xay Le and a gentleman named Tan Nguyen then flew to Vietnam. Tan Nguyen had been the principal assistant to Mr. Hao when Mr. Hao was the Deputy Prime Minister of the Republic of South Vietnam. Xay Le is a Houston businessman with connections with Mr. Hao.

Hao at that time showed Mr. Binh Ly Ron Brown's business card and said he had talked with him. While in Vietnam, from November 30 to December 19, 1992, the Prime Minister of Vietnam called from Hanoi to talk to Hao. I believe they were at that time in Saigon or what is now called Ho Chi Minh City. But the Prime Minister of Vietnam called from Hanoi to talk to Mr. Hao. The delegation also met with the Chairman of the People's Committee, the Communist People's Committee, while they were there in Ho Chi Minh City.

They were there for 2 weeks. The group then flew to Hanoi at Hanoi government expense and stayed in the government guesthouse. The delegation had a 3-hour meeting with the Prime Minister of Vietnam and his chief of staff. Mr. Hao then asked for and received a private meeting with the Prime Minister of Vietnam.

Hao then told Binh Ly, immediately after the meeting with the Prime Minister, that the deal was done, the deal was done, and Brown, Secretary Brown, was in.

Mr. Hao asked Binh Ly to draft a letter to Brown for the Prime Minister to sign. He then wanted a letter of understanding signed by the Prime Minister to Brown so Brown would know that this was a legitimate offer or was an offer coming straight from the Government of Vietnam.

Binh Ly edited the letter and he changed it into English.

The letter said, in part, to Brown, please sit down and arrange the details of the road map between the United States and Vietnam.

The following day, Mr. Hao met with the Chairman of the Communist Party of Vietnam, Du Muoi. The delegation saw the signed letter from Vo Kiet, the Prime Minister of Vietnam, to Brown. Hao also faxed a letter to Marc Ashton from Saigon.

Now, this letter that was faxed to Marc Ashton was faxed by Binh Ly. And Binh Ly, when he tried to fax it, he said Mr. Ashton picked up the phone. And he talked to Mr. Ashton briefly, and then Mr. Ashton put the phone down and the faxed letter went through.

The letter said that things were going well. They had had a successful trip and, when they got back, they were going to go to Washington to meet with Mr. Brown.

Binh Ly then took a separate flight, because they had differing things they wanted to do on their way back from Vietnam. And Binh Ly went through Taipei, I believe, and he came back to the United States another way on a different plane.

Mr. Hao then, when they got back to the United States, met with Binh Ly and told him that he had been to Washington, DC. Mr. Hao said that he had hand-carried the letter from Prime Minister Kiet to Secretary Brown. Brown was to respond and then Hao would return to Vietnam hand-carrying a letter back to the Prime Minister.

Brown had promised to lift the Vietnam trade embargo and then to establish most-favored-nation status. There were six other items in the letter as well.

I want all my colleagues to get this. Secretary Brown, it is alleged, then sent a letter back to the Prime Minister of Vietnam saying that we were going to lift, he would work to lift the trade embargo and then to establish most-favored-nation status to Vietnam, and there were six other items in the letter as well.

Hao described the deal as $700,000 to Brown from the Vietnamese Government, plus a concession on oil and gas reserves.

I want to tell my colleagues that I believe that the oil and gas reserves in Vietnam are the third largest in the

world. So when a lot of these commentators and others say, "Well, $700,000, why would Brown do that? He is a very wealthy man in his own right."

We are not talking about $700,000. We are probably talking about hundreds of millions of dollars and maybe even billions of dollars. Because if he got royalties on oil and gas reserves from Vietnam, we are talking about money that you can hardly imagine.

In addition to that, Brown was to receive a percentage of or equity in all new business from companies from the United States that went to Vietnam to do business through Brown's entree.

Now, later on, we will find out that Brown was supposed to have agreed to bring about 150 new American businesses to Vietnam. There is another large amount of money, maybe another few hundred million dollars that could have been acquired because 150 major corporations going to Vietnam and him getting a percentage was a lot of money.

The $700,000 was to be placed in an offshore account through close friends, possibly in the name of Marc Ashton or Lillian Madsen, who is the sister of Ashton's wife, or Mr. Hao.

On December 28, Binh Ly confronted Hao during a face-to-face meeting over the ethics of continuing to work with Brown, when he had been nominated for Secretary of Commerce.

□ 1420

Hao told Binh Ly that he should follow his leadership and be patient, that he was a young man and he had a lot to learn, and that Hao would groom Binh Ly as a new leader in the new Vietnam. Hao said he believed that he himself, Hao, if all this worked out, could win future elections and become Prime Minister of Vietnam himself.

Hao called Binh Ly on approximately December 30, to help pack a gift for the mayor of Saigon. Hao told him he had gotten the letter from Brown that afternoon. The next morning Hao left for Vietnam, but Binh was not asked to go on the trip. The reason Binh Ly felt he was not asked to go on the trip was because he had raised some objections to dealing with Brown, since he was now about to become Secretary of Commerce, and because of that they thought they might have a little problem with him down the road, they might not be able to trust him, so they did not ask him to go on this trip.

Binh Ly consulted with a friend and mentor. Here Binh Ly is concerned about this. He sees deep water, he told me, and because of that he and his wife got in the car while Mr. Hao went to Vietnam and they drove to Louisiana, I believe. There he met with Mr. Howard Crawford, who is kind of like a father image to Binh Ly. He told him the whole story. He told him how he got involved and everything.

Mr. Crawford recommended that Binh Ly remove himself from the group, but also, to listen to Hao when he returned to Vietnam. He suggested that the group could be subject to criminal charges if Brown stayed in the partnership.

When Binh Ly returned from Louisiana or from Lafayette, Louisiana, there were several messages on his answering machine from a very worried Mr. Hao. On January 21, Mr. Hao met with Binh Ly. He threw a bank account statement on Hao's breakfast table, saying that the account had been opened in the Banque Indosuez in Singapore. One of Hao's partners in Bangladesh, a Mr. Uyen Quang Le, is the senior vice president for the Banque Indosuez and an ex-governor of the Central Bank of Vietnam. He is the senior vice president of Banque Indosuez in Bangladesh.

He said that he had opened the account, Mr. Hao said this gentleman had opened the account in Singapore. There was to be $1 million put into the account, with $700,000 for Secretary Brown and $300,000 for the Vietnam Development Corp.

Hao then told Binh, Binh Ly, that he would be appointed as head of the energy group in Vietnam, working with the Vietnamese Government and possibly the 150 United States companies that Brown was to introduce to Vietnam. Hao told Binh that Binh and his family would have to then move to Washington, DC, because they were going to be opening an office there for the Vietnam Development Corp.

On February 3, Binh wrote a resignation letter to Mr. Hao. In the letter he said that Hao had breached their terms of agreement, and what he said he meant by that was that there would be no dishonesty or any collusion or anything that would smack of dishonesty in the negotiations for normalizing relations with Vietnam.

On February 14, Ly's brother-in-law said that Hao had demanded through him that Binh attend a meeting with him the next day. Hao and Binh met and Hao asked Binh to keep everything quiet, to keep his mouth shut, and asked how much money he wanted in cash. Hao said that if Binh kept his mouth shut he would pay him right now. Binh Ly said that was not the issue. He kept saying that over and over again. He said Mr. Hao got pretty upset, and said, "How much do you want? How much do you want? How much do you want?"

The meeting ended, and Binh Ly decided that it was time to contact the media, because he was concerned about possibly his safety, because Mr. Hao was so upset. So he contacted the Miami Herald, and the Miami Herald interviewed Binh Ly for an hour on February 18. On February 24, after the story ran in the paper, the FBI contacted Binh Ly. He was interviewed for 2 hours, and they asked him to take a lie detector test or polygraph test.

On February 25 they gave him a 6-hour, very comprehensive lie detector test. The next day the FBI contacted Bihn Ly and said that he passed with flying colors. I want all my colleagues to remember that. Binh Ly took a 6-hour lie detector test, going into all this, and he passed it with flying colors.

On March 14 Binh Ly or Binh Ly's brother-in-law said that the Miami Herald had called Mr. Hao on the phone to ask him about the story, and to try to get some answers. The message was relayed from Mr. Hao to Binh Ly through his brother-in-law to stop what he was doing with the press, because the Government of Vietnam would regard Binh Ly as an enemy. It was a threat.

He said, "If you keep this up, the Government of Vietnam is going to consider you an enemy, and you might be in real jeopardy."

The FBI suggested after the meeting on February 24 that Binh Ly try to work again with Mr. Hao. Binh Ly agreed. They tried to tap several phone conversations between Binh Ly and Mr. Hao. Mr. Hao by this time, since it was in the papers, was very concerned, and he would not say anything on the telephone, so the effort to try to get Mr. Hao to admit anything on the phone was fruitless.

On April 23 the FBI asked Binh Ly to return his beeper. Mr. Ly was very concerned. "Why do you want me to return the beeper," because they had given him a beeper so they could stay in touch with him about the case.

The FBI said they wanted the beeper back because their section was the victim of budget cuts. Mr. Ly could not understand that, because the beeper only cost about $10 a month. He said he looked at the FBI guy and said, "You are taking my beeper back, you want to break off contact with me, because you have budget cuts?" And the FBI guy kind of winked and shook his head and said, "Well, it is budget cuts." The FBI thanked him for his help and asked Binh Ly what he would do next. Binh Ly said that he was going to go to the press.

I would like to say to my colleagues, and I am making no allegations, except that Janet Reno was confirmed as the Attorney General of the United States, I believe, in March, early March, and a little over a month later the FBI decided to take the beeper back and eliminate the investigation that was involving Mr. Ly.

Nothing happened for about 3 or 4 months. Then there was a news story in one of the magazines, and my colleagues will have to forgive me, I cannot think of which magazine it was, but it went into great detail on this. Three weeks after the magazine article a grand jury was empaneled in Miami,

and the grand jury investigation is going on as we speak.

Mr. Binh Ly has not yet been called by the grand jury. We wonder why he has not been called, because his testimony it seems to me is extremely relevant to the possible prosecution, if they feel prosecution is necessary, of Mr. Brown.

I want to go into just a few more things that have happened in the past few days, but before I do that I want to go into the chronology of things that I think are very relevant. Remember that on February 25 Binh Ly took a 6-hour polygraph test, lie detector test, and he passed it with flying colors. Remember that Binh Ly said that Mr. Hao met three times with Ron Brown to seek his help in lifting the trade embargo against Vietnam. Secretary Brown denied ever meeting with Mr. Hao, denied ever knowing Mr. Hao, through a press secretary down at the Commerce Department. He said he didn't know Mr. Hao, had never had any meetings with him.

Then the gentleman at the Department, the Commerce Department, Mr. Desler, said, "I may have misinterpreted the Secretary, in what the Secretary told me in explaining that he had never met with Mr. Hao," because later on the attorney for Mr. Brown said that yes, Mr. Brown had met with Mr. Hao, not once, not twice, but three times. After his press secretary denied all this, the attorney for Mr. Brown then admitted that he did know Mr. Hao and had met with him three times.

The last time he met with Mr. Hao was at the Department of Commerce. They had dinner and then they went over to the Department of Commerce to talk. Mr. Brown alleges that his meetings were social. He denied meeting this gentleman three times, then he admits meeting the man three times. Now he is saying they were just social meetings.

Binh Ly made the statement that he and Mr. Hao traveled to Vietnam in December and met with Prime Minister Vo Van Kiet. Binh Ly drafted a letter from the Prime Minister to Ron Brown asking him to prepare a road map for better relations between the United States Government and Vietnam. The Vietnam Government has denied that it sought help from Ron Brown or offered him money. However, on October 1, ABC News reported that the FBI has obtained two fax notes from Mr. Hao to a high-level government official in Vietnam describing his meetings with Ron Brown in November and December as very positive. I don't know why he would have said that in these letters, after having been to Vietnam, twice, this was before the second time he went back to Vietnam, but after having been there, and saying they were very positive meetings.

Mr. Ly stated on January 21 that Mr. Hao met with Binh Ly and showed him a bank statement from Banque Indosuez in Singapore. He said $700,000 was to be deposited into an account for Mr. Brown or somebody, and another $300,000 to set up their office here in Washington.

□ 1430

On October 2 the New York Times reported that Federal investigators, and this is very important for our colleagues, Federal investigators have uncovered evidence that the Vietnamese Government was preparing to establish a special bank account in Singapore. The evidence is in the form of the transfer of undisclosed sums of money between East Asian banks to some bank in Singapore.

These allegations are so important and so severe that there needs to be a complete and thorough investigation by the Congress of the United States. Many of my colleagues have said well, wait a minute, you have a grand jury investigation going on right now down in Miami; why are you suggesting we do something while that grand jury investigation is going on. The grand jury investigation deals with whether or not a Cabinet official, Mr. Brown, did something corrupt for which he should be indicted and brought to justice through a trial. But the Clinton administration has taken two steps to normalize relations with Vietnam, once in July and once in September. And those steps to normalize relations create a cloud over this administration that needs to be cleared up. And the only way we can clear up that is by the Congress of the United States conducting an investigation to find out if a Cabinet official used his influence to normalize relations with Vietnam when we still have not had a full accounting of the 2,200 POW-MIA's that are over there.

We have said continually that we would never normalize relations with Vietnam until we had a full accounting of all of those POW-MIA's, and yet in July and September steps were taken to normalize relations with Vietnam by withdrawing our opposition to our allies giving loans to Vietnam so that they could get themselves in a position where financially they could request IMF and World Bank loans.

Then in September the Clinton administration approved a program where American businesses can go over there, and if World Bank loans are forthcoming, they can bid for that business and start doing business in Vietnam and the communist Vietnamese Government.

Ron Brown said in testimony before our committee last week, and I asked him directly, he told me that he has never discussed with Mr. Hao or the administration normalizing relations with Vietnam during this period, and he has never discussed with his top Commerce Department officials normalizing relations with Vietnam. And yet we found out that in June, when the National Security Council met to talk about Vietnam, it was at the principal level, which is the highest Cabinet level, either the Cabinet official or their designees are supposed to be in those meetings, that normalization of Vietnam was discussed very thoroughly. And I have been led to believe that in those meetings the Commerce Department, Mr. Brown's Commerce Department took the lead in pushing for normalization of relations.

Now if that is true, and if Mr. Brown or one of his chief lieutenants that has discussed this with Mr. Brown was at those meetings, and led the fight to normalize relations with Vietnam, then if that is true Mr. Brown misled the Congress last week when he appeared before our committee.

All of these things must be investigated. This is very, very important not just for the 2,200 families of the POW's and MIA's, but to this government as a whole. I say to my colleagues we need either to have a special prosecutor, or an independent counsel law passed so that we can have an independent counsel, or we need to have a complete investigation by the Congress, or possibly two of the three. That is, having a special prosecutor and an investigation.

I have written letters to the President of the United States asking for a lot of answers. We will be writing another letter to him asking for more information, a letter of inquiry. We will be writing a letter to Mr. Brown asking for in-depth information about these transactions and allegations. And if we do not receive a response from them within 10 days or 2 weeks, then I will be filing a resolution of inquiry with the Congress, which I believe will be referred to the Committee on Government Operations, which should be the committee of jurisdiction. And we will urge them to have a complete investigation, to bring all of this to light. This is extremely important. Every day new revelations come forth, and we as a Congress representing the people of this country need to get to the bottom of this.

If Mr. Brown is innocent, then he should be exonerated, and be able to go on about his business, conducting his office over there at the Department of Commerce. But if he is guilty, then he needs to be removed from office and brought to justice. And if he used his influence to normalize relations with Vietnam at a time when we have had no full accounting of the POWs and MIAs, then by golly, this administration should stop the negotiations with Vietnam immediately. And we have already written a letter to the President asking him to stop these negotiations with Vietnam right now, until all of this is cleared up.

But we should cut off relations with Vietnam until we get that full accounting on the POW's and MIA's, No. 1; and No. 2, until the entire issue has been eliminated by the administration and by this Congress.

This is very serious. And my colleagues on the other side, many of them have said to me, "Oh, DAN, this is a witch hunt." I want to tell them that we had other witch hunts in the past. We had Watergate, we had Irangate, we had what else, we had two or three other things, and I never heard any of them objecting to that. These are very serious allegations, and the man who made the charges, Mr. Binh Ly, passed a 6-hour lie detector test. And the FBI was so convinced that they gave him a beeper, and they conducted a very thorough investigation, and even tapped Mr. Hao's phone.

We need to get to the bottom of things. We can trace a lot of these things if we have the ability to, if we get a subpoena from the Congress of the United States. We can find out, for instance, if Mr. Brown chartered that plane for $8,000 to fly down to Florida, which he said, or initially his spokesman said he did not do. We can find out through Federal Express if that package of information was sent up to Mr. Brown from Mr. Hao's home early on. And we can get a lot of other things like telephone records. We can find out if Mr. Brown received phone calls for Mr. Hao at the Commerce Department, or before, and we can find out through phone records over at the Commerce Department if Mr. Brown was contacting Mr. Hao. There are a ton of things we can find out if we get the authority through subpoena, and through investigation in this Congress.

I submit to my colleagues we need to get to the bottom of this.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, first of all I just want to commend the gentleman from Indiana for taking this special order to bring out these facts.

You know, the American people, and a large number of the American people have felt for years that there has been a cover-up over the whole Vietnam POW-MIA issue. There are still, as the gentleman said, over 2,000 American servicemen who are unaccounted for. That means that there are 2,000 families who do not have the peace of mind of knowing what happened to those young men and women who have served this country so valiantly.

I can recall having taken a CODEL there 7 years ago in which we met with the Foreign Minister at that time in Vietnam in which he finally, for the first time 7 years ago, said that there was a possibility that alive American POW's and MIA's could possibly be in their country, not under the official control of the Federal Government, but perhaps back in the caves, or with local gendarmes, as he used the term, but not under their control. And even to this day there has still not been a total cooperation.

We have word now that even during the Korean war American soldiers were sent into Russia and Siberia. We know that they were sent from Vietnam into the Soviet Union. We need to have that accounting.

There should be absolutely no normal relations with that country until there is full cooperation.

Again, this whole thing with Mr. Brown just tends to lead to that assumption that there was some kind of a cover-up all along in this Government, and that should not be. So if Mr. Brown is innocent, then by all means let him prove it. If he is not, let us get to the bottom of this thing.

I really admire the gentleman for taking this special order and bringing this to the attention of this Congress, and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Let me just end up by saying that this is not the end of this. This is just the beginning. A number of us, myself included, are going to do every single thing in our power to force this issue until we get these answers.

There is a lot at stake here, the credibility of our Government is at stake, and the credibility of Mr. Brown is at stake, the families and loved ones of the POW's and MIA's are at stake, and we cannot leave these things unanswered. So we need to do a number of things in this Congress, and I urge my colleagues to join with me in asking for a full accounting on all of these issues to get to the bottom of it.

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

□ 1440

THE SITUATION IN SOMALIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SOLOMON. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday I spoke at length on the situation that is taking place in Somalia. I am going to do the same thing today because there are so many unanswered questions concerning this situation which is taking the lives of American soldiers today.

I am taking this special order to express my concern again, my profound concern, about the ongoing situation in that place called Somalia. The events of the past 72 hours have taken a fearsome toll: 12 American lives have been taken, 12 dead; 78 seriously wounded; and perhaps as many as 8 being held hostage in a place called Mogadishu.

Mr. Speaker, this carnage, this madness must stop. The so-called rebuilding of Somalia is not worth the price of one American life, much less the carnival of death that has been displayed on our television screens, such a despicable situation.

When American troops were first sent to Somalia 10 months ago, their mission was supposed to be humanitarian in nature and it was supposed to be short term in duration. Few Americans had any quarrel with such a proposition because we are a nation that cares about people, particularly starving people. Indeed, our troops performed their intended mission with professionalism and with skill, as they did in Desert Storm under a different kind of mission. They should have come home, mission accomplished, when that mission was completed. And it was completed.

Now they are confronted with an altogether different situation, an altogether different mission. Our troops have been thrust into a primitive and hostile environment and are now being expected to come up with the solutions to Somalia's problems, solutions which the diplomats and politicians around the world have failed to produce.

Mr. Speaker, call it nation-building, call it stabilizing the situation, call it anything you like; this new mission has nothing to do with the training that our forces have received, the equipment at their disposal, or the reasons for which they were sent there in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, if anyone in the United Nations or the Clinton administration can offer an explanation as to how our troops are supposed to perform this new mission, I would certainly like to hear about it. And I would especially like to hear how any operation can be conducted under a United Nations command and control structure which is so inept that a contingent of our forces, our American forces, could be pinned down for a full 7 hours the other day before reinforcements were ever sent in. That is unheard of.

The plain fact is, Mr. Speaker and colleagues, that there is nothing in Somalia to rebuild or to reestablish in the first place. This is a country which scarcely fits any plausible definition of a viable nation-state, even in the best of times. Somalia has been a basket case ever since its independence was declared back in 1960. There is nothing there for our troops to rebuild. The Somalis are essentially a nomadic people, and their fighters can disappear into the shifting sands in the wink of an eye.

Mr. Speaker, the Gannett papers in my district expressed this dilemma very well in an editorial just this morning. To quote them:

> A humanitarian United Nations mission to help starving Somalis is quickly turning into an undeclared war with American casualties.

The mission has changed, which makes the original U.S. policy no policy at all. President Clinton must avoid dragging the United States deeper and deeper into a war for an uncertain and possibly unachievable mission.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make just one final observation. Suggestions have been made in some quarters that a United States pullout from Somalia would endanger future U.N. peacekeeping efforts. I would simply respond by saying that this debacle in Somalia is a perfect example of how misguided idealism can distort our policies and our understanding of our own national interest. The only time that American troops should be used anywhere in the world is when there is a compelling national United States of America interest.

Furthermore, the United Nations must also show some sense of discrimination and proportion.

The United States simply cannot be a party to a process that elevates each and every civil war between tin-pot dictators into a full-blown international crisis that requires our country and our troops to act as referee.

Mr. Speaker and Members of this House, the time has come to do two things: We must go into Somalia with everything we have, full-blast, to get our hostages, all eight of them, and any dead besides, out of there. And then we have to get our troops out of Somalia and we have to keep them out. This misguided, deadly adventure in Somalia has got to stop, and it must stop today.

Mr. Speaker, in about 1 hour, those Members who want to, are going to be meeting, with Secretary of Defense Les Aspin and Secretary of State Warren Christopher. I just hope and pray that they are going to be able to say to us what I have just said to you, that the administration is going to bring those troops home. They have no business being in Somalia. American foreign policy under all modern Presidents, going all the way back to Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Harry Truman, Dwight Eisenhower, John F. Kennedy, Ronald Reagan and all the rest, has been to support the sovereignty and the boundaries of sovereign, democratic nations. Ladies and gentlemen, this is not protecting the sovereign boundaries of a democracy or a nation; this is nothing but anarchy and chaos, and we should not be there. Hopefully, Warren Christopher and Les Aspin will be able to give the American families who have servicemen serving in the Armed Forces today the answers we want to hear, to confirm the overwhelming thought that we should not be in Somalia in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the House taking the time to hear me talk about this issue, and hopefully we will not have to keep doing this day by day.

□ 1450

Mr. Speaker, I would continue my special order and yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], a very respected member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs of the Committee on Appropriations, who has been very much involved in the foreign affairs of our country for so many years.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding to me. I congratulate him on taking this special order.

I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am very concerned about our Somali policy.

I was concerned about it when we first agreed to go in there, but we had a clear and concise motivation. We were sending our troops in to stop the starvation, and we did so. We accomplished that feat in a matter of 3 or 4 weeks.

I went over there to Somalia in January. Our young marines and our young soldiers were doing an outstanding job of maintaining security, maintaining peace so that the private volunteer organizations could get around the country and feed the starving people of Somalia.

We have maintained that peace, but in the process, in the last couple months, we have all of a sudden found ourselves engaged in a partisan war. We were not being partisan at the outset. We were intermediaries. We were neutral.

Now it seems that we are not only partisan, but that we are in the process of killing citizens of Somalia and they are in the process of killing young men in American uniforms. That process has to stop.

I regret very strongly that we were not able to complete the task and pull out peacefully. I thought we should have been out of Somalia in the spring, but we were not. Now it has come to havoc.

I believe strongly that we should get our prisoners back this weekend, but then we should declare victory over hunger and get every last American troop out of Somalia.

It is not in the American interest, it is not in the interest of the United States for us to remain any longer than it is necessary to get our troops out and get our prisoners back.

So whether General Aideed is found or not, it seems to me that if he is ultimately captured, there will be other warlords to take his place.

Somalia does not have a single infrastructure of government in place. If we are there truly to nationbuild, we will be there for the rest of our natural lives.

Unfortunately, for too many of our young soldiers and marines, that time limit is bad because they will be killed in action.

It is not in our interest to stay there. It is not in our interest to send 40,000 troops under the auspices of the United Nations to Bosnia. It is not in our interest to send 600 young soldiers under the auspices of the United Nations to Haiti. We have to act in our own national interest. We have to act in the interests of the free world. Those interests are not being threatened in any one of those three places, Somalia, Bosnia, or Haiti.

We should not deploy American lives there. We should not risk American soldiers. We should not risk American marines any longer than is absolutely necessary to pull out every last troop from Somalia. Come back home and then make sure that we do not risk lives unnecessarily, except in the national interest.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding to me.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for those cogent remarks.

I might add that this is not any kind of a partisan attack. Yesterday on this floor during a special order that I conducted on the same subject, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON], a very valuable member of the Armed Services Committee and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Personnel talked about the very serious problems we have now with severe cuts in our military budget. The gentleman from Louisiana knows because he serves on the Appropriations Committee that makes the appropriations for the defense of our Nation. He talked about the fact that we cannot be involved in civil wars all over the world with the kind of defense budget we have today. We have to be able to maintain a readiness against situations that could occur in a place called Russia. I recall being with the gentleman in Moscow not too many months ago when we met with this criminal Vice President of Russia, Mr. Rutskoi. He pointed to a map on the wall and he said, "That is my vision of Russia." It took in all of Central and Eastern Europe, and God knows what else. We have to be prepared to defend against such things.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield just for one more comment, in the last 5 years we have cut roughly half a million people in uniform out of the armed services of the United States. In the last year alone we have cut $15 billion out of our defense budget, and yet we currently have 73,000 troops scattered all around the world under 17 difference peacekeeping missions. We currently have about 4,000 or 5,000 people in Somalia. We are planning on putting 30,000 people in Bosnia. We have 300 in Macedonia. We are talking about 600 in Haiti to restore a fellow who was elected in a democratic fashion, but who is quoted as saying that he favors necklacing such as they did in South

Africa where they put tires over people's heads and fill them up with gasoline and light them on fire. We are going to put 600 of our soldiers in there to secure that man in power? Thank you, no.

That is not in the national interest of the United States. We should not be doing this to our young men and women in uniform.

Frankly, I hope that the President goes back and re-reads his speech to the United Nations in which he stated very clearly the criteria and conditions under which we should be deploying troops. Those conditions do not apply to Somalia. They do not apply to Bosnia. They do not apply to Haiti and we should not be having troops there.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, on that one point, when my colleague and good friend and I were over in Somalia earlier this year in the winter, in January or February, one of the things we heard repeatedly from the troops were that many of these young men had been away from their families three of the last four holiday seasons because of commitments we had made on their behalf either in Desert Storm or in exercises around the world and in Somalia.

We do not realize when we make the level of cuts that this President is proposing what it does to ordinary human beings, and yet this President in cutting back so much on defense wants to send them all over the place for these excursions where we lose more lives and keep them away from their families and ultimately cause morale to go down and readiness to go down.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, by making the cuts we force these young men and women in uniform to be deployed more frequently constantly and in more places around the world on a more frequent basis.

Even in January with the cuts that went on in the Bush administration, we saw people flying 7 days a week, flying C-130's, the pilots and the air crews, 13- to 15-hour days without a break for a month at a time.

The young Marines and sailors who had been deployed were already at sea for 6 months and they were unlikely to get back for another 2 or 3 months, even though it is our stated naval policy to not keep people at sea for longer than 6 months.

You cannot cut, cut, cut on the one hand, and expect these youngsters who are absolutely wonderful to go out and represent our interests all over the world with greater and greater frequency and be deployed in more increasingly hazardous situations that are not in our national interest, without suffering some adverse fallback. We are suffering it today. We have lost some of the prime of our youth, and I think it has got to stop.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Louisiana as well as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] makes a terribly important point.

You know, you have to go back to look at Desert Storm. The reason that we had so very few losses of life during that situation was because we had the best trained, the best equipped, the most highly motivated troops we have ever had in this country.

Go back to 12 years before that, go back to 1979 when American hostages were being held in a place called Iran. To get those hostages out, the Army had to cannibalize about 15 helicopter gunships in order to get 5 that would work, and 3 of those failed. Then the two went in and the mission failed and we never did bring those hostages home under those conditions. That is what we are going back to, back to the days when American families who had their main breadwinner in the service were on food stamps all over this world, whether they were in Germany or in South Korea, wherever they were. In the 1970's, we lost all the good qualified technical people out of the military, both officers and noncommissioned officers.

We are headed back that way again. The time will come if we continue in this direction when our troops will be equipped the same way they were back in the seventies, and we will suffer terrible losses if we ever have to get these troops back into a place called Bosnia, which never will work. Adolf Hitler put 42 divisions in the Balkans, into Yugoslavia, and they failed miserably.

□ 1500

They got knocked off 1, and 5, and 10 at a time by snipers. That is what is going to happen to American troops, whether it is 25,000 or 250,000.

Let me yield to a former member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and a gentleman who now serves with me on the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

Mr. GOSS. I say to the gentleman, thank you very much. I thank the gentleman from Glens Falls, my ranking member on the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman knows, I have got to go to a Committee on Rules meeting very shortly, but I welcome this opportunity to address this issue which the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] have already addressed so eloquently, along with many others today in the 1-minutes.

I picked up the paper today, the Washington paper, and the headline on it is: Rebellion Against Yeltsin Collapses After Army Shells Russian Parliament.

Mr. Speaker, that should be the headline of the century. That is about the equivalent of the unthinkable, of tanks being down on the Mall shelling the U.S. Capitol, in Russian history. That is a tremendously dramatic event, the Bolshevik Revolution replayed in our time, as it were.

But that is not the headline, Mr. Speaker. If my colleagues unfold the paper, the top headline is: Somalia Battle Killed 12 Americans, Wounded 78.

When did we declare war on Somalia? Was the U.S. Congress advised? How did we get into this all of a sudden, that the Washington paper's main headline, after the event of the century in Russia, is that we have a battle where we have a loss of life in a place called Somalia? What precisely is going on? Is the White House telling us? Is the White House telling America what the rules of engagement are? What our purposes are? What we are trying to accomplish?

I read in this story that the distinguished Secretary of State says in the face of these kinds of attacks it is time for Americans to be steady in our response and not to talk about getting out.

The people of this country are talking about getting out of Somalia; wake up, the word is out, we are talking about it.

Supposedly we are going to say it is still a secure environment is obtained. Now is that going to be the same policy we have had in Haiti, we are going to have in Haiti, for these 8,600 troops that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] talks about? I do not know what the rules of engagement for Haiti are going to be, but, if we stay in Haiti until we have a stable environment, and it has been 200 years since we have had a stable environment, since the founding of the country, it will probably be another 200 years. I am not sure that is a good criterion to commit out trooops overseas.

Was it not the President of the United States that just last week suggested to us that the U.N. needs to know when to say no?

Now Americans are beginning to say, "Yes, the U.N. needs to know when to say no, and we need to know when to say no to subcontracting our troops to the U.N."

I do not think there is a single person who wants to see American armed service personnel responding to an officer corps that is not just as well trained and just as well versed in the military arts as the American officer corps, and I think that is a concern we all have to worry about.

But behind it all, the most troubling thing, even after one has said all of that, comes down to the lesson that General Powell, and my colleagues all remember General Powell; he only retired a few days ago. He said, "Don't commit a few troops. Commit enough troops to do the job."

And what is our response so far? Sending a few hundred more with a few pieces of military equipment into a situation where they do not have the manpower, the firepower or the air power, to control the situation, extract our people and conduct a successful military event without unnecessary risk to our Armed Forces personnel.

That is the mistake. We are making the very mistake that Colin Powell advised us against, and he has only been gone a very short time. One would think that our memories would be a little bit better than that.

The final point I would like to make, if the gentleman would yield for just a second more, that bothers me on this is that I am not sure the American people are comfortable in thinking that the White House knows what is going on or just how they are responding to it right now. I think that this is a debate we should have here, but as the gentleman of this Chamber, the gentlewoman of this Chamber, know, we tried to have this debate here. We have tried to have the voice of Congress speak on this subject, and we have been shut off, as those of us on the Committee on Rules very well know. We have had a weak substitute out there, but the basic, hardcore debate about getting out of Somalia now has been shut off, and that debate needs to be turned on.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate the learned gentleman's remarks, and let me at this time yield to really one of the outstanding Members of this House from Wisconsin. I served with him on the Committee on Foreign Affairs for many years. He is still there as one of the senior ranking members and one of the most knowledgeable Members of this House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH].

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], my friend, for yielding, and I thank him for taking this special order.

I want to say that I am very proud of the people that spoke here this afternoon. I do not think we have heard more eloquent debate on this floor ever than we have heard today because I think it has been heartfelt, this morning in the speeches and also this afternoon, and I think people are opening up their hearts to this problem because they can see that it is going to create more and more pain for our country in the future.

I say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], a little while ago you had mentioned, and I appreciate your demeanor, you had mentioned that this is really a bipartisan issue. I don't quite see it that way, if you forgive me for saying that, although I respect your opinion very much. The reason I say that is this, is that when you look at all the evidence, the people speaking out against our policy in Somalia are all Republicans. I don't see any of the Democrats.

Mr. Speaker, when I see who wants to stay in Somalia, I talk with all of our Republicans. I did not find a single Republican today that said he wants to stay in Somalia, not a single one.

But yet the President wants to stay. The President said that we are going to put more troops into Somalia, and we are not going to widen the effort.

Secretary of State Christopher stated that no one should even think about getting out of Somalia. He is Democrat.

Secretary of our Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], said it would be a serious mistake to pack up and come home because it would harm U.S. and U.N. credibility. Now he is a Democrat.

We have Secretary Aspin say that we have to stay. Now he is a Democrat.

Mr. Speaker, all these people right down the line who want to stay are all Democrats. I have been going around this Chamber today. As my colleagues know, I did not find a single Republican that said he wanted to stay.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, my conclusion is that the Democrats want to stay in Somalia, and the Republicans are saying, "Hey, we have done enough, we have done our share, it's time to come out." Every one of the Republicans that I talked to say the same thing.

Mr. Speaker, the United States cannot be the 911 for every trouble spot in the world. It is unfair to our soldiers, it is unfair to our troops, unfair to our taxpayers.

As my colleagues know, last night I had a chance to see the movie "Gettysburg," and my colleagues here today probably had a chance to go down and see it, too. It is an interesting metaphor for what is going on in our country today. As General Lee knew, once you commit yourself, it is almost impossible to get out of a situation, and so on the first day, when General Meade came to Gettysburg and engaged the Union Army, after that they were locked in. They could not retreat.

As my colleagues know, that is the same thing that happens in Bosnia, that is going to happen if we allow troops in Bosnia. We already have troops in Macedonia. It happened in Somalia.

I remember when we put our troops into Somalia in December. I called the White House, and I asked, "When are we going to get out of Somalia?"

Do my colleagues know what they told me?

"We are going to be out by Inauguration Day"; that is, January 20.

Well, January 20 came and went, and I went down to the White House after the new administration came in, and I said, "When are we going to leave Somalia?"

They said, "By the springtime we will be gone."

What happened in the springtime? In the springtime we had a resolution on this floor saying that we are going to be in Somalia for a year, but, if my colleagues read the fine print, it was a year or longer.

Mr. Speaker, if we Republicans do not take the initiative, we are going to be in Somalia at the turn of the century, and we are going to lose hundreds and hundreds of soldiers, and it is not fair to them. The Americans do not realize today that we had 4,000 troops in Somalia. Today we have got 5,700, and they are some of our elite troops, and the President wants to put more troops into Somalia. This is a real quagmire, and we have got to have the stamina and the courage to say no. Somebody has got to speak up for the American people.

And that is where the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], he and some of our other friends that spoke here this afternoon, have to come in. We have got to take the leadership. If the President does not speak for the American people, if the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense do not, then we, in this Congress, have the obligation to speak up for our people because, after all, they put their trust and confidence in us, and that is why I say to my colleagues, "I'm proud of you gentleman for taking this special order today because, if no one else does it, then, by golly, we are going to do it. We have got to do that for our people. We owe it to the people who put their trust and confidence in us."

I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for having yielded to me on this very, very crucial issue, and I hope, when the President and the administration come down here, and they ask us to put troops into Bosnia, I hope this is a real object lesson for us.

□ 1510

Because they always say that is the one thing we learn from history, is that we never learn from history. Let us for once say we are going to learn a historical lesson.

Barbara Tuchman, in her great book, "Guns of August," which is really a classic of how the world slipped into World War I, and I know all of you have read it, there is an interesting example where the British General says to the French General Foch, "How many troops do you want, General?" And the French General said, "Just send me one. And after you send me one, you will send me all you have got."

That is something we have to remember when we debate these issues here on the floor of Congress.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH] on that statement, because that statement needs to be heard all over this Chamber. The American people need to let the President know exactly what the gentleman has just said.

As a matter of fact, we just got the cost of maintaining our troops in Somalia. In this short period of time, it has cost us over $1 billion. That money comes out of the readiness of this Nation. If we were to put 25,000 troops into Bosnia, it would cost 50 times that much in a short period of time. Just think what that would do to the readiness of our defense posture, to the operations and maintenance of our regular forces.

Mr. Speaker, let me yield to a very distinguished member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs whom I served with for many years, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], now the ranking member on that committee.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend and distinguished colleague from New York, Mr. SOLOMON, for arranging for this special order to enable the House to address this most critical issue—the United States role in Somalia.

Listening to my colleagues earlier today, it has become apparent that the time has come for the Congress to take matters in hand and end our military involvement in Somalia.

On December 8, 1992, President Bush began deploying United States military forces in Somalia to help bring food to hundreds of thousands who faced death from starvation.

President Bush acted in response to a U.N. Security Council resolution to establish as "soon as possible a secure environment for humanitarian relief operations" there.

President Bush emphasized that United States forces would be withdrawn from Somalia—and replaced by a new U.N. peacekeeping operation—as soon as that secure environment was established.

In May, the U.N. Security Council, with support from the Clinton administration, changed the rules while we in Congress weren't looking.

There was an evolution in our role in Somalia.

The U.N. Security Council turned the humanitarian mission of feeding hungry people to a political mission of building a nation in a land whose people consider themselves not citizens of Somalia, but members of a particular clan or subclan.

In assuming the leading military position, the United States has truly been handed a mission impossible. This has become more and more evident as the number and intensity of armed clashes has grown—to the tragedy we have witnessed these past few days.

But the Clinton administration has yet to tell the American people why their sons and daughters are being sent into what has become a maelstrom of violence.

Last July, I submitted an amendment to the fiscal 1994 Defense authorization bill to cut off all funding for military operations in Somalia by December 31, 1993.

When it became evident that the Rules Committee would not act on that amendment, I joined with the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, the majority leader, Mr. GEPHARDT, in a resolution that calls on the President to report on Somalia to Congress by October 15, and to request and receive congressional authorization by November 15 for continued deployment of United States forces there.

Mr. Speaker, today I called on the President urging him to send up his policy statement as soon as possible. We can't afford to wait any longer for that report—and yet another month to vote.

We must act quickly, before the lives of any more brave young American service men and women are snuffed out in Somalia.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] for his remarks. The gentleman is a very valuable Republican leader on the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

At this time let me yield to another valuable Member of this House, a member of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL].

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and compliment him for calling this special order on this most important topic.

Clearly the debate over our policy in Somalia is overdue. This debate should have occurred a long time ago. It is elemental that in a plan for a military campaign, the first thing that is accomplished is the development of the goals, and then the plan to achieve those goals, very specific goals, including when you know you have won, when you know it is time to pull out, to leave.

Unfortunately, the administration had apparently not developed with sufficient specificity the goal, the plan, and, therefore, a timetable for the United States to extricate its forces from that region. As a result, the facts have now changed. Unfortunately, we cannot any more simply call for the immediate withdrawal of our troops, because we now have American casualties and, as important, apparently American POW's.

Obviously our first priority must be to gain the release of those POW's. In addition to that, the administration may now want to have a goal of securing the end of the Aideed regime, the people who are causing all of the trouble there. I do not know whether that is the administration's goal or not. If it is, it cannot be achieved by merely sending another 200 troops and a couple of tanks to that region. Obviously more is required than that.

We have to have this debate in order to determine what specifically our goals are. Now that we have achieved a situation of stability, where people can be fed, is there something more that needs to be done? Is it law and order? Is it the establishment of a predicate for the evolution of a democratic regime and a free market in that country? Is it, beyond that, the capture of Aideed and the establishment and maintaining of peace?

If so, is this to be achieved with U.N. forces and U.S. forces under the U.N. command? I think not. I hope not.

These are all questions that have to be answered, and answered now. That is why the Congress is appropriately debating this, and I again compliment the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for calling this special order so that we can continue to debate it.

Mr. Speaker, I would just offer these quick thoughts for the benefit of the Congress and the President. Our options are now more limited than they were just a few days ago, because now we have some necessary military objectives which did not exist before, namely, how to deal with the American POW's. We have got to get that issue behind us. That may take much more military force than we contemplated originally.

But we also have to identify when we have achieved success. As soon as we have achieved that, it is not necessarily a specific date, but the achievement of a goal. And when we have achieved that, we have got to have our forces home.

It is very clear, based upon the calls to my office just today, that my constituents want us to get out of Somalia. They are very much in approval of the idea we would help those people from a humanitarian point of view. Beyond that, they do not believe we should be there. And I think these casualties and POW's demonstrate the wisdom of my constituents' views.

Goal one, let us set that set of goals; two, the specific plans; three, a specific delineation of when we know we have achieved our objective so that we can get our troops out of Somalia. I hope that that can be accomplished just as soon as humanly possible.

Mr. Speaker, with that, let me again express my appreciation to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for engaging in this very important debate.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I certainly thank the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL] for his contribution. Again, the gentleman is one of the most knowledgeable Members of this House, particularly on national defense issues.

Mr. Speaker, let me yield to another member of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON].

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding. I want to thank the gentleman for taking out this special order on the whole situation in Somalia.

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin with a quote, because it ties in with our discussion of what this administration's intent is in terms of being involved in Somalia.

We have heard a lot of rhetoric coming out of the White House and the leadership in this body on what our real time limit should be. Many of us on the Republican side have repeatedly said we should come out immediately.

The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], who was here earlier, and I, when we came back from Somalia in January, said we should come out within the first quarter of this year, because we had accomplished our mission. There were votes on this floor in the spring where we supported our leader, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], in trying to bring the troops home immediately. Not 3 months from now, not 6 months from now, not years from now, but immediately.

□ 1520

We lost that vote. Once again, the leadership and the White House were on the side of keeping our troops there longer.

Let me give you a quote from August 15, 1993. This quote is from David Shinn, who was the United States Special Coordinator for Somalia. This is what he said. He is speaking of getting out in 1994 or 1995. This is the chief spokesman for the Clinton administration on Somalia saying that he sees us involved in Somalia through 1995.

I would submit to you, Mr. Speaker, this is absolutely unacceptable. It is outrageous, and it is not what the American people want to see occurring here.

As was mentioned earlier today, we had a full and open debate on whether or not to use force in Desert Storm. It was probably this body's finest hour. We have had no such debate on our presence in Somalia, as we have redefined the mission. In fact, we do not even know what the mission is today.

What outraged me so much was the vote we had last Wednesday on the Defense authorization bill, when many of us tried to have a straight up or down vote on whether or not to bring the troops home immediately. The Rules Committee and the leadership of this body would not let us have that up or down vote so they forced us to vote on what I called a sham amendment, a sham resolution that said that by October 15, the President has to give us our mission.

We have been there for 10 months. We have had 24 troops killed. But it is going to take him until October 15 to define for this body what our mission is in Somalia and, by October 15, to report back to us on whether or not he wants to continue our forces there and to what time period.

This is outrageous. This is not what the American people want. This is not what we want, and it is in violation of everything this country stands for.

It was earlier this year, when Ambassador Robert Oakley and Brigadier General Tony Zinni, who were both involved as junior officers during the Vietnam era, they were doing separate interviews on the Somalia situation, yet their quotes were very similar. They said three basic and simple things in terms of advice to us in avoiding another Vietnam.

They said, go in quickly, avoid entanglements with one side or the other, and get out.

We have not followed that advice. We are entangled. We now have POW's. We have troops being fired upon on a daily basis, and we cannot see the light at the end of the tunnel. That is why we have to bring our troops home.

Let me read a quotation from a letter that I had faxed to me from a family in my district, Michael and Stephanie Carroll. This letter will be hand-delivered by me tomorrow to the White House, when I go over for another ceremony. I want to read one paragraph of this letter, because it is very important. I think it sums up the frustration of the American people.

"We supported the successful humanitarian relief effort provided by maybe 10 times the American troops strength in December than by what are currently in Mogadishu. As a proud father and former serviceman with the 82d Airborne, I can say with much pride how much I appreciate the effort and courage of the American troops in Somalia today. However, it is my feeling, after speaking with Michael," their son, "and I stress this is my personal feeling, that the military of the United States should do one of two things—withdraw all American troops from Somalia or supply adequate reinforcements to complete the mission so the American troops and people can continue to hold their heads high with pride and respect."

Their son was ambushed and shot in the shoulder, had his shoulder torn apart, and is in a hospital in Germany right now, when he was trying to stabilize the situation when the two helicopters were shot down. These parents feel as the American people and many of us in this Congress feel. We have lost our mission.

The President had the White House lawn ceremony where he paraded down the green pasture of the White House with the troops behind him and he said, we are back home again. Welcome home, America. But he forgot to tell the American people, we left 4,000 and now 5,700 troops behind. This past weekend 12 of them were brutally murdered and massacred.

It is time that this President stopped worrying about the cameras and what looks good walking down the White House lawn and start worrying about the young men and women who are serving in Somalia. It is time that he bring them back home. And if he will not do that, then we have to do it legislatively.

Many of us tried to do it on the floor of the House last week, and the Rules Committee and the leadership would not let us have an up or down vote. Why? because they knew they would be embarrassed. Democrats as well as Republicans would have voted to cut off all funding for the Somalia operation, so the leadership of this body said, do not authorize that type of an amendment on the House floor.

I want to ask my colleagues to do something very simple. H.R. 239 was introduced by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA] on August 4 of this year. It is a very simple resolution. It says, bring the troops home.

I have asked the Clerk of the House today to prepare a discharge petition to force this bill on the House floor for a vote within 7 legislative days. I am asking all of our colleagues, those that are on the floor tonight, those that are back in their offices and those that might be watching any other place inside the beltway, to come down to this well today, tomorrow, and Thursday and sign the discharge petition for H. Res. 239.

If this President will not face up to reality, if the leadership of this body will not face up to reality, then we have an obligation to take care of those troops who are currently in harm's way.

We have got to bring out our POW's. We have got to bring all of our troops back home to America.

I would urge all our colleagues to join with us in that effort, and I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TANNER). The Chair would like to remind Members that it is not in order to direct remarks in debate to persons viewing the proceedings in the galleries or on television or even to other Members who, not being present in the Chamber, might be viewing the proceedings on television. All remarks should be addressed to the Chair.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH].

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I make my remarks to the Chair.

I would like to compliment the previous speaker for the excellent statement he made, because had this Congress joined the previous speaker and myself in that May 25 vote, our soldiers would be home today. And they would not be coming home in body bags or be prisoners of war in Somalia. They would be here in this country today.

What concerns me, Mr. Speaker, is that we have a President who wants to

stay there. And, Mr. Speaker, we have a Secretary of State who wants to stay there. We have a Secretary of Defense who wants to stay there. We have a chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, all Democrats, who wants to stay there.

But every Republican I have talked to wants to bring our soldiers home.

Mr. Speaker, that is precisely why we have to have this special order, because the American people are asking us to act for them, if their leadership does not. So we have to speak for the American people. That is why I want to thank the previous speaker and all the speakers we had here this afternoon and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for taking this special order. I think it is important to point out that the people who want to stay there are the Democrats. The people who want to come home are the Republicans.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin.

We also have another outstanding Member of this House, the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY].

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY].

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding to me and also for taking this special order on a very, very vital subject.

I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] and to point out to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] and others that my office has been inundated in the last 24 hours, in particular, with calls from constituents who are absolutely irate that our men are being abused as they are in Somalia. And they are saying, come home. We have no business being over there.

I think what we need to do is maybe review these things a little bit. I know it has been done in this special order already, but I am going to do it once more, because I have a couple of comments I want to put on the end.

In December, President Bush deployed more than 20,000 troops in Somalia to restore order and disperse food. The House approved U.S. participating in May, but the Senate left the resolution in limbo.

Since May, Republicans have been trying to get our troops out. As many people who could be fed have been fed.

The situation has degenerated into a civil war.

I have voted constantly to remove our troops.

The situation reminds me of Vietnam. In 1961, the United States sent 275 observers. Eventually, we had to send troops to protect our observers. Finally, we were in war—without knowing why nor knowing how to extricate ourselves.

I think the so-called Powell Doctrine sums up the Republican position—don't go anywhere unless one, it is in the national interest, two, there are defined objectives, and three, there is a definitive exit strategy.

The current United States strategy in Somalia fails on all three points.

This is simply a situation of knowing when to say "when." We have done what we could do to ease the suffering in Somalia. I would venture to say that the continued presence of American troops will only add to the suffering of these people.

Last week—as has happened several times before, the House Democrat leadership stopped an up-and-down vote on American participation in Somalia.

What started as an American peacekeeping mission is rapidly becoming a Democrat leadership war. We should bring our troops home now, and let the Somalis fight their own civil war.

□ 1530

We should let all countries everywhere fight their own civil war, without risking the lives of Americans.

Mr. SOLOMON. I thank the gentlewoman from Maryland. As always, she is right on the mark, and I have a great deal of respect for her.

Mr. Speaker, in bringing this special order to a close, let me just point out that the humanitarian mission of our military in Somalia was accomplished weeks and months ago. Troops should have come home weeks and months ago. Now look at what has happened: 12 dead, 8 missing or held prisoner, and maybe even more; 78 seriously wounded, and maybe even more.

That situation is going to get worse and worse and worse, because there is no visible enemy there to fight. This is not fighting a country that has been invaded. This is not really even a civil war, as I alluded to before. It is nothing but anarchy and chaos in a country that does not even have a government. We have no business being there.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] mentioned that we had a resolution on this floor which was offered in the form of a motion to recommit, which would have required the President to come to this Congress and state the United States' interest and goals that will be served by continuing our troops in this place called Somalia. That motion to recommit was voted down.

I have to say, there were about 20 good Democrats who voted "yes" with about 175 Republicans. But there were about 240 Democrats who voted against that very reasonable resolution. If it had passed, these deaths may not have happened. Mr. Speaker, there is no United States interest and no United States goal in keeping our troops in Somalia today.

That is why I urge all Members to attend the 4 o'clock meeting in SC-5 over on the Senate side, where Secretary of Defense Aspin and Secretary of State Christopher are going to speak to Members and give us reasons. Good reasons are not going to be there.

I ask all Members to go to that meeting and speak up on behalf of the constituents they represent, because they know that the public overwhelmingly rejects our troops being kept in Somalia today. Please go to the meeting, please tell the President to bring these troops home. That is real humanitarianism.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1634

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BONIOR) at 4 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2491, DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Mr. DERRICK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103-274) on the resolution (H. Res. 268) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany 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 officers for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and order to be printed.

NOTIFICATION OF MEMBERS REGARDING CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1804, GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT

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

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, this is to notify members of the House of the Rules Committee's plans regarding H.R. 1804, Goals 2000: Educate America Act. The committee is planning to meet the week of October 11, 1993 to take testimony and grant a rule on the bill. In order to assure timely consideration of the bill on the floor, the Rules Committee is considering a rule that may limit the offering of amendments.

Any Member who is contemplating an amendment to H.R. 1804 should submit to the Rules Committee in H-312 in the Capitol, 55 copies of the amendment and a brief explanation of the amendment no later than 12 noon on Tuesday, October 12, 1993.

The Rules Committee is expected to make in order the text of H.R. 3210 as original text for the purposes of amendment. This text, in addition to a number of necessary technical and conforming changes, incorporates changes requested by the administration into the Goals 2000 bill that was reported from the Committee on Education and Labor. Therefore, all amendments should be drafted to that text. It is my understanding that this substitute will be available from the document room tomorrow. Members should instruct legislative counsel to draft their amendments to conform to the text of H.R. 3210.

We appreciate the cooperation of all Members in this effort to be fair and orderly in granting a rule for H.R. 1804.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2518

Mr. NATCHER submitted the following conference report and statement on 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:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 103-275)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to 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," having met after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 13, 21, 26, 31, 39, 67, 71, 72, 109, 116, 118, 121, 125, 126, 127, 134, and 135.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 30, 50, 52, 61, 63, 73, 78, 82, 87, 90, 101, 112, 113, 114, 115, 119, and 122, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$4,615,801,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$64,218,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$85,576,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$5,579,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$1,122,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$2,926,381,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$2,051,132,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$331,915,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$128,701,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$21,677,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$119,981,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$233,605,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$111,039,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$3,750,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$69,917,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$135,409,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$2,189,960,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$2,189,960,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$300,000,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 62:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$4,237,050,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$871,282,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 66:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$63,590,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 75:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$6,924,497,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 76:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$6,896,052,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 77:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 77, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$5,642,000,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 79:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 79, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$41,434,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 80:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$91,373,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 81:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$305,193,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 83:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 83, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$798,208,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$613,445,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 85:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$123,129,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 86:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 86, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$33,437,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 88:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$1,376,659,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 89:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 89, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$1,050,603,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 91:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 91, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$250,998,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 93:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$240,155,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 94:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 94, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$36,431,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 95:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 95, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$38,992,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 96:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 96, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$3,108,702,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 97:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 97, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$2,149,686,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 98:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 98, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$339,257,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 99:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 99, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$253,152,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 100:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 100, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$116,878,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 102:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 102, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$2,296,936,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 103:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$78,435,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 105:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate Numbered 105, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$1,481,183,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 106:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 106, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$38,077,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 107:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 107, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$23,455,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 110:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 110, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$8,020,160,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 128:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 128, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment insert: *$205,097,000*.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 130:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 130, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$1,690,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 131:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 131, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$8,657,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 132:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 132, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

SEC. 507. 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").

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 6, 11, 15, 23, 24, 25, 28, 29, 34, 41, 45, 48, 49, 51, 53, 54, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 65, 68, 69, 70, 74, 92, 104, 108, 111, 117, 120, 123, 124, 129, and 133.

WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
NEAL SMITH,
DAVID R. OBEY,
LOUIS STOKES,
STENY H. HOYER,

NANCY PELOSI,
NITA M. LOWEY,
JOSÉ E. SERRANO,
ROSA L. DELAURO,
JOHN EDWARD PORTER,
BILL YOUNG,
HELEN DELICH BENTLEY,
HENRY BONILLA,
JOSEPH M. MCDADE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

TOM HARKIN,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,
DANIEL K. INOUYE,
DALE BUMPERS,
HARRY REID,
HERB KOHL,
PATTY MURRAY,
ARLEN SPECTER,
MARK O. HATFIELD,
TED STEVENS,
THAD COCHRAN,
SLADE GORTON,
CONNIE MACK,
CHRISTOPHER S. BOND,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to 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, submit the following joint statement to the House and Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ADMINISTRATION

TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICES

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $4,615,801,000 instead of $4,943,181,000 as proposed by the House and $4,588,536,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement includes $4,234,000 to continue the Samoan, Pacific Islander and Asian American employment and training initiative, including $3,234,000 to be allocated to the State of Hawaii, $2,970,000 for labor market information and $1,500,000 for microenterprise grants under title IV of JTPA. The conferees agree that the $12,537,000 provided for the McKinney homeless program includes $7,482,000 for the Employment and Training Administration and $5,055,000 for the Assistant Secretary for Veterans Employment and Training.

Amendment No. 2: Earmarks $64,218,000 for Native American job training instead of $61,871,000 as proposed by the House and $65,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3: Earmarks $85,576,000 for migrants and seasonal farmworkers instead of $78,303,000 as proposed by the House and $88,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are agreed that the farmworker housing program should be continued in its current form, with the understanding that grants may be awarded on a competitive basis; the agreement includes $3,000,000 for this program.

Amendment No. 4: Earmarks $5,579,000 for all activities conducted by and through the National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee instead of $5,357,000 as proposed by the House and $5,800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 5: Earmarks $3,861,000 for rural concentrated employment programs as proposed by the Senate instead of $3,831,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 6: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the first sum named in said amendment, insert: *$206,000,000*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement provides an additional $206,000,000 for the summer youth employment program for the summer of 1994, instead of $300,000,000 as proposed by the House and $178,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The agreement also provides for a separate appropriation of $50,000,000 for the school-to-work program to be available for obligation for the period October 1, 1993 through June 30, 1995.

With the amount appropriated in this bill for summer youth employment for program year 1993, it is the intent of the conferees to ensure that the Department of Labor has sufficient funds to maintain the program year 1992 participant level of 655,000 youths.

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates $1,122,000 for the National Center for the Workplace instead of $744,000 as proposed by the House and $1,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8: Inserts separate appropriation of $750,000 for the Women in Apprenticeship and Nontraditional Occupations Act as proposed by the Senate. The House bill did not include a separate appropriation for this.

Amendment No. 9: Deletes language proposed by the House providing that certain summer youth employment funds shall be available for obligation for the period October 1, 1993 through June 30, 1994. This matter has been addressed under amendment number 6. Also deletes language proposed by the House that would have provided that funds are to be available for the period beginning October 1, 1993 to carry out the women in Apprenticeship and Nontraditional Occupations Act. This matter has been addressed under amendment number 8.

STATE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE OPERATIONS

Amendment No. 10: Appropriate $77,042,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $69,542,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 11: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert: *$3,376,617,000*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement includes $9,140,000 for unemployment insurance automation grants and $9,000,000 for employment service automation grants.

Amendment No. 12: Earmarks $74,986,000 for activities under the Wagner-Peyser Act as proposed by the Senate instead of $67,486,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 13: Inserts unemployment workload threshold level of 3.28 million proposed by the House instead of 3.437 million as proposed by the Senate.

PENSION AND WELFARE BENEFITS ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates $64,058,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $64,408,000 as proposed by the House.

EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 15: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert: *: Provided, That the Secretary of Labor is authorized to accept, retain and spend in the name of the Department of Labor all sums of money ordered to be paid to the Secretary of Labor, in accordance with the terms of the Consent Judgment in Civil Action No. 91-0027 of the United States District Court for the District of the Northern Mariana Islands (May 21, 1992)*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

Inserts language proposed by the Senate that would authorize the Secretary of Labor to accept and spend funds received as a result of a consent judgment in U.S. District Court for the Northern Mariana Islands. Deletes language proposed by the Senate expressing the sense of the Congress that Members of Congress should participate on an equal basis with all other Americans in the health care system that results from health care reform legislation.

BLACK LUNG DISABILITY TRUST FUND

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates $1,002,175,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,001,575,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 17: Earmarks $29,529,000 for transfer to the salaries and expenses account as proposed by the Senate instead of $28,929,000 as proposed by the House. The increase over the House bill is for the financing of an additional 39 FTE's to prevent the closings of the black lung field offices.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates $297,244,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $294,640,000 as proposed by the House. The conference agreement includes $31,112,000 for the onsite consultation program.

MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 19: Appropriates $195,002,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $193,858,000 as proposed by the House.

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates $282,018,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $281,768,000 as proposed by the House. The conference agreement includes $250,000 for continuation of the BLS publication of the aircraft manufacturers employment cost index; this funding is provided for one additional year of publication, with the intent that the industry and interested Federal agencies cooperate in seeking any funding for subsequent fiscal years.

Amendment No. 21: Makes available $51,927,000 from the Unemployment Trust Fund as proposed by the House instead of $51,227,000 as proposed by the Senate.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates $143,127,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $142,242,000 as proposed by the House.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

Amendment No. 23: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of

the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert:

For expenses necessary during the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and each fiscal year thereafter, for the maintenance and operation of a comprehensive program of centralized services which the Secretary of Labor may prescribe and deem appropriate and advantageous to provide on a reimbursable basis under the provisions of the Economy Act (subject to prior notice to OMB) in the national office and field: *Provided*, That such fund shall be reimbursed in advance from funds available to agencies, bureaus, and offices for which such centralized services are performed at rates which will return in full cost of operations including services obtained through cooperative administrative services units under the Economy Act, including reserves for accrued annual leave, worker's compensation, depreciation of capitalized equipment, and amortization of ADP software and systems (either acquired or donated): *Provided further*, That funds received for services rendered to any entity or person for use of Departmental facilities, including associated utilities and security services, shall be credited to and merged with this fund.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement includes the Senate language with regard to the Working Capital Fund amended to make it permanent in nature.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 24: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert:

SEC. 102. None of the funds in the Employees' Compensation Fund under 5 U.S.C. 8147 shall be expended for payment of compensation, benefits, and expenses to any individual convicted of a violation of 18 U.S.C. 1920, or of any felony fraud related to the application for or receipt of benefits under subchapters I or III of chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement includes language prohibiting the payment of benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to any individual who has been convicted of defrauding the program.

Amendment No. 25: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which prohibits the Secretary of Labor from implementing, during fiscal year 1994 only, certain Davis-Bacon "helper" regulations and certain proposed regulations concerning apprenticeship in the construction industry. The conferees have taken this action on a one-time basis and are agreed that any further action on this matter should be taken by the authorizing committees of jurisdiction.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES

Amendment No. 26: Deletes a legal citation proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 27: Appropriates $2,926,381,000 instead of $2,833,588,000 as proposed by the House and $2,954,341,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Within the total provided for the health care for the homeless program, the conferees have included $3,250,000 to provide school-based primary health care services to homeless and at-risk youth.

The conferees support the continued efforts to establish a Statewide health care system and health scholarship program for Native Hawaiians. Of the funds made available, $450,000 is intended for the administration of Papa Ola Lokahi, and $700,000 is for the Native Hawaiian Health Care Scholarship Program to support a wide variety of health care disciplines, particularly nurse practitioners. The remaining funds are to be utilized for the operation of the five island health care systems.

The conferees intend that $1,500,000 of the funds made available under the Pacific Basin initiative be allocated to the Medical Officer Training Program.

If any funds are available under the Area Health Education Centers program to initiate any new core centers, the conferees encourage the agency to give consideration, among other factors, to applicants in States that demonstrate a strong financial commitment to Area Health Education Centers.

The conferees do not intend to require the Health Resources and Services Administration to revise its procedures for allocating fiscal year 1994 lending authority in the Health Education Assistance Loan Program.

Amendment No. 28: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which establishes a limitation on funds that may be used for the health centers malpractice claims fund.

VACCINE INJURY COMPENSATION PROGRAM TRUST FUND

Amendment No. 29: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which appropriates $3,000,000 for administrative costs rather than $2,500,000 as proposed by the House.

VACCINE INJURY COMPENSATION

Amendment No. 30: Appropriates $110,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $80,000,000 as proposed by the House.

CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION

DISEASE CONTROL, RESEARCH, AND TRAINING

Amendment No. 31: Deletes a legal citation proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates $2,051,132,000 instead of $1,910,182,000 as proposed by the House and $2,088,781,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement includes sufficient funds to support the full cost of the Tuskegee reimbursement program within the sexually transmitted diseases grants and infertility programs.

The conferees commend the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) for undertaking a comprehensive review of their HIV prevention activities and for initiating a process for community-level planning. Within the funds provided for HIV prevention programs, the conferees intend that the CDC have the flexibility to respond to the changing nature of the HIV epidemic by implementing administrative reforms. Meanwhile, the CDC is encouraged to continue the direct funding of community-based organizations until such time as comprehensive reforms are in place and evaluated.

The conference agreement includes $116,769,000 for tuberculosis control activities rather than $120,269,000 as proposed by the House and $106,269,000 as proposed by the Senate.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE

The conferees encourage the Institute to provide grants to meet the important equipment and instrumentation needs in cancer research, with a particular emphasis on those emerging institutions of excellence so recognized with cancer center planning grant awards. The conferees believe it is of critical importance to provide for the unique needs of emerging institutions of excellence to enable them to attract the quality researchers necessary to build a highly competitive research institution.

The conferees intend that the Director of the Institute have the discretion in reviewing cancer research facilities construction needs to address excellent and outstanding projects with the funds provided in fiscal year 1994.

The conferees encourage the Institute to permit citizens of the State of Hawaii, and particularly Native Hawaiians, to participate in Federally-supported clinical trials.

NATIONAL HEART, LUNG, AND BLOOD INSTITUTE

The conferees are encouraged by the progress that the Institute has made with respect to both sickle cell disease and bone marrow transplantation. The conferees encourage the Institute to continue to capitalize on the research opportunities it has created in these areas, including, for example, applying the new approaches of gene therapy and bone marrow transplants to curing sickle cell disease.

The conferees are pleased that the Director is moving ahead with the establishment of the National Center for Sleep Disorders Research and encourages support for the full range of Center activities.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF MENTAL HEALTH

The conferees remain concerned about suicide, particularly among youths, and are supportive of the suicide centers. The conferees strongly encourage the Institute to continue its commitment to basic and epidemiological research on potential causes and risk factors for suicide, as well as interventions to prevent suicide and suicidal behavior.

NATIONAL CENTER FOR RESEARCH RESOURCES

Amendment No. 33: Appropriates $331,915,000 instead of $328,915,000 as proposed by the House and $332,915,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 34: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert: *$7,000,000*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement identifies $7,000,000 for construction of extramural facilities instead of $8,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The House had no comparable provision. In accordance with the National Institutes of Health Revitalization Act of 1993, the conferees expect twenty-five percent of the extramural facilities construction funds appropriated to be awarded to institutions of emerging excellence.

NATIONAL CENTER FOR HUMAN GENOME RESEARCH

Amendment No. 35: Appropriates $128,701,000 instead of $119,030,000 as proposed by the House and $131,925,000 as proposed by the Senate.

JOHN E. FOGARTY INTERNATIONAL CENTER

Amendment No. 36: Appropriates $21,677,000 instead of $22,240,000 as proposed by the House and $19,988,000 as proposed by the Senate.

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

Amendment No. 37: Appropriates $119,981,000 instead of $118,481,000 as proposed by the House and $120,481,000 as proposed by the Senate.

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

(Including Transfer of Funds)

Amendment No. 38: Appropriates $233,605,000 instead of $224,746,000 as proposed by the House and $241,225,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 39: Deletes language proposed by the Senate earmarking $15,000,000 for a director's discretionary fund and directing that $12,000,000 of this amount be allocated for Decade of the Brain activities.

The conference agreement includes $7,500,000 for a director's discretionary fund instead of $15,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The House bill did not include funds for this purpose. The amount agreed to will permit the Director to respond quickly to problems which emerge during the fiscal year without having to transfer funds from other priorities. The conferees note that the Office of the Director appropriation is unique within the National Institutes of Health in permitting full funding of the cost of scientific projects through the use of multiyear awards. The conferees expect the Director to use this authority for any initiatives which are undertaken within the discretionary fund. None of these funds are to be used to initiate projects requiring additional funding in future years without the formal approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations through the normal reprogramming process. The conferees believe that the portion of this amount which should be allocated to Decade of the Brain activities should be determined by the Director after considering the full range of scientific needs at the National Institutes of Health. Accordingly, the conferees have not specified a funding level for Decade of the Brain activities.

The conference agreement also includes $3,505,000 for the Office of Alternative Medicine and $11,138,000 for the Office of Research on Women's Health.

The conferees are concerned about serious charges of racial discrimination and sexual harassment at the National Institutes of Health. The problem should be addressed and resolved. The conferees instruct the Secretary to submit progress reports on the resolution of this problem to the House and Senate committees semiannually with an initial report due not later than January 31, 1994.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

Amendment No. 40: Appropriates $111,039,000 instead of $114,385,000 as proposed by the House and $101,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement includes $27,500,000 to continue construction of the consolidated office building.

69-059 O—97 Vol. 139 (Pt. 16) 38

SUBSTANCE ABUSE AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

SUBSTANCE ABUSE AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

Amendment No. 41: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert: *$2,125,178,000*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

Amendment No. 42: Limits the amount available for obligation pursuant to section 571 of the Public Health Service Act to $3,750,000 instead of $4,000,000 as proposed by the House and $3,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR HEALTH

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR HEALTH

Amendment No. 43: Appropriates $69,917,000 instead of $68,758,000 as proposed by the House and $71,167,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees direct the Department to allocate $70,000 to the General Services Administration to conduct an environmental assessment of the East Plaza of the Hubert Humphrey Building to determine the feasibility of that site for the National Museum of Health and Medicine.

AGENCY FOR HEALTH CARE POLICY AND RESEARCH

HEALTH CARE POLICY AND RESEARCH

Amendment No. 44: Appropriates $135,409,000 instead of $129,051,000 as proposed by the House and $139,305,000 as proposed by the Senate.

HEALTH CARE FINANCING ADMINISTRATION

GRANTS TO STATES FOR MEDICAID

Amendment No. 45: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate providing a $26,600,000,000 advance fiscal year 1995 Medicaid appropriation.

PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

Amendment No. 46: Makes available from trust funds $2,189,960,000 instead of $2,172,598,000 as proposed by the House and $2,192,414,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 47: Earmarks $2,189,960,000 instead of $2,172,598,000 as proposed by the House and $2,192,414,000 as proposed by the Senate.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

SPECIAL BENEFITS FOR DISABLED COAL MINERS

Amendment No. 48: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which provides an advance appropriation of $190,000,000 for the first quarter of fiscal year 1995 for black lung benefit payments as proposed by the Senate. The House bill did not provide an advance appropriation for this purpose.

SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME PROGRAM

Amendment No. 49: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert: *$20,183,775,000*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate. The bill includes $20,183,775,000 for supplemental security income instead of $20,181,775,000 as proposed by the House and $20,172,775,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement provides $6,000,000 that was included in the Senate bill for SSI outreach demonstration projects. The House bill did not provide funding for this purpose. The conferees have also provided $41,000,000 to reimburse the trust funds for the SSI program share of the automation initiative funded in the limitation on administrative expenses account. The House bill included $45,000,000 for this purpose, and the Senate bill included $30,000,000.

Amendment No. 50: Provides that indefinite budget authority can be used to fund supplemental security income benefit payments after June 15 as proposed by the Senate, instead of after July 31 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 51: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which provides an advance appropriation of $6,770,000,000 for the first quarter of fiscal year 1995 for supplemental security income benefit payments as proposed by the Senate. The House bill did not provide an advance appropriation for this purpose.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Amendment No. 52: Provides a limitation on administrative expenses of $4,876,085,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $4,874,285,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 53: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which provides authority to fund work related to the Coal Industry Retiree Health Benefit Act of 1992 from the Limitation on Administrative Expenses account as proposed by the Senate. The House bill contained no similar provision.

Amendment No. 54: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert: *: Provided, That reimbursement to the Trust Funds under this heading for administrative expenses to carry out sections 9704 and 9706 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall be made, with interest, not later than September 30, 1996: Provided further, That not more than $1,800,000 is available until September 30, 1995 for expenses necessary for the Commission on the Social Security "Notch" Issue, established by section 635 of Public Law 102-393 as amended*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate requiring that the trust funds be reimbursed with interest for work related to the Coal Industry Retiree Health Benefit Act of 1992, and which earmarks $1,800,000 for the Commission on the Social Security "Notch" Issue to remain available until September 30, 1995. The conferees have deleted language proposed by the Senate which limited the amount of Medicare trust funds which could be used for administrative expenses. The House bill included no similar provision.

Amendment No. 55: Appropriates $300,000,000 for an automation initiative instead of $330,000,000 as proposed by the House and $220,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

FAMILY SUPPORT PAYMENTS TO STATES

Amendment No. 56: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which provides an advance appropriation of $4,200,000,000 for the first quarter of fiscal year 1995 for family support payments to States payments as proposed by the Senate. The House bill did not provide an advance appropriation for this purpose.

LOW INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE

Amendment No. 57: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert:

LOW INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE

For making payments under title XXVI of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, $1,475,000,000 to be available for obligation in the period October 1, 1994 through June 30, 1995.

For making payments under title XXVI of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, an additional $600,000,000: Provided, That all of the funds available under this paragraph are hereby designated by Congress to be emergency requirements pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: Provided further, That these funds shall be made available only after submission to Congress of a formal budget request by the President that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement includes an advance appropriation of $1,475,000,000 for low income home energy assistance for the program year 1994–1995, and does not include borrowing authority to reimburse prior year costs. The Senate bill included an advance appropriation of $1,507,408,000, of which $100,000,000 could be used for FY 1994 costs. The House bill did not contain an advance appropriation for this program. The conferees recommend that $25,000,000 be used for the leveraging incentive fund in program year 1993–1994, and that $35,000,000 be used for this purpose in program year 1994–1995.

The conference agreement also includes language proposed by the Senate which provides an additional $600,000,000 which shall be available only upon submission to Congress of a formal budget request designating the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985. These funds are intended to be made available to meet emergencies which may be national, regional, or local in scope. The conferees therefore urge the Administration to make sufficient LIHEAP emergency funds available to meet the needs of flood victims in the Midwest States, without requiring a nationwide, formula distribution.

COMMUNITY SERVICES BLOCK GRANT

Amendment No. 58: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert: *$464,224,000, of which $42,940,000 shall be for carrying out section 681(a) of the Community Services Block Grant Act, including $12,000,000 which shall be for carrying out the National Youth Sports Program: Provided, That payments from such amount to the grantee and subgrantee administering the National Youth Sports Program may not exceed the aggregate amount contributed in cash or in kind by the grantee and subgrantee: Provided further, that amounts in excess of $9,400,000 of such amount may not be made available to the grantee and subgrantees administering the National Youth Sports Program unless the grantee agrees to provide contributions in cash over and above the preceding year's cash contribution to such program in an amount that equals 29 percent of such excess amount*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement provides $464,224,000 for Community Services Block Grant programs instead of $447,643,000 as proposed by the House and $472,649,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate which earmarks $12,000,000 for the National Youth Sports Program and requires the grantee to provide a cash match of 29% of the amount in excess of $9,400,000. The House bill did not include a matching provision.

The conferees expect the Department of Health and Human Services to promulgate new regulations delineating increased matching requirements for the youth sports program, as well as to require a competitive process, for one or more awards. Promotional activities for this program shall include acknowledgement of the federal funding provided through the Department of Health and Human Services.

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the Senate which reduced funding for consultant services for agencies funded in the bill by 3.52 percent from the level proposed in the President's Budget. The House bill contained no similar provision.

PAYMENTS TO STATES FOR CHILD CARE ASSISTANCE

Amendment No. 59: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which makes funding for the child care and development block grant program available for obligation under the same terms and conditions applicable in the prior fiscal year. The House bill contained no similar provision.

SOCIAL SERVICES BLOCK GRANT

Amendment No. 60: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which appropriates $2,800,000,000 for the ongoing social services block grant under title XX of the Social Security Act and appropriates an additional $1,000,000,000, to remain available until expended, for the newly-authorized activities under title XX related to public investments in qualified empowerment zones and enterprise communities. The House bill included $2,800,000,000 for the ongoing title XX program.

CHILDREN AND FAMILIES SERVICES PROGRAMS

Amendment No. 61: Inserts a legal citation for the Commission on Child and Family Welfare as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are concerned about the increasing number of commissions that have an extended life. It is not the intention of the conferees to fund this Commission beyond fiscal year 1995.

Amendment No. 62: Appropriates $4,237,050,000 instead of $4,169,806,000 as proposed by the House and $4,296,796,000 as proposed by the Senate.

FAMILY SUPPORT AND PRESERVATION

Amendment No. 63: Appropriates $60,000,000 for family support and preservation as proposed by the Senate. The House bill did not include funding for this new program, which was authorized in the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1993 after passage of the House appropriations bill.

ADMINISTRATION ON AGING

AGING SERVICES PROGRAMS

Amendment No. 64: Appropriates $871,282,000 instead of $841,875,000 as proposed by the House and $881,863,000 as proposed by the Senate.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

GENERAL DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

Amendment No. 65: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert: *$94,431,000*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment to the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement includes $500,000 to continue the HHS human services transportation initiative.

The conferees are aware that a significant amount of activity is occurring within the Department concerning programs related to domestic violence. The conferees request the Department to prepare and submit a report prior to next year's appropriations hearings outlining the amount of money being spent on this subject and explaining the operations of the various programs and the degree to which they are coordinated.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Amendment No. 66: Appropriates $63,590,000 instead of $62,379,000 as proposed by the House and $64,800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 67: Restores House language stricken by the Senate providing the funds for administrative costs for each Public Health Service agency funded in this Act shall not exceed the amount requested in the President's budget.

Amendment No. 68: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert: *1911(d) and section 1503*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment to the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement restores a legal citation stricken by the Senate pertaining to automatic taps in authorizing legislation.

The conferees direct the National Cancer Institute and the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences to become more aggressive in the pursuit of research into the role environmental factors play in contributing to elevated rates of breast cancer such as have been observed in Nassau and Suffolk counties, in the State of New York, and in other counties throughout the United States. In prohibiting funding for section 1911(d) of P.L. 103–43, it is not the intention of the conferees to prohibit the conduct of the study described in section 1911(a) through 1911(c). The conferees strongly encourage such research into the role of environmental factors and note that the National Cancer Institute retains the discretion

to use funds appropriated under this Act to carry out the study so described.

Amendment No. 69: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert: *SEC. 207. For the purpose of carrying out subparts II and III of part B of title XIX of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x–21 et seq.) for fiscal year 1994, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall obligate $7,532,065 from the amounts made available pursuant to section 1935(b) of that Act for fiscal year 1994 to those States and Indian tribes or tribal organizations for which the amounts specified in the award statement issued by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration under those subparts on November 2, 1992, was greater than the amount specified in the award statement issued on August 6, 1993, in the amounts equal to those differentials.*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

Inserts language proposed by the Senate that requires the Secretary to obligate $7,532,065 from funds available for the Substance Abuse Block Grant program to compensate certain States for reductions in their fourth quarter allocations for the block grant in fiscal year 1993. The original allocations were based on faulty data. The language has been modified to delete references to individual States. The conferees stress that this one-time action is only being taken to correct an error by the Department in the original allocation of funds to the States. This action will have no impact on State allocations under the block grant in fiscal year 1994.

Amendment No. 70: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate pertaining to funding limits for peer review organizations in the Medicare program.

Amendment No. 71: Deletes language proposed by the Senate pertaining to disproportionate share hospital payments in the Medicaid program.

Amendment No. 72: Deletes without prejudice Senate language which would have prohibited payment of Social Security disability benefits to individuals who are confined to mental institutions because of a "not guilty by reason of insanity" court judgment. The conferees believe this issue should be addressed by the authorizing committees.

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

EDUCATION REFORM

Amendment No. 73: Inserts technical provision added by the Senate indicating that this appropriation account includes authority to transfer funds.

Amendment No. 74: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert: *For carrying out education reform activities authorized in law including activities authorized by the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, $155,000,000, of which $5,000,000, under section 402 of the Perkins Act, shall be used by the Secretary for activities, including peer review of applications, related to school-to-work transition, and $45,000,000 shall be used under section 420A of the Perkins Act for State grants and subgrants to initiate activities in States and localities related to school-to-work transition: Provided, That $105,000,000 of the funds provided shall be for carrying out activities authorized by the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, or similar legislation, if enacted into law by April 1, 1994, of which $5,000,000 shall be used for "State Planning for Improving Student Achievement Through Integration of Technology Into the Curriculum"; and that if such legislation is not enacted by that date, the $105,000,000 shall be transferred to "Student Financial Assistance" to be used to alleviate the funding shortfall in the Pell Grant program under subpart 1 of part A of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended: Provided further, That funds appropriated in this account shall become available on July 1, 1994 and remain available through September 30, 1995.*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement includes $50,000,000 for school-to-work initiatives as proposed by the Senate instead of $33,750,000 as proposed by the House.

The conference agreement also provides a contingent appropriation of $105,000,000 to implement the Goals 2000: Educate America legislation currently being considered by the House and the Senate. This amount includes $5,000,000 for new initiatives to integrate technology into school curricula, if authorized. The agreement provides that if the Goals 2000 legislation is not enacted by April 1, 1994 that the funds provided will be applied to the shortfall in the Pell Grant program as proposed by the Senate. This appropriation is provided on a forward funded basis similar to other education accounts.

COMPENSATORY EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Amendment No. 75: Appropriates $6,924,497,000 for compensatory education for the disadvantaged programs instead of $6,871,147,000 as proposed by the House and $6,971,620,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 76: Provides that $6,896,052,000 become available on a forward funded basis instead of $6,844,682,000 as proposed by the House and $6,943,175,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 77: Earmarks $5,642,000,000 for basic grants instead of $5,597,000,000 as proposed by the House and $5,687,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 78: Deletes language included by the House but stricken by the Senate. The conference agreement follows the basic statute which provides for a setaside of basis grant funds for grants to the Pacific Outlying Areas.

Amendment No. 79: Earmarks $41,434,000 for capital expenses instead of $39,734,000 as proposed by the House and $42,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 80: Earmarks $91,373,000 for the Even Start program instead of $89,123,000 as proposed by the House and $92,123,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 81: Earmarks $305,193,000 for migrant education programs instead of $302,773,000 as proposed by the House and $306,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 82: Earmarks $4,960,000 for rural technical assistance as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,980,000 as proposed by the House.

IMPACT AID

Amendment No. 83: Appropriates $798,208,000 for Impact Aid activities instead of $813,074,000 as proposed by the House and $748,368,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 84: Earmarks $613,445,000 for 3(a) payments instead of $630,000,000 as proposed by the House and $563,780,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 85: Earmarks $123,129,000 for 3(b) payments instead of $123,629,000 as proposed by the House and $121,629,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 86: Earmarks $33,437,000 for 3(d)(2)(B) payments instead of $29,462,000 as proposed by the House and $34,762,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 87: Deletes earmark for 3(e) payments included by the House but stricken by the Senate. The conference agreement includes no funding for this activity.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Amendment No. 88: Appropriates $1,376,659,000 for school improvement activities instead of $1,339,178,000 as proposed by the House and $1,393,893,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 89: Provides that $1,050,603,000 of these funds be available on a forward funded basis instead of $1,014,709,000 as proposed by the House and $1,065,101,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 90: Earmarks $25,196,000 for chapter 2 national programs as proposed by the Senate instead of $24,925,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 91: Earmarks $250,998,000 for State grants for mathematics and science education instead of $246,016,000 as proposed by the House and $252,658,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 92: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert: *Provided further, That of the amount provided, $20,000,000 shall be used for Department of Education activities authorized under the Safe Schools Act, or similar legislation, if such legislation is enacted by April 1, 1994, except that if such legislation is not enacted by that date, this amount shall be transferred to "Student Financial Assistance" to be used to alleviate the funding shortfall in the Pell Grant program under subpart 1 of part A of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended.*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement includes $20,000,000 for a new safe schools initiative if enacted into law by April 1, 1994 instead of $32,838,000 as proposed by the Senate. The House bill did not include funds for this purpose. The conferees are agreed that this amount should be available on a forward funded basis similar to other elementary and secondary education programs. The conference agreement provides that if the necessary authorizing legislation is not enacted by April 1, 1994, that these funds will be transferred to "Student Financial Assistance" for the Pell Grant shortfall.

The conferees intend that all of the funds provided for the Ellender fellowships program be used for student fellowships and that the Close Up Foundation provide a Federal dollar match no less than the amount matched in FY 1993. The conferees further intended that the Close Up Foundation match Federal dollars on at least a one to two basis in 1995.

The conferees intend that the funding provided for Education for Native Hawaiians be distributed as follows:

Special Education Program	$1,000,000

Family Based Education Centers	5,000,000
Gifted and Talented Program	1,000,000
Model Curriculum Implementation Project	50,000
Higher Education Program	800,000

Further, given that a priority recommendation of the Native Hawaiian Education Summit was the establishment of cultural learning centers, a minimum of $374,000 shall be for the planning and development of at least two cultural learning centers.

BILINGUAL AND IMMIGRANT EDUCATION

Amendment No. 93: Appropriates $240,155,000 for bilingual and immigrant education instead of $242,789,000 as proposed by the House and $232,251,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 94: Earmarks $36,431,000 for training programs instead of $36,672,000 as proposed by the House and $35,708,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 95: Earmarks $38,992,000 for immigrant education programs instead of $40,000,000 as proposed by the House and $35,968,000 as proposed by the Senate.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Amendment No. 96: Appropriates $3,108,702,000 for special education instead of $3,039,442,000 as proposed by the House and $3,134,734,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 97: Earmarks $2,149,686,000 for Part B grants to States instead of $2,108,218,000 as proposed by the House and $2,163,508,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 98: Earmarks $339,257,000 for preschool grants instead of $325,773,000 as proposed by the House and $343,751,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 99: Earmarks $253,152,000 for Part H grants for infants and families instead of $243,769,000 as proposed by the House and $256,280,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 100: Earmarks $116,878,000 for the Chapter 1 handicapped program instead of $113,755,000 as proposed by the House and $120,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

REHABILITATION SERVICES AND DISABILITY RESEARCH

Amendment No. 101: Includes the citation for the Technology-Related Assistance for Individuals with Disabilities Act as proposed by the Senate. The House bill included a similar citation.

Amendment No. 102: Appropriates $2,296,936,000 for rehabilitation services and disability research instead of $2,251,028,000 as proposed by the House and $2,316,913,000 as proposed by the Senate.

SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

GALLAUDET UNIVERSITY

Amendment No. 103: Appropriates $78,435,000 for Gallaudet University instead of $77,435,000 as proposed by the House and $79,435,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 104: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert: *$1,000,000*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement includes $1,000,000 to remain available until expended for construction instead of $2,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The House bill did not include funds for this purpose.

VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION

Amendment No. 105: Appropriates $1,481,183,000 for vocational and adult education instead of $1,474,243,000 as proposed by the House and $1,483,433,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 106: Earmarks $38,077,000 for vocational education research and demonstration activities instead of $31,327,000 as proposed by the House and $40,327,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 107: Earmarks $23,455,000 for vocational education demonstrations instead of $16,705,000 as proposed by the House and $25,705,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 108: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert: *, including $3,000,000 for model community education and employment centers*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement modifies language inserted by the Senate to require that $3,000,000 of funds for vocational education be earmarked to demonstrate the model community education and employment centers concept. The Senate bill earmarked $5,000,000 for this purpose. The House bill included no similar provision.

STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

Amendment No. 109: Deletes citation proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 110: Appropriates $8,020,160,000 for student financial assistance instead of $8,120,366,000 as proposed by the House and $8,004,293,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 111: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert: *$2,300: Provided further, That notwithstanding section 401(g) of the Act, as amended, if the Secretary determines, prior to publication of the payment schedule for award year 1994–1995, that the $6,303,566,000 included within this appropriation for Pell Grant awards for award year 1994–1995 is insufficient to satisfy fully all such awards for which students are eligible, as calculated under section 401(b) of the Act, the amount paid for each such award shall be reduced by either a fixed or variable percentage, or by a fixed dollar amount, as determined in accordance with a schedule of reductions established by the Secretary for this purpose*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement sets the maximum Pell Grant Award for the 1994–1995 academic year at $2,300 as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,250 as proposed by the House. The conference agreement also includes language requested by the Department of Education requiring the Secretary to reduce awards if the appropriation is inadequate to fully fund Pell awards with the $2,300 maximum. Both the Department and the conferees believe that the amount agreed to in conference for the Pell program is adequate to finance the agreed upon maximum. The additional language authorizing adjustment is not expected to be used but has been included to meet scorekeeping requirements under the Budget Enforcement Act.

The conferees have agreed to provide $584,407,000 for Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants, $616,508,000 for the Federal Work-Study program, and $72,429,000 for State Student Incentive Grants. These are the same levels provided in the Senate bill and the same levels appropriated in fiscal year 1993. The conference agreement also includes $21,250,000 for the second year of the new State Postsecondary Review Program, instead of $25,000,000 as proposed by the House and $10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

GUARANTEED STUDENT LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

NATIONAL COMMISSIONS

Amendment No. 112: Deletes language included by the House but stricken by the Senate. The conference agreement deletes the rescission of Fiscal Year 1993 funds proposed by the House. This rescission would have eliminated all funds for two new commissions authorized by the Higher Education Amendments of 1992. The conference action leaves in place $992,000 each for the National Commission on the Cost of Higher Education and the National Commission on Independent Higher Education.

FEDERAL DIRECT STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Amendment No. 113: Inserts the word "Student" into the appropriate heading as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 114: Modifies the legislative citation for the Federal Direct Student Loan Program Account as proposed by the Senate.

HIGHER EDUCATION

Amendment No. 115: Modifies legislative citation as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 116: Restores legislative citation included by the House but stricken by the Senate. This citation relates to studies of the training needs in the civilian airline industry. The conferees are agreed that $700,000 is included for this study under the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education.

Amendment No. 117: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert: *$893,688,000*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement provides $893,688,000 for higher education instead of $889,855,000 as proposed by the House and $882,974,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 118: Deletes without prejudice legislative language proposed by the Senate. This language would have made a technical amendment to the Higher Education Act related to the Robert Byrd Scholarships program. The conferees understand that this issue is currently being addressed by the authorizing committee. The conference agreement includes sufficient funds to support the cost of this technical change.

HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY

CAPITAL FINANCING, PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Amendment No. 119: Provided for a limitation of $357,000,000 on the volume of loan guarantees issued in Fiscal Year 1994 as proposed by the Senate. The House bill provided for $178,500,000 of guarantees.

EDUCATION RESEARCH, STATISTICS AND IMPROVEMENT

Amendment No. 120: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of

the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which clarifies that funding for this account is available for activities under legislative citations other than section 405 and 406 of the General Education Provisions Act. These citations are expected to be modified by new legislation during Fiscal year 1994.

Amendment No. 121: Restores the citation for Blue Ribbon Schools stricken by the Senate.

Amendment No. 122: Deletes the citation for educational partnership grants as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 123: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert: *$292,592,000: Provided, That $31,000,000 shall be for research centers, including funds to extend the existing award for a research center on the education of disadvantaged students for up to one year; $38,032,000 shall be for regional laboratories, including $9,508,000 for rural initiatives; $32,500,000 shall be for activities under the Fund for Innovation in Education; $4,463,000 shall be for civic education activities under section 4609; $5,396,000 shall be for Grants for Schools and Teachers under subpart 1 and $3,687,000 shall be for Family School Partnerships under subpart 2 of part B of title III of Public Law 100-297; $16,072,000 shall be for national programs under section 2012, including not less than $5,472,000 for the National Clearinghouse for Science and Mathematics under section 2012(d); and $13,871,000 shall be for regional consortia under subpart 2 of part A of title II; $25,944,000 shall be for star schools, of which $4,000,000 shall be awarded competitively for a demonstration of a statewide, two-way interactive fiber optic telecommunications network, carrying voice, video, and data transmissions, and housing a point of presence in every county; and $3,212,000 shall be for the National Writing Project*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

LIBRARIES

Amendment No. 124: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert: *$146,309,000 of which $17,972,000 shall be used to carry out the provisions of title II of the Library Services and Construction Act and shall remain available until expended, and $4,960,000 shall be for section 222 and $2,802,000 shall be for section 223 of the Higher Education Act, of which $2,500,000 shall be for demonstration of on-line and dial-in access to a statewide, multitype library bibliographic data base through a statewide fiber optic network housing a point of presence in every county, connecting library services in every municipality, to be awarded competitively*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement includes $2,500,000 for a demonstration of high technology library bibliographic databases. The conference agreement provides that these funds are to be awarded competitively.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 125: Appropriates $352,008,000 for departmental management as proposed by the House instead of $291,921,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees are concerned the Department continues to ignore the provisions in the Higher Education Act regarding the appointment of a liaison for community and junior colleges. To date, no action has been taken regarding this appointment. The conferees urge the Secretary to comply with the law, including all of the qualifications for the appointee outlined in the Act, and fill the position on an expedited basis.

The conferees concur in concerns expressed in the House report about the Department's peer review of grant applications, and have provided additional resources and flexibility to promote needed improvement of the process. The conferees strongly encourage the Department to return to the practice of requiring three readers for competitive grant proposals, at least two of whom should come from outside the Department and have some expertise in the field in which the grant is to be made. The conferees are particularly concerned about the quality of the review process used to select awardees under the Student Support Services program under TRIO.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 126: Deletes without prejudice Senate language which expressed the sense of the Congress concerning specific funding levels for education in future years.

Amendment No. 127: Deletes without prejudice Senate language which expressed the sense of the Congress that a specific procedure for considering proposals to consolidate or eliminate education programs be established as recommended in the National Performance Review. This matter is currently being reviewed by the Department and proposals are expected in the near future.

TITLE IV—RELATED AGENCIES

ACTION

OPERATING EXPENSES

Amendment No. 128: Appropriates $205,097,000 instead of $201,526,000 as proposed by the House and $206,287,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement deletes the House language that earmarked funds for the VISTA program and the Senate language which reduced funding for consultant services for agencies funded in the bill by 5.025 percent.

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

Amendment No. 129: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert: *$312,000,000, of which $7,000,000 shall be for Ready to Learn activities consistent with the purposes outlined in P.L. 102-545.*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conferees agree that $7,000,000 be set aside for Ready to Learn activities prior to allocating funds under the Public Telecommunications Act of 1992, P.L. 102-356.

The Corporation for Public Broadcasting shall consult with the Department of Education to assure that the Department's school readiness and curriculum goals are integrated into the programming and accompanying materials promulgated in accordance with P.L. 102-245, the Ready to Learn Act.

It is the understanding of the conferees that the Corporation shall award contracts, cooperative agreements, or grants to eligible entities defined in Public Law 102-545, sections 4702(b)(1) and 4702(b)(2).

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON DISABILITY

Amendment No. 130: Appropriates $1,690,000 for National Council on Disability instead of $1,590,000 as proposed by the House and $1,791,000 as proposed by the Senate.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Amendment No. 131: Appropriates $8,657,000 for National Mediation Board instead of $8,506,000 as proposed by the House and $8,807,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 132: Restores section 507 as proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate providing that funds expended under this Act shall be expended in accordance with the Buy American Act. Deletes other language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate concerning the purchase of American-made products.

(Rescission)

Amendment No. 133: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the section number named in said amendment, insert: *508*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement inserts language proposed by the Senate that provides for a cost-of-living adjustment for black lung benefit payments in January, 1994; the agreement also includes a rescission of $225,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, from funds appropriated for the Community Investment Program in Public Law 102-368. The House bill included no similar provisions.

Amendment No. 134: Deletes language proposed by the Senate expressing the sense of the Senate that the Department of Justice should investigate whether any Federal civil rights laws were violated as a result of the murder of Yankel Rosenbaum on August 19, 1991 and the ensuing riots in Crown Heights.

TITLE VI—NONSMOKING POLICY

Amendment No. 135: Deletes title VI of the bill proposed by the Senate that would have required the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to issue within 180 days of enactment guidelines for instituting and enforcing a nonsmoking policy at each indoor facility where children's services are provided and required any person who provides children's services to establish and enforce a nonsmoking policy that meets or exceeds certain requirements.

	FY 1993 Comparable	FY 1994 Budget Request	House Bill	Senate Bill	Conference	Conference vs FY93 Comparable
SUMMARY						
Title I - Department of Labor:						
Federal Funds	12,270,516,000	12,872,261,000	10,972,157,000	10,859,651,000	10,914,538,000	-1,355,978,000
Trust Funds	(3,462,511,000)	(3,690,914,000)	(3,692,212,000)	(3,662,424,000)	(3,701,352,000)	(+238,841,000)
Title II - Department of Health and Human Services:						
Federal Funds	210,931,782,000	215,624,206,000	175,032,320,000	215,968,067,000	215,802,937,000	+4,871,155,000
Current year	(172,736,374,000)	(176,459,426,000)	(175,032,320,000)	(176,700,659,000)	(176,567,937,000)	(+3,831,563,000)
1995 advance	(38,195,408,000)	(39,164,780,000)	---	(39,267,408,000)	(39,235,000,000)	(+1,039,592,000)
Trust Funds	(7,049,992,000)	(8,374,324,000)	(7,774,421,000)	(7,686,037,000)	(7,763,583,000)	(+713,591,000)
Title III - Department of Education:						
Federal Funds	28,087,420,000	30,921,629,000	28,627,320,000	28,755,410,000	28,765,192,000	+677,772,000
Title IV - Related Agencies:						
Federal Funds	1,064,129,000	1,053,017,000	1,047,414,000	1,080,037,000	1,070,596,000	+6,467,000
Current year	(771,489,000)	(760,377,000)	(754,774,000)	(760,037,000)	(758,596,000)	(-12,893,000)
1996 advance	(292,640,000)	(292,640,000)	(292,640,000)	(320,000,000)	(312,000,000)	(+19,360,000)
Trust Funds	(111,062,000)	(109,589,000)	(109,514,000)	(109,514,000)	(109,514,000)	(-1,548,000)
Weed and Seed (P.L. 102-360) (rescission)	225,000,000	---	---	-225,000,000	-225,000,000	-450,000,000
Bill-wide consultant savings	---	---	---	-10,000,000	---	---
Total, all titles:						
Federal Funds	252,578,847,000	260,471,113,000	215,679,211,000	256,428,165,000	256,328,263,000	+3,749,416,000
Current year	(214,090,799,000)	(221,013,693,000)	(215,386,571,000)	(216,840,757,000)	(216,781,263,000)	(+2,690,464,000)
1995 advance	(38,195,408,000)	(39,164,780,000)	---	(39,267,408,000)	(39,235,000,000)	(+1,039,592,000)
1996 advance	(292,640,000)	(292,640,000)	(292,640,000)	(320,000,000)	(312,000,000)	(+19,360,000)
Trust Funds	(10,623,565,000)	(12,174,827,000)	(11,576,147,000)	(11,457,975,000)	(11,574,449,000)	(+950,884,000)
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF LABOR						
EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ADMINISTRATION						
PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION						
Job training programs	22,890,000	25,451,000	23,229,000	23,229,000	23,229,000	+339,000
Trust funds	(2,192,000)	(2,244,000)	(2,244,000)	(2,244,000)	(2,244,000)	(+52,000)
Employment security	457,000	1,970,000	1,582,000	1,582,000	1,582,000	+1,125,000
Trust funds	(13,624,000)	(15,117,000)	(15,117,000)	(15,117,000)	(15,117,000)	(+1,493,000)
Financial and administrative management	14,635,000	19,769,000	19,115,000	19,115,000	19,115,000	+4,480,000
Trust funds	(10,095,000)	(8,232,000)	(8,232,000)	(8,232,000)	(8,232,000)	(-1,863,000)
Executive direction and administration	4,817,000	6,361,000	6,100,000	6,100,000	6,100,000	+1,283,000
Trust funds	(4,240,000)	(1,424,000)	(1,424,000)	(1,424,000)	(1,424,000)	(-2,816,000)
Regional operations	15,934,000	27,539,000	25,184,000	25,184,000	25,184,000	+9,250,000
Trust funds	(25,205,000)	(19,638,000)	(19,638,000)	(19,638,000)	(19,638,000)	(-5,567,000)
Apprenticeship services	16,874,000	17,196,000	17,196,000	17,196,000	17,196,000	+322,000
Total, Program Administration	130,963,000	144,941,000	139,061,000	139,061,000	139,061,000	+8,098,000
Federal funds	75,607,000	98,286,000	92,406,000	92,406,000	92,406,000	+16,799,000
Trust funds	(55,356,000)	(46,655,000)	(46,655,000)	(46,655,000)	(46,655,000)	(-8,701,000)
TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICES						
Grants to States:						
Adult training	1,015,021,000	1,030,021,000	988,021,000	988,021,000	988,021,000	-27,000,000
Youth training	676,682,000	686,682,000	658,682,000	658,682,000	658,682,000	-18,000,000
Summer youth employment and training program	840,674,000	1,688,782,000	988,782,000	853,782,000	888,282,000	+47,608,000
Dislocated worker assistance	566,646,000	1,921,006,000	1,118,000,000	1,118,000,000	1,118,000,000	+551,354,000
Flood relief supplemental	54,600,000	---	---	---	---	-54,600,000
Federally administered programs:						
Native Americans	61,871,000	61,871,000	61,871,000	65,000,000	64,218,000	+2,347,000
Migrants and seasonal farmworkers	78,303,000	78,303,000	78,303,000	88,000,000	85,576,000	+7,273,000
School-to-work	---	135,000,000	33,750,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	+50,000,000
Job Corps:						
Operations	891,532,000	913,913,000	913,913,000	913,913,000	913,913,000	+22,381,000
Construction and renovation	74,543,000	239,756,000	126,556,000	126,556,000	126,556,000	+52,013,000
Subtotal, Job Corps	966,075,000	1,153,669,000	1,040,469,000	1,040,469,000	1,040,469,000	+74,394,000
Youth Fair Chance	50,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	---	25,000,000	-25,000,000
Veterans' employment	8,957,000	8,957,000	8,957,000	8,957,000	8,957,000	---
National activities:						
Pilots and demonstrations	35,080,000	35,080,000	35,080,000	37,080,000	36,580,000	+1,500,000
Research, demonstration and evaluation	8,301,000	8,301,000	12,301,000	12,301,000	12,301,000	+4,000,000
Other	20,521,000	20,521,000	20,521,000	23,550,000	23,021,000	+2,500,000
Subtotal, National activities	63,902,000	63,902,000	67,902,000	72,931,000	71,902,000	+8,000,000
Subtotal, Federal activities	1,229,108,000	1,526,702,000	1,316,252,000	1,325,357,000	1,346,122,000	+117,014,000
Total, Job Training Partnership Act	4,382,731,000	6,853,193,000	5,069,737,000	4,943,842,000	4,999,107,000	+616,376,000

	FY 1993 Comparable	FY 1994 Budget Request	House Bill	Senate Bill	Conference	Conference vs FY93 Comparable
Job training for the homeless:						
Regular program	7,482,000	7,482,000	7,482,000	7,482,000	7,482,000	---
Veterans program	5,055,000	5,055,000	5,055,000	5,055,000	5,055,000	---
Glass Ceiling Commission	744,000	744,000	744,000	744,000	744,000	---
National Center for the Workplace	744,000	744,000	744,000	1,500,000	1,122,000	+378,000
Total, Training and Employment Services	4,396,756,000	6,867,218,000	5,083,762,000	4,958,623,000	5,013,510,000	+616,754,000
COMMUNITY SERVICE EMPLOYMENT FOR OLDER AMERICANS						
National contracts	308,926,000	328,472,000	320,190,000	320,190,000	320,190,000	+11,264,000
State grants	87,134,000	92,646,000	90,310,000	90,310,000	90,310,000	+3,176,000
Total	396,060,000	421,118,000	410,500,000	410,500,000	410,500,000	+14,440,000
FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT AND ALLOWANCES						
Trade adjustment	211,000,000	189,900,000	189,900,000	189,900,000	189,900,000	-21,100,000
Other activities	250,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	-150,000
Total	211,250,000	190,000,000	190,000,000	190,000,000	190,000,000	-21,250,000
STATE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE OPERATIONS						
Unemployment Compensation (Trust Funds):						
State Operations	(1,629,783,000)	(1,715,906,000)	(1,715,906,000)	(1,715,906,000)	(1,715,906,000)	(+86,123,000)
State integrity activities	(327,356,000)	(356,928,000)	(356,928,000)	(356,928,000)	(356,928,000)	(+29,572,000)
National Activities	(8,741,000)	(16,295,000)	(16,295,000)	(34,575,000)	(25,435,000)	(+16,694,000)
Contingency	(299,912,000)	(347,272,000)	(347,272,000)	(347,272,000)	(347,272,000)	(+47,360,000)
Contingency bill language (OMB estimate)	(114,300,000)	(70,500,000)	(70,500,000)	(70,500,000)	(70,500,000)	(-43,800,000)
Portion treated as budget authority	---	(39,770,000)	(39,770,000)	---	(39,770,000)	(+39,770,000)
Subtotal, Unemployment Compensation(trust funds)	(2,265,792,000)	(2,476,171,000)	(2,476,171,000)	(2,454,681,000)	(2,485,311,000)	(+219,519,000)
Employment Service:						
Allotments to States:						
Federal funds	21,555,000	24,986,000	24,986,000	24,986,000	24,986,000	+3,431,000
Trust funds	(789,405,000)	(807,870,000)	(807,870,000)	(807,870,000)	(807,870,000)	(+18,465,000)
Subtotal	810,960,000	832,856,000	832,856,000	832,856,000	832,856,000	+21,896,000
National Activities:						
Federal funds	2,002,000	2,056,000	2,056,000	2,056,000	2,056,000	+54,000
Trust funds	(66,754,000)	(68,556,000)	(68,556,000)	(60,556,000)	(68,556,000)	(+1,802,000)
Targeted jobs tax credit	(14,880,000)	(15,282,000)	(14,880,000)	(15,282,000)	(14,880,000)	---
One-stop Career Centers	---	150,000,000	42,500,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	+50,000,000
Subtotal, Employment Service	894,596,000	1,068,750,000	960,848,000	960,750,000	968,348,000	+73,752,000
Federal funds	23,557,000	177,042,000	69,542,000	77,042,000	77,042,000	+53,485,000
Trust funds	(871,039,000)	(891,708,000)	(891,306,000)	(883,708,000)	(891,306,000)	(+20,267,000)
Total, State Unemployment	3,160,388,000	3,544,921,000	3,437,019,000	3,415,431,000	3,453,659,000	+293,271,000
Federal Funds	23,557,000	177,042,000	69,542,000	77,042,000	77,042,000	+53,485,000
Trust Funds	(3,136,831,000)	(3,367,879,000)	(3,367,477,000)	(3,338,389,000)	(3,376,617,000)	(+239,786,000)
ADVANCES TO UNEMPLOYMENT TRUST FUND AND OTHER FUNDS	4,665,000,000	2,556,000,000	2,556,000,000	2,556,000,000	2,556,000,000	-2,109,000,000
Total, Employment & Training Administration	12,960,417,000	13,724,198,000	11,816,342,000	11,669,615,000	11,762,730,000	-1,197,687,000
Federal funds	9,768,230,000	10,309,664,000	8,402,210,000	8,284,571,000	8,339,458,000	-1,428,772,000
Trust funds	(3,192,187,000)	(3,414,534,000)	(3,414,132,000)	(3,385,044,000)	(3,423,272,000)	(+231,085,000)
LABOR - MANAGEMENT STANDARDS						
SALARIES AND EXPENSES						
Labor-management relations service	1,339,000	1,370,000	1,370,000	1,370,000	1,370,000	+31,000
Labor-management standards enforcement	26,010,000	25,939,000	25,939,000	25,939,000	25,939,000	-71,000
Total, LMS	27,349,000	27,309,000	27,309,000	27,309,000	27,309,000	-40,000
PENSION AND WELFARE BENEFITS ADMINISTRATION						
SALARIES AND EXPENSES						
Enforcement and compliance	48,888,000	48,977,000	49,630,000	49,280,000	49,280,000	+392,000
Policy, regulation and public service	11,357,000	11,303,000	11,303,000	11,303,000	11,303,000	-54,000
Executive direction	3,592,000	3,475,000	3,475,000	3,475,000	3,475,000	-117,000
Total, PWBA	63,837,000	63,755,000	64,408,000	64,058,000	64,058,000	+221,000
PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION						
Program Administration subject to limitation (Trust Funds)	(33,533,000)	(34,194,000)	(34,194,000)	(34,194,000)	(34,194,000)	(+661,000)
Services related to terminations not subject to limitations (non-add) 1/	(99,039,000)	(101,487,000)	(101,487,000)	(101,487,000)	(101,487,000)	(+2,448,000)
Total, PBGC	(132,572,000)	(135,681,000)	(135,681,000)	(135,681,000)	(135,681,000)	(+3,109,000)

	FY 1993 Comparable	FY 1994 Budget Request	House Bill	Senate Bill	Conference	Conference vs FY93 Comparable
EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS ADMINISTRATION						
SALARIES AND EXPENSES						
Enforcement of wage and hour standards	94,957,000	95,157,000	97,379,000	97,379,000	97,379,000	+2,422,000
Federal contractor EEO standards enforcement	55,695,000	55,398,000	56,443,000	56,443,000	56,443,000	+748,000
Federal programs for workers' compensation	70,336,000	71,923,000	71,923,000	71,923,000	71,923,000	+1,587,000
Trust funds	(991,000)	(989,000)	(989,000)	(989,000)	(989,000)	(-2,000)
Executive direction and support services	11,466,000	11,431,000	11,431,000	11,431,000	11,431,000	-35,000
Total, salaries and expenses	233,445,000	234,898,000	238,165,000	238,165,000	238,165,000	+4,720,000
Federal funds	232,454,000	233,909,000	237,176,000	237,176,000	237,176,000	+4,722,000
Trust funds	(991,000)	(989,000)	(989,000)	(989,000)	(989,000)	(-2,000)
SPECIAL BENEFITS						
Federal employees compensation benefits	286,000,000	275,000,000	275,000,000	275,000,000	275,000,000	-11,000,000
Longshore and harbor workers' benefits	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	---
Total, Special Benefits	290,000,000	279,000,000	279,000,000	279,000,000	279,000,000	-11,000,000
BLACK LUNG DISABILITY TRUST FUND						
Benefit payments and interest on advances	888,251,000	947,967,000	947,967,000	947,967,000	947,967,000	+59,716,000
Employment Standards Admin., salaries & expenses	29,726,000	28,929,000	28,929,000	29,529,000	29,529,000	-197,000
Departmental Management, salaries and expenses	25,698,000	24,384,000	24,384,000	24,384,000	24,384,000	-1,314,000
Departmental Management, inspector general	352,000	295,000	295,000	295,000	295,000	-57,000
Subtotal, Black Lung Disablty. Trust Fund, apprn	944,027,000	1,001,575,000	1,001,575,000	1,002,175,000	1,002,175,000	+58,148,000
Treasury administrative costs (indefinite)	756,000	756,000	756,000	756,000	756,000	---
Total, Black Lung Disability Trust Fund	944,783,000	1,002,331,000	1,002,331,000	1,002,931,000	1,002,931,000	+58,148,000
Total, Employment Standards Administration	1,468,228,000	1,516,229,000	1,519,496,000	1,520,096,000	1,520,096,000	+51,868,000
Federal funds	1,467,237,000	1,515,240,000	1,518,507,000	1,519,107,000	1,519,107,000	+51,870,000
Trust funds	(991,000)	(989,000)	(989,000)	(989,000)	(989,000)	(-2,000)
OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION						
SALARIES AND EXPENSES						
Safety and health standards	8,008,000	8,647,000	8,647,000	8,647,000	8,647,000	+639,000
Enforcement:						
Federal Enforcement	134,689,000	137,518,000	137,518,000	138,122,000	138,122,000	+3,433,000
State programs	67,285,000	68,630,000	68,630,000	68,630,000	68,630,000	+1,345,000
Technical Support	17,377,000	17,946,000	17,946,000	17,946,000	17,946,000	+569,000
Compliance Assistance	40,957,000	41,859,000	42,009,000	44,009,000	44,009,000	+3,052,000
Safety and health statistics	12,820,000	12,795,000	12,795,000	12,795,000	12,795,000	-25,000
Executive direction and administration	7,114,000	7,095,000	7,095,000	7,095,000	7,095,000	-19,000
Total, OSHA	288,250,000	294,490,000	294,640,000	297,244,000	297,244,000	+8,994,000
MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION						
SALARIES AND EXPENSES						
Enforcement:						
Coal	100,331,000	101,416,000	102,723,000	103,377,000	103,377,000	+3,046,000
Metal/nonmetal	39,259,000	40,399,000	41,052,000	41,542,000	41,542,000	+2,283,000
Standards development	1,398,000	1,378,000	1,378,000	1,378,000	1,378,000	-20,000
Assessments	2,497,000	3,802,000	3,802,000	3,802,000	3,802,000	+1,305,000
Educational policy and development	13,359,000	14,475,000	14,475,000	14,475,000	14,475,000	+1,116,000
Technical support	21,683,000	21,977,000	21,977,000	21,977,000	21,977,000	+294,000
Program administration	12,970,000	8,451,000	8,451,000	8,451,000	8,451,000	-4,519,000
Total, Mine Safety and Health Administration	191,497,000	191,898,000	193,858,000	195,002,000	195,002,000	+3,505,000
BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS						
SALARIES AND EXPENSES						
Employment and Unemployment Statistics	84,934,000	85,150,000	86,470,000	86,470,000	86,470,000	+1,536,000
Labor Market Information (Trust Funds)	(48,907,000)	(50,227,000)	(51,927,000)	(51,227,000)	(51,927,000)	(+3,020,000)
Prices and cost of living	89,345,000	93,144,000	93,144,000	93,144,000	93,144,000	+3,799,000
Compensation and working conditions	64,305,000	64,211,000	64,211,000	64,461,000	64,461,000	+156,000
Productivity and technology	6,721,000	6,986,000	6,986,000	6,986,000	6,986,000	+265,000
Economic growth and employment projections	4,082,000	4,193,000	4,193,000	4,193,000	4,193,000	+111,000

1/ Increase in non-limitation funds per 11/6/92 reapportionment.

	FY 1993 Comparable	FY 1994 Budget Request	House Bill	Senate Bill	Conference	Conference vs FY93 Comparable
Executive direction and staff services	25,605,000	26,764,000	26,764,000	26,764,000	26,764,000	+1,159,000
Total, Bureau of Labor Statistics	323,899,000	330,675,000	333,695,000	333,245,000	333,945,000	+10,046,000
Federal Funds	274,992,000	280,448,000	281,768,000	282,018,000	282,018,000	+7,026,000
Trust Funds	(48,907,000)	(50,227,000)	(51,927,000)	(51,227,000)	(51,927,000)	(+3,020,000)
DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT						
SALARIES AND EXPENSES						
Executive direction	20,676,000	19,751,000	19,751,000	19,751,000	19,751,000	-925,000
Legal services	58,485,000	59,096,000	59,096,000	59,446,000	59,446,000	+961,000
Trust funds	(326,000)	(332,000)	(332,000)	(332,000)	(332,000)	(+6,000)
International labor affairs	7,590,000	7,572,000	7,572,000	7,942,000	7,942,000	+352,000
Administration and management	15,069,000	14,911,000	14,911,000	14,911,000	14,911,000	-158,000
Adjudication	16,638,000	19,369,000	19,369,000	19,369,000	19,369,000	+2,731,000
Promoting employment of people with disabilities	4,312,000	4,320,000	4,320,000	4,320,000	4,320,000	+8,000
Women's Bureau	7,757,000	7,605,000	7,605,000	7,770,000	7,770,000	+13,000
Civil Rights Activities	4,922,000	4,906,000	4,906,000	4,906,000	4,906,000	-16,000
Chief Financial Officer	6,691,000	4,712,000	4,712,000	4,712,000	4,712,000	-1,979,000
Total, Salaries and expenses	142,466,000	142,574,000	142,574,000	143,459,000	143,459,000	+993,000
Federal funds	142,140,000	142,242,000	142,242,000	143,127,000	143,127,000	+987,000
Trust funds	(326,000)	(332,000)	(332,000)	(332,000)	(332,000)	(+6,000)
VETERANS EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING						
State Administration:						
Disabled Veterans Outreach Program	(82,004,000)	(84,218,000)	(84,218,000)	(84,218,000)	(84,218,000)	(+2,214,000)
Local Veterans Employment Program	(76,111,000)	(78,166,000)	(78,166,000)	(78,166,000)	(78,166,000)	(+2,055,000)
Subtotal, State Administration	(158,115,000)	(162,384,000)	(162,384,000)	(162,384,000)	(162,384,000)	(+4,269,000)
Federal Administration	(21,309,000)	(21,339,000)	(21,339,000)	(21,339,000)	(21,339,000)	(+30,000)
National Veterans Training Institute	(2,848,000)	(2,925,000)	(2,925,000)	(2,925,000)	(2,925,000)	(+77,000)
Total, Trust Funds	(182,272,000)	(186,648,000)	(186,648,000)	(186,648,000)	(186,648,000)	(+4,376,000)
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL						
Audit:						
Federal funds	20,285,000	19,436,000	19,436,000	19,436,000	19,436,000	-849,000
Trust funds	(3,954,000)	(3,990,000)	(3,990,000)	(3,990,000)	(3,990,000)	(+36,000)
Investigation:						
Federal funds	8,426,000	8,945,000	8,945,000	8,945,000	8,945,000	+519,000
Trust funds	(341,000)	---	---	---	---	(-341,000)
Office of Labor Racketeering	11,632,000	11,690,000	11,690,000	11,690,000	11,690,000	+58,000
Executive Direction and Management	6,641,000	7,144,000	7,144,000	7,144,000	7,144,000	+503,000
Total, Office of the Inspector General	51,279,000	51,205,000	51,205,000	51,205,000	51,205,000	-74,000
Federal funds	46,984,000	47,215,000	47,215,000	47,215,000	47,215,000	+231,000
Trust funds	(4,295,000)	(3,990,000)	(3,990,000)	(3,990,000)	(3,990,000)	(-305,000)
Total, Departmental Management	376,017,000	380,427,000	380,427,000	381,312,000	381,312,000	+5,295,000
Federal funds	189,124,000	189,457,000	189,457,000	190,342,000	190,342,000	+1,218,000
Trust funds	(186,893,000)	(190,970,000)	(190,970,000)	(190,970,000)	(190,970,000)	(+4,077,000)
Total, Labor Department 1/	15,733,027,000	16,563,175,000	14,664,369,000	14,522,075,000	14,615,890,000	-1,117,137,000
Federal funds	12,270,516,000	12,872,261,000	10,972,157,000	10,859,651,000	10,914,538,000	-1,355,978,000
Trust funds	(3,462,511,000)	(3,690,914,000)	(3,692,212,000)	(3,662,424,000)	(3,701,352,000)	(+238,841,000)
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES						
HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES ADMINISTRATION						
HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES						
Health Care Delivery and Assistance:						
Community health centers	558,808,000	617,308,000	584,600,000	610,000,000	603,650,000	+44,842,000
Migrant health centers	57,306,000	63,806,000	59,000,000	59,000,000	59,000,000	+1,694,000
Black lung clinics	3,968,000	3,968,000	3,968,000	4,200,000	4,142,000	+174,000
Health care for the homeless	58,014,000	57,960,000	64,014,000	60,000,000	63,011,000	+4,997,000
National Health Service Corps:						
Field placements	42,720,000	44,720,000	44,720,000	46,720,000	44,720,000	+2,000,000
Recruitment	75,939,000	93,939,000	80,000,000	82,000,000	82,000,000	+6,061,000
Subtotal, Natl Health Service Corps	118,659,000	138,659,000	124,720,000	128,720,000	126,720,000	+8,061,000
Grants to communities for scholarships	478,000	478,000	478,000	478,000	478,000	---
Public housing health service grants	8,923,000	8,916,000	8,923,000	8,923,000	8,923,000	---
Hansen's disease services	18,623,000	18,487,000	18,487,000	21,500,000	20,747,000	+2,124,000
Payment to Hawaii, treatment of Hansen's Disease	2,976,000	2,976,000	2,976,000	2,976,000	2,976,000	---

1/ Includes Federal and Trust funds.

	FY 1993 Comparable	FY 1994 Budget Request	House Bill	Senate Bill	Conference	Conference vs FY93 Comparable
Native Hawaiian health care	3,589,000	3,586,000	3,586,000	4,586,000	4,336,000	+747,000
Pacific Basin initiative	2,556,000	873,000	873,000	3,000,000	2,468,000	-88,000
Alzheimers demonstration grants	4,959,000	4,933,000	4,959,000	4,959,000	4,959,000	---
Total, Health Care Delivery & Assistance	838,859,000	921,950,000	876,584,000	908,342,000	901,410,000	+62,551,000
Maternal and child health:						
Maternal & child health block grant	664,534,000	704,534,000	664,534,000	694,534,000	687,034,000	+22,500,000
Healthy start	79,325,000	100,325,000	90,000,000	100,000,000	97,500,000	+18,175,000
Emergency medical services for children	4,810,000	4,808,000	7,500,000	7,500,000	7,500,000	+2,690,000
Total, Maternal and child health	748,669,000	809,667,000	762,034,000	802,034,000	792,034,000	+43,365,000
Health Professions:						
Exceptional financial need scholarships	10,433,000	10,428,000	10,433,000	10,433,000	10,433,000	---
Centers of excellence	23,481,000	23,442,000	23,481,000	23,481,000	23,481,000	---
Disadvantaged assistance	31,202,000	37,702,000	31,202,000	31,202,000	31,202,000	---
HPSL recapitalization	7,925,000	7,923,000	7,925,000	7,925,000	7,925,000	---
Scholarships for disadvantaged students	17,102,000	17,088,000	17,102,000	17,102,000	17,102,000	---
Faculty loan repayment	1,053,000	1,045,000	1,053,000	1,053,000	1,053,000	---
Public health and preventive medicine	7,265,000	10,692,000	7,265,000	8,000,000	7,816,000	+551,000
Health administration traineeships / projects	1,494,000	995,000	995,000	995,000	995,000	-499,000
Family medicine training / departments	38,194,000	47,194,000	47,194,000	47,194,000	47,194,000	+9,000,000
General dentistry residencies	3,730,000	2,483,000	3,730,000	3,730,000	3,730,000	---
General internal medicine and pediatrics	16,847,000	20,080,000	16,847,000	16,847,000	16,847,000	---
Physician assistants	4,916,000	8,867,000	4,916,000	7,100,000	6,554,000	+1,638,000
Primary care loan program	---	5,000,000	---	---	---	---
Allied health special projects	3,467,000	2,305,000	3,467,000	3,467,000	3,467,000	---
Area health education centers	19,812,000	13,177,000	19,812,000	23,000,000	22,203,000	+2,391,000
Border health training centers	2,836,000	---	2,836,000	2,836,000	2,836,000	---
Geriatric training and education centers	10,013,000	6,661,000	6,661,000	10,013,000	9,175,000	-838,000
Interdisciplinary traineeships	4,017,000	---	---	4,017,000	4,017,000	---
Health professions data system	643,000	3,643,000	643,000	643,000	643,000	---
Research on health professions issues	1,123,000	2,623,000	1,123,000	1,123,000	1,123,000	---
Podiatric medicine	615,000	---	---	615,000	615,000	---
Chiropractic demonstration grants	---	---	---	1,000,000	750,000	+750,000
Nurse training:						
Advanced nurse education	12,253,000	8,158,000	12,000,000	12,253,000	12,253,000	---
Nurse practitioners / nurse midwives	15,443,000	19,583,000	15,443,000	17,443,000	16,943,000	+1,500,000
Special projects	10,401,000	10,500,000	10,401,000	10,401,000	10,401,000	---
Professional nurse traineeships	13,973,000	19,623,000	13,973,000	15,973,000	15,473,000	+1,500,000
Nurse disadvantaged assistance	3,693,000	5,193,000	3,693,000	3,693,000	3,693,000	---
Nurse anesthetists	2,724,000	1,813,000	2,724,000	2,724,000	2,724,000	---
School nurse initiative	---	4,000,000	---	---	---	---
Loan repayment for shortage area service	2,044,000	2,043,000	2,044,000	2,044,000	2,044,000	---
Subtotal, Nurse training	60,531,000	70,913,000	60,278,000	64,531,000	63,531,000	+3,000,000
Total, Health professions	266,699,000	292,261,000	266,963,000	286,307,000	282,692,000	+15,993,000
Resources development:						
Organ transplantation	2,767,000	2,652,000	2,652,000	2,652,000	2,652,000	-115,000
Health teaching facilities interest subsidies	415,000	415,000	415,000	415,000	415,000	---
Trauma care	4,368,000	4,349,000	4,349,000	5,000,000	4,837,000	+469,000
Total, Resources Development	7,550,000	7,416,000	7,416,000	8,067,000	7,904,000	+354,000
Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS):						
Education and training centers	16,435,000	16,435,000	16,435,000	16,435,000	16,435,000	---
Pediatric demonstrations	20,897,000	20,897,000	---	---	---	-20,897,000
Ryan White AIDS Programs:						
Emergency assistance	184,757,000	336,457,000	318,000,000	328,000,000	325,500,000	+140,743,000
Comprehensive care programs	115,288,000	233,988,000	183,897,000	183,897,000	183,897,000	+68,609,000
Early intervention program	47,968,000	81,568,000	47,968,000	47,968,000	47,968,000	---
Title IV	---	6,000,000	22,000,000	22,000,000	22,000,000	+22,000,000
Subtotal, Ryan White AIDS programs	348,013,000	658,013,000	571,865,000	581,865,000	579,365,000	+231,352,000
AIDS dental services	---	---	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	+7,000,000
Subtotal, AIDS	385,345,000	695,345,000	595,300,000	605,300,000	602,800,000	+217,455,000

	FY 1993 Comparable	FY 1994 Budget Request	House Bill	Senate Bill	Conference	Conference vs FY93 Comparable
Family planning	173,418,000	208,418,000	173,418,000	183,418,000	180,918,000	+7,500,000
Rural health research	4,176,000	4,176,000	4,176,000	11,176,000	9,426,000	+5,250,000
Rural outreach grants	24,779,000	24,779,000	24,779,000	26,779,000	26,279,000	+1,500,000
Buildings and facilities	982,000	942,000	942,000	942,000	942,000	-40,000
National practitioner data bank	6,000,000	7,500,000	7,500,000	7,500,000	7,500,000	+1,500,000
User fees	-6,000,000	-7,500,000	-7,500,000	-7,500,000	-7,500,000	-1,500,000
Program management	121,487,000	121,976,000	121,976,000	121,976,000	121,976,000	+489,000
Total, Health resources and services	2,571,964,000	3,086,930,000	2,833,588,000	2,954,341,000	2,926,381,000	+354,417,000
MEDICAL FACILITIES GUARANTEE AND LOAN FUND:						
Interest subsidy program	10,900,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	-1,900,000
HEALTH EDUCATION ASSISTANCE LOANS PROGRAM (HEAL):						
New loan subsidies	22,202,000	23,512,000	23,512,000	23,512,000	23,512,000	+1,310,000
Liquidating account (non-add)	(47,631,000)	(64,878,000)	(64,878,000)	(64,878,000)	(64,878,000)	(+17,247,000)
HEAL loan limitation (non-add)	(340,000,000)	(375,000,000)	(375,000,000)	(375,000,000)	(375,000,000)	(+35,000,000)
Program management	2,946,000	2,946,000	2,946,000	2,946,000	2,946,000	---
Total, HEAL	25,148,000	26,458,000	26,458,000	26,458,000	26,458,000	+1,310,000
VACCINE INJURY COMPENSATION PROGRAM TRUST FUND:						
Post - FY88 claims (trust fund)	54,740,000	84,180,000	84,180,000	84,180,000	84,180,000	+29,440,000
HRSA administration (trust fund)	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	+500,000
Subtotal, Vaccine injury compensation trust fund	57,240,000	86,680,000	86,680,000	87,180,000	87,180,000	+29,940,000
VACCINE INJURY COMPENSATION:						
Pre - FY89 claims (appropriation)	110,000,000	80,000,000	80,000,000	110,000,000	110,000,000	---
Total, Vaccine injury	167,240,000	166,680,000	166,680,000	197,180,000	197,180,000	+29,940,000
Total, Health Resources & Services Admin	2,775,252,000	3,289,068,000	3,035,726,000	3,186,979,000	3,159,019,000	+383,767,000
CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL						
DISEASE CONTROL, RESEARCH AND TRAINING						
Preventive Health Services Block Grant	148,743,000	148,743,000	148,743,000	160,000,000	157,186,000	+8,443,000
Prevention centers	5,456,000	5,456,000	5,456,000	7,500,000	6,989,000	+1,533,000
Sexually transmitted diseases:						
Grants	78,042,000	78,042,000	78,042,000	80,000,000	79,511,000	+1,469,000
Infertility program	---	14,000,000	5,000,000	10,000,000	8,750,000	+8,750,000
Direct operations	11,510,000	11,510,000	11,510,000	11,510,000	11,510,000	---
Subtotal, Sexually transmitted diseases	89,552,000	103,552,000	94,552,000	101,510,000	99,771,000	+10,219,000
Immunization:						
Grants	287,820,000	557,620,000	377,000,000	482,000,000	455,750,000	+167,930,000
Direct operations	50,868,000	107,568,000	70,000,000	70,000,000	70,000,000	+19,132,000
Adverse events reporting	2,393,000	2,393,000	2,393,000	2,393,000	2,393,000	---
Subtotal, Immunization programs	341,081,000	667,581,000	449,393,000	554,393,000	528,143,000	+187,062,000
Infectious disease	40,282,000	40,282,000	40,282,000	50,282,000	47,782,000	+7,500,000
Tuberculosis:						
Grants	73,566,000	123,566,000	115,000,000	101,000,000	111,500,000	+37,934,000
Program operations	5,269,000	5,269,000	5,269,000	5,269,000	5,269,000	---
Subtotal, Tuberculosis	78,835,000	128,835,000	120,269,000	106,269,000	116,769,000	+37,934,000
Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS)	498,253,000	543,253,000	543,253,000	543,253,000	543,253,000	+45,000,000
Chronic and environmental disease prevention	70,117,000	92,117,000	108,017,000	128,000,000	123,004,000	+52,887,000
Lead poisoning prevention	29,683,000	29,683,000	34,683,000	34,683,000	34,683,000	+5,000,000
Breast and cervical cancer screening	71,303,000	85,303,000	72,303,000	80,000,000	78,076,000	+6,773,000
Injury control	31,808,000	41,808,000	31,808,000	41,808,000	39,308,000	+7,500,000
Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH):						
Research	101,252,000	111,252,000	104,000,000	119,252,000	115,439,000	+14,187,000
Training	11,092,000	11,092,000	12,592,000	13,000,000	12,898,000	+1,806,000
Subtotal, NIOSH	112,344,000	122,344,000	116,592,000	132,252,000	128,337,000	+15,993,000
Epidemic services	73,520,000	73,520,000	73,520,000	73,520,000	73,520,000	---
National Center for Health Statistics:						
Program operations	48,605,000	56,605,000	48,605,000	52,605,000	51,605,000	+3,000,000
Program support	2,927,000	2,927,000	2,927,000	2,927,000	2,927,000	---
1% evaluation funds (non-add)	(28,873,000)	(28,873,000)	(28,873,000)	(28,873,000)	(28,873,000)	---
Subtotal, health statistics	51,532,000	59,532,000	51,532,000	55,532,000	54,532,000	+3,000,000
Buildings and facilities	16,648,000	16,648,000	16,648,000	16,648,000	16,648,000	---
Program management	3,388,000	3,131,000	3,131,000	3,131,000	3,131,000	-257,000
Total, Disease Control	1,662,545,000	2,161,788,000	1,910,182,000	2,088,781,000	2,051,132,000	+388,587,000

	FY 1993 Comparable	FY 1994 Budget Request	House Bill	Senate Bill	Conference	Conference vs FY93 Comparable
NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH (INCLUDES AIDS)						
National Cancer Institute	1,978,341,000	2,041,324,000	2,082,267,000	2,082,267,000	2,082,267,000	+103,926,000
Forward funding (FY95 - FY97)	---	100,798,000	---	---	---	---
National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute	1,214,715,000	1,198,402,000	1,277,880,000	1,277,880,000	1,277,880,000	+63,165,000
National Institute of Dental Research	161,141,000	163,009,000	169,520,000	169,520,000	169,520,000	+8,379,000
National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases	680,660,000	671,284,000	716,054,000	716,054,000	716,054,000	+35,394,000
Forward funding (FY95 - FY97)	---	5,851,000	---	---	---	---
National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke	599,477,000	590,065,000	630,650,000	630,650,000	630,650,000	+31,173,000
National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases	984,210,000	1,065,583,000	1,065,583,000	1,065,583,000	1,065,583,000	+81,373,000
National Institute of General Medical Sciences	832,235,000	825,897,000	875,511,000	875,511,000	875,511,000	+43,276,000
Forward funding (FY95 - FY97)	---	7,167,000	---	---	---	---
National Institute of Child Health and Human Development	527,752,000	539,464,000	555,195,000	555,195,000	555,195,000	+27,443,000
Forward funding (FY95 - FY97)	---	2,893,000	---	---	---	---
National Eye Institute	275,913,000	272,201,000	290,260,000	290,260,000	290,260,000	+14,347,000
National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences	251,187,000	253,356,000	264,249,000	264,249,000	264,249,000	+13,062,000
Forward funding (FY95 - FY97)	---	7,950,000	---	---	---	---
National Institute on Aging	399,528,000	392,615,000	420,303,000	420,303,000	420,303,000	+20,775,000
Forward funding (FY95 - FY97)	---	1,541,000	---	---	---	---
National Institute of Arthritis and Musculoskeletal and Skin Diseases	212,243,000	210,382,000	223,280,000	223,280,000	223,280,000	+11,037,000
National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders	154,775,000	153,088,000	162,823,000	162,823,000	162,823,000	+8,048,000
National Institute of Nursing Research	48,496,000	48,975,000	51,018,000	51,018,000	51,018,000	+2,522,000
National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism	176,442,000	173,615,000	185,617,000	185,617,000	185,617,000	+9,175,000
National Institute on Drug Abuse	404,183,000	407,098,000	425,201,000	425,201,000	425,201,000	+21,018,000
National Institute of Mental Health	583,122,000	576,015,000	613,444,000	613,444,000	613,444,000	+30,322,000
National Center for Research Resources	312,657,000	324,625,000	328,915,000	332,915,000	331,915,000	+19,258,000
Forward funding (FY95 - FY97)	---	3,262,000	---	---	---	---
National Center for Human Genome Research	106,134,000	131,925,000	119,030,000	131,925,000	128,701,000	+22,567,000
Forward funding (FY95 - FY97)	---	2,624,000	---	---	---	---
John E. Fogarty International Center	19,715,000	19,988,000	22,240,000	19,988,000	21,677,000	+1,962,000
National Library of Medicine	103,613,000	133,349,000	118,481,000	120,481,000	119,981,000	+16,368,000
Office of the Director	190,334,000	234,907,000	224,746,000	241,225,000	233,605,000	+43,271,000
Buildings and facilities	108,731,000	108,731,000	114,385,000	101,000,000	111,039,000	+2,308,000
Total N.I.H.	10,325,604,000	10,667,984,000	10,936,652,000	10,956,389,000	10,955,773,000	+630,169,000
Current year, FY 1994	(10,325,604,000)	(10,535,898,000)	(10,936,652,000)	(10,956,389,000)	(10,955,773,000)	(+630,169,000)
Forward funding (FY95 - FY97)	---	(132,086,000)	---	---	---	---
SUBSTANCE ABUSE AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION						
Center for Mental Health Services:						
Mental Health Block Grant	277,919,000	277,919,000	267,919,000	277,919,000	277,919,000	---
Children's mental health	4,903,000	4,903,000	40,000,000	15,000,000	35,000,000	+30,097,000
Clinical training	2,956,000	2,956,000	---	2,956,000	2,500,000	-456,000
AIDS training	2,987,000	2,987,000	2,943,000	2,987,000	2,943,000	-44,000
Community support demonstrations	24,402,000	24,402,000	24,402,000	24,402,000	24,402,000	---
Grants to States for the homeless (PATH)	29,462,000	29,462,000	29,462,000	29,462,000	29,462,000	---
Homeless services demonstrations	21,419,000	21,419,000	21,419,000	21,419,000	21,419,000	---
Protection and advocacy	20,832,000	20,832,000	20,832,000	22,332,000	21,957,000	+1,125,000
AIDS demonstrations	---	---	2,000,000	---	1,500,000	+1,500,000
Subtotal, mental health	384,880,000	384,880,000	408,977,000	396,477,000	417,102,000	+32,222,000
Center for Substance Abuse Treatment:						
Substance abuse block grant	1,107,899,000	1,130,509,000	1,096,899,000	1,190,509,000	1,167,107,000	+59,208,000
Transfer from forfeiture fund (non-add)	---	---	---	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(+10,000,000)
Treatment grants to crisis areas	34,848,000	34,848,000	34,848,000	34,848,000	34,848,000	---
Treatment improvement demos:						
Pregnant/post partum women and children	43,638,000	49,228,000	49,228,000	49,228,000	49,228,000	+5,590,000
Transfer from forfeiture fund (non-add)	(5,000,000)	---	---	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	---
Campus program	18,395,000	9,395,000	9,395,000	9,395,000	9,395,000	-9,000,000
Criminal justice program	32,990,000	32,990,000	32,990,000	33,990,000	33,990,000	+1,000,000
Critical populations	44,681,000	44,681,000	44,681,000	43,681,000	43,681,000	-1,000,000

	FY 1993 Comparable	FY 1994 Budget Request	House Bill	Senate Bill	Conference	Conference vs FY93 Comparable
Comprehensive community treatment program	16,573,000	26,773,000	27,773,000	26,773,000	27,523,000	+10,950,000
Transfer from forfeiture fund (non-add)	(4,700,000)	---	---	---	---	(-4,700,000)
Training	5,429,000	5,429,000	5,429,000	5,429,000	5,429,000	---
AIDS demonstration & training:						
Training	2,812,000	2,812,000	2,812,000	2,812,000	2,812,000	---
Linkage	7,809,000	7,809,000	7,809,000	7,809,000	7,809,000	---
Outreach	10,535,000	10,535,000	10,535,000	10,535,000	10,535,000	---
Treatment capacity expansion program	---	88,872,000	22,072,000	---	10,000,000	+10,000,000
Transfer from forfeiture fund (non-add)	(15,300,000)	---	---	(10,000,000)	---	(-15,300,000)
Subtotal, Substance Abuse Treatment	1,325,609,000	1,443,881,000	1,344,471,000	1,415,009,000	1,402,357,000	+76,748,000
Center for Substance Abuse Prevention:						
Prevention demonstrations:						
High risk youth	56,295,000	69,295,000	61,295,000	65,295,000	63,295,000	+7,000,000
Pregnant women & infants	50,212,000	43,440,000	43,440,000	43,440,000	43,440,000	-6,772,000
Other programs	18,483,000	18,483,000	17,483,000	17,483,000	17,483,000	-1,000,000
Community partnership	96,040,000	116,741,000	104,741,000	104,741,000	104,741,000	+8,701,000
Transfer from forfeiture fund (non-add)	(8,701,000)	---	---	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(+1,299,000)
Training	14,512,000	14,512,000	14,512,000	14,512,000	14,512,000	---
Subtotal, Substance Abuse Prevention	235,542,000	262,471,000	241,471,000	245,471,000	243,471,000	+7,929,000
Buildings and facilities	952,000	952,000	952,000	952,000	952,000	---
Program management	57,820,000	61,296,000	61,296,000	61,296,000	61,296,000	+3,476,000
Total, Substance Abuse & Mental Health	2,004,803,000	2,153,480,000	2,057,167,000	2,119,205,000	2,125,178,000	+120,375,000
ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR HEALTH						
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR HEALTH						
Population affairs: Adolescent family life	7,598,000	7,591,000	7,591,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	-598,000
Health Initiatives:						
Office of Disease Prevention and Health Promotion	4,778,000	4,771,000	4,771,000	4,771,000	4,771,000	-7,000
Physical fitness and sports	1,453,000	1,453,000	1,453,000	1,453,000	1,453,000	---
Minority health	20,398,000	25,398,000	20,398,000	20,398,000	20,398,000	---
National vaccine program	2,737,000	8,737,000	2,737,000	2,737,000	2,737,000	---
Office of research integrity	---	6,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	+4,000,000
Office of women's health	---	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	+1,000,000
Emergency preparedness	---	3,000,000	1,500,000	2,500,000	2,250,000	+2,250,000
Health care reform data analysis	---	5,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	+3,000,000
Health Service Management	21,379,000	21,379,000	19,379,000	21,379,000	20,379,000	-1,000,000
National AIDS program office	2,936,000	2,929,000	2,929,000	2,929,000	2,929,000	-7,000
Total, OASH	61,279,000	87,258,000	68,758,000	71,167,000	69,917,000	+8,638,000
PUBLIC HEALTH EMERGENCY FUND						
Public health emergency fund	6,000,000	---	---	---	---	-6,000,000
Flood relief supplemental	75,000,000	---	---	---	---	-75,000,000
RETIREMENT PAY AND MEDICAL BENEFITS FOR COMMISSIONED OFFICERS						
Retirement payments	109,462,000	119,660,000	119,660,000	119,660,000	119,660,000	+10,198,000
Survivors benefits	6,835,000	7,856,000	7,856,000	7,856,000	7,856,000	+1,021,000
Dependent's medical care	21,565,000	22,665,000	22,665,000	22,665,000	22,665,000	+1,100,000
Military Services Credits	2,900,000	2,879,000	2,879,000	2,879,000	2,879,000	-21,000
Total, Retirement pay and medical benefits	140,762,000	153,060,000	153,060,000	153,060,000	153,060,000	+12,298,000
AGENCY FOR HEALTH CARE POLICY AND RESEARCH						
Health services research:						
Research	29,121,000	45,042,000	43,121,000	48,042,000	46,812,000	+17,691,000
Trust funds	(994,000)	(994,000)	(994,000)	(994,000)	(994,000)	---
AIDS	9,624,000	11,700,000	10,624,000	10,624,000	10,624,000	+1,000,000
1% evaluation funding (non-add)	(13,204,000)	(13,204,000)	(13,204,000)	(13,204,000)	(13,204,000)	---
Subtotal including trust funds & 1% funds	(52,943,000)	(70,940,000)	(67,943,000)	(72,864,000)	(71,634,000)	(+18,691,000)
Medical treatment effectiveness:						
Federal funds	67,875,000	79,872,000	72,875,000	78,208,000	75,542,000	+7,667,000
Trust funds	(4,792,000)	(4,792,000)	(4,792,000)	(4,792,000)	(4,792,000)	---
Subtotal, Medical treatment effectiveness	(72,667,000)	(84,664,000)	(77,667,000)	(83,000,000)	(80,334,000)	(+7,667,000)
Program support	2,431,000	2,431,000	2,431,000	2,431,000	2,431,000	---
Total, Health Care Policy and Research:						
Federal Funds	109,051,000	139,045,000	129,051,000	139,305,000	135,409,000	+26,358,000
Trust funds	(5,786,000)	(5,786,000)	(5,786,000)	(5,786,000)	(5,786,000)	---

	FY 1993 Comparable	FY 1994 Budget Request	House Bill	Senate Bill	Conference	Conference vs FY93 Comparable
Total, 1% evaluation funding (non-add)	(13,204,000)	(13,204,000)	(13,204,000)	(13,204,000)	(13,204,000)	---
Total, Health Care Policy & Research (non-add)	(128,041,000)	(158,035,000)	(148,041,000)	(158,295,000)	(154,399,000)	(+26,358,000)
Total, Public Health Service:						
Federal Funds	17,160,296,000	18,651,683,000	18,290,596,000	18,714,886,000	18,649,488,000	+1,489,192,000
Trust funds	(5,786,000)	(5,786,000)	(5,786,000)	(5,786,000)	(5,786,000)	---
HEALTH CARE FINANCING ADMINISTRATION						
GRANTS TO STATES FOR MEDICAID						
Medicaid current law benefits	79,697,500,000	85,733,613,000	85,733,613,000	85,733,613,000	85,733,613,000	+6,036,113,000
State and local administration	2,898,150,000	3,343,800,000	3,343,800,000	3,343,800,000	3,343,800,000	+445,650,000
Subtotal, Medicaid program level, FY 1994	82,595,650,000	89,077,413,000	89,077,413,000	89,077,413,000	89,077,413,000	+6,481,763,000
Less funds advanced in prior year	-17,100,000,000	-24,600,000,000	-24,600,000,000	-24,600,000,000	-24,600,000,000	-7,500,000,000
Total, request, FY 1994	65,495,650,000	64,477,413,000	64,477,413,000	64,477,413,000	64,477,413,000	-1,018,237,000
New advance, 1st quarter, FY 1995	24,600,000,000	26,600,000,000	---	26,600,000,000	26,600,000,000	+2,000,000,000
PAYMENTS TO HEALTH CARE TRUST FUNDS						
Supplemental medical insurance	45,478,000,000	45,097,000,000	45,097,000,000	45,097,000,000	45,097,000,000	-381,000,000
Hospital insurance for the uninsured	328,000,000	458,000,000	458,000,000	458,000,000	458,000,000	+130,000,000
Federal uninsured payment	39,000,000	48,000,000	48,000,000	48,000,000	48,000,000	+9,000,000
Program management	117,862,000	128,440,000	128,440,000	128,440,000	128,440,000	+10,578,000
Total, Payment to Trust Funds, current law	45,962,862,000	45,731,440,000	45,731,440,000	45,731,440,000	45,731,440,000	-231,422,000
PROGRAM MANAGEMENT						
Research, demonstration, and evaluation:						
Regular program, trust funds	(35,951,000)	(36,000,000)	(41,000,000)	(44,000,000)	(43,250,000)	(+7,299,000)
Counseling program	(9,920,000)	(9,920,000)	(9,920,000)	(9,920,000)	(9,920,000)	---
Rural hospital transition demonstrations, trust funds	(22,816,000)	(10,000,000)	(16,000,000)	(22,816,000)	(21,112,000)	(-1,704,000)
Essential access community hospitals, trust funds	---	(11,000,000)	---	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(+10,000,000)
New rural health grants	---	(1,700,000)	(1,700,000)	(1,700,000)	(1,700,000)	(+1,700,000)
Subtotal, research, demonstration, & evaluation	(68,687,000)	(68,620,000)	(68,620,000)	(88,436,000)	(85,982,000)	(+17,295,000)
Medicare Contractors (Trust Funds)	(1,600,362,000)	(1,615,300,000)	(1,615,300,000)	(1,615,300,000)	(1,615,300,000)	(+14,938,000)
State Survey and Certification:						
Medicare certification, trust funds	(148,009,000)	(145,800,000)	(145,800,000)	(145,800,000)	(145,800,000)	(-2,209,000)
Federal Administration:						
Trust funds	(333,693,000)	(347,903,000)	(343,000,000)	(343,000,000)	(343,000,000)	(+9,307,000)
Less current law user fees	(-122,000)	(-122,000)	(-122,000)	(-122,000)	(-122,000)	---
Subtotal, Federal Administration	(333,571,000)	(347,781,000)	(342,878,000)	(342,878,000)	(342,878,000)	(+9,307,000)
Total, Program management	(2,150,629,000)	(2,177,501,000)	(2,172,598,000)	(2,192,414,000)	(2,189,960,000)	(+39,331,000)
HMO LOAN AND LOAN GUARANTEE FUND	13,800,000	---	---	---	---	-13,800,000
Total, Health Care Financing Administration:						
Federal funds	136,072,312,000	136,808,853,000	110,208,853,000	136,808,853,000	136,808,853,000	+736,541,000
Current year, FY 1994	(111,472,312,000)	(110,208,853,000)	(110,208,853,000)	(110,208,853,000)	(110,208,853,000)	(-1,263,459,000)
New advance, 1st quarter, FY 1995	(24,600,000,000)	(26,600,000,000)	---	(26,600,000,000)	(26,600,000,000)	(+2,000,000,000)
Trust funds	(2,150,629,000)	(2,177,501,000)	(2,172,598,000)	(2,192,414,000)	(2,189,960,000)	(+39,331,000)
SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION						
PAYMENTS TO SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUNDS	45,242,000	28,178,000	28,178,000	28,178,000	28,178,000	-17,064,000
SPECIAL BENEFITS FOR DISABLED COAL MINERS						
Benefit payments	800,437,000	766,000,000	766,000,000	766,000,000	766,000,000	-34,437,000
Administration	4,951,000	5,181,000	5,181,000	5,181,000	5,181,000	+230,000
Subtotal, Black Lung, FY 1994 program level	805,388,000	771,181,000	771,181,000	771,181,000	771,181,000	-34,207,000
Less funds advanced in prior year	-198,000,000	-196,000,000	-196,000,000	-196,000,000	-196,000,000	+2,000,000
Total, Black Lung, current request, FY 1994	607,388,000	575,181,000	575,181,000	575,181,000	575,181,000	-32,207,000
New advance, 1st quarter, FY 1995	196,000,000	190,000,000	---	190,000,000	190,000,000	-6,000,000
SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME						
Federal benefit payments	21,810,096,000	25,478,000,000	25,478,000,000	25,478,000,000	25,478,000,000	+3,667,904,000
Beneficiary services	47,600,000	51,600,000	51,600,000	51,600,000	51,600,000	+4,000,000
Research demonstration	12,625,000	6,700,000	6,700,000	12,700,000	12,700,000	+75,000
Administration	1,476,450,000	1,690,475,000	1,690,475,000	1,690,475,000	1,690,475,000	+214,025,000
Investment proposals:						
Automation investment initiative	---	45,000,000	45,000,000	30,000,000	41,000,000	+41,000,000
Disability investment initiative	---	60,000,000	60,000,000	60,000,000	60,000,000	+60,000,000
Subtotal, SSI FY 1994 program level	23,346,771,000	27,331,775,000	27,331,775,000	27,322,775,000	27,333,775,000	+3,987,004,000

	FY 1993 Comparable	FY 1994 Budget Request	House Bill	Senate Bill	Conference	Conference vs FY93 Comparable
Less funds advanced in prior year	-5,240,000,000	-7,150,000,000	-7,150,000,000	-7,150,000,000	-7,150,000,000	-1,910,000,000
Total, SSI, current request, FY 1994	18,106,771,000	20,181,775,000	20,181,775,000	20,172,775,000	20,183,775,000	+2,077,004,000
New advance, 1st quarter, FY 1995	7,150,000,000	6,770,000,000	---	6,770,000,000	6,770,000,000	-380,000,000
LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES (Trust Funds)	(4,028,125,000)	(5,376,887,000)	(4,781,887,000)	(4,871,887,000)	(4,751,887,000)	(+723,762,000)
Notch Commission	---	---	---	(1,800,000)	(1,800,000)	(+1,800,000)
Portion treated as budget authority	(696,576,000)	(742,398,000)	(742,398,000)	(542,398,000)	(742,398,000)	(+45,822,000)
Subtotal, LAE operating level	(4,724,701,000)	(6,119,285,000)	(5,524,285,000)	(5,416,085,000)	(5,496,085,000)	(+771,384,000)
(Contingency reserve)	(98,400,000)	---	---	---	---	(-98,400,000)
Subtotal, LAE	(4,823,101,000)	(6,119,285,000)	(5,524,285,000)	(5,416,085,000)	(5,496,085,000)	(+672,984,000)
Total, Social Security Administration: Federal funds	26,105,401,000	27,745,134,000	20,785,134,000	27,736,134,000	27,747,134,000	+1,641,733,000
Current year FY 1994	(18,759,401,000)	(20,785,134,000)	(20,785,134,000)	(20,776,134,000)	(20,787,134,000)	(+2,027,733,000)
New advances, 1st quarter FY 1995	(7,346,000,000)	(6,960,000,000)	---	(6,960,000,000)	(6,960,000,000)	(-386,000,000)
Trust funds	(4,823,101,000)	(6,119,285,000)	(5,524,285,000)	(5,416,085,000)	(5,496,085,000)	(+672,984,000)
ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES						
FAMILY SUPPORT PAYMENTS TO STATES						
Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC)	12,443,069,000	12,662,000,000	12,662,000,000	12,662,000,000	12,662,000,000	+218,931,000
Quality control liabilities	---	-68,856,000	-68,856,000	-68,856,000	-68,856,000	-68,856,000
Payments to territories	15,532,000	15,532,000	15,532,000	15,532,000	15,532,000	---
Emergency assistance	102,000,000	149,000,000	149,000,000	149,000,000	149,000,000	+47,000,000
Repatriation	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	---
State and local welfare administration	1,411,000,000	1,504,000,000	1,504,000,000	1,504,000,000	1,504,000,000	+93,000,000
Work activities child care	395,000,000	450,000,000	450,000,000	450,000,000	450,000,000	+55,000,000
Transitional child care	84,000,000	95,000,000	95,000,000	95,000,000	95,000,000	+11,000,000
At risk child care	377,761,000	300,000,000	300,000,000	300,000,000	300,000,000	-77,761,000
Subtotal, Welfare payments	14,829,362,000	15,107,676,000	15,107,676,000	15,107,676,000	15,107,676,000	+278,314,000
Child Support Enforcement:						
State and local administration	1,559,000,000	1,746,000,000	1,746,000,000	1,746,000,000	1,746,000,000	+187,000,000
Federal incentive payments	379,000,000	415,000,000	415,000,000	415,000,000	415,000,000	+36,000,000
Less federal share collections	-1,160,000,000	-1,265,000,000	-1,265,000,000	-1,265,000,000	-1,265,000,000	-105,000,000
Subtotal, Child support	778,000,000	896,000,000	896,000,000	896,000,000	896,000,000	+118,000,000
Surplus budget authority	87,710,000	-87,710,000	-87,710,000	-87,710,000	-87,710,000	-175,420,000
Total, Payments, FY94 program level	15,695,072,000	15,915,966,000	15,915,966,000	15,915,966,000	15,915,966,000	+220,894,000
Less funds advanced in previous years	-4,000,000,000	-4,000,000,000	-4,000,000,000	-4,000,000,000	-4,000,000,000	---
Total, Payments, current request, FY 1994	11,695,072,000	11,915,966,000	11,915,966,000	11,915,966,000	11,915,966,000	+220,894,000
New advance, 1st quarter, FY 1995	4,000,000,000	4,200,000,000	---	4,200,000,000	4,200,000,000	+200,000,000
PAYMENTS TO STATES FOR AFDC WORK PROGRAMS	1,000,000,000	1,100,000,000	1,100,000,000	1,100,000,000	1,100,000,000	+100,000,000
LOW INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE						
Regular program	663,812,000	70,000,000	---	---	---	-663,812,000
Additional appropriation 9/30	682,218,000	---	---	---	---	-682,218,000
Emergency allocation 1/	(600,000,000)	---	---	(600,000,000)	(600,000,000)	---
Advance from prior year (non-add)	---	(1,437,408,000)	(1,437,408,000)	(1,437,408,000)	(1,437,408,000)	(+1,437,408,000)
FY 1994 program level (non-add)	(1,346,030,000)	(1,507,408,000)	(1,437,408,000)	(1,437,408,000)	(1,437,408,000)	(+91,378,000)
Advance funding (FY 1995)	1,437,408,000	1,404,780,000	---	1,507,408,000	1,475,000,000	+37,592,000
REFUGEE AND ENTRANT ASSISTANCE						
Transitional and medical services	245,811,000	284,382,000	264,330,000	264,330,000	264,330,000	+18,519,000
Social services	80,802,000	80,802,000	80,802,000	80,802,000	80,802,000	---
Preventive health	5,471,000	5,471,000	5,471,000	5,471,000	5,471,000	---
Targeted assistance	49,397,000	49,397,000	49,397,000	49,397,000	49,397,000	---
Total, Refugee and entrant assistance	381,481,000	420,052,000	400,000,000	400,000,000	400,000,000	+18,519,000

1/ For FY 1994 - Available only upon submission of a formal budget request designating the need for funds as an emergency as defined by the BEA.

STATE LEGALIZATION IMPACT ASSISTANCE GRANTS 1/						
Current year	-812,000,000	---	---	---	---	+812,000,000
Advance funding	812,000,000	---	---	---	---	-812,000,000

	FY 1993 Comparable	FY 1994 Budget Request	House Bill	Senate Bill	Conference	Conference vs FY93 Comparable
COMMUNITY SERVICES BLOCK GRANT						
Grants to States for Community Services	372,000,000	372,000,000	372,000,000	390,000,000	385,500,000	+13,500,000
Homeless services grants	19,840,000	19,840,000	19,840,000	19,840,000	19,840,000	---
Discretionary funds:						
Community economic development	20,733,000	20,733,000	20,733,000	23,733,000	22,233,000	+1,500,000
Rural housing	4,960,000	4,960,000	4,960,000	5,960,000	5,460,000	+500,000
Farmworker assistance	2,947,000	2,947,000	2,947,000	2,947,000	2,947,000	---
National youth sports	9,424,000	9,424,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	+2,576,000
Technical assistance	219,000	219,000	219,000	1,225,000	300,000	+81,000
Subtotal, discretionary funds	38,283,000	38,283,000	40,859,000	45,865,000	42,940,000	+4,657,000
Demonstration Partnerships	3,804,000	3,804,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	+4,196,000
Community Food and Nutrition	6,944,000	6,944,000	6,944,000	8,944,000	7,944,000	+1,000,000
Total, Community services	440,871,000	440,871,000	447,643,000	472,649,000	464,224,000	+23,353,000
GRANTS TO STATES FOR CHILD CARE						
Block grants to States	892,711,000	932,711,000	892,711,000	892,711,000	892,711,000	---
(Base program)	(892,711,000)	(892,711,000)	(892,711,000)	(892,711,000)	(892,711,000)	---
SOCIAL SERVICES BLOCK GRANT (TITLE XX)	2,800,000,000	2,800,000,000	2,800,000,000	3,800,000,000	3,800,000,000	+1,000,000,000
CHILDREN AND FAMILIES SERVICES PROGRAMS						
Programs for Children, Youth, and Families:						
Head start	2,776,285,000	4,150,245,000	3,276,285,000	3,376,285,000	3,326,285,000	+550,000,000
Comprehensive child development centers	46,790,000	46,790,000	46,790,000	46,790,000	46,790,000	---
Child development associate scholarships	1,372,000	1,372,000	1,372,000	1,372,000	1,372,000	---
Runaway and homeless youth	35,110,000	35,110,000	36,110,000	36,110,000	36,110,000	+1,000,000
Runaway youth - transitional living	11,785,000	11,785,000	12,200,000	12,200,000	12,200,000	+415,000
Runaway youth activities - drugs	14,603,000	14,603,000	14,603,000	14,603,000	14,603,000	---
Youth gang substance abuse	10,647,000	10,647,000	10,647,000	10,647,000	10,647,000	---
Child abuse state grants	20,354,000	20,354,000	20,354,000	25,354,000	22,854,000	+2,500,000
Child abuse discretionary activities	15,927,000	15,927,000	15,927,000	15,927,000	15,927,000	---
Child abuse challenge grants	5,270,000	5,270,000	5,270,000	5,270,000	5,270,000	---
ABCAN	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000	---
Temporary childcare/crisis nurseries	11,942,000	11,942,000	11,942,000	11,942,000	11,942,000	---
Abandoned infants assistance	13,563,000	13,563,000	13,563,000	15,563,000	14,563,000	+1,000,000
Dependent care planning and development	12,939,000	12,939,000	12,939,000	12,939,000	12,939,000	---
Emergency protection grants - substance abuse	19,039,000	19,039,000	19,039,000	19,039,000	19,039,000	---
Child welfare services	294,624,000	294,624,000	294,624,000	294,624,000	294,624,000	---
Child welfare training	4,441,000	4,441,000	4,441,000	4,441,000	4,441,000	---
Child welfare research	6,467,000	6,467,000	6,467,000	6,467,000	6,467,000	---
Adoption opportunities	12,163,000	12,163,000	12,163,000	12,163,000	12,163,000	---
Family violence	24,679,000	24,679,000	24,679,000	28,679,000	27,679,000	+3,000,000
Social services research	13,828,000	15,954,000	13,828,000	13,828,000	13,828,000	---
Family support centers	6,875,000	6,874,000	6,874,000	7,874,000	7,374,000	+499,000
Family resource centers	4,910,000	4,910,000	5,910,000	5,910,000	5,910,000	+1,000,000
Developmental disabilities program:						
State grants	67,372,000	67,372,000	67,372,000	70,000,000	69,343,000	+1,971,000
Protection and advocacy	22,506,000	22,506,000	22,506,000	25,000,000	23,753,000	+1,247,000
Developmental disabilities special projects	3,034,000	3,034,000	3,034,000	4,534,000	3,784,000	+750,000
Developmental disabilities university affiliated programs	16,125,000	16,125,000	16,125,000	19,000,000	18,281,000	+2,156,000
Subtotal, Developmental disabilities	109,037,000	109,037,000	109,037,000	118,534,000	115,161,000	+6,124,000
Native American Programs	34,507,000	34,507,000	34,507,000	40,000,000	38,627,000	+4,120,000
Program direction	150,935,000	167,935,000	159,935,000	159,935,000	159,935,000	+9,000,000
Total, Children and Families Services Programs	3,658,392,000	5,051,477,000	4,169,806,000	4,296,796,000	4,237,050,000	+578,658,000
FAMILY SUPPORT AND PRESERVATION	---	60,000,000	---	60,000,000	60,000,000	+60,000,000
PAYMENTS TO STATES FOR FOSTER CARE AND ADOPTION ASSISTANCE						
Foster care	2,610,050,000	2,605,500,000	2,605,500,000	2,605,500,000	2,605,500,000	-4,550,000
Adoption assistance	243,964,000	317,400,000	317,400,000	317,400,000	317,400,000	+73,436,000

1/ FY92 bill delayed availability of $1,137,672,216 from FY92 to FY93.

	FY 1993 Comparable	FY 1994 Budget Request	House Bill	Senate Bill	Conference	Conference vs FY93 Comparable
Independent living	70,000,000	70,000,000	70,000,000	70,000,000	70,000,000	---
Total, Payments to States	2,924,014,000	2,992,900,000	2,992,900,000	2,992,900,000	2,992,900,000	+68,886,000
Total, Administration for Children and Families	30,575,979,000	31,388,757,000	24,719,026,000	31,638,430,000	31,537,851,000	+961,872,000
Current year	(24,326,571,000)	(25,783,977,000)	(24,719,026,000)	(25,931,022,000)	(25,862,851,000)	(+1,536,280,000)
FY 1995	(6,249,408,000)	(5,604,780,000)	---	(5,707,408,000)	(5,675,000,000)	(-574,408,000)
ADMINISTRATION ON AGING						
AGING SERVICES PROGRAMS						
Grants to States:						
Supportive services and centers	296,844,000	296,844,000	296,844,000	310,000,000	306,711,000	+9,867,000
Ombudsman services	3,870,000	3,870,000	4,370,000	4,370,000	4,370,000	+500,000
Prevention of elder abuse	4,348,000	4,348,000	4,648,000	4,648,000	4,648,000	+300,000
Pension counseling	---	---	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	+2,000,000
Preventive health	16,864,000	16,864,000	16,864,000	17,200,000	17,032,000	+168,000
Nutrition:						
Congregate meals	363,235,000	363,235,000	363,235,000	380,000,000	375,809,000	+12,574,000
Home-delivered meals	89,659,000	89,659,000	89,659,000	95,000,000	93,665,000	+4,006,000
Frail elderly in-home services	7,075,000	7,075,000	7,075,000	7,075,000	7,075,000	---
Grants to Indians	15,110,000	15,110,000	15,110,000	17,500,000	16,902,000	+1,792,000
Aging research, training and special projects	25,693,000	25,830,000	25,830,000	25,830,000	25,830,000	+137,000
Federal Council on Aging	178,000	177,000	177,000	177,000	177,000	-1,000
White House Conference on Aging	---	---	---	2,000,000	1,000,000	+1,000,000
Program administration	15,800,000	16,063,000	16,063,000	16,063,000	16,063,000	+263,000
Total, Administration on Aging	838,676,000	839,075,000	841,875,000	881,863,000	871,282,000	+32,606,000
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY						
GENERAL DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT:						
Federal funds	90,384,000	94,149,000	94,149,000	92,793,000	94,431,000	+4,047,000
Trust funds	(22,038,000)	(22,975,000)	(22,975,000)	(22,975,000)	(22,975,000)	(+937,000)
Portion treated as budget authority	(7,947,000)	(8,286,000)	(8,286,000)	(8,286,000)	(8,286,000)	(+339,000)
Total, General Departmental Management:						
Federal funds	90,384,000	94,149,000	94,149,000	92,793,000	94,431,000	+4,047,000
Trust funds	(29,985,000)	(31,261,000)	(31,261,000)	(31,261,000)	(31,261,000)	(+1,276,000)
Total	(120,369,000)	(125,410,000)	(125,410,000)	(124,054,000)	(125,692,000)	(+5,323,000)
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL:						
Federal funds	62,379,000	62,379,000	62,379,000	64,800,000	63,590,000	+1,211,000
Trust funds	(16,020,000)	(16,020,000)	(16,020,000)	(16,020,000)	(16,020,000)	---
Portion treated as budget authority	(20,597,000)	(20,597,000)	(20,597,000)	(20,597,000)	(20,597,000)	---
Total, Office of the Inspector General:						
Federal funds	62,379,000	62,379,000	62,379,000	64,800,000	63,590,000	+1,211,000
Trust funds	(36,617,000)	(36,617,000)	(36,617,000)	(36,617,000)	(36,617,000)	---
Total	(98,996,000)	(98,996,000)	(98,996,000)	(101,417,000)	(100,207,000)	(+1,211,000)
OFFICE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS:						
Federal funds	18,308,000	18,308,000	18,308,000	18,308,000	18,308,000	---
Trust funds	(97,000)	(97,000)	(97,000)	(97,000)	(97,000)	---
Portion treated as budget authority	(3,777,000)	(3,777,000)	(3,777,000)	(3,777,000)	(3,777,000)	---
Total, Office for Civil Rights:						
Federal funds	18,308,000	18,308,000	18,308,000	18,308,000	18,308,000	---
Trust funds	(3,874,000)	(3,874,000)	(3,874,000)	(3,874,000)	(3,874,000)	---
Total	(22,182,000)	(22,182,000)	(22,182,000)	(22,182,000)	(22,182,000)	---
POLICY RESEARCH	8,047,000	15,868,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	+3,953,000
Total, Office of the Secretary:						
Federal funds	179,118,000	190,704,000	186,836,000	187,901,000	188,329,000	+9,211,000
Trust funds	(70,476,000)	(71,752,000)	(71,752,000)	(71,752,000)	(71,752,000)	(+1,276,000)
Total	(249,594,000)	(262,456,000)	(258,588,000)	(259,653,000)	(260,081,000)	(+10,487,000)
Total, Department of Health and Human Services:						
Federal Funds	210,931,782,000	215,624,206,000	175,032,320,000	215,968,067,000	215,802,937,000	+4,871,155,000
Current year FY 1994	(172,736,374,000)	(176,459,426,000)	(175,032,320,000)	(176,700,659,000)	(176,567,937,000)	(+3,831,563,000)
FY 1995	(38,195,408,000)	(39,164,780,000)	---	(39,267,408,000)	(39,235,000,000)	(+1,039,592,000)
Trust funds	(7,049,992,000)	(8,374,324,000)	(7,774,421,000)	(7,686,037,000)	(7,763,583,000)	(+713,591,000)
TITLE III - DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION						
EDUCATION REFORM						
Goals 2000: Educate America Act (proposed legislation)	---	420,000,000	100,000,000	116,000,000	105,000,000	+105,000,000
Technology (non-add)	---	---	---	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(+5,000,000)
School-to-work initiative	---	135,000,000	33,750,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	+50,000,000

	FY 1993 Comparable	FY 1994 Budget Request	House Bill	Senate Bill	Conference	Conference vs FY93 Comparable
Urban-rural initiative	---	15,000,000	---	---	---	---
Teacher professional development	---	15,000,000	---	---	---	---
Total	---	585,000,000	133,750,000	166,000,000	155,000,000	+155,000,000
COMPENSATORY EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED						
Grants for the disadvantaged (Chapter 1):						
Grants to local educational agencies:						
Basic grants	5,449,925,000	5,800,000,000	5,597,000,000	5,687,000,000	5,642,000,000	+192,075,000
Concentration grants	675,998,000	700,000,000	694,000,000	694,000,000	694,000,000	+18,002,000
Subtotal, grants to LEA's	6,125,923,000	6,500,000,000	6,291,000,000	6,381,000,000	6,336,000,000	+210,077,000
Capital expenses for private school children	39,734,000	39,734,000	39,734,000	42,000,000	41,434,000	+1,700,000
Even start	89,123,000	110,000,000	89,123,000	92,123,000	91,373,000	+2,250,000
State agency programs:						
Migrant	302,773,000	310,948,000	302,773,000	306,000,000	305,193,000	+2,420,000
Neglected and delinquent	35,407,000	36,363,000	35,407,000	35,407,000	35,407,000	---
State administration	60,712,000	60,712,000	60,712,000	60,712,000	60,712,000	---
State program improvement grants	25,933,000	25,933,000	25,933,000	25,933,000	25,933,000	---
Evaluation and technical assistance 1/	14,036,000	13,100,000	13,100,000	13,100,000	13,100,000	-936,000
Rural technical assistance centers 1/	4,960,000	2,980,000	2,980,000	4,960,000	4,960,000	---
Total, Chapter 1	6,698,601,000	7,099,770,000	6,860,762,000	6,961,235,000	6,914,112,000	+215,511,000
Migrant education:						
High school equivalency program 1/	8,161,000	8,161,000	8,161,000	8,161,000	8,161,000	---
College assistance migrant program 1/	2,224,000	2,224,000	2,224,000	2,224,000	2,224,000	---
Subtotal, migrant education	10,385,000	10,385,000	10,385,000	10,385,000	10,385,000	---
Total, Compensatory education programs	6,708,986,000	7,110,155,000	6,871,147,000	6,971,620,000	6,924,497,000	+215,511,000
Subtotal, forward funded	(6,679,605,000)	(7,083,690,000)	(6,844,682,000)	(6,943,175,000)	(6,896,052,000)	(+216,447,000)

1/ Current funded.

IMPACT AID

Maintenance and operations:						
Payments for ''a'' children:						
Regular payments	567,080,000	600,000,000	630,000,000	563,780,000	613,445,000	+46,365,000
3(d)(2)(B) districts	17,677,000	16,000,000	17,677,000	20,857,000	20,062,000	+2,385,000
Subtotal	584,757,000	616,000,000	647,677,000	584,637,000	633,507,000	+48,750,000
Payments for ''b'' children:						
Regular payments	123,629,000	61,800,000	123,629,000	121,629,000	123,129,000	-500,000
3(d)(2)(B) districts	11,785,000	---	11,785,000	13,905,000	13,375,000	+1,590,000
Subtotal	135,414,000	61,800,000	135,414,000	135,534,000	136,504,000	+1,090,000
Payments for Federal property (Section 2)	16,293,000	8,000,000	16,293,000	16,293,000	16,293,000	---
Payments related to decreased activity (Sec. 3e)	1,786,000	---	1,786,000	---	---	-1,786,000
Subtotal	738,250,000	685,800,000	801,170,000	736,464,000	786,304,000	+48,054,000
Construction	11,904,000	3,000,000	11,904,000	11,904,000	11,904,000	---
Flood relief supplemental	70,000,000	---	---	---	---	-70,000,000
Total, Impact aid	820,154,000	688,800,000	813,074,000	748,368,000	798,208,000	-21,946,000
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS 1/						
Educational improvement (Chapter 2):						
State and local programs:						
State block grants 2/	435,488,000	415,488,000	369,500,000	369,500,000	369,500,000	-65,988,000
National programs:						
Inexpensive book distribution (RIF)	10,029,000	10,029,000	10,029,000	10,300,000	10,300,000	+271,000
Arts in education	6,944,000	6,944,000	8,944,000	8,944,000	8,944,000	+2,000,000
Law - related education	5,952,000	3,000,000	5,952,000	5,952,000	5,952,000	---
Subtotal, National programs	22,925,000	19,973,000	24,925,000	25,196,000	25,196,000	+2,271,000
Total, Chapter 2	458,413,000	435,461,000	394,425,000	394,696,000	394,696,000	-63,717,000
Drug-free and Safe schools:						
State grants 2/	498,565,000	498,565,000	369,500,000	369,500,000	369,500,000	-129,065,000
School personnel training	13,614,000	13,614,000	13,614,000	13,614,000	13,614,000	---
National programs	61,496,000	61,496,000	59,496,000	59,496,000	59,496,000	-2,000,000
Emergency grants	24,552,000	24,552,000	24,552,000	24,552,000	24,552,000	---
Safe schools initiative (proposed leg.) 1/ 2/	---	75,000,000	---	32,838,000	20,000,000	+20,000,000
Subtotal, Drug-free schools	598,227,000	673,227,000	467,162,000	500,000,000	487,162,000	-111,065,000

1/ House bill considered Safe Schools request under Education Reform account.

2/ Forward funded.

	FY 1993 Comparable	FY 1994 Budget Request	House Bill	Senate Bill	Conference	Conference vs FY93 Comparable
Strengthening teaching and administration:						
Eisenhower mathematics and science education State grants 1/	246,016,000	252,658,000	246,016,000	252,658,000	250,998,000	+4,982,000
Christa McAuliffe fellowships	1,964,000	2,104,000	1,964,000	1,964,000	1,964,000	---
Other school improvement programs:						
Magnet schools assistance	107,985,000	107,985,000	107,985,000	107,985,000	107,985,000	---
Education for homeless children & youth 1/	24,800,000	25,470,000	25,470,000	25,470,000	25,470,000	+670,000
Women's educational equity	1,984,000	1,984,000	1,984,000	1,984,000	1,984,000	---
Training and advisory services (Civil Rights IV-A)	21,606,000	21,606,000	21,606,000	21,606,000	21,606,000	---
Dropout prevention demonstrations	37,530,000	37,730,000	42,230,000	37,730,000	37,730,000	+200,000
General assistance to the Virgin Islands	2,455,000	1,227,000	1,227,000	1,227,000	1,227,000	-1,228,000
Ellender fellowships/Close up 1/	4,223,000	---	4,223,000	4,223,000	4,223,000	---
Follow through	8,478,000	8,478,000	8,478,000	8,478,000	8,478,000	---
Education for native Hawaiians	6,448,000	---	6,448,000	10,000,000	8,224,000	+1,776,000
Foreign languages assistance 1/	10,912,000	---	---	10,912,000	10,912,000	---
Training in early childhood education and violence counseling (HEA V-F)	4,960,000	4,960,000	9,960,000	14,960,000	14,000,000	+9,040,000
Subtotal, other school improvement programs	231,381,000	209,440,000	229,611,000	244,575,000	241,839,000	+10,458,000
Total, School improvement programs	1,536,001,000	1,572,890,000	1,339,178,000	1,393,893,000	1,376,659,000	-159,342,000
Subtotal, forward funded	(1,220,004,000)	(1,267,181,000)	(1,014,709,000)	(1,065,101,000)	(1,050,603,000)	(-169,401,000)
BILINGUAL AND IMMIGRANT EDUCATION						
Bilingual education:						
Bilingual programs	149,696,000	153,738,000	153,738,000	149,696,000	152,728,000	+3,032,000
Support services	10,879,000	12,379,000	12,379,000	10,879,000	12,004,000	+1,125,000
Training grants	35,708,000	36,672,000	36,672,000	35,708,000	36,431,000	+723,000
Immigrant education	29,462,000	29,462,000	40,000,000	35,968,000	38,992,000	+9,530,000
Total	225,745,000	232,251,000	242,789,000	232,251,000	240,155,000	+14,410,000
SPECIAL EDUCATION						
State grants:						
Grants to States part ''b''	2,052,728,000	2,163,708,000	2,108,218,000	2,163,508,000	2,149,686,000	+96,958,000
Chapter 1 handicapped program	126,394,000	113,755,000	113,755,000	120,000,000	116,878,000	-9,516,000
Preschool grants	325,773,000	343,751,000	325,773,000	343,751,000	339,257,000	+13,484,000
Grants for infants and families	213,280,000	256,280,000	243,769,000	256,280,000	253,152,000	+39,872,000
Subtotal, State grants	2,718,175,000	2,877,494,000	2,791,515,000	2,883,539,000	2,858,973,000	+140,798,000
Special purpose funds:						
Deaf-blindness	12,832,000	12,832,000	12,832,000	12,832,000	12,832,000	---
Serious emotional disturbance	4,147,000	4,147,000	4,147,000	4,147,000	4,147,000	---
Severe disabilities	9,330,000	9,330,000	9,330,000	9,330,000	9,330,000	---
Early childhood education	25,167,000	25,167,000	25,167,000	25,167,000	25,167,000	---
Secondary and transitional services	21,966,000	21,966,000	21,966,000	21,966,000	21,966,000	---
Postsecondary education	8,839,000	8,839,000	8,839,000	8,839,000	8,839,000	---
Innovation and development	20,635,000	20,635,000	20,635,000	20,635,000	20,635,000	---
Media and captioning services	17,892,000	17,892,000	18,392,000	18,892,000	18,642,000	+750,000
Technology applications	10,862,000	10,862,000	10,862,000	10,862,000	10,862,000	---
Special studies	3,855,000	3,855,000	3,855,000	3,855,000	3,855,000	---
Personnel development	90,122,000	90,122,000	90,122,000	92,555,000	91,339,000	+1,217,000
Parent training	12,400,000	12,400,000	12,400,000	12,735,000	12,735,000	+335,000
Clearinghouses	2,162,000	2,162,000	2,162,000	2,162,000	2,162,000	---
Regional resource centers	7,218,000	7,218,000	7,218,000	7,218,000	7,218,000	---
Subtotal, Special purpose funds	247,427,000	247,427,000	247,927,000	251,195,000	249,729,000	+2,302,000
Total, Special education	2,965,602,000	3,124,921,000	3,039,442,000	3,134,734,000	3,108,702,000	+143,100,000
REHABILITATION SERVICES AND DISABILITY RESEARCH						
Vocational rehabilitation State grants:						
Grants to States	1,879,679,000	1,939,828,000	1,939,828,000	1,989,828,000	1,974,145,000	+94,466,000
Supported employment State grants	32,273,000	33,144,000	33,144,000	35,000,000	34,536,000	+2,263,000
Client assistance	9,296,000	9,547,000	9,547,000	9,547,000	9,547,000	+251,000
Subtotal, State grants	1,921,248,000	1,982,519,000	1,982,519,000	2,034,375,000	2,018,228,000	+96,980,000
Special purpose funds:						
Special demonstration programs	19,942,000	19,942,000	19,942,000	19,942,000	19,942,000	---
Supported employment projects	10,616,000	10,616,000	10,616,000	10,616,000	10,616,000	---
Recreational programs	2,596,000	2,596,000	2,596,000	2,596,000	2,596,000	---

1/ Forward funded.

	FY 1993 Comparable	FY 1994 Budget Request	House Bill	Senate Bill	Conference	Conference vs FY93 Comparable
Migratory workers	1,171,000	1,171,000	1,171,000	1,171,000	1,171,000	---
Projects with industry	21,571,000	21,571,000	21,571,000	22,571,000	22,071,000	+500,000
Helen Keller National Center	6,564,000	6,741,000	6,741,000	6,741,000	6,741,000	+177,000
Independent living:						
State grants	15,376,000	15,791,000	15,791,000	18,553,000	18,003,000	+2,627,000
Centers	31,446,000	34,446,000	34,446,000	37,943,000	36,818,000	+5,372,000
Services for older blind	6,944,000	6,944,000	6,944,000	8,379,000	8,131,000	+1,187,000
Subtotal, Independent living	53,766,000	57,181,000	57,181,000	64,875,000	62,952,000	+9,186,000
Protection and advocacy	2,480,000	2,480,000	2,480,000	6,000,000	5,500,000	+3,020,000
Training	39,629,000	39,629,000	39,629,000	39,629,000	39,629,000	---
National Institute on Disability & Rehabilitation Research	67,238,000	67,238,000	67,238,000	69,053,000	68,146,000	+908,000
Technology assistance	34,068,000	37,744,000	37,744,000	37,744,000	37,744,000	+3,676,000
Evaluation	1,810,000	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000	-210,000
Subtotal, Special purpose funds	261,451,000	268,509,000	268,509,000	282,538,000	278,708,000	+17,257,000
Total, Rehabilitation services	2,182,699,000	2,251,028,000	2,251,028,000	2,316,913,000	2,296,936,000	+114,237,000
SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES						
AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND	6,298,000	6,463,000	6,463,000	6,463,000	6,463,000	+165,000
NATIONAL TECHNICAL INSTITUTE FOR THE DEAF:						
Operations	40,026,000	41,307,000	41,307,000	41,307,000	41,307,000	+1,281,000
Endowment grant	336,000	336,000	336,000	336,000	336,000	---
Construction	351,000	193,000	193,000	193,000	193,000	-158,000
Subtotal	40,713,000	41,836,000	41,836,000	41,836,000	41,836,000	+1,123,000
GALLAUDET UNIVERSITY:						
University programs	51,056,000	52,715,000	52,715,000	52,715,000	52,715,000	+1,659,000
Precollege programs	23,096,000	23,720,000	23,720,000	23,720,000	23,720,000	+624,000
Endowment grant	982,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	+18,000
Construction	2,455,000	---	---	2,000,000	1,000,000	-1,455,000
Subtotal	77,589,000	77,435,000	77,435,000	79,435,000	78,435,000	+846,000
Total, Special institutions for persons with disabilities	124,600,000	125,734,000	125,734,000	127,734,000	126,734,000	+2,134,000
VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION						
Vocational education:						
Basic State grants	972,750,000	972,750,000	972,750,000	972,750,000	972,750,000	---
Community - based organizations	11,785,000	11,785,000	11,785,000	11,785,000	11,785,000	---
Consumer and homemaking education	34,720,000	---	34,720,000	34,720,000	34,720,000	---
Tech-Prep education	104,123,000	104,123,000	104,123,000	104,123,000	104,123,000	---
Tribally controlled postsecondary vocational institutions 1/	2,946,000	2,946,000	2,946,000	2,946,000	2,946,000	---
State councils	8,928,000	8,928,000	8,928,000	8,928,000	8,928,000	---
National programs:						
Research	9,662,000	9,662,000	9,662,000	9,662,000	9,662,000	---
Demonstrations	16,705,000	16,705,000	16,705,000	25,705,000	23,455,000	+6,750,000
Data systems (NOICC/SOICC)	4,960,000	4,960,000	4,960,000	4,960,000	4,960,000	---
Subtotal, national programs	31,327,000	31,327,000	31,327,000	40,327,000	38,077,000	+6,750,000
Bilingual vocational training	2,946,000	---	2,946,000	2,946,000	2,946,000	---
Subtotal, Vocational education	1,169,525,000	1,131,859,000	1,169,525,000	1,178,525,000	1,176,275,000	+6,750,000
Adult education:						
State Programs	254,624,000	261,500,000	254,624,000	254,624,000	254,624,000	---
National programs	8,837,000	9,250,000	8,837,000	8,837,000	8,837,000	---
Literacy training for homeless adults	9,584,000	10,000,000	9,584,000	9,584,000	9,584,000	---
Workplace literacy partnerships	18,906,000	22,000,000	18,906,000	18,906,000	18,906,000	---
State literacy resource centers	7,857,000	7,857,000	7,857,000	7,857,000	7,857,000	---
Literacy programs for prisoners	4,910,000	5,100,000	4,910,000	5,100,000	5,100,000	+190,000
Subtotal, adult education	304,718,000	315,707,000	304,718,000	304,908,000	304,908,000	+190,000
Total, Vocational and adult education	1,474,243,000	1,447,566,000	1,474,243,000	1,483,433,000	1,481,183,000	+6,940,000

1/ Current funded

	FY 1993 Comparable	FY 1994 Budget Request	House Bill	Senate Bill	Conference	Conference vs FY93 Comparable
STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE						
Federal Pell Grants: Regular program	5,757,568,000	6,303,566,000	6,303,566,000	6,303,566,000	6,303,566,000	+545,998,000
Flood relief supplemental	30,000,000	---	---	---	---	-30,000,000
Federal Pell Grants: Funding for shortfall	671,237,000	2,023,730,000	415,000,000	185,296,000	250,000,000	-421,237,000
Subtotal, Pell Grants	6,458,805,000	8,327,296,000	6,718,566,000	6,488,862,000	6,553,566,000	+94,761,000
Federal Supplemental educational opportunity grants	583,407,000	499,892,000	555,000,000	583,407,000	583,407,000	---
Federal Work-study	616,508,000	526,941,000	586,000,000	616,508,000	616,508,000	---
Federal Perkins loans:						
Capital contributions	165,780,000	144,037,000	158,000,000	158,000,000	158,000,000	-7,780,000
Loan cancellations	14,880,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	+120,000
Subtotal, Federal Perkins loans	180,660,000	159,037,000	173,000,000	173,000,000	173,000,000	-7,660,000
State student incentive grants	72,429,000	---	62,800,000	72,429,000	72,429,000	---
State postsecondary review program	5,300,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	10,000,000	21,250,000	+15,950,000
Student financial assistance administration	---	---	---	60,087,000	---	---
Total, Student financial assistance	7,917,109,000	9,538,166,000	8,120,366,000	8,004,293,000	8,020,160,000	+103,051,000
FEDERAL FAMILY EDUCATION LOANS PROGRAM (EXISTING GUARANTEED STUDENT LOANS PROGRAM)						
Federal education loans:						
New loan subsidies (indefinite)	2,182,721,000	2,086,350,000	2,086,350,000	2,086,350,000	2,086,350,000	-96,371,000
Mandatory admin expenses (indefinite)	41,828,000	92,340,000	92,340,000	92,340,000	92,340,000	+50,512,000
Federal administration	60,487,000	72,466,000	72,466,000	72,466,000	72,466,000	+11,979,000
Total	2,285,036,000	2,251,156,000	2,251,156,000	2,251,156,000	2,251,156,000	-33,880,000
FEDERAL DIRECT LOAN DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM (HEA IV-D)						
Direct loan subsidies: New loans (sec. 451)	---	22,179,000	22,179,000	22,179,000	22,179,000	+22,179,000
HIGHER EDUCATION						
Aid for institutional development:						
Strengthening institutions	86,257,000	88,586,000	88,586,000	88,586,000	88,586,000	+2,329,000
Strengthening historically black colleges & univ.	98,208,000	100,860,000	100,860,000	100,860,000	100,860,000	+2,652,000
Strengthening historically black grad institutions	11,501,000	11,812,000	17,312,000	11,501,000	15,859,000	+4,358,000
Endowment challenge grants:						
Endowment grants	5,525,000	5,674,000	5,674,000	5,674,000	5,674,000	+149,000
HBCU set-aside	1,841,000	1,891,000	1,891,000	1,891,000	1,891,000	+50,000
Subtotal, Institutional development	203,332,000	208,823,000	214,323,000	208,512,000	212,870,000	+9,538,000
Program development:						
Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Educ.	15,872,000	17,872,000	15,872,000	17,872,000	17,372,000	+1,500,000
Dwight D. Eisenhower leadership program	3,472,000	---	---	4,000,000	4,000,000	+528,000
Minority teacher recruitment	2,480,000	2,547,000	2,480,000	2,480,000	2,480,000	---
Minority science improvement	5,892,000	5,892,000	5,892,000	5,892,000	5,892,000	---
Innovative projects for community service	1,436,000	2,872,000	1,436,000	1,436,000	1,436,000	---
Student Literacy and Mentoring Corps	5,270,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	---	---	-5,270,000
International educ & foreign language studies:						
Domestic programs	49,283,000	48,301,000	51,283,000	51,283,000	52,283,000	+3,000,000
Overseas programs	5,843,000	5,843,000	5,843,000	5,843,000	5,843,000	---
Institute for International Public Policy	---	4,000,000	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	+1,000,000
Subtotal, International education	55,126,000	58,144,000	58,126,000	57,126,000	59,126,000	+4,000,000
Cooperative education	13,749,000	---	13,749,000	13,749,000	13,749,000	---
Law school clinical experience	9,920,000	9,920,000	14,920,000	14,920,000	14,920,000	+5,000,000
Urban community service	9,424,000	9,424,000	9,424,000	11,000,000	10,606,000	+1,182,000
Subtotal, Program development	122,641,000	107,671,000	122,899,000	128,475,000	129,581,000	+6,940,000
Construction:						
Interest subsidy grants, prior year construction	18,689,000	18,029,000	18,029,000	18,029,000	18,029,000	-660,000
Special grants:						
Assistance to Guam	397,000	---	397,000	397,000	397,000	---
Robert A. Taft Institute	319,000	---	---	---	---	-319,000
Mary C. McLeod Bethune Memorial Fine Arts Center	---	12,500,000	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, Special grants	716,000	12,500,000	397,000	397,000	397,000	-319,000
Federal TRIO programs	388,048,000	398,525,000	418,525,000	418,525,000	418,525,000	+30,477,000
Scholarships:						
Byrd honors scholarships	9,470,000	18,940,000	18,940,000	19,294,000	19,294,000	+9,824,000
National science scholars	4,464,000	6,048,000	4,464,000	4,464,000	4,464,000	---
National Academy of Science, Space and Technology	2,161,000	---	---	---	---	-2,161,000
Douglas teacher scholarships	14,731,000	15,379,000	14,731,000	14,731,000	14,731,000	---

	FY 1993 Comparable	FY 1994 Budget Request	House Bill	Senate Bill	Conference	Conference vs FY93 Comparable
Early Intervention Scholarships	---	---	2,500,000	---	1,875,000	+1,875,000
Teacher Opportunity Corps	---	---	2,500,000	---	1,875,000	+1,875,000
Subtotal, Scholarships	30,826,000	40,367,000	43,135,000	38,489,000	42,239,000	+11,413,000
Graduate fellowships:						
Women & minority participation in grad education	5,846,000	6,004,000	5,846,000	5,846,000	5,846,000	---
Harris graduate fellowships	20,427,000	21,796,000	20,427,000	20,427,000	20,427,000	---
Javits fellowships	7,857,000	8,664,000	7,857,000	7,857,000	7,857,000	---
Graduate assistance in areas of national need	27,498,000	35,623,000	27,498,000	27,498,000	27,498,000	---
Faculty development fellowships	---	8,500,000	4,000,000	2,000,000	3,500,000	+3,500,000
Subtotal, Graduate fellowships	61,628,000	80,587,000	65,628,000	63,628,000	65,128,000	+3,500,000
School, college & university partnerships	3,928,000	3,928,000	3,928,000	3,928,000	3,928,000	---
Legal training for the disadvantaged (CLEO)	2,991,000	2,991,000	2,991,000	2,991,000	2,991,000	---
Total, Higher education	832,799,000	873,421,000	889,855,000	882,974,000	893,688,000	+60,889,000
HOWARD UNIVERSITY						
Academic program	150,764,000	154,835,000	154,835,000	154,835,000	154,835,000	+4,071,000
Endowment program	3,351,000	3,441,000	3,441,000	3,441,000	3,441,000	+90,000
Research	4,533,000	4,655,000	4,655,000	4,655,000	4,655,000	+122,000
Howard University Hospital	28,973,000	29,755,000	29,755,000	29,755,000	29,755,000	+782,000
Construction:						
Regular grants	5,300,000	---	---	---	---	-5,300,000
Matching program	1,084,000	---	---	---	---	-1,084,000
Total, Howard University	194,005,000	192,686,000	192,686,000	192,686,000	192,686,000	-1,319,000
COLLEGE HOUSING AND ACADEMIC FACILITIES LOANS PROGRAM:						
Loan subsidies	2,973,000	---	---	---	---	-2,973,000
Federal administration	727,000	730,000	730,000	730,000	730,000	+3,000
Loan limitation (non-add)	(29,465,000)	---	---	---	---	(-29,465,000)
Total, College Housing Program	3,700,000	730,000	730,000	730,000	730,000	-2,970,000
HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGE & UNIVERSITY CAPITAL FINANCING PROGRAM						
Federal insurance limitation (non-add)	---	(375,000,000)	(187,500,000)	(375,000,000)	(375,000,000)	(+375,000,000)
Letter of credit limitation (non-add)	---	(357,000,000)	(178,500,000)	(357,000,000)	(357,000,000)	(+357,000,000)
Federal administration	---	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	+200,000
Total	---	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	+200,000
EDUCATION RESEARCH, STATISTICS, AND IMPROVEMENT						
Research and statistics:						
Research	73,984,000	90,750,000	73,984,000	78,000,000	78,000,000	+4,016,000
Statistics	48,588,000	60,000,000	48,588,000	48,588,000	48,588,000	---
Assessment, regular program	29,262,000	65,000,000	29,262,000	29,262,000	29,262,000	---
Subtotal, Research and statistics	151,834,000	215,750,000	151,834,000	155,850,000	155,850,000	+4,016,000
Fund for Innovation in Education	28,008,000	40,000,000	28,008,000	40,000,000	32,500,000	+4,492,000
Civics Education	---	---	---	4,463,000	4,463,000	+4,463,000
Fund for the Improvement and Reform of Schools and Teaching:						
Grants for schools and teachers	5,396,000	5,396,000	5,396,000	5,396,000	5,396,000	---
Family-school partnerships	3,687,000	3,687,000	3,687,000	3,687,000	3,687,000	---
Eisenhower mathematics & science educ national program	15,872,000	15,872,000	15,872,000	16,072,000	16,072,000	+200,000
Eisenhower math-science regional consortia	13,590,000	12,741,000	12,741,000	15,000,000	13,871,000	+281,000
National Diffusion Network	14,582,000	14,582,000	14,582,000	14,582,000	14,582,000	---
Blue ribbon schools	879,000	903,000	879,000	---	879,000	---
Javits gifted and talented students education	9,607,000	9,607,000	9,607,000	9,607,000	9,607,000	---
Star schools	22,777,000	27,000,000	22,777,000	27,000,000	25,944,000	+3,167,000
Educational partnerships	4,136,000	2,120,000	2,120,000	---	---	-4,136,000
Territorial teacher training	1,737,000	---	1,737,000	1,737,000	1,737,000	---
National writing project	3,212,000	---	3,212,000	3,212,000	3,212,000	---
National Board for Professional Teaching Standards	4,792,000	4,921,000	4,792,000	4,792,000	4,792,000	---
Total, ERSI	280,109,000	352,579,000	277,244,000	301,398,000	292,592,000	+12,483,000

	FY 1993 Comparable	FY 1994 Budget Request	House Bill	Senate Bill	Conference	Conference vs FY93 Comparable
LIBRARIES						
Public libraries:						
Services	83,227,000	95,000,000	83,227,000	83,227,000	83,227,000	---
Construction	16,584,000	---	16,584,000	19,000,000	17,792,000	+1,208,000
Interlibrary cooperation	19,749,000	19,749,000	19,749,000	19,749,000	19,749,000	---
Foreign language materials (Title V-LSCA)	968,000	---	---	---	---	-968,000
Library literacy programs	8,098,000	---	8,098,000	8,098,000	8,098,000	---
College library technology	3,873,000	---	3,873,000	3,873,000	3,873,000	---
Library education and training	4,960,000	---	4,960,000	4,960,000	4,960,000	---
Research and demonstrations	2,802,000	---	2,802,000	2,802,000	2,802,000	---
Research libraries	5,808,000	---	5,808,000	5,808,000	5,808,000	---
Total, Libraries	146,069,000	114,749,000	145,101,000	147,517,000	146,309,000	+240,000
DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT						
PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION	304,899,000	352,008,000	352,008,000	291,921,000	352,008,000	+47,109,000
OFFICE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS, SALARIES AND EXPENSES	56,402,000	56,570,000	56,570,000	56,570,000	56,570,000	+168,000
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL, SALARIES AND EXPENSES	29,262,000	28,840,000	28,840,000	28,840,000	28,840,000	-422,000
Total, Departmental management	390,563,000	437,418,000	437,418,000	377,331,000	437,418,000	+46,855,000
Total, Department of Education	28,087,420,000	30,921,629,000	28,627,320,000	28,755,410,000	28,765,192,000	+677,772,000
TITLE IV - RELATED AGENCIES						
Action (Domestic Programs):						
Volunteers in Service to America:						
VISTA operations	34,667,000	36,236,000	34,667,000	36,367,000	35,942,000	+1,275,000
VISTA Literacy Corps	5,009,000	5,303,000	5,009,000	5,009,000	5,009,000	---
University year for VISTA	958,000	1,000,000	958,000	958,000	958,000	---
Subtotal	40,634,000	42,539,000	40,634,000	42,334,000	41,909,000	+1,275,000
Special Volunteer Programs:						
Drug programs	982,000	1,000,000	982,000	982,000	982,000	---
Older Americans Volunteer Programs:						
Foster Grandparents Program	64,804,000	66,301,000	64,804,000	66,554,000	66,117,000	+1,313,000
Senior Companion Program	29,548,000	29,848,000	29,548,000	29,848,000	29,773,000	+225,000
Retired Senior Volunteer Program	33,686,000	34,831,000	33,686,000	34,686,000	34,436,000	+750,000
Subtotal, Older Volunteers	128,038,000	130,980,000	128,038,000	131,088,000	130,326,000	+2,288,000
Inspector General	936,000	947,000	936,000	947,000	944,000	+8,000
Program Support	30,936,000	31,272,000	30,936,000	30,936,000	30,936,000	---
Total, Action	201,526,000	206,738,000	201,526,000	206,287,000	205,097,000	+3,571,000
Corporation for Public Broadcasting: FY96 (current request) 1/	292,640,000	292,640,000	292,640,000	320,000,000	312,000,000	+19,360,000
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	29,953,000	30,241,000	30,241,000	30,241,000	30,241,000	+288,000
Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission	5,726,000	5,842,000	5,842,000	5,842,000	5,842,000	+116,000
National Commission on Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome	1,736,000	---	---	---	---	-1,736,000
National Commission on Independent Higher Education	992,000	---	---	---	---	-992,000
National Commission on Libraries and Information Science	889,000	904,000	904,000	904,000	904,000	+15,000
White House Conference on Library and Information Services	397,000	---	---	---	---	-397,000
National Commission on Responsibilities for Financing Postsecondary Education	206,000	---	---	---	---	-206,000
National Commission on the Cost of Higher Education	992,000	---	---	---	---	-992,000
National Commission to Prevent Infant Mortality	446,000	460,000	---	---	---	-446,000
National Council on Disability	1,541,000	1,733,000	1,590,000	1,791,000	1,690,000	+149,000
National Labor Relations Board	169,807,000	171,274,000	171,274,000	171,274,000	171,274,000	+1,467,000
National Mediation Board	7,807,000	8,006,000	8,506,000	8,807,000	8,657,000	+850,000
Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission	7,112,000	7,262,000	7,362,000	7,362,000	7,362,000	+250,000
Physician Payment Review Commission (trust funds)	(4,415,000)	(4,171,000)	(4,171,000)	(4,171,000)	(4,171,000)	(-244,000)
Prospective Payment Assessment Commission (trust funds)	(4,383,000)	(4,575,000)	(4,500,000)	(4,500,000)	(4,500,000)	(+117,000)
Railroad Retirement Board:						
Dual benefits payments account	294,030,000	277,000,000	277,000,000	277,000,000	277,000,000	-17,030,000
Less income tax receipts on dual benefits	-22,000,000	-20,000,000	-20,000,000	-20,000,000	-20,000,000	+2,000,000
Subtotal, dual benefits	272,030,000	257,000,000	257,000,000	257,000,000	257,000,000	-15,030,000

1/ FY 1993 approp. adv. in FY91 is $318,636,000.
FY 1994 approp. adv. in FY92 is $275,000,000.
FY 1995 approp. adv. in FY93 is $292,640,000.

	FY 1993 Comparable	FY 1994 Budget Request	House Bill	Senate Bill	Conference	Conference vs FY93 Comparable
Federal payment to the Railroad Retirement Account	100,000	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000	+200,000
Limitation on administration:						
(Retirement)	(74,544,000)	(73,791,000)	(73,791,000)	(73,791,000)	(73,791,000)	(-753,000)
(Unemployment)	(17,185,000)	(17,010,000)	(17,010,000)	(17,010,000)	(17,010,000)	(-175,000)
Subtotal, administration	(91,729,000)	(90,801,000)	(90,801,000)	(90,801,000)	(90,801,000)	(-928,000)
(Special Management Improvement Fund)	(3,690,000)	(3,300,000)	(3,300,000)	(3,300,000)	(3,300,000)	(-390,000)
Total, limitation on administration	(95,419,000)	(94,101,000)	(94,101,000)	(94,101,000)	(94,101,000)	(-1,318,000)
(Inspector General)	(6,845,000)	(6,742,000)	(6,742,000)	(6,742,000)	(6,742,000)	(-103,000)
Soldiers' and Airmen's Home (trust fund limitation):						
Operation and maintenance	42,117,000	43,448,000	43,139,000	43,139,000	43,139,000	+1,022,000
Capital outlay	5,952,000	4,930,000	4,930,000	4,930,000	4,930,000	-1,022,000
Total	48,069,000	48,378,000	48,069,000	48,069,000	48,069,000	---
United States Institute of Peace	10,912,000	10,912,000	10,912,000	10,912,000	10,912,000	---
United States Naval Home (trust fund limitation):						
Operation and maintenance	10,775,000	10,841,000	10,775,000	10,775,000	10,775,000	---
Capital program	473,000	486,000	473,000	473,000	473,000	---
Total	11,248,000	11,327,000	11,248,000	11,248,000	11,248,000	---
Total, Title IV, Related Agencies:						
Federal funds (all years)	1,064,129,000	1,053,017,000	1,047,414,000	1,080,037,000	1,070,596,000	+6,467,000
Current year, FY 1994	(771,489,000)	(760,377,000)	(754,774,000)	(760,037,000)	(758,596,000)	(-12,893,000)
FY 1996	(292,640,000)	(292,640,000)	(292,640,000)	(320,000,000)	(312,000,000)	(+19,360,000)
Trust funds	(111,062,000)	(109,589,000)	(109,514,000)	(109,514,000)	(109,514,000)	(-1,548,000)

SUMMARY

Title I - Department of Labor:						
Federal Funds	12,270,516,000	12,872,261,000	10,972,157,000	10,859,651,000	10,914,538,000	-1,355,978,000
Trust Funds	(3,462,511,000)	(3,690,914,000)	(3,692,212,000)	(3,662,424,000)	(3,701,352,000)	(+238,841,000)
Title II - Department of Health and Human Services:						
Federal Funds	210,931,782,000	215,624,206,000	175,032,320,000	215,968,067,000	215,802,937,000	+4,871,155,000
Current year	(172,736,374,000)	(176,459,426,000)	(175,032,320,000)	(176,700,659,000)	(176,567,937,000)	(+3,831,563,000)
1995 advance	(38,195,408,000)	(39,164,780,000)	---	(39,267,408,000)	(39,235,000,000)	(+1,039,592,000)
Trust Funds	(7,049,992,000)	(8,374,324,000)	(7,774,421,000)	(7,686,037,000)	(7,763,583,000)	(+713,591,000)
Title III - Department of Education:						
Federal Funds	28,087,420,000	30,921,629,000	28,627,320,000	28,755,410,000	28,765,192,000	+677,772,000
Title IV - Related Agencies:						
Federal Funds	1,064,129,000	1,053,017,000	1,047,414,000	1,080,037,000	1,070,596,000	+6,467,000
Current year	(771,489,000)	(760,377,000)	(754,774,000)	(760,037,000)	(758,596,000)	(-12,893,000)
1996 advance	(292,640,000)	(292,640,000)	(292,640,000)	(320,000,000)	(312,000,000)	(+19,360,000)
Trust Funds	(111,062,000)	(109,589,000)	(109,514,000)	(109,514,000)	(109,514,000)	(-1,548,000)
Weed and Seed (P.L. 102-360) (rescission)	225,000,000	---	---	-225,000,000	-225,000,000	-450,000,000
Bill-wide consultant savings	---	---	---	-10,000,000	---	---
Total, all titles:						
Federal Funds	252,578,847,000	260,471,113,000	215,679,211,000	256,428,165,000	256,328,263,000	+3,749,416,000
Current year	(214,090,799,000)	(221,013,693,000)	(215,386,571,000)	(216,840,757,000)	(216,781,263,000)	(+2,690,464,000)
1995 advance	(38,195,408,000)	(39,164,780,000)	---	(39,267,408,000)	(39,235,000,000)	(+1,039,592,000)
1996 advance	(292,640,000)	(292,640,000)	(292,640,000)	(320,000,000)	(312,000,000)	(+19,360,000)
Trust Funds	(10,623,565,000)	(12,174,827,000)	(11,576,147,000)	(11,457,975,000)	(11,574,449,000)	(+950,884,000)

WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
NEAL SMITH,
DAVID R. OBEY,
LOUIS STOKES,
STENY H. HOYER,
NANCY PELOSI,
NITA M. LOWEY,
JOSÉ E. SERRANO,
ROSA L. DELAURO,
JOHN EDWARD PORTER,
BILL YOUNG,
HELEN DELICH BENTLEY,
HENRY BONILLA,
JOSEPH M. MCDADE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

TOM HARKIN,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,
DANIEL K. INOUYE,
DALE BUMPERS,
HARRY REID,
HERB KOHL,
PATTY MURRAY,
ARLEN SPECTER,
MARK O. HATFIELD,
TED STEVENS,
THAD COCHRAN,
SLADE GORTON,
CONNIE MACK,
CHRISTOPHER S. BOND,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

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. SHAW) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials:)

Mr. WELDON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. SHAW, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. GOSS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. RAMSTAD, for 60 minutes, today.
Mr. GILMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. BYRNE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes each day, on October 5, 6, 7, 12, 13, 14, and 15.
Mr. STARK, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. MINK, for 60 minutes each day, on October 25, 26, and 29.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. CLEMENT, 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. SHAW) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BAKER of California.
Mrs. VUCANOVICH.
Mr. DUNCAN.
Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.
Mr. LIGHTFOOT.

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. BYRNE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. MALONEY in three instances.
Mr. LAROCCO.
Mr. OLVER.
Mr. NATCHER.
Mr. STARK.
Mr. MATSUI.
Mr. BEILENSON.
Ms. SLAUGHTER.
Mr. MILLER of California.
Mr. STOKES.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SOLOMON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GILLMOR.
Mr. KIM.
Mr. HEFLEY.
Mr. OBERSTAR.
Mr. HASTINGS.
Mr. WHEAT.
Mr. GALLEGLY.
Mr. NADLER.
Mr. ENGEL.
Mr. BLACKWELL in two instances.
Mr. WATT.
Mr. LAFALCE.
Mr. CLYBURN.
Mr. LIGHTFOOT.
Mr. BOEHNER.
Mr. STUPAK.
Mr. OWENS.
Mr. STOKES.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 6, 1993, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1968. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification of the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Turkey for defense articles and services (Transmital No. 94-02), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1969. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting information concerning the unauthorized transfer of U.S.-origin munitions items, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2314(d); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1970. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of Presidential Determination No. 93-39 concerning assistance to Jordan, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2364(a)(1); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1971. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting the list of all reports issued or released in August 1993, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 719(h); to the Committee on Government Operations.

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:

Ms. SLAUGHTER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 268. Resolution waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany 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 (Rept. 103-274). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. NATCHER: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 2518. A bill 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 (Rept. 103-275). Ordered to be printed.

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. KILDEE (for himself and Mr. FORD of Michigan):

H.R. 3210. A bill to improve learning and teaching by providing a national framework for education reform; to promote the research, consensus building, and systemic changes needed to ensure equitable educational opportunities and high levels of educational achievement for all students; to provide a framework for reauthorization of all Federal education programs; to promote the development and adoption of a voluntary national system of skill standards and certifications; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PICKLE (for himself, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Mr. JEFFERSON):

H.R. 3211. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a temporary delay in the requirement to pay certain premiums under the Coal Industry Retiree Health Benefit Act of 1992; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Education and Labor.

By Mr. HEFLEY:

H.R. 3212. A bill to require the withdrawal of United States Armed Forces from Somalia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HEFLEY (for himself, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. KYL, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. SKEEN, and Mr. DOOLITTLE):

H.R. 3213. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for the use of biological monitoring and whole effluent toxicity tests in connection with publicly owned treatment works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. KNOLLENBERG:

H.R. 3214. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to enhance educational opportunity, increases school attendance, and promote self-sufficiency among welfare recipients; jointly, to the committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H.R. 3215. A bill to amend title I of the employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to clarify remedies against unauthorized termination or reduction of benefits under group health plans provided upon retirement; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STUPAK:

H.R. 3216. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 to control the diversion of certain chemicals used in the illicit production of controlled substances such as methcathinine and methamphetamine, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLAY (by request):

H.R. 3218. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to eliminate narrow restrictions on employee training; to provide a temporary voluntary separation incentive; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 3219. A bill to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to clarify the application of that act to extraterritorial actions of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H.R. 3220. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to increasing the number of health professionals who practice in the United States in a field of primary health care; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LANTOS:

H. Con. Res. 158. Concurrent resolution recognizing the International Rescue Committee, on the occasion of the 60th anniversary of the founding, for its great humanitarian endeavors; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII;

Mrs. FOWLER introduced a bill (H.R. 3217) to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade of the United States for the vessel *Libby Rose*; which was referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 81: Mr. HOBSON.

H.R. 125: Mr. RUSH, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 127: Mr. CARR.

H.R. 133: Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. YATES.

H.R. 135: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 298: Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 323: Mr. GINGRICH, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. COX, and Mr. MANN.

H.R. 439: Mr. ROYCE and Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.

H.R. 595: Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY.

H.R. 602: Mr. QUINN.

H.R. 715: Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 796: Mr. DOOLEY and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 830: Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. HERGER, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, and Mr. WHEAT.

H.R. 972: Mr. MANTON.

H.R. 1095: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1153: Mr. STARK and Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 1155: Mr. YATES.

H.R. 1304: Mr. MCNULTY.

H.R. 1354: Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mrs. THURMAN, Mrs. MINK, Mrs. CLAYTON, Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, and Mr. STUDDS.

H.R. 1552: Mr. COPPERSMITH.

H.R. 1604: Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 1608: Mr. BARLOW, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. CANADY, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. JACOBS, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SOLOMON, and Mr. WATT.

H.R. 1627: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mrs. FOWLER.

H.R. 1796: Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. STUMP, Mr. PASTOR, and Mr. TORRICELLI.

H.R. 1797: Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 1799: Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 1818: Ms. SHEPHERD.

H.R. 1945: Mr. LAROCCO, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. DEAL, Mr. MANN, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. SHEPHERD, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MICA, MR. BROWDER, Mr. HAYES, and Ms. MOLINARI.

H.R. 2076: Mr. TORRES and Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 2121: Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. ORTIZ, Ms. VUCANOVICH, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WYNN, Mrs. THURMAN, Ms. LONG, Mr. BISHOP, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 2142: Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 2144: Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 2241: Mr. THOMPSON.

H.R. 2417: Mr. BARLOW and Mr. MINGE.

H.R. 2612: Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 2626: Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. KLEIN, and Mr. SABO.

H.R. 2660: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. HINCHEY, and Ms. FURSE.

H.R. 2671: Mr. LIGHTFOOT.

H.R. 2676: Mr. WATT.

H.R. 2710: Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 2728: Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. FROST, Ms. WOOSLEY, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. BAESLER, and Mr. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 2831: Mr. TORRES and Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 2884: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 2921: Mr. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 2923: Mr. MARTINEZ and Mr. DEAL.

H.R. 2936: Mr. DORNAN, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, and Mr. CANADY.

H.R. 2938: Mr. DORNAN, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, and Mr. CANADY.

H.R. 2962: Ms. PELOSI, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. UNDERWOOD.

H.R. 2980: Mr. CLAY, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. BERMAN, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 2982: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 2987: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 3005: Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. ZELIFF, and Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 3006: Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 3030: Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. PAXON, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. COX, and Mr. CANADY.

H.R. 3038: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H.R. 3041: Mrs. LLOYD.

H.R. 3076: Mr. JACOBS, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H.R. 3080: Mr. BLUTE, Mr. FISH, Mr. KLUG, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. CALLAHAN, and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 3109: Mr. FILNER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. WILSON.

H.R. 3158: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.J. Res. 106: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.J. Res. 133: Mr. SANDERS.

H.J. Res. 191: Mr. WYNN.

H.J. Res. 197. Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. SWETT, Mr. SYNAR, Mrs. MINK, Mr. CLEMENT, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. TANNER, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. LEACH, Ms. LAMBERT, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. KASICH.

H.J. Res. 206: Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, and Mr. VISCLOSKY.

H.J. Res. 234: Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. PACKARD, Ms. LOWEY, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CASTLE, and Mrs. FOWLER.

H.J. Res. 246: Mr. BARRETT OF WISCONSIN, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FISH, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. NADLER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. TRAFICANT, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, and Mr. VENTO.

H.J. Res. 262: Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. TAUZIN, and Mr. BONIOR.

H.J. Res. 266: Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. BLILEY, Ms. BYRNE, and Mr. HILLIARD.

H. Con. Res. 126: Mr. CLAY, Ms. BYRNE, Mr. STOKES, Mr. LEVIN, and Ms. FURSE.

H. Con. Res. 135: Mrs. UNSOELD, Ms. FURSE, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. KLUG, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. COBLE, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. WELDON, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. HAMBURG, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H. Con. Res. 140: Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY.

H. Con. Res. 153: Mr. ROYCE.

H. Res. 54: Mr. ROYCE.

H. Res. 122: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. ROYCE.

H. Res. 234: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. HORN, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. CANADY, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. KIM.