HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, October 7, 1993*

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

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

PRAYER

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

With the noise of conflict and the sound of hostility in so many places, we pray, almighty God, that those in great need will know Your presence and Your life redeeming power. We pray, O God, that those who suffer and their families will realize the transcending strength that Your word does give and grasp the faith and hope of Your abiding nearness and Your mercy to every person. May Your benediction that speaks of abiding faith remind us of Your peace that passes all human understanding. Bless us, O God, this day and every day. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM 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 with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2401. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1994 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2750. An act making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies 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. 2401) "An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1994 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes" requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. NUNN, Mr. EXON, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. GLENN, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. BYRD, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. ROBB, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. WARNER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. LOTT, Mr. COATS, Mr. SMITH, Mr. KEMPTHORNE, Mr. FAIRCLOTH, and Mrs. HUTCHISON, 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. 2750) "An act making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994" requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. BYRD, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. SASSER, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. HATFIELD, and Mr. SPECTER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

TRIBUTE TO DR. LAUREL T. ULRICH

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

Mr. SWETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to one of New Hampshire's most admired citizens, Dr. Laurel Thatcher Ulrich, a history professor at the University of New Hampshire.

Today, President Clinton will award her the Frankel Prize and the medal of arts designated for contributions in the humanities, adding to her long list of honors. She already has received the 1991 Pulitzer Prize in history, a $320,000 McArthur Fellowship, a Guggenheim Fellowship, and the prestigious Bancroft Prize from Columbia University for her work, "A Midwife's Tale."

Dr. Ulrich's research approaches 17th-century life from the viewpoint of an anthropologist and literary critic, drawing on diaries, household inventories, gravestones, and court records, to fashion a highly original and vividly realized portrait of women and their relations with each other, their children, and men in early American history.

Her dedication to quality education and research and her commitment to the art of history and social sciences deserves our admiration and praise. I ask my colleagues to join me and the President in honoring this truly remarkable woman from New Hampshire.

DISCHARGE PETITION: ALLOW THE BRADY BILL TO COME UP FOR A VOTE

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, today I am filing a discharge petition to bring H.R. 1025, the Brady bill, to the floor of the House of Representatives for a vote.

In this Congress the Brady bill has been on the slow track to oblivion. Just one public hearing has been held, after having been canceled a couple of times, in a Judiciary subcommittee.

In the preceding Congress the Brady bill had been passed by the House in May of 1991, only to die a slow and torturous death in the other body. It seems to me that this House needs to take action on an essential element of a crime control package, the Brady bill. The only people who will be denied firearms if the Brady bill becomes law are convicted felons and adjudicated mental incompetents who cannot legally own firearms at the present time.

I urge my colleagues to sign this discharge petition because it would be a crime if Congress left town this year without voting on the Brady bill.

ON THE RETIREMENT OF RAYMON ROEBUCK

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

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise with a heavy heart for the loss we

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

incur when Raymon Roebuck leaves the House. But conversely, I find that we can do so with a light heart, and a joyous one.

It is easy to be joyous about Raymon's retirement, when you consider that now, at long last, after giving us more than three decades of his time, his professional services, his personal attention, his loyalty, and I believe, his love.

He will now have more time for his extended family, his many friends, his church work, his grandchildren.

Raymon has been a blessing. When it is late at night, and the session has been long and grinding, when tempers are short, and when patience has long gone out the window, we can go and speak softly to Raymon.

He will calm us with his insight, provide us with the sustenance our bodies and our minds need, or give us the latest on what is happening in sports.

Anything to get us through our days—that is Raymon's way of serving—even if it was the shock of telling us—Members of this body to, "Hold on, Sir, you will have to wait for your hot dog."

Again, as we all say goodby, to Raymon, today we do so knowing that Raymon is retiring from service in the House, not from life.

I wish him Godspeed.

TRIBUTE TO THE HON. "BOB" MICHEL

(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, when the next Congress convenes, the Republican conference will have a new leader and the district next door to mine will have a new Representative. Whomever those persons are, they will have a difficult time filling the shoes of BOB MICHEL. I am proud to be the leadoff speaker on our side of the aisle in honoring our retiring leader.

BOB MICHEL is one of those rare persons who can hold together a group of people as diverse as the House Republicans, who can be a partisan when necessary but can also sit down and find agreement with both sides of the aisle when the best interests of the country require it.

When he retires after nearly 50 years of public service, BOB will know that he has made our country a better place, and few people can truly make that claim. His retirement, although richly deserved, will leave a void for the country and for Illinois in particular. BOB MICHEL has been stalwart in representing the interests of central Illinois.

As an aside, Mr. Speaker, when I was first running for office in a new district and they were drawing a new map, there was some talk about MICHEL and I may end up in the same district. And as a very brash, inexperienced Member, I thought that would not be such a tough race. Little did I know what a giant BOB MICHEL was.

I am proud to call BOB MICHEL my friend and neighbor. I want to thank him for the help he has given me as a rather new Member of Congress. And I know I speak for millions of Illinoisans when I say, thank you BOB for your service, for your leadership, and for your friendship.

BAN FGM

(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, women around the world face daily humiliations, discriminations, hardships, subordination, and suffering. Women in Africa may win the prize. Young girls in many African countries face a traditional ritual that involves the cutting or complete removal of their sex organ—or female genital mutilation [FGM]. FGM is often called female circumcision, implying a similarity to male circumcision. There is no similarity, unless male circumcision involved amputation.

FGM causes serious health problems—bleeding, chronic urinary tract and pelvic infections, build up of scar tissue, and infertility. The women that have been genitally mutilated experience severe trauma, painful intercourse, are at higher risk of AIDS, and experience the trauma again with each childbirth, and all for a practice that has no medical purpose.

The practice of FGM stems from an intricate mix of traditional African society's perceptions of gender roles, sex, health practices, local customs, superstition, and religious traditions. The net result is total control over a woman's sexuality and reproductive system.

As communities of African immigrants from nations where FGM is practiced grow in the United States, we must make it clear—they and their rich and proud cultures are welcome in the United States, but the practice of FGM is not. For that reason, Representative BARBARA-ROSE COLLINS and I are introducing legislation to prohibit FGM in the United States. This practice runs contrary to this country's attitudes toward women's equality and women's place in society. There is no place for FGM here.

TRIBUTE TO BOB MICHEL

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

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to pay tribute to a man I am honored to call a friend, Congressman BOB MICHEL. He is a leader in the tradition of Gerald Ford and John Rhodes.

BOB is enormously popular with Republicans and highly respected among our Democratic colleagues. He is the kind of leader you never want to disappoint, and like all his Republican colleagues I have always looked to him for guidance.

BOB's reputation for loyalty works both up and down the Republican Party. During his time as our leader, he remains loyal to everybody from Presidents to the most junior Republican Members.

To me, his trademark is his willingness to listen. There is almost always a Member on the floor, who wants to get his ear, and as I watch him, I am impressed with the fact that BOB constantly gives his full attention. BOB's attitude has inspired me throughout my years, and I feel a great sense of loss that he retires next year.

□ 1010

THE SITUATION IN SOMALIA

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, events in Somalia make it plain that the United States must review its policy there. The death, wounding, and capture of American soldiers underscores the need for review.

Before American troops are committed to foreign operations, there must be a clear policy. Such a policy must include a precise statement of our goals and purposes and clear rules of engagement. It must also set out what we intend to do there, why we are there, how and when we will extract our people.

Such a policy must also give American troops the ability to defend themselves, and sufficient resources, in terms of the number of troops, weapons, equipment, and other forms of support, to assure their eventual safe return.

It is apparent that those requirements have not yet been met in our presence in Somalia. I am calling upon the administration to review these matters, consult with the Congress, and make available to the American people the information needed to gain their support. We cannot continue to expose U.S. military personnel to fatality, injury, or capture without giving them the means and the opportunity to defend themselves.

I will support a clear and decisive policy with discernible and achievable military goals. If that is not possible, our troops should be withdrawn forthwith.

TRIBUTE TO HON. BOB MICHEL

(Mr. HASTERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleagues on this side of the aisle to show respect and pay tribute to BOB MICHEL. BOB MICHEL has certainly been an institution to this House for years, a man whose heart is as big as this Capitol, a man whose understanding of politics and politicians goes beyond that which a junior Member like myself can really begin to comprehend.

BOB came out of the same flatlands and corn fields of Illinois as I did. He brought to this place good common sense, congeniality, and certainly a style of leadership that says we listen, we contemplate, we make wise decisions, and we follow through.

I think in my limited years at both the State and Federal levels of public service, I can think of no greater tribute than to say that BOB MICHEL is a politician in all the very best respects of that word.

BOB MICHEL has given the word politician a very, very honorable definition.

IN HONOR OF TERRY DUNCAN, OCTOBER 7, 1993

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

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Speaker, pain and suffering have visited many American families this week. We all know of the tragic losses suffered in Somalia and we grieve for the families who lost loved ones there. Our soldiers died in pursuit of a noble cause—saving the lives of others. They are heroes.

Today I would like to take a moment to honor the memory of yet another hero, an American killed in fighting this week. Terry Duncan died Sunday night during the unrest in Moscow. He, too, died saving the lives of others.

Terry Duncan was a graduate of Tulane University and George Washington University. His grandparents, Mr. and Mrs. Hurchel Boggus, are residents of Heard County, GA.

Witnesses said Terry Duncan was killed during the battle between Communist hardliners and Russian troops, but not before he saved the lives of three other people who had been wounded in the fighting, including a reporter for the New York Times.

On behalf of the House of Representatives, I extend our deepest and most heartfelt sympathies to the family and friends of Terry Duncan. Let us remember his courage and selflessness for many years to come.

ON THE RETIREMENT OF HON. BOB MICHEL

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, our leader of the Republican Party here, BOB MICHEL, is retiring. He is the son of a French immigrant. BOB MICHEL has lived the American dream.

Many people do not know that he served in World War II, was wounded as a combat infantryman, defending American freedom in World War II, earning two Bronze Stars, the Purple Heart, and four battle stars.

Politics In America writes of him:

> Many would agree with the judgment that he has been the most impressive House leader of either party since Sam Rayburn.

His calming voice has kept some of us more conservative Members in line. I would say that both parties will miss him.

TRAGIC LOSS OF OUR SOLDIERS IN SOMALIA

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

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise this morning to join in the comments on the tragic loss of American soldiers in Somalia. This is indeed a time of bereavement and a time of review.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the efforts of the administration and of this House and its leadership to move swiftly, to move expeditiously to review our policy in Somalia, for even as I speak right now on the House floor the leadership is meeting with the White House and with the administration, and I believe that very soon we are going to have a resounding and resolute policy that sets some timetables about removing our troops from Somalia; but let us never forget, Mr. Speaker, the noble and laudable efforts of the soldiers in the mission that they were originally dispatched to do, for indeed hundreds of thousands of lives have been saved. Twenty percent of all children under 5 years old were being killed in Somalia, so when we look back in the annals of time and the annals of history, Mr. Speaker, we will realize that indeed even if we have to pull out, we will have done a noble thing in Somalia and that our soldiers will not have died in vain.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTION TO INVESTIGATE THE HOUSE POST OFFICE

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

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, we do not make little messes here in Congress. When we make a mess, it is a doozy. The House bank, which caused such a fuss last year, still is not over. Only this week, Jack Russ, former Sergeant at Arms for this House, pleaded guilty to major embezzlement.

Because it takes so long to resolve these things, it is important to get started as early as possible when any problem surfaces. That is why we need to act on the resolution for an Ethics Committee investigation into the House post office.

The former bagman in that scheme has pleaded guilty to helping Members of Congress embezzle taxpayers' money. It is time to find out how many Congressmen, which Congressmen, and how much money.

No coverups, Mr. Speaker. The public is sick of Congress hounding everybody else, while going soft on our own. We cannot close our eyes and pretend nothing happened.

I will be asking for a floor vote on a privileged resolution, H.R. 238, the Istook resolution, to get our Ethics Committee active on this matter. I hope all Members of this body will support that effort.

AMERICAN MILITARY MISSION IN SOMALIA

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

Mr. MCHALE. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday a company of U.S. Rangers courageously fought a 12-hour battle against an overwhelming force of well armed urban guerrillas loyal to Somali warlord, Mohammed Aideed. Despite intense small arms and rocket fire, our soldiers fiercely and bravely defended their perimeter until reinforced by an armored relief column. The Rangers suffered 70 percent casualties, including at least 12 dead and 75 wounded. Photos and video tapes after the battle depicted atrocities which both angered and sickened our Nation.

In the wake of such battlefield courage displayed by our soldiers, I disagree with those who would appease Aideed by calling for an immediate and precipitous withdrawal from Somalia. Now is not the time to initiate a cowardly rush for the door.

In my view, American combat forces should be removed from Somalia, but in an orderly military retrograde, where the timetable is ours not Aideed's. If we as a nation display weakness, no matter how carefully cloaked in public policy debate, the inevitable message to Aideed and others will be that United States foreign policy can be shaped and altered by the brutal taking of American lives. Such a message invites repetition.

Finally, we must be firm in our resolve that those who were responsible for last Sunday's attack will be held accountable. No matter how long it takes. No matter what it costs. Such a commitment is not revenge. It is a solemn, unpaid debt we owe to our dead and wounded soldiers.

TRIBUTE TO REPUBLICAN LEADER BOB MICHEL

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today we pay tribute to our Republican leader, BOB MICHEL, who has announced his retirement at the end of this Congress.

The son of a French immigrant, BOB MICHEL has lived the American dream.

As a wounded combat infantryman, he defended American freedom in World War II, earning two Bronze Stars, the Purple Heart, and four battle stars.

As a Member of the United States House of Representatives, he has worked for the people of the Illinois 18th District since 1957.

□ 1020

BOB MICHEL's colleagues have voted him Republican leader seven consecutive times, and in 1989 President Ronald Reagan presented him with the Citizens Medal, our Nation's second highest presidential award.

Mr. Speaker, Politics in America writes of BOB MICHEL, "Many would agree with the judgment that he has been the most impressive House leader of either party since Sam Rayburn."

The Almanac of American Politics says, "He is a man of old-fashioned personal decency."

Mr. Speaker, we will miss such a great leader, and we will miss such a great friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

TWO PERSONS LEAVING AN IMPRINT ON THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

(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, normally Members take the well to talk about what we would call galactic, or global, or profound issues. Today I am not going to do that. I will talk about two very important people who I think have left an imprint on this House of Representatives, one of whom who has been spoken about at length this morning, and he is our friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], the minority leader who announced that he would not seek reelection at the end of this term.

Mr. Speaker, I have known, BOB for all of my 23 years here in the House, and he is a very good man who has served well and served faithfully his country and his constituency.

Another one who has, perhaps, a little less lofty position here in the House, but is our equally good friend, is Raymon Roebuck who is the manager of the Democratic Cloakroom. Raymon is hanging it up, or calling it a day, as we say, after over 30 years of service to the Democratic side, but also to the Republican side because often I see some of my colleagues from the Republican side coming into our Cloakroom for a good lunch, or some commiseration, or a little bit of advice from Raymon.

So, in any event, Mr. Speaker, the House is composed of great leaders with a lot of public notoriety, as well as great leaders who do not have that same kind of public celebrity, but in this case we will miss both of these gentlemen.

WE NEED A PLAN TO GET OUR TROOPS OUT OF SOMALIA

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

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, those who do not learn from history are condemned to repeat it. Two thousand more combat troops into Somalia so that they can be withdrawn in 6 months. This is the same kind of dribble in, incremental "light at the end of the tunnel" talk that we heard in Vietnam in 1968.

What are those troops going to do? Are they going to be commanded by the same incompetent U.N. bureaucrats that got 24 Americans killed in the first place?

Remember, the United Nations is still in command in Somalia. Has the United Nations agreed to let these troops concentrate on securing the release of our POW's?

What if our POW's are not back in the end of 6 months? Are we going to send more troops in? Or are we going to pull out?

Do we yet have a plan to complete the mission in Somalia? Better yet, do we even have a mission in Somalia?

Mr. Speaker, the Clinton administration has answered none of these basic questions. Yet the White House wants us to give them 6 more months. We have been there 10 months, and the situation gets worse each day.

We do not need more rhetoric about nation building, we do not need American foreign policy dictated by U.N. diplocrats in their New York salons. We want a concrete, step-by-step plan to get our POW's out and our troops home.

The next photo op on the White House lawn celebrating the return of American troops must only occur after all of our troops are safely returned to American soil.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER Mr. Speaker, when President Clinton came to Congress 2 weeks ago, he made a promise to me, and to every other American. He promised a plan to provide each of us with the security of knowing we will get the health care we need, whenever we need it.

As the President proposes, the Congress will dispose. I will be working closely with my constituents in Rochester to examine how the program will affect my district—where we have already made such great strides in expanding access and controlling health care costs.

I am pleased that there are already many aspects of the proposed health care reforms that will help the people of my district. For example, I recently heard from a constituent named James Dunbar. He is personally worried about rising health care costs—because his monthly Social Security check is almost entirely consumed by the cost of his medication. For seniors like Mr. Dunbar, health care reform promises relief, through the proposed prescription drug coverage plan. This is an important step in making prescription drugs affordable for the millions on fixed incomes.

The President's plan promises responsibility and accountability. It also proposes to keep health care costs from spiraling, by more effectively controlling spending.

For the sake of Mr. Dunbar, for our own families and communities, we must work to make these promises become reality.

We must find a way to provide coverage for those 37 million Americans currently without health care. It will be our job to look carefully and deliberatively at the President's proposal. And it will then be our turn to save what is right and correct what is wrong with our present health care system. For the sake of James Dunbar, my district and our Nation's future, I look forward to this opportunity.

THE RETIREMENT OF BOB MICHEL

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

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend our distinguished minority leader, Representative BOB MICHEL, for his many years of service to this body. The gentleman from Peoria is a man of integrity and keen intelligence, and he has served his district and our Nation in a truly outstanding manner.

Being an effective leader is never an easy task, and I am sure it can be especially frustrating as the leader of the minority party. However, Representative MICHEL has carried out his responsibilities with energy, humor, and a deep commitment to getting the job done.

His keen intelligence, his integrity, and his gentlemanly demeanor have endeared him to all the Members of the House, and we will miss him.

I hope he knows that when he leaves Washington, he will take with him not only the satisfaction of his accomplishments, but also the gratitude and best wishes of his many friends and admirers on both sides of the aisle.

SUPPORT NAFTA

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

Mr. LAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by saying the North American Free-Trade Agreement is a major breakthrough in economic policy.

NAFTA will create the largest market in the world with a combined economy of $6.5 trillion and 370 million people.

Mexico's population is growing at 2 percent per year, and it is a significant market now for U.S. agricultural products. The agreement will boost Mexico's demand for greater volume and variety of our food products.

Current Mexican tariffs on United States agricultural products range from 10 to 25 percent. These are two-and-a-half-times higher than the American tariffs on Mexican products.

Mexico will provide United States producers a new and growing market. This will help alleviate the surplus of agricultural goods in our country.

Among the agricultural industries that will benefit from a strong trade agreement with Mexico include rice, cattle, corn, grain, and cotton.

For the future of agriculture and thus our economy I am asking my colleagues to support the North American Free-Trade Agreement.

THERE'S STILL A CHANCE FOR BOB MICHEL TO BECOME SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE

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

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the distinguished Republican leader, the gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. MICHEL], a hero to the Second World War. He has also been a hero of Congress as an institution. A wise man, a man of great common sense, a decent human being, BOB MICHEL is respected on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that BOB and Mrs. Michel do not go too far when his term is up. His dream of a Republican majority will come, and a careful reading of the Constitution shows that the Speaker of the House does not have to be a Member of the House. The Speaker always has been since 1789, but, if there ever were to be a person to break that tradition, a person whose word is respected on both sides of the aisle, it is BOB MICHEL. Perhaps he yet will be Speaker of the House.

THE MISSION IN SOMALIA

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

Mr. BLUTE. Mr. Speaker, the events in Somalia took on a more personal meaning to families in my district of Massachusetts yesterday when it was learned that one native son, who was serving there as an Army ranger, had been killed, and another seriously wounded.

Mr. Speaker, we need to take a very hard look at our deployment of troops in that African nation. The administration needs to specify why our people should be continued to be deployed in Somalia. Our humanitarian mission there is long over, and it has become painfully evident that an American presence is not welcomed there.

Tragedies continue to mount, death tolls are on the rise. What is our overriding national interest in Somalia that would justify our young people continuing to risk their lives there?

Let us get a plan to get our troops home, but, while doing that, let us make sure that they have everything they need to protect themselves and prevent the type of situation which saw our troops under fire without adequate reinforcements or armor.

□ 1030

Mr. Speaker, let us vow to never let that situation happen anytime, anywhere.

TRIBUTE TO HON. BOB MICHEL, REPUBLICAN LEADER

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, over the past several years, as we have observed the respect and confidence level in this institution, the greatest deliberative body known to man, decline, no one, but no one, was thinking of BOB MICHEL.

BOB MICHEL clearly is the most capable, caring, understanding, compassionate Member of this institution bar none, and I believe that his absence, when he retires in 15 months, not tomorrow, as he likes to remind us, will create an incredible void here.

Mr. Speaker, I wish him well in his future endeavors. This place will be much worse off for his retirement.

BOB MICHEL, A MEMBER OF GREAT INTEGRITY

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, some years ago there was a gentleman who served in this body from Pennsylvania by the name of Paul Dague. Just before Paul died I had an opportunity to interview him, and I asked him what his greatest accomplishment in the Congress was, and he said, "I left the Congress with my integrity intact."

That is a statement that can be made about BOB MICHEL. In fact, I know of no one in this body who could make that statement more than BOB MICHEL. He retires with his integrity intact, and because he has had that integrity, he has had the kind of character that has allowed him to lead, but, more importantly, to mentor many Members who have come through this Congress on both sides of the aisle.

We are a greater institution for having had BOB MICHEL serve here, we will continue to be a great institution because he has 15 more months of leadership ahead, and I look forward to working with him during that time.

REFORM OF WELFARE SYSTEM TIED TO HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, the current health care system threatens our security—the security of working people, and the ability of the Government to deal with the Federal deficit.

If we do nothing to control the costs of health care, by the year 2000, 1 out of every 4 Federal dollars will go toward health care costs in the Medicare and Medicaid Programs, siphoning off needed funds to improve our economy and other critical investments.

We want to reform our welfare system. But many people find themselves in welfare lock. They are reluctant to take a job if that job will not provide them and their children with health care coverage.

Many working people find themselves in job lock. They cannot take a new job unless that new position will provide health benefits. And what is worse is people who find themselves unemployed and without coverage. These people, already in a tenuous financial condition, could be wiped out if they or a family member becomes seriously ill while they lack insurance.

Finally, many people who have taken early retirement fear that the coverage they have will be canceled or that they must work until they are eligible for Medicare.

Americans should be assured that if they get sick they will be taken care of and not be financially ruined. I look forward to working with my colleagues to ensure that this security, this piece of mind, become a reality.

WISCONSIN JOINS FIGHT ON CRIME, MOVES TO ENACT DEATH PENALTY

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

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, last year murders took the lives of 22,000 Americans. It is time we turn the tables.

To combat this horrific rise in violent crime, my own State of Wisconsin is moving to enact the death penalty—77 percent of Wisconsin residents support capital punishment according to a poll taken last night by a television station in Green Bay. Wisconsin citizens understand the need to get tough on crime.

It is about time we do the same here in Congress.

Here are some appalling examples. Carl Wayne Buntion had 11 felony convictions and 9 separate prison terms. He was released and then murdered a police officer. He should get the death penalty.

Sam Barnett was released after getting early parole only to rape the same 9-year-old girl again. He should never step outside of a prison again.

We need to get tough with criminals and protect victims for a change.

No more parole. No more endless and costly appeals. No more revolving doors at our prisons. And yes, the death penalty for certain heinous crimes.

If you do the crime you do the time. No exceptions, no excuses.

DEATH COUNT IN SOMALIA APPROACHES THAT OF DESERT STORM

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the issue of Somalia is not just upon us, it has been happening to us. We have lost nearly as many lives in Somalia as we did in Desert Storm over a much shorter period.

They have been dragging our men through the streets dead, and if it continues, perhaps our women. At a time when this Congress, under the leadership of the Democrats, has cut defense $127 billion, we are sending troops overseas. In the tax budget they passed, where 80 percent of the spending cuts come after 1996, they cut defense $127 billion. This comes at a time when the President is going to send troops to Haiti, possibly Bosnia, and, yes, we are even in Somalia today.

We need to direct our forces in areas where we can do some good. Do we stay in Somalia? If we do, do we kill the same people that we were trying to help?

Whether we are liberal, conservative, dove, or hawk, it is time to bring our men and women home from Somalia. Our mission of humanitarianism is done. Let us get out and save lives.

FURTHER DEPLOYMENT OF TROOPS IN SOMALIA DEPENDENT ON CONGRESSIONAL AUTHORIZATION

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, let me say to my colleagues that there is no legal authorization fro the deployment of the United States forces in Somalia. President Bush deployed large forces without prior or subsequent authorization from this Congress, as required under the War Powers Act, and President Clinton has continued that deployment with a reduced force but still without authorization from the Congress.

Many Members will be surprised to learn that the resolution we passed in this House last spring to authorize humanitarian assistance is not in effect because it was never subsequently passed by the U.S. Senate. There is no outstanding authorization of any sort.

The President must meet the October 15 deadline set by this House to submit a report for authorization. Furthermore, that report should be under section 4(A)(1) of the War Powers Act. It should set out the objectives, the scope, and the duration of the deployment. It should start the 60-day clock ticking in this House, and we have to either accept that report, modify it, or reject it and bring the troops home.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the President and the Congress to face up to their constitutional responsibilities.

AN EXPRESSION OF PRIDE FOR SERVICE OF REPUBLICAN LEADER, BOB MICHEL

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

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I was first elected to Congress in a special election in January 1980. The following December I had the great pleasure of voting to elect my Illinois colleague, BOB MICHEL, as our Republican leader. It was, perhaps, the best vote I have ever cast in Washington.

BOB has been our party's leader in the House ever since, during almost the entire time I have been a Member of this body, and longer, continuously, than any other Republican leader in history—longer than John Rhodes, longer than Charlie Halleck, longer than Jerry Ford.

There has never been a moment when we have been other than proud of him. Because with BOB MICHEL of Peoria, the heartland of this great country, you get exactly what you see, not an ounce of deviousness or guile, nothing but good old American straightforwardness decency and devotion to country, to this institution, to his fellow Members, to his State, community, and, perhaps most importantly, to his family.

And what a beautiful family. With his lovely wife, Corrine, always at his side, and his four fine children, BOB has cut a swath of good ole Republican fiscal conservatism combined with a desire to make our system work throughout his service in Washington.

Working together, avoiding gridlock, and yes, compromise and getting the job done—dirty words in Washington in a time of combat politics and entertainment news—have been his hallmark.

When I leave this body I will look back on my time as a soldier in BOB MICHEL's army as among my fondest memories—a man who has done the American people, the U.S. House of Representatives, and everyone of us proud.

□ 1040

SUPPORT AMERICAN TROOPS IN SOMALIA

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

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to support President Clinton in his stand to remain in Somalia and to come before the House to express the plan for the next 6 months. I think that the United States has a question: Will the United States be a member of the world body of United Nations, or will we become a country of isolationism, as President Taft wanted us to do?

Mr. Speaker, as you know, the United States did not approve the League of Nations in World War I when the body of nations came together. The Congress said we do not approve of that.

I think the question today is whether the United States of America is going to be a participant in the new international order, the new world order, where the United Nations will be the police people of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I was so proud this morning when I saw Sgt. Bobby Jackson from a hospital in Germany, an African-American who was wounded with those on that tragic day when we lost 12 soldiers. He said he was proud to be in Somalia. He said he had a mission. He said he volunteered in this all-volunteer army. He said he hopes he recovers to go back to complete the mission.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we do not allow hysteria to enter into this. Let us see where we will go in this new world order for the future.

ADMINISTRATION ON DISASTROUS COURSE

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

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, even as the President this minute is trying to justify to American parents why their sons and daughters are sacrificing their lives in Somalia, I have learned that the night before last his United Nations Ambassador voted in the United Nations, and they approved, another peacekeeping operation. This one is in Rwanda.

Even as the American troops are now entering Haiti on another peacekeeping mission and we are learning of the deaths over the weekend of 12 brave American boys in Somalia, and 2 more overnight last night. Where does it end? Can anyone in this room tell me where Rwanda is, or why we are going there, or what vital American interest is at stake in Rwanda?

We are told we are going to be patrolling between the majority Hutus and the minority Tutsis in Rwanda. Why, Mr. Speaker?

We are now involved in 17 peacekeeping operations in the world, from El Salvador to Cambodia, with 14 more requests pending. There are dozens more on the table.

Mr. Speaker, this multilateralism we are talking about is leading to American deaths, with no justification. I urge the administration to abandon this disastrous course they are now on.

TRIBUTE TO HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

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

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for this opportunity to express my appreciation to a great Republican leader the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

I had heard of BOB MICHEL many years before I actually had the chance to work with him here in the Congress. I remember him through the sixties, through the trying periods of the seventies, and well into the eighties, when we worked together to elect a great Republican President, Ronald Reagan.

BOB MICHEL was always the leader. He was always calm and thoughtful and provided great leadership when we often needed that through the years. When I was Republican State chairman in a little State far away, Washington State, BOB MICHEL came out to help us do the job that we were elected to do in electing Republicans to office. He was there for the Republican leadership conferences. He was there for those of us Western chairmen who needed a strong influence, a good spokesman for our party.

But as I have come to this Congress as a freshman, I want to say, more than ever have I appreciated our leader, BOB MICHEL. This gentleman has taken the time to listen to us freshmen, to help us learn the process, always calm, always thoughtful, always giving us good advice and providing good leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say thank you to the gentleman from Illinois. I want to say for me, and for many others, when he leaves this body, he will be taking the heart of this great institution with him.

TRIBUTE TO HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, when one thinks of honesty, integrity, fairness, warmth, and friendship you have a picture of our minority leader, BOB MICHEL.

BOB was one of the first people I met when joining the House 5 years ago. His gracious welcome has made many a freshman feel welcome and at ease, no matter how difficult the problems in Congress might be BOB never takes himself too seriously—A good lesson for all of us. If you need help or advice, you automatically turn to BOB because he always has the right approach to the situation.

We were all sorry from a professional standpoint to learn he would not seek reelection next year. At the same time, after 36 years of service in Congress, if anyone deserves the chance to sit back and smell the roses, BOB is that person.

Fortunately he will be with us to provide his leadership skills through 1994. There are many serious problems facing this Nation that will occupy him during this time, but we all know BOB will meet the challenge.

There is an old Irish saying that sums up the quality of this man:

> Humor, to a man, is like a feather pillow. It is filled with what is easy to find, but gives great comfort.

That humor and great comfort is what BOB MICHEL means to every Member of this House, both sides of the aisle.

MENTAL ILLNESS AWARENESS WEEK

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

Mr. MACHTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Mental Illness Awareness Week. Fortunately, the efforts of the mental health community have made this heightened awareness last much longer than a week.

As a cofounder of the House Working Group on Mental Illness, along with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. KOPETSKI] and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE], we have become all too familiar with the frightening statistics confronting our Nation concerning mental health.

Mr. Speaker, 19 percent of all adults in any given 6-month period are going to be suffering in this country from mental illness or substance abuse disorders. One-third of our homeless suffer from mental illness. Some 12 percent of American children and adolescents today, suffer from mental illness or substance abuse, and 4 out of every 5 will have no treatment.

The costs associated with not dealing with mental illness today are far greater than the costs associated with facing the issues. Businesses will lose over $100 billion due to lost productivity due to substance abuse and mental illness. Direct costs in treating mental illness can be as little as $68 billion. There is a cost effectiveness to dealing with this tragic issue in our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting Mental Illness Awareness Week and improving the plight of the mentally ill. It is up to us to ensure that mental illness is included in our health care debate this year.

QUESTIONS CONCERNING SOMALIA

(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, today President Clinton finally announces this administration's policy relating to Somalia. Today we hear the weak justification for sacrificing young American lives. Today the American people learn why we have wasted $1 billion to rescue ungrateful Somalis. Today we finally learn when our troops will come home.

Mr. Speaker, I and the American people demand that this Congress now ask some serious questions: Why did this House fail to act months ago on my bill to withdraw our troops? Why did we allow our troops to serve under a bungled foreign command? Why did we expose our helicopter crews to obvious fatal ground fire? Why did this administration use nation-building as a cover?

Mr. Speaker, have we so weakened our military in 10 months that this fiasco can happen again? Will we bring the Somali criminal acts to justice, or will Americans all over the world be targets for international terrorism?

Mr. Speaker, the dozens of Americans who sacrificed their lives, including the latest fatality last night, deserve answers to these questions. I demand that this House and its committees address these questions and address these issues now.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE ROBERT H. MICHEL

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, 1 minute is hardly enough time to describe our great Republican leader, BOB MICHEL. We will undoubtedly be taking special orders in the months to come to honor this great man. But for now two terms come to mind when I think of BOB MICHEL. Being a former marine myself, the first term I think of is "esprit de corps." BOB MICHEL has been the spirit of the Republican Party for all these 38 years.

□ 1050

BOB MICHEL is a great man, the living embodiment of all that is best about the Republican Party.

There is one other term that comes to mind when I think of BOB MICHEL. That word, that phrase, is "semper fidelis," another Marine Corps term. It means "always faithful."

I think back to the first 2 years of the Ronald Reagan Presidency, when BOB MICHEL put his heart and soul into passing the Reagan program through Congress. He made tough votes that were difficult to make, cutting back on entitlement programs, doing things that we should have been doing all along. He almost lost the election because of it in 1982, but he was always faithful to his beliefs, to the Republican philosophy of limited government, and to putting the vital interests of our country first.

We are going to miss that man dearly. God bless him.

TRIBUTE TO HON. BOB MICHEL

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

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak of a man who Congressional Quarterly's "Politics in America" describes—in his own words— as a "doggone decent son of a gun." Well, my fellow Members, this fine gentleman from Illinois is not only a decent and honorable man, but also a good friend and a trusted adviser to this institution.

To many of us who came into the House in 1980, we looked to BOB MICHEL as the captain of our ship—and we strongly do so today as well. With a firm hand on the tiller, BOB MICHEL has steered our party in the House through the calm waters of agreement and the stormy seas of dissent. But, through it all, this loyal public servant has stayed the course—offering guidance and good humor to all along the way.

However, Mr. Speaker, what has distinguished this leader the most in his years of service is his passion—his passion to see the good in his fellow man and woman, while others only would see the bad; his passion to fight not only for the things that would "play in Peoria," but also for the things that would help all American families; and finally, his passion for his party and this institution has been a constant source of inspiration to me and to those who may have forgotten the true meaning of public service.

Mr. Speaker, it has been—and will continue to be—a distinct honor and privilege to serve in the U.S. House under a man of such rare quality as our minority leader. While his presence in this body will be greatly missed, there are plenty of us who understand his desire to conquer the new challenges that lie ahead—like knocking those three stokes off his game in the early months of 1995.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I have one final comment to share with BOB MICHEL and that is to say "thank you." I thank you, BOB, for your tireless efforts and your loyal commitment to your party and to your Nation—your hard work certainly did not go unnoticed.

THANK YOU, BOB MICHEL

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

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I also rise today to thank BOB MICHEL, to thank BOB MICHEL for leading my party and this House with integrity and with what one publication has called "old-fashioned personal decency," but also to thank him for his extraordinary service to Presidents of the United States over his 13 years of service as leader of the Republicans in this House.

In my first 2 years in the Bush White House, I saw firsthand BOB MICHEL's great value to the Presidents of this country. I saw his calm, cool-headed approach to issues. I saw his loyalty, and I saw his very sound advice and counsel.

Mr. Speaker, our leader will be missed. I hope that we will remember what he stood for.

THE HONORABLE BOB MICHEL

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, like my colleagues before me, I rise to honor our leader, BOB MICHEL.

Leader MICHEL has exhibited traits of ethnics in all of his actions, personally and in conducting business in the House, of always putting the Nation's business before personal business. And when there is a debate on issues, whether it is within the Republican Party or with the majority party here in the House, always conducting the debate in an honorable fashion, with concentration on differences of opinion and not differences in personality.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say it has been a privilege to serve under Leader MICHEL these last 5 years. I certainly hope that whoever replaces him as leader of the Republican Party in the House in the future will keep his honorable traits in mind and incorporate them into our leadership into the future.

A TIME FOR CHANGE

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

Mrs. MEEK. Mr. Speaker, soon the House will consider the goals 2000 legislation. As one who was intimately involved with school reform in Florida, I welcome this initiative. It is not surprising that some of those opposing this effort to improve our schools are the leading opponents of public education.

For the first time in 13 years we have a President who believes that improvement of education is much more than a throw away line in a campaign speech. For the first time in 13 long years, it is possible to move ahead with educational reform because for this President reform means action, not reaction.

This bill calls for the setting of voluntary national education standards, including content standards. The bill also authorizes incentive grants to assist in the implementation of the goals.

The opponents of this legislation are using the same arguments used in the 1960's when the Federal elementary and secondary programs were created. This is yet another example for their arguments intellectual costiveness. They say this takes away local flexibility and will create a national school board, but these are the same people who decry that state of America's public schools. They really want to shut down public education and limit it to the wealthy.

Mr. Speaker, the House should reject the Janus-faced arguments of the opponents of goals 2000. Let us get on with the improvement of our schools and pass this bill.

SOMALIA

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

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I will be participating in a special order soon for a great American, BOB MICHEL. But this morning I want to pass on to my colleagues and my fellow Americans two tragic phone calls I received last night after a special order that I did with several colleagues on Somalia.

One gentleman was listening to my recitation of the names of the 12 heroic young men who were killed in Somalia. He said he began to cry, because he recognized the name of the son of his best friend from high school who, like myself, served his country in Vietnam. He and his friend had survived Vietnam, and the son dies in an alley in Mogadishu.

But the worst call came from the wife of a U.S. Army captain stationed at Fort Campbell. One of her neighbors, another military wife, recognized that it was her husband being mutilated and dragged through the streets of Mogadishu, his corpse. She had not been informed by the Army that he was dead or missing. She sees him on a television screen mutilated and dead and stark naked and being dragged around.

I think that this House ought to have a joint session, doors closed, get the intelligence briefings I am getting upstairs, every one of us, to decide how to advise the President about what to do in Somalia.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2872

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be withdrawn as a cosponsor of H.R. 2872.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2446, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers may have until midnight tonight, October 7, 1993, to file a conference report on 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.

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

There was no objection.

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, pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, October 6, 1993, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2518) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report on H.R. 2518 now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1100

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TUCKER). Pursuant to the order of the House on Wednesday, October 6, 1993, the conference report is considered as read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 5, 1993, at page H7422.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present the conference report on H.R. 2518, the fiscal year 1994 appropriations bill for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies. The full conference agreement, House Report 103–275, was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 5, 1993, and has been available to Members since Wednesday morning.

I am pleased to bring this conference report to the House. I think the conferees were able to work out a good bill. We have resolved all 135 amendments in disagreement, and we did it in the shortest conference we have had since I have been chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, let me say this, it speaks well for our staff. We have an excellent staff on our committee, just like we do on all of the committees in the House. It is a distinct honor and a privilege for me to work with the ranking member, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] and all of the members on this subcommittee. Mr. Speaker, we are friends, we work together.

I want to thank Senator HARKIN and his colleagues and all the Members on our side for their good efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I believe Members of the House will be pleased with the conference agreement. It reflects the important priorities of the administration, as well as those of Members of the House and Senate. The conference report is within, Mr. Speaker, our 602(b) allocation for both budget authority and outlays. The agreement contains $261,158 million for the three Cabinet departments and 15 related agencies under the jurisdiction of the Labor-HHS-Education Subcommittee. I will highlight just a few of the programs in the bill that I know are of interest to Members, and provide a more detailed description for the RECORD:

Childhood immunization receives $528 million, which is a $187 million increase. Mr. Speaker, that is the way it should be.

Ryan White treatment programs are increased by $231 million to a total of $579 million.

Head Start is funded at $3,326 million which is $550 million above the 1993 level.

Also $1,118 million is provided for dislocated workers, an increase of $551 million, while $888 million is provided for summer jobs to provide the same number of training slots in 1994 as in 1993.

An increase of $630 million is provided for the National Institutes of Health for a total of $10,956 million.

Mr. Speaker, the Chair will be interested to note that when I was elected a member of this committee, we had $73 million for the National Institutes of Health, as a total; $155 million is provided for the administration's education reform proposals, including $100 million for school to work, in both the Departments of Labor and Education, $8,020,000,000 is included for student financial assistance, which will support a maximum Pell grant of $2,300 and 1993 funding levels for campus-based programs; $1,475,000,000 is provided for fiscal year 1995 funding of the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program.

Finally, I want to make certain Members understand that the issue of public funding for abortions is not a part of this conference report. The Senate adopted the same language that was contained in the House bill, permitting public funding in the case of endangerment of the life of the mother, rape, and incest.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I believe the conference report is a good one. We have worked on it hard, Mr. Speaker, and we have had a lot of help. Everyone has helped us. It should be adopted by the House, and I urge that the Members support this conference report.

SUMMARY OF H.R. 2518, THE LABOR-HHS-EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS BILL

The conference agreement provides $261,158 million for fiscal year 1994 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies. This total is $13,886 million above amounts provided in fiscal year 1993. Of the total included in H.R. 2518, $67,230 million is provided for discretionary programs, which is $4,530 million above 1993, and $193,928 million is provided for mandatory program, which is $9,356 million above 1993. The bill is within its 602(b) allocation for both budget authority and outlays.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

The bill includes $14,581 million in budget authority for the Department of Labor. $10,553 million is included for discretionary

funding, which is $778 million above 1993. $1,118 million is provided for dislocated workers, and $888 million is included for summer jobs. The number of summer job training slots will be the same in calendar year 1994 as in 1993. Job Corps is funded at $1,040 million, with adequate funding to support four new centers, to be awarded competitively.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

The bill includes $216,891 million for the Department of Health and Human Services, of which $185,402 million is for mandatory programs and $31,489 million is for discretionary programs. This represents an increase of $11,349 million over 1993 for mandatory programs, and $3,586 million over 1993 for discretionary programs. Within the total, $10,956 million is included for the National Institutes of Health, which is $630 million above the 1993 level. The Head Start program receives $3,326 million, a $550 million increase over 1993. Childhood immunization is funded at $528 million, $187 million over 1993. The Ryan White treatment programs are supported at a level of $579 million, which is $231 million over 1993. $117 million is provided for tuberculosis control activities, a $38 million increase. Low income home energy assistance receives $1,475 million in fiscal year 1995 funding.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

The bill includes a total of $28,768 million for the education program. Of the total, $4,498 million is for mandatory activities, and $24,271 million is for discretionary programs. $155 million is provided for education reform activities. The bill includes $8,020 million for student financial assistance, including funding at the 1993 level for campus-based programs and sufficient funding to support a $2,300 maximum Pell grant. $250 million is included for the Pell grant shortfall. Impact aid is funded at $798 million, including $136 million for "b" payments.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege for me to manage this bill on the Republican side. On the Labor, Health and Education Subcommittee we do business in a bipartisan fashion.

Mr. NATCHER conducts all of the subcommittee business honestly, openly and with supreme integrity. His approach toward the Labor, Health and Education bill is one of inclusion, negotiation and compromise. It epitomizes the manner in which I believe we ought to govern this country, and he does it efficiently.

I want to thank the chairman's staff, which always does an outstanding job—Bob Knisely; Sue Quantius; Mark Mioduski, and he and his wife just had a baby boy, Ryan; Nancy Krekeler; Joanne Orndorff; the staff director Mike Stephens, who does such a superb job for all of us on the subcommittee, and on our side, John Blazey, representing Mr. McDade, and my staffer, Mike Myers, who also do a wonderful job.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to commend the new Members on our side who did really an outstanding job this year to get up to speed on the vast number of issues and programs we deal with in our bill. Helen Bentley and Henry Bonilla spent as many days in committee hearings as the chairman and I did, and they contributed significantly to the bill we are considering today.

This is a good bill. It is under the 602(b)s on both authority and outlays. It makes the hard priority choices to provide needed increases in important domestic programs and to provide the necessary offsets to pay for them.

Mr. Speaker, this bill does the right thing for the NIH—our Nation's premiere biomedical research organization.

The President did the country a service by calling the Nation to reform its health care system. But, he overlooked one very important component of the health care debate—research, which is our only real hope for containing long-term health care costs through cures, early diagnosis and prevention.

The President's budget cut funding below the 1993 level for 9 of the 17 Institutes, reducing funding for research on mental health, diabetes, arthritis, and heart disease—by far the largest killer of both men and women.

We restored those cuts and provided at least a 6-percent increase for each Institute, and we did it by adjusting priorities, and staying within our budget allocation. In addition, we provided important startup funding for the intramural human genome research initiative which will help find the genes which cause breast cancer, colon cancer and the other 4,000 genetic diseases.

This funding will continue modest growth in biomedical research funding to support the dramatic progress in understanding breast cancer, heart disease, Alzheimer's, diabetes, AIDS and other devastating human afflictions.

The President sent us a message about health care reform. This bill sends the President a message about biomedical research. I hope he is listening.

Mr. Speaker, this bill also contains the largest increase for Impact Aid in a decade—over $46 million to educate children whose parents live and work on Federal property. The funding, while still far short of the amount owed to local school districts by the Federal Government, will help schools maintain services to federally-connected students like the thousands of military dependents in my congressional district.

The bill is not a perfect one. It contains unauthorized advance funding for the LIHEAP program which was first enacted to provide emergency energy relief to low income individuals in 1981. Since that time, fuel oil and electricity prices have declined by 50 percent to pre-1974 levels. While we still have a need in this country to provide assistance to low-income individuals this supposedly temporary program is no longer the proper vehicle, nor is the unauthorized advance funding appropriate.

This bill also contains a Senate provision which prohibits implementation of regulations that would allow the use of helper-class workers on Davis-Bacon construction sites just as they are used on 75 percent of all private-sector construction sites. These regulations were promulgated and implemented under three successive administrations and upheld by the courts after a decade of litigation.

Mr. Speaker, it is especially ironic that Congress would pass this prohibition at the same time the administration is attempting to give women and minorities an entry point to nontraditional occupations through the school-to-work program at DOL and the Step-Up Program at HUD. These programs create training opportunities nearly identical to the helper classification.

In fact, the National Association of Minority Contractors supports the helper regulations that this bill prohibits in order to give minorities the opportunity to learn the construction trades so they may achieve journeyman status.

There is simply no justification for the Appropriations Committee to intervene in this matter, and, in fact, the conference committed that this would be a 1-time, 1-year prohibition. If the authorizing committees believe this matter requires congressional intervention, they are more than welcome to revisit the issue. And the President already has the authority to withdraw the regulations if he is dissatisfied with them.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, on the whole, this bill is a very good one, and I urge Members to vote for it.

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

□ 1110

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that the chairman and I went on this subcommittee the same day and, as he said, at the time we went on the subcommittee the funding for the National Institutes of Health was $73 million. In this bill it is $11 billion. We are doing the research essentially for the world as far as health is concerned.

In that length of time we have changed the health system of the world. The delivery system has not kept up with the research that we have done, and that is one of the big things that we are hearing about now on health.

Until the delivery system catches up, we are going to continue to hear about it because we have the kind of a system now that, if delivered, would deliver a lot more health care to the American people.

And so it is very difficult in an area where technology has moved as fast,

and the new knowledge has moved as fast, we are not moving the same kind of health care today that we moved 20 years ago.

So you cannot expect the system to operate on the same amount of money.

We are also subsidizing health professionals, doctors, to the extent of about $100,000 per year in the education of health professionals; and that is over and above what they pay. This is all good because it has produced the health system that is unequaled anywhere else in the world, if we can provide the way that people can finance it so everybody has access to it.

In education, I was on the Committee on Education and Labor when we only had one education program for post-12, and today we have numerous ones in this bill.

So the educational system has spread throughout the population.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill, it is one of the very few bills that will hit the floor that has very substantial increases for a number, a number of the programs that are in it, and it shows the dedication, I think, that we have to make the quality of life better for the American public and for American people.

So, Mr. Speaker, I support the bill.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. BONILLA], a fine new member of our subcommittee.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky to walk down the center of the aisle today in support of this most important appropriations bill. This appropriations bill helps Americans become better educated, develops the skills needed to keep pace in the job sector, and prevents and treats illness. This bill affects and protects almost every American in a fiscally responsible manner.

I want to commend my chairman, Mr. NATCHER, and my ranking member, Mr. PORTER, and their hard-working staffers for their dedication in crafting this conference report. Their success in reaching agreements on 135 items in about 2½ hours is a record for this subcommittee. I only hope that my future conference committees will be as equally efficient. I know as long as Chairman NATCHER runs the conference this new record will remain in jeopardy.

I want to highlight a few vital rural programs for my rural colleagues, who often share my view that Congress too often turns its back on the heartland. This conference report makes a good faith effort to provide access to health care in our rural communities. Overall spending has been increased by 9 percent on programs that greatly effect rural health care.

Community and migrant health care centers funding has been increased to provide comprehensive primary health care in our rural communities. Last year these clinics served over 6.5 million people.

The area health education centers [AHEC] have been increased 11 percent while the border health centers funding has been restored to fiscal year 1993 levels. The AHEC Program links university health service centers with community health service delivery systems to provide training sites for students, faculty, and practitioners. The border health education centers fund schools to support health education and training centers to improve the supply, distribution and quality of health personnel along the border between the United States and Mexico.

Rural Americans will benefit from increases in the Nurse Practioners/Nurse Midwives Program, essential access community hospitals, and restoration of some of transition grants funds. The allied health grants were increased to address the growing shortage of allied health personnel in both rural and urban areas. The Physicians Assistants Program which delivers health care and emergency services in rural areas was increased from last year's level. This program is especially important to the health of rural Americans.

The Family Medicine Residencies Program has been funded to provide grants to medical schools to teach family medicine programs which are greatly needed to field the demand for doctors in rural America.

The rural health research and rural outreach grants have been increased to coordinate public and private sector efforts nationwide to strengthen and improve the delivery of health services to populations in rural areas. They provide health services to rural populations not currently receiving them and enhance access to and utilization of existing services.

I do have one serious problem with the conference report and that is the Davis-Bacon provision. The other body included a provision that would prohibit the Secretary of Labor from using any funds to implement or administer both the recently issued final helper regulations and the proposed apprenticeship regulations. I do not believe this provision should be in the report.

I believe this ban effectively prevents the Department of Labor from executing regulations that update and upgrade the system of approving apprenticeship programs around the country and registering and training new apprentices, until Congress passes a new act.

The helper regulations were finally issued after more than 10 years of litigation and debate, culminating in favorable rulings by the U.S. District Court and the U.S. Court of Appeals. Both courts found that the helper regulations are fully consistent with the language and purpose of the Davis-Bacon Act, and the Supreme Court declined an appeal of that ruling.

This provision is very unfair to smaller employers and small minority contractors. In some States, small contractors who want to offer responsible apprenticeship programs for their own employees can not do so because of old rules that favor large companies. The National Association of Minority Contractors supports the helper regulations as a positive way for their constituents to enter the public works sector of the construction industry.

Under the current revised regulation, the helper classification serves as both a stepping stone to a formal apprenticeship or other training programs and provides a solid, well-paying job.

I believe the current regulation is consistent with the President's support of easing the transition from school to work for noncollege bound youth.

I want to commend my ranking member, Mr. PORTER for raising this issue in conference. We lost but I pledge to work harder next year to restore equity and fairness to the Federal contracting process that allows any business the ability to compete.

Overall this conference report is a good one. This bill is fiscally responsible and provides for medical research that invests in Americans and saves lives and saves dollars. I urge my colleagues to adopt the conference report.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the fiscal year 1994 appropriations bill for the Departments of Labor, Health, Human Services, and Education.

I want to begin by commending our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], with whom I have had the privilege of working to bring this important bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report reflects the real spirit of a House-Senate compromise. Each amendment has been addressed carefully, with consideration given to the impact on the people.

Indeed, as so often referred to by our chairman, H.R. 2518, as reported out here today, is truly the people's bill.

It includes support for job training programs at all levels—adults, youth, and older Americans.

Biomedical research is given the resources to exploit numerous opportunities including those in cancer, heart disease, sickle cell disease, aging related eye diseases, diabetes, and AIDS.

Support is provided for low-income home energy assistance to help ensure that our needy citizens are not forced to choose between heat and food. For far too many people, we know too well that that type of choice can mean death.

For our children, not only does the bill give the Nation's needy children a

head start, it also enhances adoption opportunities, and provides for abandoned infants as well.

The bill provides for strengthening our education system including ensuring drug-free and safe schools.

For higher education, the bill includes support to ensure continued higher education at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, at majority and minority institutions alike. This support is necessary if we are truly committed to increasing America's competitive edge in the ever changing global markets.

The bill addresses the increasing violence that is occurring across the Nation. In response to this escalating problem, the bill includes support for violence prevention initiatives, and substance abuse intervention and treatment.

The allocations reflect an equitable distribution of resources to respond to the needs of the American people. For example, the bill includes $988 million for adult job training, $1.1 billion for dislocated workers, $243 million for substance abuse prevention, $487 million for drug free schools, $3.3 billion for Head Start, $528 million for immunization programs, $1.5 billion for low-income home energy assistance, $871 million for the older American aging programs, $6.6 billion for Pell grants, and $11 billion for biomedical research.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly pleased with provisions in H.R. 2518 that support efforts which I have advocated through the years. For example, the bill includes $16 million for strengthening graduate education at historically black colleges and universities. It includes bond authority to allow historically black colleges and universities to restore deteriorated infrastructure, $3.5 million for faculty development, $1 million for the Institute for International Public Policy, and $418 million for TRIO. With regard to health, the bill includes $604 million for community health centers, $687 million for maternal and child health, and $98 million for Healthy Start Infant Mortality Program.

Mr. Speaker, the funding of these and related programs will help to better prepare Americans to capitalize on job opportunities in changing markets, to provide safer schools for our children, to reduce the frequency at which our elderly must choose between food and heat, to provide health care services to the needy, to control and prevent child abuse and family violence, and to improve the health of the American people.

I am proud of the leadership of our subcommittee and the commitment each of the subcommittee members give to addressing the needs of the American people. Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to support the passage of H.R. 2518 which will improve the quality of life for all Americans.

□ 1120

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding this time to me.

It is a great honor for us to serve on the subcommittee of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] who is the chairman of the full committee, as well. He is truly one of the historic figures in this body.

I share the view that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] and the chairman have expressed about the extraordinary capability of our staff, and I commend them for the outstanding work they have done.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss what the conferees have done with regard to two programs. I agree with the comments my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have made about the balance of this bill. I want to discuss two programs, chapter 1 and Head Start that were designed to help the most at-risk children in our society. These programs are also, I suggest, critically important to insuring a competitive, world-class work force for America in the next century.

It is my view, Mr. Speaker, that these desperately needed programs are not performing at the level we should and must expect.

In reading the Senate report on its bill, I was pleased to see that Chairman HARKIN and his colleagues in the other body agreed with our committee's assessment, as spelled out in our report, that significant program and policy change are required.

Secretaries Riley and Shalala also understand that these programs need review and "reinvention." There are signs that the Head Start Commission Secretary Shalala has convened is going to be the catalyst for a more effective Head Start Program. The administration's reauthorization proposal for the Elementary and Secondary Schools Act is a step in the right direction from where chapter 1 and other Education Department programs are now.

But, Mr. Speaker, we need to go much, much further when this Congress reauthorizes ESEA and Head Start.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, we need a fundamental consolidation and reorganization of programs serving both preschool and school-age children, and we must be evaluating our investments in these programs not based upon process requirements, as we do now, but on improved outcomes.

I agree that our current resources are not equal—and, I stress—not equal to the crisis families and children in America face today, but this makes it all the more critical that we make sure that every penny that we spend on education is spent wisely and effectively.

In absolute terms, Mr. Speaker, the resources we are spending on children in need are, though insufficient, substantial but dispersed and too difficult to access by States and local education agencies.

For example, if fiscal year 1993, we have spent over $850 million on various types of child care, another 2.7 billion on Head Start, nearly $47 million on Comprehensive Child Development Centers, not to mention almost $750 million on maternal and child health, as well as services to runaway youth and child abuse prevention.

Add another $6.7 billion in chapter 1 and $1.5 billion in what the Department calls "School Improvement Programs," as well as numerous other programs, we are not only talking about real money, we are talking about real people's lives, and a real opportunity that we at the Federal level must seize upon to improve the lives and the outcomes of those young Americans. We cannot afford to do otherwise, and I commend both the chairman [Mr. NATCHER], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] and other members of the committee and my other colleagues on the conference for recognizing that and acting on it.

Vice President GORE has talked about reinventing government. Education is a very major part of what our constituents expect us to accomplish in Government at every level. We need to give to local governments flexibility, reduction in process requirements and increase our outcome expectations and focus on performance.

I thank the chairman for his work in this regard and his continuing commitment to accomplish this objective in the years to come.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend our chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], and the ranking Republican member, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] for their leadership in bringing this conference report to the floor of the House today. I also want to thank all of my colleagues on the Labor-HHS-Education Subcommittee, for their support and hard work in crafting this bill.

The members of the conference committee had a difficult job to try to respond to the tremendous needs with which we are faced and to live within our tight budget constraint. I believe we were successful. This legislation will provide critical assistance to working men and women and it addresses America's health and education needs. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support the conference report on the 1994 Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill.

We all know how difficult times are for too many Americans today. Many

Americans and their families are struggling to find work and to keep their jobs. Our students need more assistance to meet the increasing costs of higher education. And too many children still need to be immunized, too many young teenagers are becoming parents, too many women are dying needlessly of preventable and treatable diseases and too many people are still becoming infected with HIV and dying from AIDS.

By enacting the conference agreement now before us, we will move aggressively to help those who have lost their jobs, children who need a head start on their educations, people who are suffering from devastating diseases, and students who need assistance in order to go to college.

In this bill we were able to almost double the funding dedicated to job retraining and assistance for dislocated workers—assistance essential to the hundreds of thousands of working men and women in need of help to get off the unemployment lines and back to work. This increase in funding will help give these workers a real chance at getting new and better jobs.

The bill also includes significant funding for Secretary Reich's important new one-stop-shop initiative designed to assure that workers are given all the retraining assistance they need. One-stop-shop is an essential part of the Secretary's goal of speeding the process of helping workers find new jobs.

I am also pleased that the bill includes funding to launch Secretary Reich's and Reilly's vital new school-to-work initiative, which I also strongly support. This program represents the beginning of our new thinking about the way we prepare our young people to make a successful transition to the workplace [It is the first step to assuring that American workers remain the best educated, best trained workers in the world.]

The bill provides critical increases in funding for biomedical research—a total of $10.95 billion for the NIH—and fully funds the administration's 1994 breast cancer and AIDS research requests. The committee was also able to provide funding above 1993 levels for childhood immunizations, community health centers, family planning, the Ryan White programs, and for our efforts to combat tuberculosis.

The conference agreement increases funding for Head Start by $550 million, and I was pleased that, with our chairman's leadership, impact aid, targeted to the neediest of our students and school districts, was increased. The bill also includes vital funding for college aid programs which enable our young people to pursue their higher education goals.

Mr. Speaker, Again, I want to thank Chairman NATCHER, our ranking Republican member, Mr. PORTER, all of the subcommittee members and the dedicated staff who make this all possible—Mike Stephens, Sue Quantius, Bob Knisely, Mark Mioduski, Joanne Orndorff, Nancy Kreckler, and John Blazey. I urge my colleagues to support this important conference report.

It makes a difference in the lives of American men, women, and children, and as the chairman so aptly put it to my colleague before, "This is the people's bill which we should pass in this House today."

□ 1130

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the gentleman from Maryland that, if the ranking member on the authorizing committee has anything to do with it—hopefully he will—we will make very sure that chapter 1 and Head Start concentrate on excellence, not access, and hopefully we will be successful.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 2518, the fiscal year 1994 appropriations bill for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education. As I have in the past, I wish to congratulate the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER]; the committee's ranking member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE]; the subcommittee's ranking member, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER]; and the other members of the subcommittee for having so successfully upheld the priorities of the House, because I believe we need to focus on our priorities which are both successful and cost-effective.

I was very pleased to learn that the conference report provides $91.4 million for the Even Start Program, an increase of $2.25 million over the level provided during the current fiscal year. Even Start is about helping parents gain literacy skills while learning how to be their children's first teachers. As our Nation strives to meet the national education goals, it is even more critical that we empower parents to be their child's first teacher and to provide them with the parenting and educational skills necessary to accomplish the first goal of insuring that each child comes to school ready to learn.

I was also delighted to learn that the conferees agreed to provide $4 million for the Dwight D. Eisenhower Leadership Program. This program was an initiative included in the 1992 Higher Education Act reauthorization, and its first grants are now being awarded. The support it has received in the conference report was essential to signal it has the confidence of the Congress and will become firmly established.

It was also gratifying to note the conference report provides the Infants and Families Grants Program of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act with a $39.9 million, or 18.7 percent, increase over current funding. This significant increase will encourage all States to participate in this grant program, which provides early intervention services to all eligible infants and toddlers with disabilities.

Along with other Members, I have some concern that the conference report contains a $550 million, or 19.8-percent, increase in the funding level of Head Start. Head Start seems to enjoy broad bipartisan support in Congress, but it is by no means a perfect program. With this latest increase, funding for the Head Start will have grown by well over $1 billion in the last 2 years. There are vast inconsistencies in the quality of services provided to Head Start children and their families, and just last week the inspector general at HHS issued another report that is critical of the financial management practices of Head Start.

I am also glad to see the conference committee agreed to include advance fiscal year 1995 funding for the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program.

Moving finally to the subject of employment and job training, the conference report provides needed funding increases in excess of $600 million for job training programs under the Job Training Partnership Act. Specifically, the report provides for a $551 million increase for programs that serve this Nation's dislocated workers.

Further, the conference report provides $50 million for the funding of one-stop centers—single points of entry into our training and work force preparation system. Earlier this year the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON] and I introduced legislation in the National Work Force Preparation and Development Reform Act, which is the only legislation to implement one-stop centers nationwide. I also join with the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI] and the gentlewoman from Kansas on the Senate side to introduce a reform program for Head Start.

I do have some concerns about certain cuts. I have concerns when we raid chapter 2 because we find out, as we travel across the country, that this is the one opportunity they have had to do the kind of reform programs that are necessary.

Again I want to express my appreciation to the committee, and I want to deliver a message to the staff of the chairman, and I want the staff to understand that the chairman, after all of these appropriations bills are finished, deserves and has earned a 3-day R&R program wherever the Sun is the brightest and the warmest, and I will expect the staff to make sure that happens.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, first I want to thank my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], for his statement.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] and the ranking member, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] for bringing this conference report on the Labor, Health and Human Services, Education appropriation bill for fiscal year 1994 to the floor. The chairman's wisdom and the knowledge of the different accounts in the legislation is remarkable. This is an excellent subcommittee, and I am honored to serve as a member under his leadership.

One important measure of the strength of our country, Mr. Speaker, is the health and education and well-being of our people. It is the work of this subcommittee to fund that, and that is why, as I say, it is an honor to serve there.

This bill responds to many of the top priorities of the Clinton administration and our country. The Labor section addresses displaced workers and the administration's hopes for disadvantaged youth with increased funding for youth training, Job Corps, summer youth employment, and the School-to-Work Program.

The Health and Human Services section reflects the new administration's commitment to respond to the AIDS epidemic with a 21-percent increase in funds for research, a 9-percent increase for prevention, and a 66-percent increase in funds for patient care.

The bill also reflects the administration's priority on women's health, as well as the Senate's, the Congress of the United States' emphasis on women's health, with $292 million for breast cancer research, an increase of $84 million, or 40 percent, over 1993 and $7.5 million for a new initiative to research ways to prevent domestic violence and violence against women.

At the same time, this bill gives new attention to children's concerns with major increases in funding for such programs as Head Start and childhood vaccinations. And the bill helps alleviate the backlog in Social Security disability claims.

The Education section includes $155 million for education reform and funds a variety of vital programs that will make the difference for the future of our country.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report deserves the support of this House. Again, let me commend chairman NATCHER and my colleagues on the committee for their work on this bill.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY], a fine new member of our subcommittee.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, as a new member of the Labor-HHS-Education Subcommittee, I want to take a brief moment to thank Chairman NATCHER and his very capable staff for assembling a bill that I think is good for the country. I also want to thank my ranking member, Mr. PORTER, and his staff for their fine work over the course of several months of hearings.

I think that this is a bill that we can all live with. I am pleased that the committee sought to increase programs such as Healthy Start, which has done so much to help bring down the appallingly high levels of infant mortality that continue to plague many regions of the country. I am pleased that the committee rose to meet the challenge of providing comprehensive, community-based services that will help alleviate this problem.

In addition, the bill makes great strides in terms of offering much-needed assistance to many of our struggling young families through innovative programs such as our family support centers. Our rapidly expanding senior citizen community is also well served by this bill through a variety of programs that provide much-needed services to the frail and nonfrail elderly alike.

Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the various subcommittee members this morning.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference agreement on H.R. 2518, the fiscal year 1994 Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education appropriations bill.

It was a great honor to be able to join my colleagues who are also new to the Labor-HHS Subcommittee in signing the conference agreement for the first time. I want to congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee—and of the full Appropriations Committee—Congressman NATCHER, for his leadership in shepherding this critical piece of legislation through the long and difficult budget process. I also want to thank the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, Mr. PORTER, for his important contributions to this bill and for his commitment to bipartisanship.

The subcommittee had to contend with tight budget caps that forced us to eliminate approximately $4 billion from the President's request. At the same time, however, we managed to shift our budget priorities toward investments that will improve the Nation's quality of life and economic competitiveness. In particular, I am proud that this legislation significantly increases support for biomedical research for breast cancer and AIDS; preventive health; and job training for dislocated workers. The conference report will also help eliminate waste and fraud in student aid programs so that we can use those resources to expand access to higher education.

I am especially pleased that the conference report contains language, which Senator D'AMATO and I crafted, to direct the National Institutes of Health to aggressively pursue research on the environmental causes of breast cancer. Science is currently at a loss to explain the dramatic increase in rates of breast cancer in the New York metropolitan area and around the country. I will continue to work with my colleagues to see that the NIH expands its efforts to increase our understanding of environmental factors that contribute to breast cancer and other forms of the disease. I thank the chairman and my colleagues for their help with this matter.

BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH AND PREVENTIVE MEDICINE

The bill raises funding for biomedical research at the National Institutes of Health [NIH] to a total of $10.9 billion—a $610 million increase over fiscal year 1993. These funds will provide an average increase for each Institute of 5.9 percent over fiscal year 1993 and increase the percentage of approved research grants which get funded. This success rate has fallen dangerously low in recent years, jeopardizing the Nation's future as the world leader in biomedical research.

Today we take a crucial step in securing our Nation's place as the unquestioned leader in biomedical research. This legislation provides a 40 percent increase in funding for breast cancer research that will give our doctors the tools to find a cure for this disease. These funds are an indication of continued progress in our effort to focus more support on women's health research.

We are also taking an important step in the fight against AIDS by expanding funds for research, care, and prevention. In addition to a significant increase in funding for AIDS research, the $45 million increase for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC] will provide badly needed assistance to New York City, Westchester County, and the rest of the Nation in expanding critically needed AIDS prevention activities.

I am especially pleased that the bill includes approximately $10 million for two programs aimed at enhancing preventive health efforts. Five million dollars will support expansion of the NIH's bionutrition research initiative that is seeking to develop better ways of using nutrition to prevent diseases.

The bill also includes $5 million in new funds for the CDC's Comprehensive School Health Program, which supports comprehensive health training programs in public schools. Last year, New York State's application for this program was approved but unfunded due to insufficient appropriations. This increase will help ensure that New

York State receives funding under this program.

JOB TRAINING

The bill also includes significant increases in programs designed to overhaul the Nation's employment services system in order to deal with the effects of structural unemployment and to enhance our economic competitiveness. This comprehensive effort, which was promoted by the Clinton administration, includes stepped up support for dislocated worker assistance, school-to-work transition programs, and one-stop career centers that will provide workers immediate access to information about job openings and employment training opportunities.

The conference report includes $100 million for the school-to-work transition initiative, split between the Departments of Labor and Education, and $50 million for the DOL's One-Stop Career Centers Program. New York State is on the cutting edge in efforts to update our employment services system to meet the challenges of a global economy. These new initiatives will provide critical Federal support so that New Yorkers who are struggling in this economy can get the support they need to succeed.

HIGHER EDUCATION: CRACKING DOWN ON WASTE AND FRAUD WHILE EXPANDING ACCESS

The subcommittee worked hard to find the resources to support priority programs in elementary and secondary, special, and higher education. As a member of the Education and Labor Committee and now as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I have been working to eliminate waste and fraud in Federal student aid programs.

As we struggle to deal with the funding shortfall in the Pell Grant Program and to provide low-interest loans to financially pressed students, we must act to stamp out fraud that robs these programs of literally billions each year. That is why I am especially proud that the conference report contains major new funding for the newly established State Postsecondary Review Program, which is designed to cut down on student loan defaults and target waste and fraud in all student aid programs.

By eliminating this waste, we will be able to invest more in programs to help at-risk youth stay in school and to expand access to higher education. The conferees took a step in that direction by allocating $1.8 million to kick off a new initiative aimed at helping at-risk teenagers succeed in school and qualify for college scholarships.

The Early Intervention Scholarship and Partnership Program, which is modeled after New York's Liberty Scholarship Program, will finance grants to States for programs of counseling, mentoring, tutoring for students who are at risk of dropping out of school but have the ability to benefit from postsecondary education. With future appropriations, the program will support State and local efforts to guarantee scholarships for at-risk students who stay in school.

Mr. Speaker, in an era of fiscal austerity, it is critical that we shift our spending priorities toward investments that will make our Nation stronger. I believe the conference report on H.R. 2518 makes important progress in that direction, and I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose a provision in the Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill which prohibits the Secretary of Labor from using any funds to implement or administer the recently issued Davis-Bacon helper regulations. This language is only going to waste billions of taxpayer dollars and deny the opportunity for thousands of semi-skilled workers to get the experience they need to advance in the construction field.

The Subcommittee on Labor Standards, Occupational Health and Safety has already held one hearing on reform of the Davis-Bacon Act and at least one additional hearing is planned prior to subcommittee markup. There are currently several proposals to reform the act—including H.R. 2042, of which I am a cosponsor. Any reform of the Davis-Bacon Act is most appropriately considered by the authorizing committee of jurisdiction. A legislative rider to an appropriations bill is neither the procedure nor the place for debate on such a complex and controversial issue as Davis-Bacon reform.

Helpers are semi-skilled workers who work on construction projects under the supervision of higher skilled journeyman-level workers. After nearly a decade of litigation over the use of helpers, the helper classification for Davis-Bacon projects was finally implemented by the Department of Labor last spring. Both the U.S. District Court and the U.S. Court of Appeals have found that the helper classification is totally consistent with the language and purpose of the Davis-Bacon Act. The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that the use of helpers will save $600 million and create 250,000 jobs annually.

This provision will now increase the total costs for Federal construction by 1.6 percent. The taxpayers will be forced to pay approximately $600 million more over the next year. This represents an unwise use of Federal dollars and it flies in the face of attempts to reinvent government as we know it today. Moreover, it will deny opportunities to disadvantaged workers. The helper regulations have withstood years of challenges in the court system and have been found to be entirely in line with the intent of the Davis-Bacon Act. Prohibiting the use of helpers will deny entry-level jobs to those who desperately need the opportunity to move forward and get the skills necessary for a career in the construction industry.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill, H.R. 2518, the Labor/Health and Human Services appropriations conference report for 1994.

The report before us addresses difficult choices because of our ever-tightening discretionary budget. It is not all that I would like. I had hoped that with new leadership from President Clinton and the elimination of the firewalls that separated defense and domestic spending, we could have had more resources for the important programs aimed at ensuring the education and welfare of our people, particularly our children.

The Labor/HHS appropriations report would attempt to address the continuing shortfalls in education and labor programs produced by 12 years of neglect by Republican administrations. The reality is that it is very difficult to reverse the decline in our ability to address our distressing social deficit when we are faced with an overwhelming fiscal deficit. The Appropriations Committee, led by the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. NATCHER, had done the very best it could under trying circumstances.

On the positive side, Pell grants will remain at $2,300. The appropriation for dislocated worker programs would be doubled to $1.1 billion. The Department of Labor estimates 545,000 would be able to participate. Again, however, the number of dislocated workers scrambling for jobs in the economy is enormous. We are facing auto plant closures, the migration of jobs abroad, displacements caused by our efforts to clean our air and to protect dwindling forests in the Northwest, and, of course, dislocations if NAFTA passes.

The Head Start Program, one of the items particularly targeted to increased funding by President Clinton, would receive $5 million more than in 1993. That is a good start toward the President's goal of providing Head Start to every eligible child. We hope and expect that more funding will be made available when the Committee on Education and Labor reauthorizes Head Start.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, today I voted against the conference report for H.R. 2518, Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education appropriations for fiscal year 1994. While the bill included programs that would benefit millions of Americans, in the end I had to stand by my pledge to cut spending and reduce the budget deficit.

Spending on certain programs and services could have been cut more deeply without negatively impacting essential programs. Too many areas of the conference report contained funding levels higher than what the administration requested, some of which were singled out as possible budget cutting areas by the Congressional Budget Office.

It was extremely difficult to oppose a bill that contained funding for programs I ardently support. If separate votes had been held for each provision of the bill, I would have supported funding for numerous programs and services covered in the bill, including the following: Head Start; child care; employment and training; AIDS research; local health centers; several elementary, secondary, and higher educational programs; and elderly, veterans, and family services. Had it been possible, I would have supported these programs and, in fact, would have liked to see increased spending in some areas. However, when voting on an omnibus spending bill like today's, it is impossible to distinguish irreplaceable programs from those that could have been cut. When it came to a vote, I decided I could not in good conscience abandon my work toward reducing the deficit.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 2518, the

Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education and related agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1994.

This year, the conferees have once again managed to set priorities and make hard choices. The result is a bill that continues to fund a lot of good programs, as well as to meet new needs. H.R. 2518 funds everything from our jobs programs, to the research programs in the National Institutes of Health, to key educational programs, to community health centers. It is also the major source of funds for critical women's programs, like maternal and child health, breast and cervical cancer research, and family planning. Child care programs, child support enforcement programs, Head Start, foster care and adoption assistance support services, nutrition services for our elderly citizens—all these key support systems are dependent upon the funding in this bill.

Nearly three-quarters of the money in this bill supports entitlement programs—programs whose costs we must pay—like Social Security and Medicare. The subcommittee has no control over the funds for these programs, which are automatically spent. The remaining funds—about 25 percent of the total money in this bill—are divided among the other labor, health, human services, and education programs that are so critical to us, especially now.

The total fiscal year 1994 funding in this bill is $4.1 billion less than the President requested in his budget. The bill also meets its spending target, set by the Appropriations Committee, based on the fiscal year 1994 budget resolution. H.R. 2518 does not drive us deeper into debt, but helps us meet our goal of living within our means.

America's families, workers, children, and elderly need the programs and services that H.R. 2518 sustains and provides. It is obvious that, without this bill, we would not be able to fund the essential programs that support our basic needs. A vote for the health, education, nutrition, and employment programs in H.R. 2518 is a vote for us all.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Labor-Health and Human Services-Education appropriations bill. This report includes critical funding for a wide range of programs within the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education. While the funding levels are not as high as many of us had hoped, the conferees are to be commended for their very difficult task. They were working within extremely tight budget restrictions, and they did their best to fund critical priorities.

I am particularly pleased that the conferees included $750,000 for implementation of the Women in Apprenticeship and Non-Traditional Occupations Act, legislation which I sponsored and was approved by Congress last year. This act will provide incentives to private employers to increase job opportunities for women in the skilled trade. The wage scale in such jobs is usually 30 percent higher than in typically female occupations.

The conference report also includes $7.5 million to fund a new initiative at CDC to address the public health implications of injuries resulting from domestic violence and sexual assault. This program was authorized in H.R. 2201, legislation introduced by Congressmen KREIDLER, MCDERMOTT, and I, and incorporated in the reauthorization of the Centers for Disease Control Injury Prevention and Control Program. This program will provide funding to train health care providers to identify and treat victims of domestic violence and sexual assault; to provide public education programs about the health consequences of domestic violence, and to conduct epidemiological research to determine the incidence, types, and effects of domestic violence nationwide.

Domestic violence has profound effects on women's health. Battering results in more injuries to women than rapes, car accidents, or muggings combined. It is estimated that one-third of all women in emergency rooms are there because of battering and that every year domestic violence generates 99,800 hospitalization days, 28,700 emergency room visits, and 39,900 physician visits.

I commend the conferees for providing increased funding for biomedical research at the National Institutes of Health, despite the tight budget restrictions. The conference report includes increases for AIDS research, prevention, and services. I am pleased that both the House and Senate reports included language that Senator MURRAY and I submitted urging the National Institutes of Health to fund research on the development of chemical methods, either a microbicide or virucide, to prevent the transmission of sexually transmitted diseases, including HIV, that women can use without the knowledge or consent of their partner. This research must be an essential component of our AIDS prevention effort.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you, the ranking Republican, Mr. PORTER, and the other members of the subcommittee for their fine efforts. I also want to note the contributions made by the new women members of the subcommittee, particularly in furthering women's health priorities.

□ 1140

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, we have no further requests for time.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TUCKER). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 311, nays 115, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 486]

YEAS—311

Abercrombie
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentley
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blackwell
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Callahan
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Duncan
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Grandy
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hastert
Hastings
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hutto
Hyde
Inslee
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Klug
Kopetski
Kreidler
Kyl
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Levy
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Michel
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Myers
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pickle
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Schenk
Schiff
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shays
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Snowe
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tejeda

Thompson	Velazquez	Whitten
Thornton	Vento	Williams
Torkildsen	Visclosky	Wilson
Torres	Volkmer	Wise
Torricelli	Vucanovich	Wolf
Towns	Washington	Woolsey
Traficant	Waters	Wyden
Tucker	Watt	Wynn
Unsoeld	Waxman	Yates
Upton	Weldon	Young (AK)
Valentine	Wheat	Young (FL)

NAYS—115

Allard	Goss	Paxon
Archer	Grams	Penny
Armey	Hancock	Peterson (MN)
Bachus (AL)	Hansen	Petri
Baker (CA)	Hefley	Pombo
Baker (LA)	Herger	Portman
Ballenger	Hoekstra	Quillen
Bartlett	Hoke	Quinn
Barton	Huffington	Ramstad
Bereuter	Hughes	Ridge
Boehner	Hunter	Roberts
Bunning	Hutchinson	Rohrabacher
Burton	Inglis	Roth
Buyer	Inhofe	Royce
Calvert	Istook	Saxton
Camp	Jacobs	Schaefer
Canady	Johnson (CT)	Schroeder
Castle	Johnson, Sam	Sensenbrenner
Coble	Knollenberg	Shaw
Collins (GA)	Kolbe	Shuster
Combest	Lewis (CA)	Smith (MI)
Condit	Lewis (FL)	Smith (OR)
Cox	Lightfoot	Smith (TX)
Crane	Linder	Solomon
Crapo	Manzullo	Spence
Cunningham	McCandless	Stump
Deal	McCollum	Sundquist
DeLay	McHugh	Talent
Dickey	McInnis	Tauzin
Doolittle	McKeon	Taylor (MS)
Dornan	Mica	Taylor (NC)
Dreier	Miller (FL)	Thomas (CA)
Dunn	Minge	Thomas (WY)
Everett	Moorhead	Walker
Ewing	Nussle	Walsh
Fawell	Orton	Zeliff
Fields (TX)	Oxley	Zimmer
Gallegly	Packard	
Goodlatte	Pallone	

NOT VOTING—7

Ackerman	Hayes	Thurman
de la Garza	Murtha	
Gingrich	Rahall	

□ 1203

Mr. SMITH of Michigan changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. BARCIA of Michigan changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 486 on H.R. 2518 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present I would have voted "yes."

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, October 6, 1993, the amendments in disagreement and motions printed in the joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference to dispose of amendments in disagreement are considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the first amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 6: Page 3, line 10, after "addition," insert "$178,000,000 is appropriated for carrying out part B of title II of the Job Training Partnership Act to be available for obligation for the period October 1, 1993 through June 30, 1994; and, in addition, $50,000,000 is appropriated for carrying out part D of title IV of the Job Training Partnership Act to be available for obligation for the period October 1, 1993 through June 30, 1995; and, in addition,".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the first sum named in said amendment, insert "$206,000,000".

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 11: Page 5, line 19, strike out "$3,327,707,000" and insert "$3,338,389,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "$3,376,617,000".

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 15: Page 9, line 12, after "Act" insert ": *Provided*, That, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, or any provision of Public Law 102-170, Public Law 102-394, this Act, or any subsequent Appropriations Act, 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)".

SEC. 100. CONGRESSIONAL COVERAGE UNDER HEALTH CARE LEGISLATION.—

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds:

(1) Congress is expected to consider health care reform legislation in the near future that would offer a standard benefit package with several different options for the delivery of those benefits.

(2) The standard benefits offered under all plans will be the same. Quality standards will apply to all plans.

(3) Consumers will have the ability to choose a plan on an annual basis, and will have access to full information about all plans so that they may make their choice based on the quality of plans and consumer satisfaction of plans.

(4) Members of Congress should be treated the same and offered the same choices as every American in the health care system.

(b) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that any legislation approved by Congress should provide health care plans of comparable high quality and that Members of Congress participate on equal basis with all other Americans in the health care system that results from health care reform legislation.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15 and concur therein 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 SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 23: Page 16, strike out lines 4 to 7 and insert:

For expenses necessary for the maintenance and operating 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.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23 and concur therein 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 Department facilities, including associated utilities and security services, shall be credited to and merged with this fund.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 24: Page 17, after line 2, insert:

SEC. 102. Section 8102 of title 5, United States Code ("the Act") is amended to redesignate subsection (b) of subsection (c) and to add the following new subsection (b):

"(b) An 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 subchapter I or III or chapter 81 of title 5, shall (in addition to any other penalties provided by this subchapter) as of the date of the conviction, forfeit all entitlement to any prospective benefits provided by subchapter I or III for any injury occurring on or before the date of the conviction.".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24 and concur therein 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 SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 25: Page 17, after line 2, insert:

SEC. 103. None of the funds appropriated under this Act shall be expended by the Secretary of Labor to implement or administer either the final or proposed regulations referred to in section 303 of Public Law 102-27.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and concur therein.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to an amendment contained in the Labor, HHS appropriations conference report. This amendment, No. 25, would prohibit the Secretary of Labor from using any funds to implement or administer the final Davis-Bacon helper regulations. Rather than prohibiting something new, these regulations are court-tested, final regulations which the Department of Labor has already begun implementing. It has been estimated that in order to bring these regulations fully into effect, the process will take approximately 3 years. The language contained in the conference report arbitrarily prohibits these regulations without ever giving them the opportunity to work or realize any of their projected benefits.

Helpers are semiskilled workers who work under direct supervision of higher skilled journey-level workers. Helpers are widely used in the private sector, where approximately 75 percent of all construction work is performed by contractors who use semiskilled helpers. The helper regulations serve the original purpose of the Davis-Bacon Act—bringing practices on Federal construction projects in line with locally prevailing practices on private work. In fact, Vice President GORE's National Performance Review recently recommended changes to bring the antiquated Davis-Bacon Act into the realities of today's construction marketplace, which these regulations clearly do.

Under the regulations, helpers are paid the locally prevailing wage rate for the type of work they perform. Without the helper regulations, all workers on Federal projects, regardless of task, must be paid the high wage rate paid to a skilled craftsman. In this way, the helper classification serves as an entrance into construction for groups not traditionally prevalent in the industry—for example, minorities and women. The helper classification serves as a strong first step up the job ladder for workers who are interested in furthering their education and pursuing a career in construction. At the same time, helpers who do not want to participate in a 4-year apprenticeship or other formal training program are provided entrance into the industry and a good paying job. Forcing contractors to pay all workers the high journey-level wage rate effectively precludes groups who have no previously trained in construction from having the opportunity to work on Federal construction projects.

Clearly, the helper classification is consistent with President Clinton's goal of facilitating the transition between school and work for noncollege bound youth. However, the helper classification is also strikingly similar to the recently released Department of Housing and Urban Development's Step-Up Preapprenticeship program. The regulations governing step-up provide flexibility in Federal prevailing wage and apprenticeship requirements to provide employment to public housing residents and other low-income persons. According to HUD, the Step-Up Program has proven its success in Chicago, where apprentices work side by side with union journeymen renovating housing. Under this program, apprentices spend up to 1 year in step-up status, after which they must be placed in appropriate further training or career opportunity positions.

I would also like to mention that one of the chief opponents to the helper regulations, organized labor, has seen fit to allow their own classification of helpers or subapprentices over the last decade in order to meet the private marketplace's changing needs. However, they are refusing to allow the taxpayer to enjoy the same advantage for fear of losing their crown jewel, their cash cow, and their control over young people's entrance into the construction industry together with their stronghold in the Federal construction market.

It has been estimated that when the helper classification becomes widely used on Davis-Bacon projects, an estimated 250,000 jobs will be created and $600 million a year will be saved. By prohibiting helpers on Davis-Bacon projects, we are further exacerbating the very problems which top the American agenda today—our Nation's huge Federal deficit, lack of job creation and near-stagnant economy.

More than a decade of litigation and debate regarding the helpers issue has culminated in favorable rulings by both the U.S. District Court (1990) and the U.S. Court of Appeals (1992), affirming that helper regulations are fully in line with the purpose of the Davis-Bacon Act. The Supreme Court denied an appeal of those rulings.

With all the benefits associated with the helper regulation—benefits to contractors, disadvantaged workers and the Federal Government—one may wonder why we are arbitrarily prohibiting their implementation. Supporters of this ban will tell you it is to protect against shoddy construction and unsafe working conditions for construction employees. This argument simply does not hold water.

As I previously mentioned, in the private sector more than 75 percent of all construction is performed by contractors who use semiskilled helpers. There is simply no rationale for

assuming that Federal construction is any different than private construction in this regard. A recent OSHA study found that open shop employers, the majority of whom employ semi-skilled helpers on their jobsites, are safer than their union counterparts. The OSHA report, "Analysis of Construction Fatalities—The OSHA Database 1985–1989" showed that over the 5-year period of the report, the unions experienced a fatality ratio of 20.9 per 100,000 workers—more than 25 percent higher than the open shop's 15.1 per 100,000 workers. While construction unions account for approximately one-fifth of the total workforce, they also account for more than one-fourth of the fatalities in the industry. The safety of construction employees would not be affected by the use of helpers on Davis-Bacon construction projects.

Further, construction must be performed to specifications and contractors are not paid for faulty work. Plain and simple, if a contractor were to perform shoddy construction, he would jeopardize his payment and his reputation. Quality of Federal construction would not be jeopardized by employing helpers on those projects.

Although the conference committee has seen fit to allow this 1-year ban of the Davis-Bacon helper regulations, I would like to reiterate my strong objection to this prohibition. The helper regulations have been one small positive step toward alleviating the burdens imposed by the outdated, unnecessary Davis-Bacon Act. They at least help bring the law back to its original intent, which it certainly does not meet in practice today. The Davis-Bacon Act today discriminates against minorities and women and the very group it intended to help—small, local contractors. For this reason, along with the fact that no other industry in our Nation is regulated in this manner, I have offered H.R. 2393, legislation to repeal the Davis-Bacon Act, which I urge my colleagues to support.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 28: Page 18, line 1, after "Center" insert ": *Provided further*, That no more than $5,000,000 is available for carrying out the provisions of Public Law 102-501".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and concur therein.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 29: Page 19, line 14, strike out "$2,500,000" and insert "$3,000,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and concur therein.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 34: Page 24, line 21, after "grants" insert ": *Provided further*, That $8,000,000 shall be for extramural facilities construction grants to be awarded on in a competitive basis and in accordance with the criteria of section 481A(c)(2) of subpart 1 of part E of title IV."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "$7,000,000".

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 41: Page 26, line 8, strike out "$2,057,167,000" and insert "$2,119,205,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "$2,125,178,000".

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 45: Page 28, after line 16, insert:

For making payments to States under title XIX of the Social Security Act for the first quarter of fiscal year 1995, $26,600,000,000 to remain available until expended.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and concur therein.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 48: Page 30, after line 11, insert:

For making benefit payments under title IV of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977 for the first quarter of fiscal year 1995, $190,000,000, to remain available until expended.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and concur therein.

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

The motion was agreed to.

□ 1210

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TUCKER). The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 49: Page 30, line 19, strike out "$20,181,775,000" and insert "$20,172,775,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "$20,183,775,000".

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 51: Page 31, after line 2, insert:

For carrying out title XVI of the Social Security Act for the first quarter of fiscal year 1995, $6,770,000,000, to remain available until expended.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and concur therein.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 53: Page 31, line 6, after "Act" insert "or as necessary to carry out sections 9704 and 9706 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 as such sections were in effect on January 1, 1993".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and concur therein.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 54: Page 31, line 7, after "therein" insert ": *Provided*, That no more than $542,398,000 shall be derived from the Federal Hospital Insurance and the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Funds: *Provided further*, 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 for expenses necessary for the Commission on the Social Security "Notch" Issue, established by section 635 of Public Law 102-393 as amended".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54 and concur therein 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 SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 56: Page 32, after line 14, insert:

For making payments to States or other non-Federal entities under titles I, IV-A (other than section 402(g)(6)) and D, X, XI, XIV, and XVI of the Social Security Act and the Act of July 5, 1960 (24 U.S.C. ch. 9) for the first quarter of fiscal year 1995, $4,200,000,000 to remain available until expended.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. SPEAKER, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and concur therein.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 57: Page 32, after line 18, insert:

LOW INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE

For making payments under title XXVI of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, $1,507,408,000 to be available for obligation in the period October 1, 1994 through June 30, 1995, of which $100,000,000 shall be available for reimbursing States for costs incurred during the period October 1, 1993 through September 30, 1994.

For making payment under title XXVI of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, an additional $600,000,000: *Provided*, That all 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.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57 and concur therein 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 payment 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 SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 58: Page 33, line 5, strike out "$447,643,000" and insert "$472,649,000, 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 years cash contribution to such program in an amount that equals 50 percent of such excess amount: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, no department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government receiving appropriated funds under this Act for fiscal year 1994 shall, during fiscal year 1994, obligate and expend funds for consulting services in excess of an amount equal to 96.48 percent of the amount estimated to be obligated and expended by such department, agency, or instrumentality for such services during fiscal year 1994: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the aggregate amount of funds appropriated by this Act to any such department, agency, or instrumentality for fiscal year 1994 is reduced by an amount equal to 3.52 percent of the amount expected to be expended by such department, agency or instrumentality during fiscal year 1994 for consulting services. As used in the preceding two provisos, the term 'consulting services' includes any services within the definition of sub-object class 25.1 as described in the Office of Management and Budget Circular A-11, dated August 4, 1993.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58 and concur therein 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 years cash contribution to such program in an amount that equals 29 percent of such excess amount".

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 59: Page 33, line 9, after "$892,711,000" insert ", which shall be available for obligation under the same statutory terms and conditions applicable in the prior fiscal year".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and concur therein.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 60: Page 33, strike out lines 11 and 12 and insert:

For making grants to States pursuant to section 2002 of the Social Security Act, $2,800,000,000. For carrying out section 2007 of the Social Security Act, an additional $1,000,000,000, which shall remain available until expended.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and concur therein.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 65: Page 35, line 5, strike out "$94,149,000" and insert "$92,793,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "$94,431,000".

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 68: Page 37, line 14, strike out "1911(d)" and insert "1503".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "1911(d) and section 1503".

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 69: Page 37, after line 15, insert:

SEC. 207. For the purpose of carrying out subparts II and III part B of title XIX of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x–21 et seq.) for fiscal years 1993 and 1994, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall obligate $7,532,065 from the amounts made available pursuant to section 1935(b) of such Act for fiscal year 1994, of which $673,706 shall be available to Arkansas, $40,702 shall be available to Georgia, $144,331 shall be available to Hawaii, $488,178 shall be available to Idaho, $223,109 shall be available to Indiana, $820,641 shall be available to Iowa, $729,745 shall be available to Kansas, $609,672 shall be available to Kentucky, $69,682 shall be available to Louisiana, $34,514 shall be available to Maine, $349,997 shall be available to Minnesota, $8,626 shall be available to the Red Lake Indian Tribe, $500,441 shall be available to Mississippi, $184,176 shall be available to Montana, $231,450 shall be available to Nebraska, $8,896 shall be available to North Carolina, $97,530 shall be available to North Dakota, $66,083 shall be available to Ohio, $578,520 shall be available to Oklahoma, $557,924 shall be available to Oregon, $167,753 shall be available to South Carolina, $319,674 shall be available to Tennessee, $196,426 shall be available to West Virginia, $195,834 shall be available to Wisconsin, and $234,455 shall be available to Wyoming.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. Natcher moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69 and concur therein 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 SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 70: Page 37, after line 15, insert:

SEC. 208. Not to exceed $190,400,000 may be obligated in fiscal year 1994 for contracts with Utilization and Quality Control Peer Review Organizations pursuant to part B of title XI of the Social Security Act.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70, and concur therein.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment no. 74: Page 37, strike out all after line 19 over to and including line 5 on page 38 and insert:

For carrying out education reform activities authorized in law, including activities authorized by the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, $166,000,000, 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 not less than $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 $116,000,000 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, this amount shall be used for alleviation of the funding shortfall in the Pell Grant program under subpart 1 of Part A of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965: *Provided further*, That any funds appropriated in this account may be transferred as necessary to other Department of Education accounts.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74 and concur therein 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 SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 92: Page 41, line 20, after "1965" insert ": *Provided further*, That of the amount provided for the State and local programs under part B of title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, up to $32,838,000 may 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; and any funds used for such activities shall be available from October 1, 1993 through September 30, 1994".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92 and concur therein 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 SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 104: Page 43, line 23, after "expended" insert "and $2,000,000 shall be for construction and shall be available until expended".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 104 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "$1,000,000".

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 108: Page 44, line 22, after "411(b)" insert ", including $5,000,000 for model community education and employment centers".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 108 and concur therein 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 SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 111: Page 45, line 9, strike out "$2,250" and insert "$2,300".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 111 and concur therein 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 amendment 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 SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 117: Page 46, line 23, strike out "$889,855,000" and insert "$882,974,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 117 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "$893,688,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 120: Page 49, line 8, after "amended" insert "(or any successor authority)".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 120, and concur therein.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 123: Page 49, line 15, strike out all after "Act," down to and including "2012" in line 22 and insert "$301,398,000: *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; $40,000,000 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; $14,582,000 shall be for national diffusion activities under section 1562; $16,072,000 shall be for national programs under section 2012, including $3,672,000 for the National Clearinghouse for Science and Mathematics under section 2012(d); and $15,000,000 shall be for regional consortia under subpart 2 of part A of title II; $9,607,000 shall be for Javits gifted and talented students education; $27,000,000 shall be for star schools, of which $45,500,000 shall be 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; $1,737,000 shall be for territorial teacher training; and $3,212,000 shall be for the National Writing Project".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 123 and concur therein 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 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 country; and $3,212,000 shall be for the National Writing Project."

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

The motion is agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 124: Page 50, line 2, strike out "$145,101,000" and insert "$147,517,000, of which $19,000,000 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 database through a statewide fiber optic network housing a point of presence in every county, connecting library services in every municipality".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 124 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "$146,309,000, of which $17,792,000 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 SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 129: Page 53, line 8, strike out "$292,640,000" and insert "$320,000,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 129 and concur therein 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 SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the last amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 133: Page 64, after line 2, insert:

"SEC. 509. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, monthly benefit payments under part B or part C of the Black Lung Benefits Act for months after December 1993 and before October 1994 shall be calculated as though the provisions of Federal law prescribing pay rates for Federal employees continued in effect, without amendment to or limitation of such provisions, after January 1993.

"(b) Of the amounts provided under title XII of Public Law 102-368, Additional Assistance to Distressed Communities, under the heading "Community Investment Program", $225,000,000 are rescinded.".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 133 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the section number named in said amendment, insert "508".

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

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2750, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION ACT, 1994

Mr. CARR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from

the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2750) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. WOLF

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WOLF moves that the managers on the part of the House, at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on H.R. 2750, be instructed to insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 129.

□ 1220

The SPEAKER pro termpore. (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CARR] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF].

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

Mr. Speaker, in passing its version of H.R. 2750, the fiscal year 1994 Transportation appropriations bill, the Senate has reduced the funding for the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation by $650,000. Of this amount, the Senate is assuming a $500,000 saving in fiscal year 1994 through the consolidation of the Corporation's operation in Massena, NY. The remaining $150,000 is a 50 percent cut in the Corporation's marketing budget.

Mr. Speaker, this is ill-advised, and I move to instruct the House conferees to insist that the Senate recede to the House conferees to insist that the Senate recede to the House on this matter.

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

Mr. CARR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] for his motion. We have reviewed it. It makes a lot of sense. We believe it will be helpful in the conference, and we urge its adoption.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I many consume. I do have one additional comment that I would like to make.

Mr. Speaker, let me thank the chairman for his support. I do want to raise one other issue.

I would like to talk about the amendment which was made in the Senate by Senator DOLE and Senator BOND on the Transportation appropriation bill to authorize $150,000 for the legal fees of the five travel office employees put on paid administrative leave as a result of the White House purge of the White House travel office earlier this year.

Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with this issue in this bill for only one reason, and that is the overreaching of the White House, and I believe the gross mismanagement that has taken place with regard to this issue. From the podium of the White House press secretary, these employees have been maligned and found guilty by a self-appointed jury at the White House. Their good reputations have been tarnished, and I believe that is unfortunate.

This has also proven costly for the American taxpayer. As the Washington Post pointed out today, the cost of the Clinton administration travel office firings are still growing. We are currently paying for two travel office staffs, one in the White House, and one waiting in exile to be placed in their new jobs.

There are many indicators that the ones currently working in the White House are not doing a very good job and, therefore, calling on outside agencies to help them.

I will tell my colleagues that these are career Federal employees who really do not have any money of their own. They are not like a Member of the Congress who can use his campaign fund to pay for their legal fees. It is not like they are plugged in like Cabinet officers and can get high-powered people to come and help them financially. These are average individuals who really do not have the money to pay.

Although it is unfortunate that this amendment is on the Transportation appropriation bill, and I believe it should have been more appropriately on the Treasury postal appropriation bill, which has the jurisdiction over the White House, or the State, Commerce, Justice bill, I think it is a necessary amendment.

I would also hope, Mr. Speaker, that the White House would feel a moral obligation to deal with this issue in some manner on their own so that this appropriation would not have to be expended.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I call on the White House to reduce their spending at the White House by a corresponding amount of $150,000 so that it does not cost the taxpayers of this country any additional money.

Mr. Speaker, let me also say that I do hope and urge that the attorneys involved in representing these individuals will exercise restraint in their billings on this matter and not run the clock up and think that they have an opportunity for deep pockets.

Mr. DOLE's amendment provides for the necessary legal expenses of the five former employees who were placed on administrative leave, and these funds will not be disbursed, and I want to stress this, Mr. Speaker, they will not be disbursed until the Justice Department has provided notification that such employees are no longer the subject of an investment under this matter. So in order for the money to be expended, it would be necessary for the Justice Department to release this so that the employees are no longer under investigation.

THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, September 30, 1993.

To the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

This is an interim report on the General Accounting Office (GAO) review of the White House travel office being conducted pursuant to Public Law 103-50.

During May 1993, White House and other officials took a number of actions that led to the announcement of the dismissal of the seven White House employees who had for some years operated the White House Travel Office. Those actions and others involving the Department of Justice, the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), and the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) raised concerns in the Congress about the propriety of the dismissals and related activities of the agencies involved.

Although the White House initiated an internal management review of the situation, the Congress provided for an independent review by GAO. Specifically, Section 805 of Public Law 103-50 provides that: "Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a review of the action taken with respect to the White House travel office and shall submit the findings from such review to the Congress by no later than September 30, 1993."

In response to this statutory mandate, we initiated a review of the White House Travel Office matter. To ensure that we included in our review the full range of congressional concerns about the episode, we consulted with congressional staff representing each of the committees and Members of Congress, both majority and minority, who had expressed an interest to us in the White House Travel Office. From the outset of our work, we said that it was unlikely that a comprehensive review of the issues involved could be completed before the September 30 reporting date contained in the statute. We agreed that we would inform the Congress by that date of the scope and progress of our review. That is the purpose of this report.

OBJECTIVES OF OUR REVIEW

Our review is designed to provide a comprehensive assessment of the full range of issues raised in the July 2, 1993, White House Travel Office Management Review and in the subsequent congressional debate about those events. Specifically, we are examining (1) the procurement practices, financial management, and oversight of the Travel Office prior to the events of May 1993; (2) the investigation of the Travel Office conducted by the White House officials, including the involvement (if any) of other investigative agencies of the government, such as the FBI and the IRS, as well as the involvement of nongovernment individuals and organizations; (3) actions taken to improve the management and operations of the Travel Office since the events of May; and (4) personnel actions affecting the Travel Office employees.

If other relevant issues arise during the course of our work, we will expand our objectives as necessary to ensure that our report provides a comprehensive assessment of all

of the circumstances surrounding these matters. If we uncover evidence of possible criminal action, we will refer that evidence to the FBI for further investigation.

PROGRESS HAS BEEN MADE IN ESTABLISHING PROCEDURES FOR OUR WORK

It is taking considerable time and effort to negotiate access to the information and individuals necessary for us to complete our review. We are making progress in establishing suitable procedures, and our access to records and individuals is beginning to accelerate. However, some access issues remain which we will continue to pursue.

This review of the White House Travel Office is unusual and time-consuming because of the combination of three highly sensitive concerns. First, because of balance of power concerns, the White House traditionally has been reluctant to open its operations to GAO review. Our reviews of other matters at the White House, such as the use of military aircraft for White House staff travel[1] or retroactive appointments of White House personnel,[2] have required extensive negotiations with White House officials for us to obtain access to the records and individuals necessary to complete our work. In some cases, we have been unable to reach conclusions or assure that the entire matter was reviewed because records were not made available. Over the years, and through many administrations, White House officials' actions to restrict our access have been based on the premise that the activities of the immediate offices of the President are confidential and not subject to routine congressional or public scrutiny.

The second sensitive matter in this review is the fact that the Department of Justice and the FBI have initiated several internal investigations of matters related to the White House Travel Office episode. The FBI and the Public Integrity Section of the Justice Department's Criminal Division are conducting a criminal investigation of the travel office operations. The Department of Justice's Office of Professional Responsibility is conducting an independent investigation of such matters as the interaction between the White House and the FBI during the episode and whether the criminal investigation was properly initiated through the Attorney General's office. Under most circumstances, it is GAO policy not to interfere with or duplicate ongoing criminal investigations. Thus, we generally do not need access to records and information associated with criminal or other internal Department of Justice investigations. However, in this case, because the investigations are central to the objectives of our statutorily required review, we have sought to obtain access to records and individuals despite the other ongoing investigations.

Because our requirements for information involve access to records and individuals at both the White House and Department of Justice, there have been extensive and time-consuming negotiations with both White House and senior Department of Justice officials to reach agreements that will permit us to obtain the breadth of access necessary to complete our review in a reasonable period of time. As a result, we have not made as much progress on the review itself as would have been desirable. Nonetheless, we have obtained some records of White House Travel Office activities both before and after the events of May, and we have conducted some of the interviews necessary to our work. We expect our work to accelerate in the near future as additional records and individuals are made available.

Until the past few days, however, we have not had any success in reaching agreement with the Department of Justice on access to records or individuals. We were told in mid-August by a high-level Justice official that the Department would work with us to reach agreement on appropriate procedures for obtaining records and access to individuals. However, subsequent requests to, and meetings with, relevant Justice organizations produced no progress toward that end. In response to our reiteration of the critical importance of this access to our ability to complete our review, the Associate Deputy Attorney General notified us, in a letter dated September 24, 1993, that we will be given access to most of the records and individuals requested to date (see app.). Some limitations remain, but the records and interviews promised, if provided, should permit us to make considerable progress on our objectives while we further pursue the remaining matters.

The third sensitive area involved in this review is related to the issue of assessing the IRS actions related to the White House Travel Office episode. Section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code, which prohibits, under criminal penalties, release of information about taxpayers—individuals or corporations—unless the taxpayer consents, must be carefully adhered to in our work. Through the cooperation of the IRS and the Department of the Treasury Inspector General, as well as our own access authority in this area, we expect to obtain the information we need to assess this issue. However, it is unlikely that we will be able to provide detailed information about the matter in a public report.

POTENTIALLY SERIOUS OBSTACLES REMAIN UNRESOLVED

Although both the White House and the Department of Justice have provided or promised the access needed for our work, several obstacles remain which must be overcome if we are to provide the comprehensive review we have planned and to which we are committed. Although the White House is providing documents at an increasing rate, those documents are reviewed prior to our receipt, and some decisions have been made to redact information on the grounds that it is not pertinent to our review or is information that the White House Counsel's office believes is privileged.

We have discussed with the White House Counsel officials our concern that procedures must be established for us to obtain an overview of the universe of records involved, so that we can satisfy ourselves that we have obtained all the relevant documents and understand the basis for any decision to withhold records. White House officials have stated that such procedures can be established, but is not clear to us how that will be accomplished. Failure to achieve this objective, which is central to government auditing standards, could compromise our ability to report comprehensive findings.

Another important obstacle is the limitation imposed by the FBI's ongoing criminal investigation. In his letter of September 24, 1993, the Associate Deputy Attorney General declined at this time to release documents associated with the criminal investigation. He requested that we postpone efforts to interview certain individuals because "premature interviews [of those persons] would create the risk of compromising an ongoing criminal investigation." The individuals named include the seven former Travel Office employees, as well as certain other individuals who are central to the completion of our review. The Associate Deputy Attorney General stated in his letter that an effort will be made to expeditiously complete the criminal investigation, we will be notified promptly when Justice determines that any particular interview no longer presents a problem for the criminal investigation, and the Justice Department will reconsider our request to pursue an interview on a case-by-case basis if an urgent need develops as our review proceeds.

Considerable information has been recently provided or promised and it will take some time to complete the interviews with the individuals the Justice Department has agreed we can meet with. Thus, we plan to proceed with our review and temporarily postpone certain interviews as the Justice Department requests. Such cooperation is consistent with our general policies on such matters when a criminal investigation is ongoing. If the criminal investigation is completed "expeditiously," it should not adversely affect the timely completion of our work. However, unforeseen further delays or limitations generated by the outcome of the investigation (such as the continuing unwillingness of some individuals to meet with us because they have been or might be criminally charged) may limit our ability to reach clear conclusions about the activities of the Travel Office before May 1993 or may require that we qualify our observations and conclusions. We will continue to work with the Department of Justice to minimize the impact of these problems on our review.

PLANS FOR COMPLETION OF OUR REVIEW

From the outset of this review, we have devoted the resources necessary to carry out the work in a timely fashion. We will continue to do so. We plan to provide regular status reports to interested congressional officials and will call attention promptly to any further unanticipated obstacles if they arise.

We are spending copies of this report to the Chairmen and Ranking Minority Members of relevant congressional committees, the White House Chief of Staff, the Attorney General, the Director of the FBI, the Commissioner of the IRS, and other interested parties upon request.

MILTON J. SOCOLAR,
Acting Comptroller General.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Military Aircraft: Travel by Selected Executive Branch Officials: (GAO/AFMD-92-51, April 7, 1993).

[2] Personnel Practices: Retroactive Appointments and Pay Adjustments in the Executive Office of the President (GAO/GGD-93-148, Sept. 9, 1993).

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, DC, September 24, 1993.

Ms. NANCY KINGSBURY,
Director, Federal Human Resource Management Issues, U.S. General Accounting Office, Washington, DC.

DEAR MS. KINGSBURY: The Department of Justice is making every effort to cooperate with your review of the treatment of the employees of the White House Travel Office, and I believe that you will be able to make a great deal of progress in your investigation without compromising our ongoing investigations.

I understand that the FBI and the Public Integrity Section of the Criminal Division have made arrangements for you to review documents of the White House Travel Office, and that your review of those documents is already underway. We are also prepared to

Footnotes at end of article.

make the following documents available to you:

1. Policy Statements or Operating Procedures:

All documents requested, if they exist, will be provided to you by the FBI.

2. Documents related to the FBI's interaction with the White House at the time of the dismissal of the Travel Office employees:

a. Copies of correspondence between the FBI and Members of Congress concerning the Travel Office will be provided.

b. The May 24, 1993 letter from Mr. Heymann to Senator Biden stating the Department of Justice policy regarding contacts between the White House and the Department will be provided.

c. Copies of the following documents prepared by the FBI concerning its interaction with the White House will be provided:

1. FBI "Chronology" regarding the Travel Office matter. (This internal FBI document apparently was not transmitted to the Attorney General, but formed the basis for the FBI "Management Review" which also will be provided to you.)

2. FBI "Management Review" submitted to the Attorney General will be provided.

3. Copies of any FBI statements to the press about the White House Travel Office will be provided.

3. A copy of the final report of the Office of Professional Responsibility about the White House Travel Office matter will be provided when it is completed and submitted to the Deputy Attorney General.

The following documents that you have requested do not exist:

1. copies of any records in FBI files concerning press inquiries. The FBI has advised me that no such records are kept.

2. Copies of any documents associated with the processing of a GAO Hotline complaint about the White House Travel Office filed in December 1988 by GAO with the White House Legal Counsel's office. It appears that GAO did not report this allegation to the FBI. A review of the FBI indices has been conducted and there is no record of anyone else having reported it to the FBI.

Consistent with Department of Justice policy, we are not able to provide internal FBI and Justice Department documents relating to the criminal investigation at this time. Similarly, any written correspondence with persons involved in the Travel Office investigation or their attorneys will not be released at this time. In the event that you have a specific compelling need for any particular document, please let me know and we will consider your request.

We have no objection to your request to interview the officials of the Department of Justice named in your letter about their interaction with White House officials during the early stages of the Travel Office investigation. However, we do request that you begin those interviews no earlier than October 8 so that the Office of Professional Responsibility may complete its interviewing process.

I am not aware of what involvement the FBI special agent based in Nashville, Tennessee had in the Travel Office matter. He is not a Special Agent in Charge, and I ask that you defer any request to interview him until I can determine what if any involvement he had.

I understand that the Public Integrity Section has already agreed that you may proceed to interview all but 2 of the 18 White House staff members and 1 of the 2 OMB employees mentioned in your letter. In the category of "other" individuals, the Public Integrity Section has removed its objection to one of the persons listed and requested that you defer interviews of the others. Also, the Public Integrity Section has agreed to notify you when it determines that any particular interview no longer presents a problem for the criminal investigation.

After a thorough review, it is my considered judgment that premature interviews of the remaining persons whose interviews the Public Integrity Section has requested that you postpone would create the risk of compromising an ongoing criminal investigation. As you know, GAO traditionally has deferred to the Department of Justice when actions by GAO might interfere with ongoing investigations. However, I understand your legitimate need to comply with your statutory obligation and ask only that you postpone certain interviews until the criminal investigation has progressed to the point at which there would be no undue interference. If an urgent need develops to conduct any particular interview as your investigation proceeds, we will reconsider any requests on a case-by-case basis.

As we discussed, it is important that GAO agree to disclose the results of any interviews that you conduct in the event that such disclosure is required by a court pursuant to the Jencks Act in any future prosecution.

We are trying to move expeditiously to complete our criminal investigation. I appreciate your understanding and look forward to working with you in an effort to accommodate your interests.

Sincerely,

DAVID MARGOLIS,
Associate Deputy Attorney General.

[From the Washington Post, October 7, 1993]

COSTS OF CLINTON TRAVEL FIRINGS STILL GROWING

(By Ann Devroy)

The firing of the White House travel office staff last spring is turning into a costly decision. Not only are five employees still being paid for not working, but Congress is about to authorize $150,000 for their legal fees at the same time the Justice Department is using its resources to continue investigating some of them.

The Senate yesterday, with no objection from Democrats or the White House, unanimously adopted an amendment to the Transportation Department spending bill that appropriates $150,000 to a legal defense fund. It will pay legal fees for five of the seven workers who were fired and later ordered reinstated on administrative leave.

The White House originally announced the firing of all seven travel office employees and called in the FBI to investigate what it called "serious" questions about management of funds. Aides later acknowledged five of the seven had no control over or access to funds. Those five were eventually reinstated on administrative leave.

Following its own management review, the White House announced the five would be given jobs in government, although not their old travel office positions. The White House and the five employees have not been able to agree on new jobs, but the five continue to draw their salaries. Meanwhile four other employees are being paid to handle the White House travel work.

The firings produced a plethora of follow-up inquiries into how the travel office investigation, as well as the original FBI investigation into financial improprieties, was handled. FBI sources said that investigation is "ongoing" because the five former employees retained lawyers, and other lawyers have become involved, complicating the process of interviewing witnesses.

A General Accounting Office investigation of the travel office affair also is running past its due date, in part because key administration officials have been slow to provide information and documents.

Senate Minority Leader Robert J. Dole (R–Kan.) and Sen. Christopher S. Bond (R–Mo.) said they introduced the amendment to cover the legal fees for the five reinstated workers because they were the "true, real-life victims" of the debacle. They "woke up one May morning only to hear their good reputations smeared on national television by an incompetent White House staff." They were accused of "gross mismanagement" and subjected to an FBI investigation, Dole and Bond said.

Dole said each of the five had incurred a legal bill of $30,000 or more to defend themselves against the allegations and to get their jobs back. None of the five earned more than $60,000 and some made significantly less.

The Senate version of the Transportation bill will go to conference with the House version, which was completed before the legal fees issue came up. A congressional aide said it is unlikely that the House would reject the spending, since it will be offset by a cut Dole proposed in another category of the Transportation bill.

White House Deputy Chief of Staff Roy Neel called the situations of the five "unfortunate." He said the White House had "worked very hard to provide them good jobs at good salaries." The jobs under consideration are at least comparable to the ones they held, he said. Each now is reviewing an offer to work in a federal agency, not the White House.

The seven-man team of career employees at the White House travel office has been replaced by four permanent workers, plus a subcontracted employee of American Express who makes travel arrangements for White House staff. In addition, Neel said, the White House "on occasion" uses employees of other departments, such as Commerce or Transportation, to handle out-of-town arrangements.

The original firings were portrayed by the White House as the result of gross mismanagement and as a cost-savings mechanism that would reduce the size of the travel staff yet provide the same service.

[From the Washington Times, October 7, 1993]

SENATE OKS PAYING WHITE HOUSE TRAVEL AIDES' LEGAL FEES

(By Paul Bedard)

The Senate yesterday unanimously agreed to pay $150,000 in legal bills facing five White House travel office workers wrongly fired in May.

An amendment to the Transportation Department appropriations bill sponsored by Sen. Minority Leader Bob Dole, Kansas Republican, and Sen. Christopher Bond, Missouri Republican, would let the five workers draw from the fund to pay legal bills now totaling about $150,000.

Mr. Dole, in a floor speech, blamed the White House for slandering the reputations of the five and said the fund is meant to help the longtime federal workers recover from the costly effort to fight the White House charges.

The Senate vote sets up a potential fight with the White House, which didn't endorse Mr. Dole's effort. "We're not taking a position," said White House spokeswoman Lorraine Voles.

The five travel office workers—John Dreylinger, John McSweeney, Barney Brasseaux, Robert Van Eimeren and Robert Maughan—were fired in May after the White House charged them with financial mismanagement of the office, which handles travel plans for the press and White House staff.

They subsequently were put on leave after the White House conceded the five were not involved in any financial mismanagement. However, the White House didn't stop an FBI investigation, which required them to retain lawyers.

The lawyers also acted as middlemen between the five and the White House counsel's office, which tried to find new jobs for the former travel aides.

All five said this week they planned to accept new jobs in other agencies and departments that were arranged by the White House.

They spent an average of $30,000 each defending themselves against the charges and negotiating for new jobs in the government. Private supporters contributed about $40,000 to a private defense fund.

Mr. McSweeney, whose legal expenses total $32,000, said he was pleased with the Senate vote. "I'm delighted," he said. "This is great news."

Mr. Dole and Mr. Bond rapped the White House handling of the travel office scandal. White House aides, including one of the president's cousins, ousted the longtime travel staff in a power play.

To justify the firings, the White House claimed the travel staff was guilty of mismanagement—a charge Chief of Staff Thomas F. "Mack" McLarty later retracted.

Mr. Dole said yesterday: "The only ones guilty of gross mismanagement were the White House staffers themselves, who tried to hide their own misconduct by pinning the blame on the very people whose livelihoods they were jeopardizing."

If approved in conference, the legal defense fund would be administered by the Transportation Department's general counsel's office.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding. I want to take this time to congratulate him and thank him for his leadership in trying to search out a reasonable compromise here, a reasonable policy not only in behalf of the employees of the White House, but in such a way that we will be able to really protect from future occurrences of this nature in behalf of all Federal employees. I do not know of anybody in this Congress who has been more able and more persistent and more consistent in riding shotgun, if I can use that phrase, in behalf of Federal employees than the gentleman from Virginia, and I want to thank him for his perseverance in this regard.

I have a personal interest in this particular case. I have taken the floor on past occasions. I am not on the Appropriations Subcommittee or Committee, but one of the White House employees involved in this, who is, like the others, waiting in purgatory, is my next-door neighbor. And I can assure Members as we have gone through 6 months of purgatory, it becomes a very personal issue in regard to someone who not only is a fine Federal employee, and has been doing a good job at the White House, but who is a personal friend as well.

I talked with Senator DOLE's office yesterday, and I talked with the Senator about the process. I think the gentleman from Virginia and myself would have preferred the $150,000 contingency fund or the lawyer's fund to be on the Treasury and Postal bill, or perhaps in a supplemental. But the Senator indicated to me, and I think he is right, we have to strike when the iron is hot.

I agree with the gentleman. I associate myself with his remarks.

I am concerned about a report by the GAO, who acted in behalf of this House to really conduct a full investigation and a report to the House on this matter. The report dated September 30 indicates that they have been having a lot of problems. They said at the outset that the comprehensive review of these issues might not be completed before the September 30 reporting date. So they came back to the House and indicated they have three concerns.

The White House has been reluctant to open its operations to the GAO review. Second, they are having a great deal of difficulty with the Department of Justice and the FBI. And third, they have some problems in regards to sensitive issues with the IRS, which prohibits, under a criminal penalty, the release of information about taxpayers.

I certainly hope we can reach a conclusion in regards to the GAO study, and I am concerned. Although I will say I want to thank Mr. McLarty of the White House, whom I talked with at a social occasion, who has been more than willing to work with us, and more especially thank the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], who has been extremely helpful, and our former colleague, Mr. Panetta, who has tried to put this issue behind us. But the issue is not behind us. There have been a lot of press reports about job offerings or job availability. I can tell Members from my personal experience with regard to the employees involved that there is a courtesy call to an agency, and then that individual does not know if that is a make-work job, or if it is a job that that individual can really contribute to or whatever. And these people are still in purgatory.

In essence, in terms of the so-called really a criminal investigation by the FBI, there was a statement made that these people are not under investigation. But yet their lawyers received some written correspondence saying "at this time." Well when you say "at this time," obviously it stretches on, and on, and on, and now we are at a 6-month period.

□ 1230

I hope we can resolve this. I have thought from the outset that an independent scrutiny of some kind would certainly be more in keeping with the problem here.

I again want to thank the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and let us see if we can get it resolved.

I think his idea with regard to the $150,000 is a good one. Again I associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, let me say in closing that I would hope that both sides of the aisle could come together and develop some legislation to deal with situations such as this. I know we are taking time here, I can see that some Members are bored with this, that we are taking the time of the body, but I want to tell you that if you were a Federal employee making $60,000 or $50,000 or $40,000 and you had no deep pockets, no big contributors to call on and you are trying to educate your kids this would be important to you. I would hope I would be as consistent on this issue if Reagan were President or if Bush or Jack Kemp, were President, that I would be up here, making the same points, whoever might be involved. This has been absolutely wrong.

Now, if a different person gets involved, it should make no difference.

What I want to say in closing is that I hope we can work out bipartisan legislation that would set up a group—perhaps a nonprofit group—that would look at these kind of cases, that would exercise discretion. I must tell my colleagues that although I believe it is right to assist these five travel office employees, I think the precedent that we are setting here is not necessarily a good precedent.

Let me say for myself that this is a special circumstance, a one-time example, a one-time case. But how we treat the least of these people under a political cloud indicates how we will treat anybody else.

Mr. Speaker, I will revise and extend my remarks and submit the rest of my statement in the RECORD with a number of documents with it, if I may.

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

Mr. CARR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he might consume to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN. I thank the chairman of the subcommittee very much for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I stand to underscore the fact that this is a nonpartisan, certainly a bipartisan, issue. I want to thank my colleagues and friends, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CARR], and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] for what they have been doing both publicly and behind the scenes to rectify the situation.

I know that a number of our colleagues do feel that this is taking up a lot of time for a handful of people, that we are making the White House go through the hoops trying to find jobs for these people. But the fact is that this is a problem of the White House's own making. If they had conducted themselves properly, it would not have happened, we would never have had to come to the floor.

The fact is that the White House was wrong in this situation. The fact is that even though this is just a handful of people, every one of those people represent not just an individual but a family that lives in a community that represents the Federal workforce.

What the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] said is absolutely right, that if any administration, whether it be Republican or Democrat, can get away with treating these employees in the way that the administration treated them initially, then it reflects upon their attitude toward the Federal work force.

I know that it does not, it does not reflect the President's attitude; that it will not reflect the administration policy in the future. But it is important to draw attention to this because this is an inexplicable and unjustifiable breach of trust between the executive branch and its work force. It cannot be ignored; it cannot be put under the carpet; it cannot be brushed aside by some half-hearted commitments.

The administration is going to have to follow through. They are going to have to make these people whole again. That is all that is being asked.

Again I thank my colleagues for drawing attention to it, and I trust that this body will make sure that that goal of making Federal employees whole again and treating them with dignity and the respect to which they are entitled will be accomplished.

I thank the Speaker, and I thank the chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CARR], for yielding.

Mr. CARR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Virginia, my good friend and colleague on the Subcommittee on Transportation Appropriations, Mr. WOLF, and my colleague on the full Committee on Appropriations, Mr. MORAN, and I know that we are joined in this particular issue by Mr. WYNN of Maryland and Mrs. MORELLA of Maryland and Mr. HOYER of Maryland.

I believe there is general agreement among the people in this particular area that these individuals ought to be taken care of, that their legal expenses be reimbursed and provided for.

I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] that the process by which this is being done is an unfortunate process.

Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the Members of the House that this is authorization language in an appropriations bill, and that has been very much discussed here. We are told by the House rules that we are not supposed to do this.

Furthermore, this particular provision, as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] said, is probably more appropriately in the appropriation for the White House, which is in Mr. HOYER's subcommittee, or in the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State Appropriations, chaired by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH], with the ranking member being Mr. HAROLD ROGERS from Kentucky.

We as a Subcommittee on Transportation have very little expertise other than the testimony of the two gentlemen who have just spoken about the matter.

I think we have all been interested in the issue of the travel office in the White House. Most of us have derived what information we have either from personal testimony of the individuals involved or what we have read in the newspaper.

Our subcommittee is not a particular good forum to make good judgments about this issue.

Furthermore, the appropriate authorizing committees have not contacted us and expressed their approval for this process. I think it would be well if we checked with them before going into conference.

I want to let everybody know I intend to do that. I have not had the opportunity to do that. This is an issue that has arisen since yesterday and this morning, and I intend to touch those bases and see what the authorizing committees think.

One other thing, while I am in general agreement with Mr. WOLF and Mr. MORAN, I think it bears saying that to do this is in the nature of a private bill on a public appropriation. We are talking about five individuals specifically. The legislation talks about five people specifically, not by name, but we know what their names are.

That raises the question that perhaps—and I know Mr. MORAN and Mr. WOLF would agree with this statement—there are probably others in the Federal Government who for whatever reason get wrongly discharged and then have to hire attorneys and then are subsequently reinstated and their legal bills are not paid.

So what really ought to be happening here is not having Senator DOLE lobbying this provision on the transportation appropriations bill, but Mr. DOLE and others ought to be proposing legislation which would reimburse in a generic way all public employees wrongly discharged and reinstated, for their legal expenses.

And I hope that while we have got this immediate situation and if we take care of it, I hope that the gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from Kansas will be joining in some fashion with the Democrats as well on both sides of the aisle, both Houses, to actually put some kind of generic legislation in place for the protection of all Federal workers.

□ 1240

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARR. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman makes a legitimate point. I think the distinction here is perhaps a little bit different. I have a letter from Mr. McClarty who said:

> DEAR CONGRESSMAN WOLF: At the outset, I want to say, as I have said previously, that the handling of the Travel Office matter was regrettable. On behalf of the White House, I have publicly apologized to the Travel Office employees and their families for the manner in which this issue was handled. We have tried to identify any errors that were made, and to rectify them as best we can.

So the gentleman is right. I think he makes a good case. Since there has been an acknowledgment, this was the vehicle and Senator DOLE took the vehicle, but I will work on legislation, I will put it in a draft and I will circulate it to other Members that will deal with this issue, because insofar as I am concerned, this is a one-time situation with regard to dealing with it in this manner.

I thought about it last night and I really could not let the process foreclose these five people, one who is a constituent of mine, from being taken care of.

I think the gentleman makes some very, very valid points.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARR. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

In my opening remarks I said that both the gentleman from Virginia and myself had some concern about the process, which I think the gentleman has spoken to, but at the outset let me point out that over a 6-months' time frame in trying to work this out for the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN], who has done a very good job in this respect, and our former colleague, Mr. Panetta, Mr. McClarty, and more especially the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], who has really taken the lead, we tried to do three things. We tried to say in terms of setting the record straight that none of the five were really guilty of any wrongdoing, that they work up on a certain day in May to find themselves actually pilloried in the Nation's press for something they did not do, and that in the process of making things right we asked for three things, a statement saying that they were not really guilty

of anything, and second, that some kind of an appropriate job that was commensurate with their present job could be found in the Federal Government. Those efforts are ongoing.

But in the process, all of a sudden we find that with the Justice Department continuing their investigation, they must have some kind of legal defense. Those bills are piling up.

So rather than to worry about the process, and I would remind the gentleman again that I did talk to the Senator's office in relation to what appropriate vehicle we could find, a supplemental or whatever we are talking about here, and the Senator indicated that he felt very strongly about this and we had to move; that is, the bills must be paid.

So I think it is commensurate with the promise of the White House that we take advantage of this if we can.

I will tell the gentleman that if we do not do it on the Transportation bill, I have a feeling that the Senator, and as far as I am concerned I will join that effort on every appropriation bill, be it Agriculture or be it Transportation or be it post office or the White House or whatever until we get the situation settled.

I appreciate what the gentleman is saying, but we need to get this matter behind us.

Mr. CARR. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's remarks. I would say that I do not foresee this being a major obstacle to the conclusion of our conference. I expect that the gentleman will be pleased with our actions.

I merely want to point out that circumstances do occasionally arise and they have an immediacy that far exceeds our ability to pass authorization legislation.

No one is going to get this Member of Congress to say that on occasion for good cause, with the acceptance of the appropriate parties in the House and in the Senate, we should not be doing these things.

I merely want to point out that this is a surprise to this subcommittee. This is not normally part of our jurisdiction. It was thrown in our midst from the other body, I think in a somewhat deliberate way in an effort to keep the particular issue alive. I think this issue could be solved on behalf of these individuals in a far less public forum.

I know that all the Members are concerned about the generic impact of singling out just five people who have been wrongfully displaced and reinstated, with their legal bills, when others in the Federal service have not been similarly treated, and that wreaks an unfairness on them.

I take the gentleman at his word that he will be working for authorization language in the appropriate forums, and I would like to pledge my support to those efforts.

I know the gentleman is a passionate spokesperson for the Federal worker.

With that, Mr. Speaker, and with a pledge that we will contact the appropriate authorization committees and try to work this thing out in a favorable fashion in the conference, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF].

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CARR of Michigan, DURBIN, SABO, PRICE of North Carolina, COLEMAN, FOGLIETTA, NATCHER, WOLF, DELAY, REGULA, and MCDADE.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE FROM THURSDAY, OCTOBER 7, 1993, OR FRIDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1993, TO TUESDAY, OCTOBER 12, 1993, AND RECESS OF THE SENATE FROM THURSDAY, OCTOBER 7, 1993, TO WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 13, 1993

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 161) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 161

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on Thursday, October 7, 1993 or Friday, October 8, 1993, pursuant to a motion made by the Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until noon on Tuesday, October 12, 1993, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns at the close of business on Thursday, October 7, 1993, pursuant to a motion made by the Majority Leader or his designee, in accordance with this resolution, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Wednesday, October 13, 1993, or at such time as may be specified by the Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 13, 1993

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday, October 13, 1993.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR CONTINUED PRODUCTION FROM NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. ——)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 201(3) of the Naval Petroleum Reserves Production Act of 1976 (10 U.S.C. 7422(c)(2)), I am informing you of my decision to extend the period of maximum efficient rate production of the naval petroleum reserves for 3 years from April 5, 1994, the expiration date of the currently authorized production period.

The report investigating the necessity of continued production of the reserves as required by section 201(3)(c)(2)(B) of the Naval Petroleum Reserves Production Act of 1976 is attached. Based on the report's findings, I hereby certify that continued production from the naval petroleum reserves is in the national interest.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 7, 1993.*

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 44

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove the name of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ENGLISH] as a cosponsor of the bill, H.R. 44.

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

There was no objection.

AVIATION INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT ACT OF 1993

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 269 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 269

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2739) to amend the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1994, 1995, and 1996, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text and shall not exceed 90 minutes, with 60 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of four titles as follows: (1) titles I and II consisting of the text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Public Works and Transportation now printed in the bill; (2) a title III consisting of the text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology on the bill (H.R. 2820) to authorize appropriations for the Federal Aviation Administration for fiscal years 1994, 1995, and 1996 for research, engineering, and development to increase the efficiency and safety of air transport and now printed in H.R. 2820; and (3) a title IV consisting of the text of the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. The amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text shall be considered by title rather than by section. Each title shall be considered as read. All points of order against the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text are waived. No amendment affecting the subject matter on title IV of the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text shall be in order. Upon designation of title IV of the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text, no further amendment shall be in order. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 1250

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 269 is a modified open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 2739, the Aviation Infrastructure Investment Act of 1993. The rule provides for 90 minutes of general debate.

One hour is to be equally divided and controlled between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation. Twenty minutes will be equally divided and controlled between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and 10 minutes will be equally divided and controlled between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2739 was reported from the Committee on Public Works and Transportation and authorizes funding for programs within its jurisdiction for fiscal years 1994 through 1996.

The Committee on Science, Space, and Technology was not referred H.R. 2739, but did report H.R. 2820, the Federal Aviation Administration Research, Engineering and Development Authorization of 1993, which contains matters relating to aviation research and development within the jurisdiction of that committee.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Ways and Means reported an amendment to H.R. 2739 that would amend the Internal Revenue Code relating to expenditures from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund.

Mr. Speaker, the rule makes in order, as original text, a substitute bill consisting of two titles reported by the Committee on Public Works, a third title consisting of the text of H.R. 2820 as reported by the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and a fourth title consisting of the text of the amendment reported from the Committee on Ways and Means printed in the report to accompany the rule.

The rule further provides that the substitute shall be considered by title, with each title considered as read. House Resolution 269 also waives all points of order against the substitute.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the rule provides that no amendment that affects the subject matter of title IV of the substitute shall be in order. The rule further provides that after designation of title IV, no further amendments shall be in order.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 269 provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2739, as modified, authorizes a total of $28 billion for fiscal year 1994, 1995, and 1996.

As reported by the Public Works Committee, the bill authorizes $2.1 billion for airport infrastructure improvements for fiscal year 1994 and $2.2 billion for fiscal years 1995 and 1996.

The bill also authorizes $2.4 billion for fiscal year 1994, $2.6 billion for fiscal year 1995, and $2.7 billion for fiscal year 1996 for the facilities and equipment program of the Federal Aviation Administration. In addition, Mr. Speaker, the bill authorizes $4.6 billion for fiscal year 1994, $4.7 billion for fiscal year 1995, and $4.8 billion for fiscal year 1996 for FAA operations.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2739 is important legislation. The improvement of our Nation's airports and airways is not only critical for safety reasons but also for economic reasons as well. I urge my colleagues to adopt House Resolution 269 so that the House can proceed to the consideration of this vital legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 2739, the Aviation Infrastructure Investment Act. As the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee has described, this rule incorporates the text of H.R. 2820, the Federal Aviation Administration Research, Engineering and Development Authorization Act and provides for an open amendment process for the provisions of both of these measures.

The rule also adds a title reported by the Ways and Means Committee which permits expenditures from the airport and airway trust fund for the purposes set out in the two bills. This title is not open for amendment, but I have no objection to this restriction.

Mr. Speaker, this bill authorizes funds for the improved development and operation of our Nation's airports and airways, which is badly needed. As we all know from traveling back and

forth between our districts and Washington, airport congestion and flight delays continue to grow, and it is essential that we increase the capacity of our airports. Passage of this bill will create critically needed improvements in aviation infrastructure and will also generate economic benefits and jobs.

The bill also contains important provisions to assist the Federal Aviation Administration in performing its functions to ensure an efficient and safe air traffic system.

Some Members may have concerns over certain parts of this bill, but this rule will allow those concerns to be addressed through the open amendment process.

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES 95TH–103D CONG.

Congress (years)	Total rules granted [1]	Open rules		Restrictive rules	
		Number	Percent [2]	Number	Percent [3]
95th (1977–78)	211	179	85	32	15
96th (1979–80)	214	161	75	53	25
97th (1981–82)	120	90	75	30	25
98th (1983–84)	155	105	68	50	32
99th (1985–86)	115	65	57	50	43
100th (1987–88)	123	66	54	57	46
101st (1989–90)	104	47	45	57	55
102d (1991–92)	109	37	34	72	66
103d (1993–94)	37	10	27	27	73

[1] Total rules counted are all order of business resolutions reported from the Rules Committee which provide for the initial consideration of legislation, except rules on appropriations bills which only waive points of order. Original jurisdiction measures reported as privileged are also not counted.

[2] Open rules are those which permit any Member to offer any germane amendment to a measure so long as it is otherwise in compliance with the rules of the House. The parenthetical percentages are open rules as a percent of total rules granted.

[3] Restrictive rules are those which limit the number of amendments which can be offered, and include so-called modified open and modified closed rules, as well as completely closed rule, and rules providing for consideration in the House as opposed to the Committee of the Whole. The parenthetical percentages are restrictive rules as a percent of total rules granted.

Sources "Rules Committee Calendars & Surveys of Activities," 95th–102d Cong.; "Notices of Action Taken," Committee on Rules, 103d Cong., through Sept. 29, 1993.

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES: 103d Cong.

Rule number date reported	Rule type	Bill number and subject	Amendments submitted	Amendments allowed	Disposition of rule and date
H. Res. 58, Feb. 2, 1993	MC	H.R. 1: Family and medical leave	30 (D–5; R–25)	3 (D–0; R–3)	PQ: 246–176. A: 259–164. (Feb. 3, 1993).
H. Res. 59, Feb. 3, 1993	MC	H.R. 2: National Voter Registration Act	19 (D–1; R–18)	1 (D–0; R–1)	PQ: 248–171. A: 249–170. (Feb. 4, 1993).
H. Res. 103, Feb. 23, 1993	C	H.R. 920: Unemployment compensation	7 (D–2; R–5)	0 (D–0; R–0)	PQ: 243–172. A: 237–178. (Feb. 24, 1993).
H. Res. 106, Mar. 2, 1993	MC	H.R. 20: Hatch Act amendments	9 (D–1; R–8)	3 (D–0; R–3)	PQ: 248–166. A: 249–163. (Mar. 3, 1993).
H. Res. 119, Mar. 9, 1993	MC	H.R. 4: NIH Revitalization Act of 1993	13 (d–4; R–9)	8 (D–3; R–5)	PQ: 247–170. A: 248–170. (Mar. 10, 1993).
H. Res. 132, Mar. 17, 1993	MC	H.R. 1335: Emergency supplemental Appropriations	37 (D–8; R–29)	1(not submitted) (D–1; R–0)	A: 240–185. (Mar. 18, 1993).
H. Res. 133, Mar. 17, 1993	MC	H. Con. Res. 64: Budget resolution	14 (D–2; R–12)	4 (1-D not submitted) (D–2; R–2)	PQ: 250–172. A: 251–172. (Mar. 18, 1993).
H. Res. 138, Mar. 23, 1993	MC	H.R. 670: Family planning amendments	20 (D–8; R–12)	9 (D–4; R–5)	PQ: 252–164. A: 247–169. (Mar. 24, 1993).
H. Res. 147, Mar. 31, 1993	C	H.R. 1430: Increase Public debt limit	6 (D–1; R–5)	0 (D–0; R–0)	PQ: 244–168. A: 242–170. (Apr. 1, 1993).
H. Res. 149 Apr. 1, 1993	MC	H.R. 1578: Expedited Rescission Act of 1993	8 (D–1; R–7)	3 (D–1; R–2)	A: 212–208. (Apr. 28, 1993).
H. Res. 164, May 4, 1993	O	H.R. 820: Nate Competitiveness Act	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (May 5, 1993).
H. Res. 171, May 18, 1993	O	H.R. 873: Gallatin Range Act of 1993	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (May 20, 1993).
H. Res. 172, May 18, 1993	O	H.R. 1159: Passenger Vessel Safety Act	NA	NA	A: 308–0 (May 24, 1993).
H. Res. 173 May 18, 1993	MC	S.J. Res. 45: United States forces in Somalia	6 (D–1; R–5)	6 (D–1; R–5)	A: Voice Vote (May 20, 1993)
H. Res. 183, May 25, 1993	O	H.R. 2244: 2d supplemental appropriations	NA	NA	A: 251–174. (May 26, 1993).
H. Res. 186, May 27, 1993	MC	H.R. 2264: Omnibus budget reconciliation	51 (D–19; R–32)	8 (D–7; R–1)	PQ: 252–178. A: 236–194 (May 27, 1993).
H. Res. 192, June 9, 1993	MC	H.R. 2348: Legislative branch appropriations	50 (D–6; R–44)	6 (D–3; R–3)	PQ: 240–177. A: 226–185. (June 10, 1993).
H. Res. 193, June 10, 1993	O	H.R. 2200: NASA authorization	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (June 14, 1993).
H. Res. 195, June 14, 1993	MC	H.R. 5: Striker replacement	7 (D–4; R–3)	2 (D–1; R–1)	A: 244–176.. (June 15, 1993).
H. Res. 197, June 15, 1993	MO	H.R. 2333: State Department. H.R. 2404: Foreign aid	53 (D–20; R–33)	27 (D–12; R–15)	A: 294–129. (June 16, 1993).
H. Res. 199, June 16, 1993	C	H.R. 1876: Ext. of "Fast Track"	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (June 22, 1993).
H. Res. 200, June 16, 1993	MC	H.R. 2295: Foreign operations appropriations	33 (D–11; R–22)	5 (D–1; R–4)	A: 263–160. (June 17, 1993).
H. Res. 201, June 17, 1993	O	H.R. 2403: Treasury-postal appropriations	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (June 17, 1993).
H. Res. 203, June 22, 1993	MO	H.R. 2445: Energy and Water appropriations	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (June 23, 1993).
H. Res. 206, June 23, 1993	O	H.R. 2150: Coast Guard authorization	NA	NA	A: 401–0. (July 30, 1993).
H. Res. 217, July 14, 1993	MO	H.R. 2010: National Service Trust Act	NA	NA	A: 261–164. (July 21, 1993).
H. Res. 218, July 20, 1993	O	H.R. 2530: BLM authorization, fiscal year 1994–95	NA	NA	
H. Res. 220, July 21, 1993	MC	H.R. 2667: Disaster assistance supplemental	14 (D–8; R–6)	2 (D–2; R–0)	PQ: 245–178. F: 205–216. (July 22, 1993).
H. Res. 226, July 23, 1993	MC	H.R. 2667: Disaster assistance supplemental	15 (D–8; R–7)	2 (D–2; R–0)	A: 224–205. (July 27, 1993).
H. Res. 229, July 28, 1993	MO	H.R. 2330: Intelligence Authority Act, fiscal year 1994	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (Aug. 3, 1993).
H. Res. 230, July 28, 1993	O	H.R. 1964: Maritime Administration authority	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (July 29, 1993).
H. Res. 246, Aug. 6, 1993	MO	H.R. 2401: National Defense authority	149 (D–109; R–40)		A: 246–172. (Sept. 8, 1993).
H. Res. 248, Sept. 9, 1993	MO	H.R. 2401: National defense authorization			PQ: 237–169. A: 234–169. (Sept. 13, 1993).
H. Res. 254, Sept. 22, 1993	MO	H.R. 2401: National Defense authorization		91 (D–67; R–24)	A: 241–182. (Sept. 28, 1993).
H. Res. 250, Sept. 13, 1993	MC	H.R. 1340: RTC Completion Act	12 (D–3; R–9)	1 (D–1; R–0)	A: 213–191–1. (Sept. 14, 1993).
H. Res. 262, Sept. 28, 1993	O	H.R. 1845: National Biological Survey Act	NA	NA	A: 238–188 (10/06/93).
H. Res. 264, Sept. 28, 1993	MC	H.R. 2351: Arts, humanities, museums	7 (D–0; R–7)	3 (D–0; R–3)	
H. Res. 265, Sept. 29, 1993	MC	H.R. 3167: Unemployment compensation amendments	3 (D–1; R–2)	2 (D–1; R–1)	
H. Res. 269, Oct. 6, 1993	MO	H.R. 2739: Aviation infrastructure investment	N/A	N/A	

Note.—Code: C-Closed; MC-Modified closed; MO-Modified open; O-Open; D-Democrat; R-Republican; PQ: Previous question; A-Adopted; F-Failed.

□ 1300

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the rule so that we can proceed with consideration of this bill.

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 269, a rule which will govern the floor debate of H.R. 2739, the Aviation Infrastructure Investment Act of 1993. This is an open rule which deserves the bipartisan support of all of my colleagues. H.R. 2739 authorizes funding of $28 billion for fiscal years 1994 through 1996, for the development and operation of the Nation's airports and airways. Of the $28 billion, $6.5 billion is authorized for the development of airports, $7.9 billion for modernization of the air traffic control system and other FAA facilities and equipment, and $14 billion for FAA operations.

In addition to authorizing funding for these airport and operational programs, this bill also addresses several other legislative issues that are important to improving these programs. For example, this bill addresses revenue diversion, which is an issue that has recently become the center of very public debate. Airport Improvement Program funds are very limited. Unfortunately, there are never enough discretionary funds available to meet the many airport requests. This bill directs the Secretary to take into consideration whether an airport is diverting revenue off airport when discretionary funds are awarded.

It also establishes a fixed 5-year term for the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration. As those of us who have worked with the FAA know, the average length of time that an Administrator stays in the office is approximately 2 years. This is an agency that is so highly technical that past Administrators have acknowledged that, despite their aviation expertise, the learning curve to become a proficient Administrator is over a year. The result of this combination of constant turnover and complex subject matter is that the FAA has had significant periods of time in the past several years in which the agency was being run by an Administrator in training. Hopefully, this bill will provide some additional stability to this agency that is so vital to aviation safety.

This bill addresses several other important issues that improve the operation of the air transportation system. I urge my colleagues to support this open rule that would enable this important legislation to come to the floor.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to H. Res. 269 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of bill, H.R. 2739.

The Chair designates the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN] as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole and requests the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARLOW] to assume the chair temporarily.

□ 1300

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2739) to amend the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1994, 1995, and 1996, and for other purposes, with Mr. BARLOW (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Under the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR] will be recognized for 30 minutes; the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER] will be recognized for 30 minutes; the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] will be recognized for 10 minutes; the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] will be recognized for 10 minutes; the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] will be recognized for 5 minutes; and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 9 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Public Works and Transportation today brings H.R. 2739, the Aviation Infrastructure Investment Act of 1993, to our colleagues and to this body to reauthorize the programs of the Federal Aviation Administration for the future years, $28 billion of program for fiscal years 1993, 1994, and 1995.

At the outset I want to express my appreciation to my colleague on the subcommittee, the ranking member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER]. The gentleman and I have worked together on economic development legislation and on the Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight, and now on the Subcommittee on Aviation, for more than a decade, and have had a very splendid, cordial, and mutually beneficial working relationship. I have enormous respect for the gentleman's intellect, integrity, thoughtful and constructive contributions to the work of our subcommittee. I want to express my very deep appreciation for his support and for his partnership in bringing this legislation forward.

I also want to express my great appreciation to the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA], who chaired this subcommittee some years ago, and who left a great legacy of constructive and forward-looking, progressive legislation in the field of aviation, and who has continued his partnership with our subcommittee. Also the other gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER], who I want to say to my colleagues as ranking member of the full committee has participated in every one of the hearings our subcommittee has had. The gentleman takes note and takes interest. It is a very great source of strength for all of us on the committee to have that kind of participation, interest, support, and understanding of the legislation.

Mr. Chairman, improving our aviation infrastructure is critical to the Nation's transportation network and to the well-being of our entire country. Flight delays due to inadequate infrastructure costs our economy billions of dollars annually.

In 1989, the Nation logged 114 million hours of delay in the Nation's aviation system, costing the economy over $7 billion.

It was imperative that the Congress take action to reduce delays by providing adequate funding to expand infrastructure, that is, the hard side of the airport, and to improve, modernize, and advance the state of the art of the technology of aviation in the air traffic control system.

We had landmark legislation in 1990 that moved us far along the road in that direction. This legislation that we bring today further fine-tunes the 1990 landmark bill and charts us on a course for the next 3 years.

The recession that we have been through, both at home and abroad, not just in the United States, but in the European Economic Community and in the Pacific Rim, has slowed the growth in air travel. But, nonetheless, all forecasts are for growth to resume and again place enormous demands on our airports and our air traffic control system.

The Federal Aviation Administration estimates that airline passenger emplanements will increase by 60 percent over the next 10 years, and that the number of aircraft movements will go up in the range of 23 percent. Without an aggressive investment program, this growth will not be accommodated in a manner that will be efficient and destined to reduce delay.

The programs authorized by H.R. 2739 not only will generate the critically needed improvements in aviation infrastructure, but will also generate very substantial economic benefits and jobs. For every $1 billion invested in airport development, we can count on an additional $3 billion in economic benefits and some 40,000 to 50,000 jobs.

The authorizations that we have provided in this legislation are in line with the fiscal 1994 budget resolution and with the resolution's assumptions for spending in the years beyond 1994.

Specifically, the bill authorizes $6.5 billion for fiscal years 1994, 1995, and 1996. These levels of funding will allow the airport improvement program to make the kinds of investment and capital developments at airports of all types and all sizes.

The legislation also commits a significant amount of funding to reduce the impact of aircraft noise on airport neighbors. The AIP program that we authorized in this legislation is supported 100 percent by the taxes generated under the airline ticket tax, the fuel tax, and that are deposited into the Airport and Airway Trust Fund.

The bill also takes steps toward dealing with some problems that in our hearings we discerned have crept into the AIP program, specifically that of airports diverting revenues generated at the airport to points off the airport, to support other city government functions. With only a very few exceptions, airports are required to keep revenues generated at the airport working on that airport.

The bill first requires airports to report annually on revenues shifted off the airport. This will give the FAA, the Department of Transportation, and the Congress a better idea of what is going on in this area than we have now.

Second, the FAA is directed under this legislation in administering the discretionary fund in the AIP program to consider revenue diversions as a factor mitigating against receiving a discretionary grant. Other factors can override, but this language will ensure that discretionary funds will be used where they are needed most, and we expect will discourage off-airport diversion of airport-generated funds.

□ 1310

The bill makes some relatively minor changes to the AIP program, but minor in scope, but important to those for whom these changes are made.

The minimum amount available to small primary airports is increased from $400,000 to $500,000. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER] for his work on this particular issue and for his support. This will better enable small airports to undertake the needed improvements which are so critical in this era of hub-and-spoke transportation.

The bill expands the number of airports participating in the military airport program from 12 to 16. Former military fields offer great opportunities to expand capacity at relatively low cost. The apportionment for airport system planning is increased in this bill in recognition of the importance of long-range solid planning to responsible and careful and integrated evolution of the airport transportation system.

The bill also makes eligible for AIP funding certain types of security equipment. The bill also encourages the use of innovative concrete and other materials in airport construction.

This bill authorizes nearly $8 billion for further modernization of the air traffic control system, also funded 100 percent from the Aviation Trust Fund. Overall, the modernizaton of air traffic control is expected to cost $32.8 billion through the year 2000.

Much remains to be done in modernization, and the effort has not been without its difficulties. Undertaking a project of this complexity, it is very understandable that there would be program delays and some uncertainties as to types of equipment. But I feel, based on the hearings that we have conducted, that although virtually every program and project has fallen behind schedule, the FAA and its major contractor, IBM, are well underway, on track, on course meeting timetables for the completion of the advanced automation system.

The bill authorizes $14 billion for FAA's operations over the next 3 years. This program funds the nearly 50,000 employees of FAA, including the Air Traffic Controllers, Safety Inspectors, Equipment Maintenance Technicians, Security Personnel, and all the support staff for those critical activities.

Beyond the trust fund program, the bill addresses a number of other important issues. First of all, we establish a fixed term for the Administrator of FAA of 5 years. I think this is very important to maintain continuity and stability and program planning in the FAA.

We clarify that the passenger facility charge program will not be applied to frequent flyer tickets. We commission a study of the high-density rule and allocation of landing slots at the four slot-controlled airports.

We direct that the rulemaking be undertaken to reduce the sample size of the very costly random drug testing program now in effect.

These are very important steps, important policy changes in the current operation of FAA programs and help us keep the modernization of the air traffic control system on track and the investment in the Nation's airport infrastructure program on track, expanding capacity and accommodating growth and economic development in this country.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this legislation. The distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Aviation has quite accurately described this bill.

I would emphasize that we come to the floor today with strong bipartisan support for this legislation. We do here, in funding improvement of our Nation's airports, what I think the Congress and the Government should be doing, which is to spend the taxpayers' dollars to build assets for America. And it is very important to emphasize that the expenditures included in the construction of our airports and the support systems for our airports come from the Aviation Trust Fund, and so the expenditures do not contribute to the general fund deficit.

The funds come from the Aviation Trust Fund, which is supported by user charges. The people who use the airports are the ones who put the money into the trust fund, and that is as it should be. And indeed, there is a balance in the trust fund of over $4 billion today so the trust fund is quite adequate to support the level of spending included in this legislation.

Further, I would emphasize that this legislation is fair to the small airports, the small primary airports. As has been pointed out by the distinguished chairman, we will have their minimum allocation rise from $400,000 to $500,000 a year. It is very important that this occur, again, out of the trust fund, because this is one of the few sources available to small airports.

The larger airports have bonding capabilities and other capabilities to raise funds, but the smaller airports are quite limited. So this provision is particularly important to the smaller primary airports across America.

The only problem that I have had with this legislation is that, indeed, there is a provision in here which says that the National Labor Relations Act "shall apply to National and Dulles Airports." The problem is not with the National Labor Relations Act or the collective bargaining provisions but with the application of this law to public airports.

No other airport in America is subject to the NLRA or told how to deal with their employees. This is a local option. In fact, the Washington airport employees have actually done quite well under the airport's current labor code. In my view, there is no need for this provision. And it is unfortunate that we were unable to eliminate this particular provision in committee.

However, in all other respects, I strongly support this legislation. It is good for America. I urge its passage.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of my time be allocated to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER], the distinguished member of the Subcommittee on Aviation, who will manage this bill for our side from this point on.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BARLOW). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA].

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2739, the Aviation Infrastructure Investment Act of 1993. This important piece of legislation authorizes for 3 years the FAA airport improvement program, FAA facilities and equipment, and FAA operations. In addition to these funding authorizations, the bill makes several legislative changes to existing law on a variety of issues. These changes will help enhance the effectiveness of the programs and the air transportation system.

At the outset, let me express my appreciation for the dedication of the chairman and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Aviation, Chairman OBERSTAR and Congressman CLINGER. Their continued responsiveness to the issues facing the aviation community have resulted in a bipartisan legislative product that is balanced in its approach to both authorization levels and legislative issues. This bill reflects the many hours of hearings and meetings held to obtain input from interested parties. In addition, I would like to thank the ranking member of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, Congressman SHUSTER, for his help and support in this effort.

The airport improvement program is authorized in the amounts of $2.105 billion for fiscal year 1994, $2.161 billion for fiscal year 1995, and $2.214 billion for fiscal year 1996. These authorization levels reflect a balance between the safety and capacity enhancement needs of the airports and the budget realities that necessarily limit our ability to meet all existing needs. The FAA facilities and equipment and operations programs are currently authorized through fiscal year 1995. This bill would provide authorization for an additional year in order for the three programs to expire at the same time. The funding levels for the facilities and equipment and FAA operations programs have been reduced to reflect the lower than anticipated rate of growth in air traffic.

These funding levels will continue to spend down the uncommitted balance in the Aviation Trust Fund, which is important to keep faith with the flying public. Excise taxes are collected for the transportation by air of commercial passengers and cargo. It is important that the taxes collected for the upkeep of the air transportation system are actually spent for that purpose. For too long, the uncommitted balance in the trust fund was permitted to grow. This bill continues this committee's effort to spend down that balance and put to work the taxes collected by the users of the air space system.

The bill also addresses several legislative issues that range from increasing the minimum entitlement for small airports from $400,000 to $500,000 annually, to ensuring that a sufficient number of slots are available at high density airports to meet the needs of essential air service to rural communities. These legislative changes improve the implementation of the programs funded by the trust fund.

Some of the provisions address issues that are important to the airline community. For example, this bill clarifies that passenger facility charges are not authorized to be collected on unpaid air transportation, such as frequent flier awards. In addition, the Secretary may disapprove a project to be funded with PFC's if the project cannot be adequately justified. I believe these changes are important in order to preserve the integrity of the passenger facility charge program, which provides airports with a much needed revenue source.

Also of importance to commercial airlines, this bill requires the Department of Transportation to complete a rulemaking within 1 year of the enactment of this legislation to determine whether and how much the random drug testing rate for safety and security sensitive airline employees should be reduced. If such a rulemaking is not completed within the specified time, the random drug testing rate shall be automatically reduced from 50 to 25 percent. The aviation community has long called for such a reduction, especially since the Department of Transportation's own internal random drug testing rate was reduced several years ago to 25 percent. This type of reduction would save the airlines millions of dollars a year. It is also worth nothing that the Commission to Ensure a Strong Competitive Airline Industry recommended that a reduction in the random drug testing rate be studied.

The bill contains several other legislative provisions which I fully support, including a fixed term for the FAA Administrator and a mandatory study of the high density rule.

Finally, I strongly urge my colleagues to pass this important piece of legislation. It clearly reflects a bipartisan effort. It is well reasoned in its approach. It has the support of the airport and aviation community. It deserves the support of all my colleagues here today.

□ 1320

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to join my chairman in strong support of H.R. 2739, the Aviation Infrastructure Investment Act. I would start by saluting my chairman, who is one of the preeminent leaders in aviation matters in this country, and has fashioned here, I think, a very thoughtful, excellent bill, taking into account the concerns of all in the industry, and it has been a real pleasure to work with him.

I would also thank him for the extreme generosity which he has always shown to the members of the minority as full partners in fashioning this piece of legislation, and in other matters which we have dealt with as partners over the years.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2739 is a straightforward 3-year reauthorization of the Federal Aviation Administration's Airport Improvement Program [AIP], as has been indicated, and makes no significant policy changes. It does contain a couple of dozen provisions that I would characterize as a refinement.

Examples of these include a prohibition on airports collecting passenger facility charges from passengers traveling on frequent flyer tickets, a bone of contention for some time; establishing a 5-year term for the FAA Administrator, which the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR] mentioned; directing DOT to study and make recommendations on the need to continue with the high-density rule; and a provision prohibiting DOT from taking slots away from U.S. carriers in order to accommodate foreign carriers at our high-density airports, unless the foreign country provides equal access to U.S. carriers.

It has already been mentioned that the Airport Improvement Program is entirely funded out of the Aviation Trust Fund, which gets its receipts through taxes levied on airline tickets and aviation fuel. The program does not, repeat, does not rely on general tax revenues. It is in every sense a user-supported program, much the same way as gasoline taxes underwrite our Federal highway construction program.

They are consistent, I would say, with the traditional treatment of this bill in this Congress. There are no earmarks, no set-asides, for specific airports in this bill. That has been a longstanding policy of our committee.

I am not going to describe the bill. The chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR] has done a superb job at describing all of the provisions in the bill, but I would like to mention two items, the first of which I feel will be of immeasurable help to small community airports.

Under current law commercial service airports enplaning 10,000 or more passengers receive at least $400,000 annually from the Aviation Trust Fund. This bill would increase that minimum entitlement to $500,000.

I represent, as do many in this body, a rural district comprising or encompassing 15 counties. Virtually every airport in or near my district is served by a commuter airline picking up or dropping off 20 to 30 passengers at a time. Needless to say, the magnitude of the traffic, the relatively small number of passengers enplaning, the limitation on the fact that we cannot really make a lot of money from landing fees or long-term parking concessions, means that they really have limited resources to address the needs that they have, so they are almost totally reliant and rely upon AIP grants for capital improvements.

Let us face it, airports are a very expensive proposition, no matter their size. It does not matter where you are building it, they cost a lot of money. Relatively mundane items such as runway lights, repaving taxiways, repairing or improving terminal buildings, easily run into hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of dollars.

Small airports are constantly being challenged by the need to maintain and update their plant, and finding the resources to make such improvements. That is why I think increasing this minimum entitlement is so important to the many, many small airports around this country that rely upon AIP for their funding.

The second issue I wanted to bring to Members' attention is the effort of some cities to divert, and I underscore what the chairman has already mentioned, the effort by some cities to divert airport-generated revenues into their own coffers; collect money from citizens all over the country to be used only in the city where the airport happens to be located. I think fundamental to our system of airways and airports is the notion that it is a national system.

The Federal Government, in partnership with local governments, has played a major role building a system of airports through the Aviation Trust Fund, with its collection and disbursement of airline ticket taxes and aviation fuel taxes.

The role played by local governments, though, is usually limited, and I think rightly limited, to ownership and management in lending their credit ratings to help airports raise capital in the credit market. Rarely do local governments actually contribute local tax revenues to support an airport's operation.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, local governments are beginning to look upon airports as a source of revenue, as a cash cow, to support local needs such as public education and fire and police services. This, I think, breaks faith with what we have traditionally recognized as a source of funding to create a national system.

In one instance a large city is currently attempting to triple its landing fees charged to commercial air carriers using the excess revenues for general government purposes. If the city is successful in this instance, it will open up, I think, a Pandora's box. It will open up all airports across the country to the same sort of raids on their cash flows.

The consequence of this scenario is chilling. The cost of flying will rise dramatically, at a time when they really cannot afford to do that. Fewer people will fly, and air carriers will pare back their services and employees, so language has been inserted in this bill directing the Secretary to consider whether cities are attempting to shift revenues off-site.

If the Secretary makes such a finding, then it could be used as a factor

against awarding discretionary grants to the airports. Such a finding would not have any bearing whatever, and I have to underscore this, would not have any bearing whatever on an airport's annual entitlement program as compared with the discretionary funds.

Finally, I would just join with my leader, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER], ranking member of the full committee, in indicating our dissent from section 207 of the bill stipulating that employees of Washington's National and Dulles Airports should be covered by the National Labor Relations Act and its governing collective bargaining positions, because this is unique to this airport.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill. By and large, I think it seeks to build on the accomplishments we have achieved, and to be sure that we continue to have safe, efficient airport and airway facilities for future generations.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BARLOW). The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The Chair would state that 10 minutes of general debate is controlled by the Committee on Ways and Means.

At this point the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] for 5 minutes, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI].

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2739, the Aviation Infrastructure Investment Act of 1993, including the Ways and Means Committee amendment.

H.R. 2739 authorizes needed funding for the development of our Nation's aviation system. It funds programs that are essential to improving the safety of air travel, increasing the capacity of our aviation system, and reducing congestion at our Nation's airports. It recognizes the critical role that our airports and airways play, as part of our Nation's overall transportation system, in allowing us to compete successfully in the global economy. And, importantly, the programs established by H.R. 2739 will generate economic development and provide much-needed jobs for Americans who desperately want to work.

The Ways and Means Committee amendment is necessary to make this bill work. It extends authority to spend out of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund and allows expenditures to be made for the purposes envisioned by the Committees on Public Works and Science, Space, and Technology. The Committee on Public Works asked us to provide this amendment because, without it, expenditures generally could not be made out of the trust fund for the purposes contemplated by the bill. Thus, it was necessary that the Ways and Means Committee amendment be incorporated into the authorization bill.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that H.R. 2739 is important for the safety of the traveling public, for the development of our country's airports and airways, for global competitiveness, and for economic stimulation and job creation. I strongly urge support for H.R. 2739, including the Ways and Means Committee amendment.

For purposes of legislative history, I am entering into the RECORD an explanation of the Ways and Means Committee amendment to H.R. 2739.

EXPLANATION OF WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2739 (AVIATION INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT ACT OF 1993)

I. LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

H.R. 2739 ("Aviation Infrastructure Investment Act of 1993") was reported by the House Committee on Public Works and Transportation on September 14, 1993 (H. Rept. 103-240). The bill, as reported, amended the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982 (as amended in 1987, 1990, and 1992) to provide airport and aviation program authorizations for the Department of Transportation and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) (other than research and development (R&D) for fiscal years 1994, 1995, and 1996). (H.R. 2739 modifies existing authorizations for fiscal years 1994 and 1995, and adds authorizations for fiscal year 1996.)

The House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology reported H.R. 2820 ("Federal Aviation Administration Research, Engineering, and Development Authorization Act of 1993") on August 31, 1993 (H. Rept. 103-225). H.R. 2820 provides authorizations for FAA R&D programs for fiscal years 1994, 1995, and 1996. The Committee on Science, Space, and Technology expects to offer the provisions of H.R. 2820 as an amendment to H.R. 2739, when H.R. 2739 is considered by the House. (H.R. 2820 modifies existing R&D authorizations for fiscal year 1994, and adds R&D authorizations for fiscal years 1995 and 1996.)

The Committee on Public Works and Transportation requested that the Committee on Ways and Means provide a conforming amendment to the Airport and Airway Trust Fund ("Trust Fund") provisions in the International Revenue Code (sec. 9502) to reflect the proposed authorizations from the Trust Fund. The Committee on Ways and Means approved a committee amendment by voice vote on October 6, 1993, and the amendment is to be offered as a separate title to H.R. 2739.

II. EXPLANATION OF COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

PRESENT LAW—AVIATION EXCISE TAXES; TRANSFER OF REVENUES TO THE AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND

Aviation Trust Fund taxes.—Under present law, aviation excise taxes for the Trust Fund are imposed as follows: 10-percent air passenger ticket tax; 6.25-percent air cargo tax; $6.00 per person international departure tax; and, fuels taxes for noncommercial aviation (15-cents-per-gallon tax on gasoline and 17.5-cents-per-gallon tax on jet fuel). These Trust Fund taxes are scheduled to expire after December 31, 1995.

The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 ("1990 Act") provided for increases in the air passenger tax from 8 percent to 10 percent, the air cargo tax from 5 percent to 6.25 percent, the gasoline tax for noncommercial aviation from 12 cents to 15 cents per gallon, and the jet fuel tax for noncommercial aviation from 14 cents to 17.5 cents per gallon. Under the conference agreement for the 1990 Act, the revenues from these increases in the aviation taxes were to be retained in the General Fund through December 31, 1992, and to be transferred to the Trust Fund for 1993-1995.[1] For 1993-1995, all of the above aviation excise tax revenues are to be credited to the Trust Fund.

Other taxes on aviation fuels.—Currently, there is also a tax of 0.1 cent per gallon imposed on all aviation fuels (commercial and noncommercial), which is deposited in the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund (through December 31, 1995, when this tax is scheduled to expire). In addition, the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 ("1993 Act") imposed a permanent 4.3-cents-per-gallon tax (beginning on October 1, 1993) on noncommercial aviation fuels, to be retained in the General Fund. Effective on October 1, 1995, commercial aviation fuels will be subject to the 4.3-cents-per-gallon General Fund tax.

TRUST FUND EXPENDITURE PURPOSES

The present Trust Fund statute (Code sec. 9502(d)) authorizes amounts to be paid out of the trust Fund for obligations incurred under the previous airport and airway authorization Acts from 1970 to 1992 (as those Acts were in effect on the date of enactment of the Airport and Airway Safety, Capacity, Noise Improvement and Intermodal Transportation Act of 1992). Also, amounts are authorized to be paid out of the Trust Fund for obligations incurred under the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, which are attributable to planning, research and development, construction, or operations and maintenance of (1) air traffic control, (2) air navigation, (3) communications, or (4) supporting services for the airway system.[2] In addition, administrative expenses of the Department of Transportation attributable to Trust Fund-related activities described above are authorized from the Trust Fund. Trust Fund expenditures currently are authorized through September 30, 1995.

PROPOSED AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEARS 1994-1996 UNDER H.R. 2739 AND H.R. 2820, AS REPORTED

TRUST FUND AUTHORIZATION AMOUNTS

H.R. 2739, as reported by the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, and H.R. 2820, as reported by the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, would provide total trust Fund authorizations of $6.7 billion for fiscal year 1994, $6.9 billion for fiscal year 1995, and $7.1 billion for fiscal year 1996, as compared to $6.7 billion for fiscal year 1993.

Table 1 shows the Trust Fund authorization amounts for fiscal year 1993 under present law and for fiscal years 1994, 1995, and 1996 under H.R. 2739 and H.R. 2820, respectively, as reported.

[1] Footnotes at end of article.

TABLE 1.—AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND PROGRAM AUTHORIZATIONS, FISCAL YEARS 1993–1996

[In millions of dollars]

Program	Present law 1993	Projected— 1994	1995	1996
H.R. 2739				
Airport improvement program [AIP]	1,800	2,105	2,161	2,214
Facilities and equipment [F&E]	2,350	2,524	2,670	2,735
Operations and maintenance [O&M]	2,279	1,725	1,745	1,803
Small community air service	39	39	39	39
Rental payments—GSA lease	30	37	38	39
Subtotal	6,498	6,430	6,653	6,830
H.R. 2820				
Research, engineering, and development	230	250	275	302
Total trust fund	6,728	6,680	6,928	7,132

These authorizations are subject to appropriations. Thus, the amounts actually spent on aviation programs could be smaller than the amounts shown above. The uncommitted balances in the Trust Fund at the end of fiscal years 1994, 1995 and 1996, respectively, will depend upon the amounts actually appropriated and the Trust Fund revenues actually received. Further, the uncommitted balance in fiscal year 1996 will be affected by whether or not (and at what level) the Trust Fund taxes are extended beyond their current expiration date of December 31, 1995.

MODIFICATION OF TRUST FUND EXPENDITURE PROGRAMS

Limit on FAA operations amounts.—As reported, H.R. 2739 would reduce the current overall limit on Trust Fund financing of the FAA budget from a maximum of 75 percent to 70 percent for each fiscal year. Further, the Trust Fund amount for FAA operations and maintenance could not exceed 50 percent of the amounts appropriated each year for airport improvements, airway facilities and equipment, and research and development. (The intent of this provision is to limit the portion of Trust Fund spending to approximately one-third for FAA operations and maintenance (O&M) and two-thirds for FAA's capital-related programs (AIP, F&E, and R&D).)

Airport equipment.—As reported, H.R. 2739 would clarify (specify) that security equipment eligible for AIP funding includes explosive detection devices and universal access systems.

Noise abatement program.—As reported, H.R. 2739 would make permanent the existing authorization for soundproofing of certain residential buildings.

REASONS FOR CHANGE

The Committee on Ways and Means considers it important to continue to allow expenditures to be made from the Trust Fund to maintain and expand the Nation's airport and airway system and to improve aviation safety. The committee amendment extends the Trust Fund expenditure authority through fiscal year 1996 to reflect the Trust Fund authorization programs contained in H.R. 2739 and H.R. 2820.

EXPLANATION OF PROVISION

The committee amendment provides conforming amendments to the Trust Fund statute (code sec. 9502(d)) to (1) extend authority to make expenditures from the Trust Fund from October 1, 1995 through September 30, 1996 (fiscal year 1996), and (2) allow expenditures from the Trust Fund for the purposes provided in H.R. 2739 and H.R. 2820.

Effective date.—The committee amendment is effective on the date of enactment.

FOOTNOTES

[1] 1990 Act Conference Report (H.Rept. 101-964), pp. 1054–1055. However, due to a statutory drafting omission in the 1990 Act, revenues from the increases in the air passenger and air cargo taxes initially were not retained in the General Fund through 1992 as intended in the conference agreement. A technical correction was enacted in 1992 (P.L. 102-581) to reflect the intent of the 1990 Act conference agreement, and the appropriate fund adjustment was made.

[2] The Airport and Airway Trust Fund expenditure programs authorized under present law include: (1) the airport improvement program (airport planning, airport construction and repair, certain airport terminal facilities, land acquisition, airport-related equipment, airport noise abatement, and interactive training programs); (2) airway facilities and equipment (FAA air navigation facilities); (3) research, engineering, and development; (4) operations and maintenance (FAA air controller system); (5) small community air service ("essential air service" for certain small communities); and (6) grants to up to four vocational institutions for the acquisition of facilities for the advanced training of maintenance technicians for air carrier aircraft.

□ 1330

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

The CHAIRMAN. The time controlled by the Committee on Ways and Means is considered as having been used or yielded back.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SANGMEISTER].

Mr. SANGMEISTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

First of all, let me thank full committee Chairman MINETA and Aviation Subcommittee Chairman OBERSTAR, as well as ranking members, BUD SHUSTER and BILL CLINGER, for their hard work and fairness in bringing this bill to the floor.

I rise in support of H.R. 2739 and urge Members to vote for its passage. I would like to take a moment, though, to address an issue of the utmost importance to the Chicago region and, for that matter, the entire aviation industry. I am speaking of the proposed development of a third major airport to serve the Chicago area.

Like most in this Chamber, I support the AIP Discretionary Grant Program. I believe it makes sense to give FAA leeway in determining which airports receive funds—they are the experts. It also is designed to take politics and pork out of the picture when disbursing limited airport funds. However, recent actions by FAA raise serious concerns about the decisionmaking process used in awarding or denying these grant moneys. It seems that FAA has taken its "discretionary" role to new levels. Let me explain.

In January of this year, the State of Illinois was allocated $2 million under the AIP Program to prepare a master plan and environmental assessment for development of a third airport in the south suburban area of Chicago. This allocation, in effect, set aside the funds and laid out certain requirements that had to be met before they were released. For months, the State of Illinois worked diligently to meet all of these requirements—the most important one being that they would "continue to work with all parties and communities to achieve regional consensus regarding its preferred site." The State of Illinois provided documentation of its efforts and, again, met the requirements laid out in the original allocation.

Last week, however, the FAA decided to change the rules in the middle of the game—or, I should say, with 1 second left on the clock. FAA withdrew the $2 million allocation on September 30, the last day of fiscal year 1993. In a written statement they rationalized this action by saying that regional consensus had not been achieved. The only problem is, this never was a requirement for release of the funds. The only burden on the State of Illinois regarding "regional consensus" was that they had to work to achieve it. FAA played a card that wasn't even in the deck when the game began. That, my colleagues, is unfair and in my view poses some serious questions that I want addressed.

I would like to stress at this point that I do not think Congress should get involved in micro-managing the AIP Discretionary Grant Program by setting the requirements for grants. However, as a member of the committee with oversight of the AIP Program, I strongly believe that Congress should make sure FAA is living up to its commitments to grant applicants. FAA should not be allowed to pull the rug out from under applicants who work in good faith and meet all the requirements of allocation agreements.

Again, this episode raises some serious questions that FAA must address and at the proper time ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD

by October 5, 1993, letter to FAA Administrator David Hinson.

First of all, is this "regional consensus" requirement going to be applied to all AIP grant applications? If so, I would be interested in knowing how such a vague standard would be implemented. If its not going to be applied to all applicants, then one would think that, at the very least, it should be applied to all AIP grants in the Chicago area—last week's action has shown us that FAA is very concerned with the need to show consensus on airport projects in this area.

I bring it to the committee's attention, though, that this has not been the case. FAA has approved a request from the city of Chicago to do a new master plan for O'Hare International Airport—without the consensus of the States of Illinois or Indiana. Mr. Chairman, this is obviously a double standard, one that, I believe, raises questions about how the AIP Program is being run.

To be sure, there is always plenty of room for disagreement over airport improvements and expansions. The Federal Government, through the AIP Program, should be the catalyst for helping communities work through these differences so that needed infrastructure improvements can go forward. I am sure we can all agree that FAA should live up to its commitments to applicants, regardless of what political party controls the executive branch. I thank the gentleman for this time and assure the leadership of the Public Works and Transportation Committee that I will be providing them a copy of FAA's response to my inquiry.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 5, 1993.

Mr. DAVID HINSON,
Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration, Suite 1010, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. HINSON: In am writing in regard to FAA's recent decision not to release the $2 million in previously approved Airport Improvement Program (AIP) funds to study a third major airport for the Chicago area. I am concerned that the decision to tie any planning funds for this project to a showing of "regional consensus" not only reverses the terms of the original grant allocation, it sets a troubling precedent.

It is my understanding that the applicant, the State of Illinois, has satisfied all terms of the original allocation. However, FAA has now changed the terms of that agreement by tying any planning funds for this project to a showing of regional consensus between the States of Illinois and Indiana and the City of Chicago. This is an obvious departure from the original agreement, which simply required that the State of Illinois pledge "to continue to work with all parties and communities to achieve regional consensus regarding its preferred site."

The first question I would like answered is: what is FAA's definition of "regional consensus" in this particular case? Does FAA's decision not to award these funds mean that the City of Chicago and the States of Illinois and Indiana must agree on a *site* for a third airport or simply the need for a third airport? As I am sure you know, a great deal of time and money has been invested in the planning process for this project. I need to know if these efforts are meaningless without the City of Chicago's approval of a specific site.

The other question I would like answered is whether this new "showing of regional consensus" standard will be applied to all future AIP discretionary grant applications. If so, I would like to know FAA's plans for implementing this policy. If not, I would like to know the Department's justification for singling out this particular application.

I would appreciate your prompt attention to this matter and look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

GEORGE E. SANGMEISTER,
Member of Congress.

cc: Chairman Norman Mineta, House Committee on Public Works and Transportation; Chairman James Oberstar, House Subcommittee on Aviation.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. KIM], a member of the committee.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this important, bipartisan legislation. As a member of the Aviation Subcommittee and having helped shape this measure, I believe that by and large this is a good bill that represents a sound investment in American's airports and airways. It's the kind of constructive, affordable progress the American public wants to see from Congress.

The 3-year reauthorization of the Airport Improvement Program will help direct stable, long-term investment in airports across the Nation, including many in southern California. Funding for these improvements comes mostly from the Aviation Trust Fund, a special account entirely supported by aviation consumer user fees like passenger ticket, freight waybill, international department and jet fuel taxes.

These aviation taxes have already been collected as evidenced by the $4 billion uncommitted surplus in the Aviation Trust Fund. They cannot be used for anything else. Therefore, these aviation infrastructure improvements do not add to the deficit. We are simply fulfilling the promise made to the taxpayer to put those already collected monies to work upgrading our Nation's air services.

These improvements will help stimulate new job creation and economic growth around the country at no new cost to the taxpayer. Through continued modernization of our air transportation system, we help ensure our economic leadership in today's and tomorrow's increasingly interdependent and competitive global market.

For example, Ontario International Airport—an important transportation hub in California's rapidly growing inland empire—is undergoing a major expansion and modernization program which includes the construction of a new passenger terminal to meet current and future growth. Just last week, an $11 million Federal down payment on the apron and enplanement infrastructure was made. A $22 million letter of intent is pending with the FAA. All this is possible because of the AIP we are reauthorizing today.

This legislation also sets aside 10 percent of the AIP for improvements to small reliever airports, like those in Chino and Upland, CA. Unlike major airports, they cannot rely on airlines and concession fees for supplemental income. The AIP is their primary resource for safety and other needed improvements.

This bill also responsibly addresses a number of smaller, but locally significant, problems. For example, it includes a provision I added that helps provide relief to Orange County residents adversely affected by aircraft noise coming from the new flight patterns at John Wayne International Airport. These flight path changes were made by the FAA for safety reasons. I am encouraged that John Wayne will now be able to compete for noise mitigation funds just like other airports around the country. This is a win-win measure as it helps improve safety at the airport while positively addressing the quality of life concerns raised by John Wayne's neighbors.

While not a perfect bill, this is a positive measure deserving support. It is product of careful, bipartisan work on the Public Works Committee. I want to commend Chairman MINETA, RANKING member SHUSTER, Subcommittee Chairman OBERSTAR and Subcommittee ranking member CLINGER for their leadership in directing the responsible measure. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for H.R. 2739.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee on Science, Space, and Technology controls 20 minutes of the time.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. VALENTINE].

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of debate, I yield 10 minutes of that time to the ranking member of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEWIS], and I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to yield portions of that time.

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

There is no objection.

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of title III of H.R. 2739 which was reported from the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology as H.R. 2820. I speak as chairman of the Subcommittee on Technology, Environment and Aviation which reported H.R. 2820 and as the Member who introduced that bill.

Title III authorizes appropriations for the FAA Research, Engineering and Development for fiscal years 1994, 1995,

and 1996. This legislation has been thoroughly reviewed and has widespread support. We held hearings and received testimony from some of the most knowledgeable people in aviation. Before considering this legislation we had meetings with universities, industry, and the FAA as well.

For the past several years, the committee has requested that FAA submit a research budget that would be sufficient to address the safety and capacity issues facing the aviation community. The committee is pleased that the administration now has begun to place increased emphasis on the research program. The administration's fiscal year 1994 request is equivalent to the committee's authorization of $250 million. We look forward to working cooperatively with the administration as we strive toward continuous improvement in our air traffic control system.

For fiscal year 1994, H.R. 2739 replaces the $336 million authorization level contained in Public Law 102-581, to reflect the amount requested by the administration. The authorized level of $250 million is $20 million above the fiscal year 1993 appropriated level. The bill authorizes for fiscal years 1995 and 1996, $275 million and $302 million for FAA Research, Engineering and Development.

These additional funds would come from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund and be used for research, engineering and development, and demonstration projects and activities. Portions of the funding would be used to establish two new programs—a research and development program to enhance the competitiveness of the U.S. aviation industry and an aircraft cabin air quality research program. Finally, the bill would impose "made in America" requirements for all funded projects.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

□ 1340

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support H.R. 2739.

The Federal Aviation Administration's research authorization before the House represents a strong bipartisan effort to enhance the Agency's research programs.

The legislation mandates that FAA establish a long-term research program in cabin air quality.

Airplane cabin air quality has not shown to be harmful. However, that is the heart of the problem. The potential transmission of diseases by bacteria and viruses has never been studied scientifically.

In 1979 an outbreak of flu occurred, infecting 72 percent of the passengers on a commercial aircraft that was delayed on the ground for 3 hours.

In 1981 and in 1982 outbreaks of measles occurred among international passengers who flew to the United States.

Currently, the Centers for Disease Control is involved in four separate investigations on the possibility of the transmission of tuberculosis in the cabin air environment.

The author of the only scientific study of the airline cabin environment testified that "* * * further research should be done to investigate links between reduced ventilation rate and potential for increased transmission of infections or diseases."

A similar request was made by flight attendants.

In response to all this information FAA admitted that such research had never been conducted.

The legislation mandates that FAA study the cabin air quality. If there is a problem, it should be addressed before major health problems occur.

On the other hand, if the cabin air quality and disease transmission are not problems, then FAA will have a scientific database on which to base future decisions.

The FAA R&D authorization also contains a provision requiring the Agency to establish a joint dual-use aviation research and development program.

One solution that addresses the decreasing defense technology base and, at the same time enhances U.S. aviation competitiveness, is the Joint Aviation R&D program.

The program calls for the establishment of a joint FAA-Federal Agency aviation research and development program, which will be conducted by grants to industry.

The intent is to assist the defense sector in making the transition to civilian sector. This would preserve both the high technology involved and the jobs.

Moreover, the technologies developed could be used by industry to improve U.S. aviation competitiveness, which would benefit all taxpayers.

This approach utilizes the expertises of FAA, with its long history of joint DOD-FAA industry projects, that has produced many commercially viable technologies. To be successful, a joint program must be industry led.

In order to make advancements in aviation safety and to develop future technologies, FAA must have a strong research program.

This authorization before the House accomplishes that goal.

I want to thank Chairman BROWN, and ranking Republican member, Mr. WALKER, for their leadership and support of the FAA research programs.

I also want to thank subcommittee chairman, Mr. VALENTINE, for his willingness to work in a bipartisan manner to draft the authorization legislation and to include and support the provisions I discussed earlier.

Finally, I want to thank Public Works chairman, Mr. MINETA, and ranking member, Mr. SHUSTER, for their willingness to work with the Science Committee to include the research provisions in the legislation before the House.

I also want to thank the subcommittee chairman, Mr. OBERSTAR, and ranking member, Mr. CLINGER, for their leadership.

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

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

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKEON], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, subsection "C" of section 105 of H.R. 2739 designates funding for infrastructure improvements at current and former military airports. This program increases system capacity by encouraging joint-use agreements at military airports and promoting civilian use of former military airports. Currently, there are 12 airports which the Federal Aviation Administration has designated for this program. Under H.R. 2739, this number would be increased to 16.

Mr. Chairman, Palmdale Regional Airport, which is located in my district, and has operated under a joint-use agreement since 1990, has sought FAA designation under this program. I know that members of the Aviation Subcommittee, including our chairman, Mr. OBERSTAR, have visited this facility and realize that it meets the criteria for inclusion under section 105. The military airport set-aside is especially timely in this era of defense conversion, and I was pleased that Norton Air Force Base, which is represented by our California colleague, Mr. LEWIS, was the first California installation selected to this program.

Mr. Chairman, Palmdale Airport, which is situated in an area dominated by aerospace, should also be included as part of this ongoing effort to ensure successful civilian use of military airports. I look forward to continuing to work with the Aviation Subcommittee and the FAA on this issue, and urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISCLOSKY].

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I would call your attention to page 16 of House Report 103-240, which accompanies H.R. 2739, the Aviation Infrastructure Investment Act of 1993.

This section of the committee's report encourages a $2 million Federal grant to the Illinois Department of Transportation for a study of the south suburban area of Chicago, IL, for the Chicago metropolitan region's third major airport. I am strongly opposed to the release of any Federal moneys to the State of Illinois by the FAA for the purpose of site selection for a third Chicago airport because any money spent without the consensus of the State of Indiana, the State of Illinois, and the city of Chicago will be completely wasted.

As you know, the site selection for a third Chicago airport has been debated and studied for many years. The tri-state site selection process, which originally included the State of Wisconsin, led to the bistate site selection process when all proposed sites had been narrowed down to those within the States of Indiana and Illinois. After more than 7 years and the expenditure of more than $7 million, no ground has been broken and no airport is being built.

Mr. Chairman, I am specifically concerned about language in the second paragraph under item No. 3, "New Chicago Airport," which states:

The Committee * * * encourages the Secretary [of Transportation] and the FAA Administrator to take all necessary steps to ensure that the release of this $2 million award is carried out within 30 days after the enactment of this legislation.

On September 30, 1993, the FAA notified the Illinois Department of Transportation that it was withdrawing the conditional allocation of the $2 million for this study made in the final days of the Bush administration. I will include a copy of this FAA letter for printing in the RECORD.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that the committee filed its report on September 14, 1993—more than 2 weeks before the FAA sent its letter to the Illinois Department of Transportation. Thus, I would ask for clarification that, in light of the September 30 FAA letter, the committee recognizes that since fiscal year 1993 has ended, these funds can no longer be released. Finally, I would like clarification that it remains the committee's position that, before any further grant award is made to the State of Illinois for the purpose of developing an air carrier airport in the south suburban area of Chicago, IL, the State of Illinois, the city of Chicago, and the State of Indiana should continue to work to achieve regional consensus regarding a proposed site for this project.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION,
Des Plaines, IL, September 30, 1993.

Hon. KIRK BROWN,
Secretary, Illinois Department of Transportation, Springfield, IL.

DEAR SECRETARY BROWN: On January 19, 1993, the Federal Aviation Administration conditionally approved an allocation of $2,000,000 in fiscal year 1993 Airport Improvement Program funds to prepare an airport master plan and environmental assessment (Phase 2A) for the development of an air carrier airport at a site located in the south suburban area of Chicago, Illinois.

I am writing to inform you that we have concluded that it is necessary to withdraw the allocation at this time.

I want to express our appreciation for your cooperation. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

LOUIS H. YATES,
Manager,
Chicago Airports District Office.

□ 1350

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has stated the issue essentially correctly. The committee report language does state very clearly that the Secretary should first determine that the State of Illinois is attempting to work with all interested parties and affected communities to achieve regional consensus regarding the proposed site.

In consultation with my colleagues from Illinois on the subcommittee, there is a clear consensus that all parties should be consulted and that there should be a continual effort working toward regional consensus.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER] for purposes of engaging in a colloquy with Chairman OBERSTAR and myself.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to bring to the attention of the committee a difficulty that has developed regarding the interpretation of regulations at the Federal Aviation Administration with regard to the designations of primary airports.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I wish to entertain a colloquy with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER].

For the last 3 years, Kokomo Airport in my district in Indiana has received the designation as a primary airport for the purpose of participation in the Airport Improvement Program. Now the FAA has changed its mind and claims that it made a mistake with the original classification as a primary airport in 1990. An airport just outside my district in Anderson which is in the district of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SHARP] is similarly affected, and any negative repercussions would be strongly felt in the entire area.

While I am concerned for my local community, I am also concerned that this is another blow to rural America. Here is another barrier to rural America's economic well-being that is not felt by our urban areas, who are much better placed to seek alternative sources of funding, not only for airport services, but also general economic development. This interpretation on the part of the Federal Aviation Administration is another governmental roadblock on rural areas that large cities do not encounter.

I am also concerned that this is discriminatory in that the users of small airports contribute to the Airport Improvement Program through the payment of aviation fuel taxes, yet they do not receive the comparable access or availability of funds as do other end users.

This removal of the designation as a primary airport will have negative consequences to the Kokomo Airport and the surrounding community. I am concerned over the airport's continued capability to maintain and improve needed aviation services. I am also concerned over the ability of the airport to serve as a drawing card for economic development. Kokomo Airport is used extensively by one of the largest employers in the community, that being Delco Electronics, a subsidiary of G.M. We also have Chrysler there in Kokomo.

I recognize that these two airports in Indiana may not be the only ones impacted by this situation. I have only recently learned that administrative remedies that were pursued at the Department of Transportation have been denied. Therefore, I am hopeful that the Committee will look into the definition of revenue passenger, its use in determining primary airports under the Airport Improvement Program, and what relief might be available to small airports that nonetheless have significant passenger movements, not only in my district in Indiana, but also across this country.

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

Mr. BUYER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has raised a very important issue here. It is unique in his circumstance, but not unique in the whole country. There are other airports, and we do not know the extent of the question, there are other airports in a similar situation.

While the fuel tax yields less than 1 percent of the total revenues into the Aviation Trust Fund, there should be a means—it is 5 percent, less than 5 percent let us say, into the trust fund, there should be a way that we can accommodate the gentleman's concern in order to assure that the Komomo Airport, which is making a contribution to air travel but in a different way, participate more fully in the Aviation Improvement Program.

With my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, we will be glad to work with the gentleman and the FAA to come to perhaps a happier resolution of this matter.

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

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

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I just would indicate that I share the gentleman's concern. I appreciate the gentleman bringing this matter to our attention.

Coming from a rural area, I can appreciate what the gentleman is raising here. I think it is an important issue and we look forward to working with the gentleman to try to resolve this.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank both gentlemen and look forward to working with them.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIPINSKI].

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment on some of the things said by my friends and colleagues, the gentlemen from Illinois and Indiana.

I have worked with the gentleman from Illinois throughout this reauthorization in an attempt to resolve this regional issue. While I certainly look forward to working with him in the future, Mr. VISCLOSKY raises a point here today that deserves my support.

Although we are talking about spending Federal money, this is really just a regional issue. Other than the Federal Government, the three units of Government involved are: The city of Chicago, the State of Illinois, and the State of Indiana. All three will be significantly impacted by the construction of a third Chicago airport.

This impact will be felt whether or not the airport is built in Peotone.

The Governor of Illinois is up for reelection and wants to build an airport so that he can say to the voters, "Hey, look what I can do. I can bring Federal money back to the State of Illinois."

The problem with the Governor's plan is that we in this House must also answer to the voters. We must be able to defend how we spend the taxpayers' money. We must make good decisions, based on sound data and not on political whim.

I opposed the $2 million grant award for one very simple, straightforward reason: There is no need to build a third airport in the Chicago Metropolitan Area. It would be a waste of money to build—or even study the building—of such a facility.

Chicago is home to two of the Nation's premier airports: Midway Airport and O'Hare International. These facilities serve as international gateways and hub facilities for major carriers and regional airlines. Both airports serve as the economic base for the local community and the entire region. Thousands of jobs depend on the continued vitality of these airports.

Each of these airports have been improved—and will continue to be improved—with Federal dollars. This is because O'Hare and Midway are capable of handling any future increase in air traffic. A third airport would only serve to divert traffic away from these two facilities.

Mr. SANGMEISTER has raised the subject of O'Hare and its master plan—that the FAA should now ensure that the State of Illinois is consulted on—and supportive of—grants to Chicago's airports. After all, he correctly pointed out, the $2 million was denied because the State could not achieve regional consensus on Peotone.

Let me just say that the FAA is completely within the law to approve funding for O'Hare and Midway Airports, without regard to the desires of the State or Governor of Illinois.

O'Hare and Midway are real. They are viable facilities that help this Nation transport its citizens and their goods. The Federal Government is committed to providing the funding necessary to carry out these important missions.

Peotone is fantasy. There is no comparison, legally or otherwise, between grants made to O'Hare and Midway, and the grant for the Peotone study. I think the State of Illinois would do well to remember this fact.

I understand Mr. VISCLOSKY'S motivation for raising this important subject today. I also understand why Mr. SANGMEISTER has felt the necessity to speak out.

All three of us have remained—and will remain—deeply involved in local aviation issues. But, regardless of the committee report, the grant has now been denied. The FAA acted within its rights and saved the taxpayers $2 million that would otherwise have been wasted. I cannot help but join my colleague from Indiana in applauding this action.

□ 1400

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KLINK].

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Chairman, I was prepared to offer an amendment. I understand some concerns by the subcommittee and feel that I can probably address this by making a comment to the committee and to the House at this time. I want to talk about a program administered in Beaver County, PA, in the western part of my district. It has been a program that has successfully trained and placed students in air traffic control towers in good-paying technical jobs and at no cost to taxpayers. Ironically this program now is being pitted against more traditional programs with similar objectives which are completely financed with Federal taxpayer dollars. Now I am convinced the FAA air traffic control college training program can serve as a model for our new era of reinventing Government which can produce greater results while expending fewer resources. It is in the same vein that I would like to express my utter dismay at recent events which would serve to undermine the continued success of the FAA air traffic control college training initiative and an institutional bias against programs which trained qualified air traffic controllers at no cost to the Federal Government. I want to add that now the FAA has continued to keep many of these CCBC graduates on the waiting list for up to 1½ years after initially hiring 33 of these graduates who have distinguished themselves very well in control towers.

Now in order to give these demonstration programs an opportunity to work, Mr. Chairman, employment must be found for these graduates. I understand that some 300 air traffic controllers may be expected to retire this year, opening new opportunities for some of these graduates. Of course, the FAA has the authority to discontinue this former relationship.

As I was saying, the FAA has the authority to discontinue its former relationship with the ATC CTI institutions; however, I cannot imagine the logic behind a decision to drop support for a program which has provided the FAA with well screened, well trained employment candidates and at no cost to the FAA. The Community College of Beaver County program has proven that academic institutions can, without direct financial support from the FAA, prepare students for the air traffic control profession with a level of competence which qualifies them for direct placement into air traffic control positions, and I think this is the direction we want to go.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds for the purpose of saying I appreciate the gentleman raising this issue. It is our position on the subcommittee that graduates of all the various air traffic controller programs should receive equal consideration for hiring by the FAA on the basis of qualification. There should be no preferential treatment for any particular group, nor should any group be discriminated against because of one or another independent judgment levied by the FAA.

Mr. KLINK. I agree, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER] has no other speakers, I will yield myself such time as I may consume just to make a few concluding remarks. I will then yield back, and then we can proceed under the 5-minute rule.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion of general debate I simply want to say that I think the issues have been laid out very thoroughly in discussion on both the Republican side and on our side.

This is a $28 billion investment program in aviation for the next 3 years to enhance and expand the capacity of our air traffic control system, make air travel safer, make it more efficient, reduce cost to the traveling public, keep the airlines operating efficiently and sustain competition, and that is our principal objective, and we urge support for this legislation.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2739, Aviation Infrastructure Investment Act of 1993, which authorizes the appropriation of funds to improve the Nation's airports and airways. It expands and clarifies much needed language which I proposed and was adopted in 1987 to insure that disadvantaged business enterprises are encouraged to participate as contractors at airports across the country. As former chair of the Government Operations Subcommittee with jurisdiction in this area, the former Government Activities and Transportation Subcommittee, I have followed the ups and downs of our aviation system over the years and I am keenly aware of the importance of investing in the appropriate systems and structures to insure that we retain the most modern and efficient aviation industry in the world. We must continue to provide the appropriate supports to this system which is vital to our Nation's health.

While generally pleased that this bill continues in our tradition of insuring safe air travel for all, I am particularly pleased that the report includes language that expands and clarifies the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Program as I proposed and was adopted in the Airport and Airway Safety, Capacity and Expansion Act of 1987. The language would permit the airport owner-operator and businesses operating at the airport concessions, including automobile rental and all other consumer products and services, to achieve compliance with the statutory minimum 10-percent goal through direct ownership arrangements with DBE's. Where direct ownership is not practical, the statute provides an alternative means for achieving DBE participation through the purchase of goods and services from DBE firms.

The past administration was particularly slow in publishing proposed regulations on this program. Even though the legislation gave the administration 180 days to promulgate regulations after becoming law, we had to wait until this week for them to be printed in the Federal Register. I hope and expect that the Clinton administration will move more quickly in printing the regulations for H.R. 2739 than the previous administration.

In the report the committee notes that the DBE Program has been hampered by inadequate funding to assist minority contractors to take advantage of potential contracts. The report explains that one of the barriers to this program is the lack of knowledge by many airport sponsors that the costs of DBE Program development and implementation are allowable costs under the Airport Improvement Program [AIP] when they are incurred in connection with approved AIP projects. I am sure that the new Department of Transportation can get the word out. In addition, I am hopeful that the final regulations proposed by the Department of Transportation will make it clear that the same barriers exist for the implementation of DBE programs at airport consumer services and products concessions, such as automobile rental and other consumer services. Clearly funds must be made available so that disadvantaged business enterprises can be made aware of the programs that exist to increase their participation in these contracts.

Mr. Speaker, I once again commend the committee on its fine work and I look forward to working with them and the administration in insuring that the programs included in this bill are administrated effectively. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting in favor of H.R. 2739.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my strong opposition to the delay of $2 million in funding for a study of a third major regional airport for the Chicago area, to be undertaken in Peotone, IL. The Chicago region is facing two serious aviation constraints which are negatively impacting air travel nationwide. First, O'Hare airport, the world's busiest, is nearing its capacity to handle additional aircraft. Second, operating delays at O'Hare are costing the airlines hundreds of millions of dollars and affecting airline schedules nationwide.

Funding for a study of a third major airport in the Chicago area has been stalled because the Federal Aviation Administration asserts there is no regional consensus for the Peotone site. From the outset of this project, exceptional efforts were made to include all parties impacted by a new airport in the Chicago area. While no site received the complete support of all parties involved, such a consensus could not be realistically expected given the size and impact of this type of project and the diverse makeup of the parties involved in the negotiations for a site.

I find it unfortunate that partisan tactics have won the day over real progress. If the regional consensus is to be the standard against which all major projects of this type are to be judged, then I would expect the FAA apply this same criteria to any expansions of Chicago's O'Hare or Midway Airports. Any plans to expand these airports would necessarily be at the exclusion of a third site and would therefore impact communities that would benefit from a third airport.

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Chairman, while I will support H.R. 2739, the Aviation Infrastructure Investment Act of 1993, I do so with some reservations. I hope the chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee, my friend JIM OBERSTAR, understands my concerns and will work with me to ensure that my concerns are unfounded.

Mr. Chairman, section 210 of the bill, "High Density Rule and Reallocation of Slots," causes me some distress. The purpose and potential effect of this provision is certainly open to a myriad of interpretations. As a Congressman representing one of the Nation's busiest airports, La Guardia, a high-density airport which operates under the slot system, I want to make absolutely sure that it is not the intent of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation that this legislation be a backdoor method of changing existing statutes and regulations and regard to high density airports.

As the good chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee knows, I have long been concerned about the safety of operations at La Guardia and other high density airports and the impact these airports have on the citizens living near them, particularly with regard to noise. In fact, Chairman OBERSTAR was kind enough to work with me during the development of the aviation provisions contained in Public Law 101–508, the Fiscal Year 1991 Budget Reconciliation Act, to address the concerns of my constituents in Queens, NY, who have long suffered from airport noise pollution.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the language included in H.R. 2739 which ensures that the high-density study called for under section 210 will take into account the concerns of citizens living adjacent to major airports, including the residents of Queens, with regard to safety and noise. I am particularly pleased that the proposed study involves the cities, the airport authorities and, most importantly, the citizens most directly affected by airport operations.

As the chairman of the subcommittee knows, I fully support the accelerated development of quieter airplanes. I believe the Federal Government should do its utmost to facilitate the phase-in of stage III aircraft and I stand ready to assist Chairman OBERSTAR any way I can to achieve this goal.

Mr. Chairman, I look forward to an exhaustive study of operations at high density airports which will focus on the impacts of airport operations on the surrounding communities. However, I will strongly oppose any attempts to white-wash these complicated issues so as to force high density airports to grant additional slots to airlines which are not warranted and which will pose an adverse risk to the safety and well-being of the average citizen living near these airports.

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the following four titles will be considered by titles as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and each title is considered as read:

First, titles I and II consisting of the text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in H.R. 2739;

Second, title III consisting of the text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in H.R. 2820; and

Third, title IV consisting of the text of the amendment printed in House Report 103–277.

No amendment affecting the subject matter of title IV is in order.

Upon designation of title IV, no further amendment is in order.

The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1 is as follows:

H.R. 2739

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 "Aviation Infrastructure Investment Act of 1993".

Mr. CARR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the subcommittee members for

their work. We track on the Appropriations Transportation Subcommittee their work and know it well. We know that they have worked very, very hard. There are many good things in this particular bill, and I want to commend the chairman and the ranking member of those many good things.

I reluctantly, however, have to oppose the bill in its present form, Mr. Chairman. Perhaps through the amendment process we would get to a better bill, and I want to alert the House that I had intended to offer an amendment to strike section 102(b)(5), which I will get to in a few minutes, but I am not going to do that today in the interests of time. We understand that the bill that has been introduced on the other side does not contain this provision. We hope and urge the subcommittee members not to recede to the Senate, if they are successful in passing their bill, without this particular provision which I am going to talk about in a minute, and we will handle it that way.

I merely want to make a couple of comments and, hopefully, constructive criticism of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, we hear from the same people in the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee that the gentleman's committee hears from, the FAA and from people around the country. The evidence before our committee discloses that the AIP program is sorely deficient in that it does not have or contain a mechanism by which we can have accountable investment criteria used for the many airport grants that are spread across the Nation. It is as if one were taking grass seed and throwing it out on the lawn hoping that something good was going to happen from it, and we know that when one broadcasts grass seed on their front lawn, only about 5 percent of that germinates. My guess is that, when we broadcast airport dollars across the Nation with no real investment criteria, we only get for the economy a rate of return that is very, very low. On the other hand, where we target our grass seed in our lawn, and where we drill it and we plant it, we can get germination rates of 95 percent, and we believe that one of the great deficiencies in our aviation airport grant program is that we are not doing enough to require the FAA to create an investment criteria so that we can guarantee to the taxpayers that we are investing their scarce dollars in a priorities manner which will ensure a positive economic rate of return.

□ 1410

Mr. Chairman, it is quite clear that there is a return to whatever community gets to spend the money. The question is whether their spending the money in that particular location is the best and highest use from an economic rate of return for the entire aviation system. And we submit that it really is not.

I was sorely disappointed that the authorizing subcommittee did not take this opportunity to really investigate investment criteria, trying to get a positive economic rate of return to the economy, and somehow or other fold that into the authorization program. We really would urge them to do that in the future.

I think the second problem that we have is that it is a 3-year authorization. As you know, the administration only asked for a 1-year authorization. Apparently the other body is into a 1-year authorization. We believe that a 1-year authorization is prudent at this time, while we are going through the reinvention of Government, the proposal by the Gore task force to alter the construct of the FAA. We think that would have been a preferable way to deal with this. In fact, this appropriator is more pleased when the authorization committee is doing the job more frequently. We think that is a more productive interplay for both our committees and enhances cooperation.

Lastly, let me get to the point I raised earlier that I wanted to deal with by way of amendment, but will not, in the interest of time today.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BARLOW). The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CARR] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. CARR was allowed to proceed for 4 additional minutes.)

Mr. CARR. Mr. Chairman, the Members of this body should be aware that there is a provision in this bill which is bad public policy, is opposed by the administration, and should not be enacted into law. That is section 102(b)(5), which brings back a so-called penalty clause. Similar legislation was in effect from 1976 through 1990. The purpose of the provision was to force the Appropriations Committees to fully fund the authorized levels recommended for capital investment programs of the FAA. In effect, the provision penalized the general taxpayers of this country by requiring that they unfairly subsidize the aviation system out of general tax revenues, while aviation user fees built up in the Aviation Trust Fund.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, the penalty clause was directly responsible for the accumulation of unobligated funds in the Aviation Trust Fund. Let me quote from a report they issued in December 1988:

> The current accumulated surplus in the aviation trust fund is illusory. While this surplus appears to indicate that private sector users have paid more in taxes than they have received in service, the opposite is, in fact, the case. The uncommitted balance in the trust fund has developed, ironically, because private sector users of the aviation system have received more in capital and operating spending than they have paid in taxes.

According to CBO in March 1989, "the major financial effect of the penalty clause is the buildup of a trust fund surplus * * * $5.3 billion of the current $6.8 billion surplus—about 75 percent—may be attributed to the penalty clause."

The overpayment of aviation expenses by the general fund was affirmed by the Assistant Secretary of Transportation for Governmental Affairs, who wrote the House Appropriations Committee in January 1990 that "aviation users are getting more than they are paying for, but at the expense of the general taxpayer."

The penalty clause was discontinued in 1990, because it was finally realized that the provision was not effective at forcing the Appropriations Committee to fully fund particular programs without regard to program realities, the need to reduce the deficit, or congressionally mandated budget allocations. Since the repeal of the penalty clause, trust fund expenses have greatly exceeded annual revenues, drawing down the trust fund balance. For example, in fiscal year 1993, trust fund revenues are estimated at $4.5 billion, while appropriations from the trust fund are $7.2 billion. Over that single year, the trust fund balance is being reduced from $10.5 billion to $7.9 billion.

However, in this bill, the Public Works Committee is recommending that the penalty clause be put back into place. Their report, page 10, even admits that the uncommitted trust fund balance will rise over the period covered by this authorization, after falling significantly between 1990 and 1994. The amount of the FAA's budget which would come from the trust fund would be reduced to 70 percent, even though the experts in the FAA and the Department of Transportation say that the fair share from the trust fund is 85 percent. The general taxpayer will have to pick up the rest of the bill, while unused funds build up again in the Aviation Trust Fund.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, the penalty clause is not a partisan issue—it has been opposed by Republican and Democratic administrations alike. It is not supported by the experts in the Congressional Budget Office, the FAA, or the Department of Transportation. It is not even effective at achieving its stated purpose.

We would kindly ask the chairman, the ranking member, and all the members of the Subcommittee on Aviation if in conference they would not remove this provision from the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there any amendments to section 1?

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to amplify and support the comments of the gentleman from Michigan, the chairman of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee, on the so-called penalty clause, section 102b6.

Just a few days ago, this body agreed that the Aviation Trust Fund should

pay $2.3 billion of the FAA's operating expenses for fiscal year 1994. According to the FAA, however, the penalty clause in this bill would cause that amount to be reduced by over $350 million and made up from general revenues. That is money that will sit unused in the Aviation Trust Fund while the general taxpayer subsidizes aviation users. I believe the Members of this body are tired of jurisdictional games with the transportation trust funds. Just 3 years ago, the FAA Administrator testified before the Public Works Committee that 85 percent of the agency's budget should be financed from the Aviation Trust Fund. This bill caps that amount at 70 percent, and the effective percentage is considerably less than that: general fund taxpayers will have to subsidize aviation travelers, while the taxes paid by aviation users pile up in the Aviation Trust Fund.

We have been down this road before, Mr. Chairman. The trust fund balance builds up due to the penalty clause, then there are calls to take the trust fund off budget to ensure that funds are spent. I would hope the Members would see through these kinds of gimmicks, and not reinstitute a failed provision that was dropped in 1990.

I want to assure my colleagues that this is not a partisan issue. The penalty clause is opposed by the Clinton administration, just as the previous penalty clause was opposed by the Republican administration. The Department of Transportation has written to the chairman of the Public Works Committee that this provision is one which gives DOT serious concern, and they recommend the provision not be enacted.

I hope the committee will reconsider its position on the penalty clause when members go to conference, because in general this is a good bill and one which lays out a solid foundation for aviation infrastructure in this country. I want to compliment Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. MINETA, and Mr. CLINGER for their leadership on this legislation, and I look forward to working with them on this and other matters in the coming months.

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

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues have heard the Committee on Appropriations' side of this issue. Now I shall attempt to clarify the issue and lay out the facts and the reality.

The reality, first of all, is there is no penalty clause reinstituted. There was a penalty clause in the years prior to 1990. Together with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER], I endeavored with the then chairman of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN], to work out a means by which we could repeal the penalty clause, achieve an increasing level of funding out of the trust fund for airport improvement programs commensurate with the inflow of tax dollars from the ticket tax to the trust fund, in sufficient amount to ensure a dedicated revenue stream to keep on track the improvements in airport capacity enhancement that are necessary to accommodate air traffic growth and reduce delays in the systems. We achieved that understanding.

This chairman, in the committee-reported bill in 1990, worked out language that repealed that penalty clause, I say to my colleague the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PRICE] and to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CARR].

□ 1420

And in walking in lockstep, the Office of Management and Budget, the Department of Transportation, the Federal Aviation Administration, the House Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Transportation, the Senate Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee, and our committee moved ahead with an authorization level that was matched by the appropriation level without the penalty clause and, at the same time, we agreed to increase to 75 percent the amount of money coming out of the Aviation Trust Fund into operations and maintenance, an amount that was agreed upon with OMB, the Department, the Subcommittee on Transportation and the aviation-using and traveling public as an amount that was appropriate, an amount that reflects the Department of Defense usage, the public interest role in air traffic control and the contribution of general revenue dollars that would be appropriate at that level.

For 2 years, this accommodation worked. For fiscal 1993, the appropriation level was reduced. For fiscal 1994, the appropriation level was drastically reduced from the amount authorized.

We intended that level to go up to $2.1 billion, and we were slowed down by the other body that refused to approve a 3-year bill last year. We got into a 1-year bill.

The gentleman from Michigan raised the question of more frequent authorizations. Our objective is a little different. We think it is more useful to set forth a 3-year authorization level so that the aviation community, the Office of Management and Budget, the Department of Transportation, the FAA can all plan on dependable amounts of money for airport improvement projects and that the Committee on Appropriations can look ahead down the line. And we worked with the committee to see not what is needed in the system but what level of funding do they think they can provide. And we put an authorization that reflected their judgment as well as that of the executive branch.

Now, if we reduce the amount of money out of the Aviation Trust Fund for the AIP Program, and we keep the percentage going out of the trust fund into O&M, then there is going to be a very great disparity over time. And the amount of money going into O&M out of trust fund dollars will escalate as the AIP goes down.

We do not think that that is appropriate. We do not think that that is fairness in the context of the agreement that we reached almost 3 years ago. In fact, if we look at the levels of funding, we see that when the amount went down from $1.8 billion, which the administration requested, to $1.5 billion that the Subcommittee on Transportation in the House reported to this body, we see some very significant changes in the way in which the O&M is funded.

If we cut it even further, we would even exceed that 75-percent amount coming out of the O&M. So I think it is appropriate, keeping the two in check.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BARLOW). The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR] has expired.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. There are two ways to accommodate the concerns of the gentleman from North Carolina and the gentleman from Michigan.

One, for the tax to be reduced, to take that 2 percentage points which we did not ask for in the 1990 summit that were added on to the ticket tax, take that 2 percent off. That will slow down the amount of build up into the Aviation Trust Fund.

Or, second, the Committee on Appropriations could appropriate up to the level authorized.

Now, we will be glad to sit with the Committee on Appropriations and work out an accommodation on the dollar amounts that they believe are appropriate for aviation, that they believe under their 602(b) allocation can go into aviation. But when that subcommittee took the 1.8 that the administration requested and took $300 million out of it and shifted it to surface transportation, it really shortchanged aviation.

So I say to my colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations, let us, as the Prophet Isaiah said, "Sit down and reason together."

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. If there are no further amendments to section 1, the Clerk will designate title I.

The text of title I is as follows:

TITLE I—AIRPORT AND AIRWAY IMPROVEMENT ACT AMENDMENTS

SEC. 101. AIRPORT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 505(a) of the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982 (49 U.S.C. App. 2204(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking "and" following "1992,"; and

(2) by inserting after "1993" the following: ", $18,071,700,000 for fiscal years ending before October 1, 1994, $20,232,700,000 for fiscal years ending before October 1, 1995, and $22,446,700,000 for fiscal years ending before October 1, 1996".

(b) OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY.—Section 505(b)(1) of such Act is amended by striking "1993" and inserting "1996".

SEC. 102. AIRWAY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

(a) AIRWAY FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT.—Section 506(a)(1) of the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982 (49 U.S.C. App. 2205(a)(1)) is amended by striking "$11,100,000,000" and all that follows through "1995" and inserting the following: "$10,724,000,000 for fiscal years ending before October 1, 1994, $13,394,000,000 for fiscal years ending before October 1, 1995, and $16,129,000,000 for fiscal years ending before October 1, 1996".

(b) OTHER EXPENSES.—Section 506(c) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking "–1995" in the heading for paragraph (4) and inserting "–1993";

(2) by striking "1993, 1994, and 1995" in paragraph (4) and inserting "and 1993"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(5) FISCAL YEARS 1994–1996.—The amount appropriated from the Trust Fund for the purposes of clauses (A) and (B) of paragraph (1) of this subsection for each of fiscal years 1994, 1995, and 1996 may not exceed the lesser of—

"(A) 50 percent of the amount of funds made available under section 505 and subsections (a) and (b) of this section for such fiscal year; or

"(B)(i) 70 percent of the amount of funds made available under section 505, subsections (a) and (b) of this section, and section 106(k) of title 49, United States Code, for such fiscal year; less

"(ii) the amount of funds made available under section 505 and subsections (a) and (b) of this section for such fiscal year.".

(c) PRESERVATION OF FUNDS.—Section 506(e)(5) of such Act is amended by striking "1995" and inserting "1996".

SEC. 103. OPERATIONS OF FAA.

Section 106(k) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ", $5,100,000,000" and all that follows through "1995" and inserting ", $4,576,000,000 for fiscal year 1994, $4,674,000,000 for fiscal year 1995, and $4,810,000,000 for fiscal year 1996".

SEC. 104. APPORTIONMENT OF FUNDS.

(a) MINIMUM AMOUNT FOR PRIMARY AIRPORTS.—Section 507(b)(1) of the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982 (49 U.S.C. App. 2206(b)(1)) is amended by striking "$400,000" and inserting "$500,000".

(b) CONSIDERATION OF DIVERSION OF REVENUES IN AWARDING DISCRETIONARY GRANTS.—Section 507 of such Act is further amended by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (g) and by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsection:

"(f) CONSIDERATION OF DIVERSION OF REVENUES IN AWARDING DISCRETIONARY GRANTS.—In deciding whether or not to distribute funds to an airport from the discretionary funds established by subsections (c) and (d), the Secretary shall consider as a factor militating against the distribution of such funds to the airport the fact that the airport is using revenues generated by the airport or by local taxes on aviation fuel for purposes other than capital or operating costs of the airport or the local airports system.".

SEC. 105. USE OF APPORTIONED AND DISCRETIONARY FUNDS.

(a) INTEGRATED AIRPORT SYSTEM PLANNING SET-ASIDE.—Section 508(d)(4) of the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982 (49 U.S.C. App. 2207(d)(4)) is amended by striking "½" and inserting "¾".

(b) MILITARY AIRPORT SET-ASIDE.—Section 508(d)(5) of such Act is amended by striking "and 1995" and inserting ", 1995, and 1996".

(c) DESIGNATION OF MILITARY AIRPORTS.—Section 508(f)(1) of such Act is amended by striking "12" and inserting "16".

(d) CONSTRUCTION OF PARKING LOTS, FUEL FARMS, AND UTILITIES.—Section 508(f)(6) of such Act is amended by striking "and 1995" and inserting "1995, and 1996".

SEC. 106. PROJECT SPONSORSHIP.

Section 511(a) of the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982 (49 U.S.C. App. 2210(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking "and" at the end of paragraph (16);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (17) and inserting "; and"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(18) the airport owner or operator will submit to the Administrator and make available to the public an annual report listing in detail (A) all amounts paid by the airport to any other unit of government and the purposes for which each such payment was made, and (B) all services and property provided to other units of government and the amount of compensation received for provision of each such service and property.".

SEC. 107. INCLUSION OF TERMINAL DEVELOPMENT AS A PROJECT COST.

Section 513(b)(2) of the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982 (49 U.S.C. App. 2212(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in the second sentence by inserting after "may be used" the following: ", subject to the approval of the Secretary,"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following: "All or any portion of the sums to be distributed at the discretion of the Secretary under sections 507(c) and 507(d) for any fiscal year may be distributed for use by primary airports each of which annually has .05 or less of the total enplanements in the United States for project costs allowable under paragraph (1) of this subsection.".

SEC. 108. INCLUSION OF EXPLOSIVE DETECTION DEVICES AND UNIVERSAL ACCESS SYSTEMS.

Section 503(a)(2)(B)(ii) of the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982 (49 U.S.C. App. 2202(a)(2)(B)(ii)) is amended by inserting after "or security equipment" the following: ", including explosive detection devices and universal access systems,".

SEC. 109. DECLARATION OF POLICY.

Section 502(a) of the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982 (49 U.S.C. App. 2201(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking "and" at the end of paragraph (13);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (14) and inserting "; and"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(15) the airport improvement program should be administered to encourage the development and use of innovative concrete and other materials in the construction of airport facilities to minimize initial laydown costs, minimize time out of service, and maximize lifecycle durability.".

SEC. 110. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 503(a)(2)(B) of the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982 (49 U.S.C. App. 2202(a)(2)(B)) is amended by moving clauses (vii) and (viii) 2 ems to the right.

(b) AIRPORT PLANS.—Section 504(a)(1) of such Act (49 U.S.C. App. 2203(a)(1)) is amended by redesignating clauses (1), (2), and (3) as clauses (A), (B), and (C), respectively.

(c) AIP OTHER EXPENSES.—Section 506(c)(3)(B)(i) of such Act (49 U.S.C. App. 2205(c)(3)(B)(i)) is amended by striking "and," and inserting ", and".

SEC. 111. LETTERS OF INTENT.

Section 513(d)(1) of the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982 (49 U.S.C. App. 2212(d)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(H) LIMITATION ON STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the obligation of amounts pursuant to a letter of intent under this paragraph in the same fiscal year as the letter of intent is issued.".

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there any amendments to title I?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCANDLESS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCANDLESS: Page 8, after line 22, insert the following:

SEC. 112. PALM SPRINGS, CALIFORNIA.

(a) AUTHORITY TO GRANT RELEASE.—Notwithstanding section 4 of the Act of October 1, 1949 (50 U.S.C. App. 1622c), and subject to the provisions of subsection (b), the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall grant releases from all of the terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions contained in the deed of conveyance dated September 15, 1949, under which the United States conveyed certain property to Palm Springs, California, for airport purposes. The releases shall apply only to approximately 11 acres of lot 16 of section 13, and approximately 39.07 acres of lots 19 and 20 of section 19, used by the city of Palm Springs, California, for general governmental purposes.

(b) CONDITIONS.—Any release granted by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration under subsection (a) shall be subject to the following conditions:

(1) The Administrator shall waive any requirement that there be credited to the account of the airport any amount attributable to the city's use for governmental purposes of any land conveyed under the deed of conveyance referred to in subsection (a) before the date of the enactment of this section.

(2) The city shall abandon all claims, against income of the Palm Springs Regional Airport or other assets of that airport, for reimbursement of general revenue funds that the city may have expended before the date of the enactment of this section for acquisition of 523.39 acres of land conveyed August 28, 1961, for airport purposes and for expenses incurred at any time in connection with such acquisition, and such claims shall not be eligible for reimbursement under the Airport and Airway Improvement Act or any successor Act.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. McCANDLESS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, is this the amendment that deals with the transfer of land at the Palm Springs Airport?

Mr. McCANDLESS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, we have reviewed this amendment and we are prepared to accept it.

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

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

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Chairman, we have also had a chance to review the amendment on this side and are prepared to accept it.

Mr. McCANDLESS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlemen for their acceptance of the amendment.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there any further amendments to title I?

If not, the Clerk will designate title II.

The text of title II is as follows:

TITLE II—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. PROTECTION OF SMALL COMMUNITY AIRLINE PASSENGERS.

(a) ACCESS TO HIGH DENSITY AIRPORTS.—Section 419(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. App. 1389(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(10) ACCESS TO HIGH DENSITY AIRPORTS.—

"(A) NONCONSIDERATION OF SLOT AVAILABILITY.—In determining what is basic essential air service and in selecting an air carrier to provide such service, the Secretary shall not give consideration to whether slots at a high density airport are available for providing such service.

"(B) MAKING SLOTS AVAILABLE.—If basic essential air service is to be provided to and from a high density airport, the Secretary shall ensure that a sufficient number of slots at such airport are available to the air carrier providing or selected to provide such service. If necessary to carry out the objectives of this subsection, the Secretary shall take such action as may be necessary to have such slots transferred or otherwise made available to the air carrier; except that the Secretary shall not be required to make slots available at O'Hare International Airport in Chicago, Illinois, if the number of slots available for basic essential air service to and from such airport is at least 132 slots.".

(b) TRANSFERS OF SLOTS AT HIGH DENSITY AIRPORTS.—Section 419(b)(7) of such Act (49 U.S.C. App. 1389(b)(7)) is amended—

(1) by striking "TRANSFER OF OPERATIONAL AUTHORITY AT CERTAIN" and inserting "TRANSFERS OF SLOTS AT";

(2) by striking "an airport at which the Administrator limits the number of instrument flight rule takeoffs and landings of aircraft" and inserting "a high density airport";

(3) by striking "operational authority" and inserting "slots";

(4) by striking "has to conduct a landing or takeoff" and inserting "have";

(5) by striking "such authority" the first place it appears and inserting "such slots";

(6) by striking "such authority is" and inserting "such slots are"; and

(7) by inserting "basic essential" after "used to provide".

(c) DEFINITIONS.—Section 419(k) of such Act (49 U.S.C. App. 1389(k)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

"(6) HIGH DENSITY AIRPORT.—The term 'high density airport' means an airport at which the Administrator limits the number of instrument flight rule takeoffs and landings of aircraft.

"(7) SECRETARY.—The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Transportation.

"(8) SLOT.—The term 'slot' means a reservation for an instrument flight rule takeoff or landing by an air carrier of an aircraft in air transportation.".

SEC. 202. ACCESS OF FOREIGN AIR CARRIERS TO HIGH DENSITY AIRPORTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title IV of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1371–1389) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 420. ACCESS OF FOREIGN AIR CARRIERS TO HIGH DENSITY AIRPORTS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall not take a slot at a high density airport from an air carrier and award such slot to a foreign air carrier if the Secretary determines that air carriers are not provided equivalent rights of access to airports in the country of which such foreign air carrier is a citizen.

"(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms 'high density airport', 'Secretary', and 'slot' have the meaning such terms have under section 419.".

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The portion of the table of contents contained in the first section of such Act relating to title IV is amended by adding at the end the following:

"Sec. 420. Access of foreign air carriers to high density airports.

"(a) In general.

"(b) Definitions.".

SEC. 203. RULEMAKING ON RANDOM TESTING FOR PROHIBITED DRUGS.

Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall complete a rulemaking proceeding and issue a final decision on whether there should be a reduction in the annualized rate of random testing for prohibited drugs now required by the Secretary for personnel engaged in aviation activities. If the Secretary does not issue the final decision on or before the last day of such 1-year period, then, effective on the succeeding day, the annualized rate of random testing shall be 25 percent of such personnel.

SEC. 204. PASSENGER FACILITY CHARGES.

(a) CLARIFICATION OF APPLICABILITY.—

(1) GENERAL RULE.—Section 1113(e)(1) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. App. 1513(e)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: "After the date of the enactment of this sentence, no public agency authority shall collect a fee authorized to be imposed under this subsection from a passenger enplaning at an airport if the passenger did not pay for the air transportation which resulted in such enplanement, including any case in which the passenger obtained the ticket for the air transportation with a frequent flier award coupon without monetary payment.".

(2) LIMITATION ON STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall not be construed as requiring any person to refund any fee paid before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) USE OF REVENUES AND RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FEES AND REVENUES.—Section 1113(e)(2) of such Act is amended—

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

(2) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (B)(iii) and inserting "; and"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(C) that the application includes adequate justification for each of the specific projects.".

SEC. 205. TERM OF OFFICE OF FAA ADMINISTRATOR.

Section 106(b) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following: "The term of office for any individual appointed as Administrator after the date of the enactment of this sentence shall be 5 years.".

SEC. 206. NOISE ABATEMENT PROGRAM.

(a) SOUNDPROOFING OF CERTAIN RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS.—Section 104(c)(2) of the Aviation Safety and Noise Abatement Act of 1979 (49 U.S.C. App. 2104(c)(2)) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(A)" before "to operators of airports"; and

(2) by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and (B) for projects to soundproof residential buildings—

"(i) if the operator of the airport involved received approval for a grant for a project to soundproof residential buildings pursuant to section 301(d)(4)(B) of the Airport and Airway Safety and Capacity Expansion Act of 1987;

"(ii) if the operator of the airport involved submits updated noise exposure contours, as required by the Secretary; and

"(iii) if the Secretary determines that the proposed projects are compatible with the purposes of this Act.".

(b) SOUNDPROOFING AND ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES.—Section 104(c) of such Act is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"(4) SOUNDPROOFING AND ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES.—The Secretary is authorized under this section to make grants to operators of airports and to units of local government referred to in paragraph (1) for projects to soundproof residential buildings located on residential properties, and for projects to acquire residential properties, at which noise levels are not compatible with normal operations of an airport—

"(A) if the operator of the airport involved amended an existing local aircraft noise regulation during calendar year 1993 to increase the maximum permitted noise levels for scheduled air carrier aircraft as a direct result of implementation of revised aircraft noise departure procedures mandated for aircraft safety purposes by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration for standardized application at airports served by scheduled air carriers;

"(B) if the operator of the airport involved submits updated noise exposure contours, as required by the Secretary; and

"(C) if the Secretary determines that the proposed projects are compatible with the purposes of this Act.".

SEC. 207. LABOR MANAGEMENT RELATIONS.

The Metropolitan Washington Airports Act of 1986 (49 U.S.C. App. 2451–2461) is amended—

(1) in section 6007(c)(5) by striking "to the extent that the Federal Aviation Administration is so authorized on the date of enactment of this title";

(2) by redesignating sections 6010, 6011, and 6012 as sections 6011, 6012, and 6013, respectively; and

(3) by inserting after section 6009 the following new section:

"SEC. 6010. LABOR MANAGEMENT RELATIONS.

"(a) APPLICATION OF FEDERAL LABOR LAWS.—Except as otherwise provided by this section, the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act and the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947 shall apply to labor-management relations between the Airports Authority and labor organizations representing bargaining units at the Metropolitan Washington Airports.

"(b) SUITS.—

"(1) JURISDICTION OF U.S. COURTS.—The courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction with respect to actions brought by the National Labor Relations Board under this section to the same extent that such courts have jurisdiction with respect to actions brought under the National Labor Relations Act.

"(2) LABOR CONTRACT VIOLATIONS.—Suits for violation of contracts between the Airports Authority and a labor organization representing bargaining units at the Metropolitan Washington Airports, or between any such labor organizations, may be brought in any district court of the United States having jurisdiction of the parties, without respect to the amount of controversy.

"(3) AGENTS OF LABOR ORGANIZATIONS.—A labor organization described in paragraph (2) and the Airports Authority shall be bound by the authorized acts of their agents. Any such labor organization may sue or be sued as an entity and in behalf of those whom it represents in the courts of the United States. Any money judgment against such a labor organization in a district court of the United States shall be enforceable only against the organization as an entity and against its assets and shall not be enforceable against any individual member or the member's assets.

"(c) COLLECTIVE-BARGAINING AGREEMENTS.—

"(1) PERIOD OF EFFECTIVENESS.—Collective-bargaining agreements between the Airports Authority and labor organizations shall be effective for not less than 2 years.

"(2) RESOLUTION OF GRIEVANCES.—Collective-bargaining agreements negotiated by the Airports Authority shall provide for procedures for resolution by the parties of grievances and other disputes arising during the term of the agreement, culminating in binding third-party arbitration, unless the parties agree otherwise.

"(3) RESOLUTION OF DISPUTES IN NEGOTIATIONS.—The Airports Authority and a labor organization may by mutual agreement adopt procedures for the resolution of disputes or impasses arising in the negotiation of a collective-bargaining agreement.

"(d) LABOR DISPUTES.—

"(1) WRITTEN NOTICE REQUIREMENT.—If there is a collective-bargaining agreement between the Airports Authority and labor organizations in effect, no party to such agreement shall terminate or modify such agreement unless the party desiring such termination or modification serves written notice upon the other party to the agreement of the proposed termination or modification not less than 90 days prior to the time it is proposed to make such termination or modification. The party serving such notice shall notify the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service of the existence of a dispute within 45 days of such notice if no agreement has been reached by that time.

"(2) MEDIATION OF DISPUTES.—If the parties fail to reach agreement or to adopt a procedure providing for a binding resolution of a dispute by the expiration date of the agreement in effect, or the date of the proposed termination or modification, the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service shall direct mediation of the dispute. For this purpose, the Director shall submit to the parties a list of not fewer than 10 names. If the parties fail to select a mediator, the selection shall be made by the Director.

"(3) ARBITRATION BOARD.—

"(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—If no agreement is reached within 90 days after the expiration or termination of the agreement or the date on which the agreement became subject to modification under paragraph (1) of this subsection, or if the parties decide upon arbitration but do not agree upon the procedures therefor, an arbitration board shall be established consisting of 3 members, 1 of whom shall be selected by the Airports Authority, 1 by the bargaining representative, and the third by the 2 thus selected who shall be designated chairman. If either of the parties fails to select a member, or if the members chosen by the parties fail to agree on the third person within 5 days after their first meeting, the selection shall be made utilizing the rules of the American Arbitration Association.

"(B) HEARINGS AND DECISIONS.—The arbitration board shall give the parties a full and fair hearing, including an opportunity to present evidence in support of their claims, and an opportunity to present their case in person, by counsel or by other representative as they may elect. All procedural disputes shall be decided by the board. The board shall have the authority to administer oaths and compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of documents. Decisions of the board shall be conclusive and binding upon the parties. The board shall render its decision within 45 days after its appointment, unless a later date is mutually agreed upon by both parties.

"(C) COSTS.—Costs of the arbitration board shall be shared equally by the Airports Authority and the bargaining representative.

"(D) PROCEDURES.—In the case of a bargaining unit whose collective-bargaining representative does not have an agreement with the Airport Authority, if the parties fail to reach agreement within 90 days of the commencement of collective bargaining, mediation will take place in accordance with the terms of paragraph (2) of this subsection, unless the parties have previously agreed to another procedure for a binding resolution of their differences. If the parties fail to reach agreement within 180 days of the commencement of collective bargaining and if they have not agreed to another procedure for binding resolution, an arbitration board shall be established to provide conclusive and binding arbitration in accordance with the terms of paragraph (3) of this subsection.

"(E) CONSIDERATIONS IN MAKING AWARDS.—Except insofar as compensation and benefits may be specified elsewhere in this title, the arbitration board, in arriving at its award, shall take into account compensation, benefits, and conditions of employment of comparable employees in Alexandria, Arlington, and Fairfax Counties, Virginia; the District of Columbia; and Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties, Maryland, and other criteria traditionally considered in collective bargaining.

"(e) NO STRIKES OR LOCKOUTS; MAINTENANCE OF STATUS QUO.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the parties to a collective bargaining agreement between the Airports Authority and a labor organization shall not resort to strike or lockout. The parties shall refrain from making changes in working conditions pending the resolution of labor disputes as provided in subsection (d) of this section.".

SEC. 208. TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.

Section 9130 of the Aviation Safety and Capacity Expansion Act of 1990 (49 U.S.C. App. 2226b) is amended by striking "subsection" and inserting "section".

SEC. 209. REPORT ON CERTAIN BILATERAL NEGOTIATIONS.

The Secretary of Transportation shall report every other month to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate on the status of all active aviation bilateral negotiations and informal government-to-government consultations with United States aviation trade partners.

SEC. 210. HIGH DENSITY RULE AND REALLOCATION OF SLOTS.

(a) HIGH DENSITY RULE.—

(1) STUDY.—The Secretary of Transportation shall conduct a study and provide recommendations to Congress on whether improvements in the technology and procedures of the air traffic control system and the use of quieter aircraft make it possible to eliminate the limitations on hourly operations imposed by the high density rule contained in part 93 of title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations or to increase the number of operations permitted under such rule. The study shall include consideration of the effects of the elimination of limitations or an increase in the number of operations allowed on each of the following:

(A) Safety.

(B) Congestion and delay in any part of the national aviation system.

(C) The impact of noise on persons living near the airport.

(D) Competition in the air transportation system.

(E) The profitability of operations of airlines serving the airport.

(2) COORDINATION.—In conducting the study under this subsection, the Secretary of Transportation shall consult with officials of airports subject to the high density rule, the cities in which such airports are located, representatives of citizens living in the vicinity of such airports, air carriers now serving such airports or interested in inaugurating such service, and other interested persons.

(3) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall transmit the findings of the study conducted under this subsection, together with recommendations, to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

(b) SLOTS FOR FOREIGN AIR TRANSPORTATION.—

(1) STUDY.—The Secretary of Transportation shall conduct a study to determine the impact of a change in law or regulations that would prohibit the withdrawal of a slot from an air carrier providing interstate air transportation at a high density airport in any case in which such slot is withdrawn in order to allocate it to an air carrier or foreign air carrier to provide foreign air transportation.

(2) CONTENTS.—In conducting the study under this subsection, the Secretary shall examine the following:

(A) The impact of a prohibition described in paragraph (1) on the aviation relationship between the United States Government and foreign governments.

(B) Whether such a prohibition would result in the withdrawal of slots from general aviation and military aviation in order to allocate them to air carriers and foreign air carriers providing foreign air transportation and the impact of such a withdrawal of slots on general aviation and military aviation.

(C) The impact on air carriers providing interstate air transportation of the current practice of withdrawing slots in order to allocate them to air carriers or foreign air carriers providing foreign air transportation.

(D) The impact of the planned relocation of Air Force Reserve units and the Air National Guard at O'Hare International Airport on the future availability of slots at that airport.

(3) REPORT.—Not later than June 1, 1994, the Secretary of Transportation shall transmit to Congress a report on the results of the study conducted under this subsection, together with such recommendations for legislative or administrative action as the Secretary determines appropriate.

SEC. 211. REPEAL.

Section 31 of the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970 (49 U.S.C. App. 1731) is hereby repealed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GLICKMAN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GLICKMAN:

SEC. 212. LOVE FIELD, TEXAS.

Section 29 of the International Air Transportation Competition Act of 1979 is repealed.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, at the outset, I want to say it is my intention to ask unanimous consent to withdraw this amendment.

This amendment is controversial, and it is one that I have been working for many years on with the chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER] and others.

But I wish to at least bring it to the attention of the body today. The section I am attempting to strike is commonly known as the Wright amendment, named after our former Speaker. That amendment prohibits commercial air carriers from providing service between Dallas Love Field and points located outside of Texas or its four surrounding States. That is, out of Dallas Love Field we can only fly airplanes within the State of Texas or within the States of New Mexico, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Louisiana.

It is the only airport in the country which restricts flights based upon point of destination, what State one is in.

I have come down to the floor and railed about this amendment, because the city I represent, Wichita, is only about 45 miles from the Oklahoma border. Unfortunately, our airport, our city is not eligible to be served from Dallas Love Field, because we are not in the next contiguous State.

Over the last several years, we have had a very nice, low-cost carrier operating out of Dallas Love Field, which has served points within the four contiguous States at a much lower price, much lower fare than they offer people outside of the four-State area.

This statue was originally passed as part of a law, the International Air Competition Act of 1980, to protect then relatively new Dallas-Fort Worth Airport, DFW.

□ 1430

It was developed to ensure commercial air carriers moved from the older Love Field to the new primary airport at DFW. However, now DFW is the second busiest airport in the United States. Its gates are full. Its runways are jammed, as anybody knows who flies there. It no longer needs protection from Love Field's competition.

It is time to allow the power of the marketplace, rather than the intrusion of unnecessary Federal law, to dictate who our airports serve.

In any event, I am going to put most of my statement in the RECORD. I would have to acknowledge, however, that fares from Dallas-Fort Worth to Wichita have been much lower in recent months. American Airlines has made a significant attempt, it has led the way, to bring down the excessively high fares Wichita and other cities shut out by the Wright amendment have experienced over the last several years, and Delta Airlines has in many cases followed suit. Both carriers have been working with me and others on ways to try to improve the fare differential.

In my judgment the Wright amendment is still unreasonable and wholly unfair. By allowing travel to Love Field only from points in Texas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and New Mexico, it arbitrarily permits service from cities such as Albuquerque to Love Field, which is nearly 600 miles, but does not allow service from Wichita, which is 330 miles, to Love Field. The amendment does not even permit connecting service.

In any event, I have pursued this matter for some time. I do know that the air carriers today are in very serious trouble, and at least for the time being, I am intent on working with the carriers and the airport authorities to see if we can get this matter resolved without the need for legislation. I am convinced that as long as this threat of legislation is there, the carriers will be responsible and deal with me on this issue.

However, I am going to tell them that I am going to continue to monitor the issue, and as I saw once in a movie, and I cannot remember which one, I think it was the movie "Oliver," where Fagan said, "I am reviewing the situation." Well, I will be constantly reviewing the situation to make sure that we continue to work responsibly with the carriers, who I know are having some serious financial problems, particularly in this era.

I want to thank the chairman of the Subcommittee on Aviation for his help generally on these and many other issues, and look forward to his working with me side-by-side to continue monitoring the fares and route problems arising out of the Wright amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. (Mr. BARLOW). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BARLOW). The amendment is withdrawn.

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

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN] withdrawing the amendment. He has been a vigorous advocate for his community and for increased competition, and as an advocate for competition, I share that outlook and I respect his doggedness and determination and perseverance on this subject.

The gentleman is correct, Love Field is the only airport in the country governed by a Federal law that regulates services to and from that airport. However, the context was that this was part of an agreement between the two cities of Dallas and Fort Worth, and made possible the construction of the new airport. We have held extensive hearings on the subject at the gentleman's request, and specifically on his bill.

Mr. Chairman, I have two concerns, but the first concern is of opening Love Field to greater traffic creates very serious safety problems. There does not appear to be a way to resolve those safety problems by pursuing the matter in the context that the gentleman from Kansas chooses to pursue it; that is, by expanding services at Love Field to the entire United States. There would be very, very limited separation, and an unsafe distance of roughly 2 miles from aircraft that would be making the approach to Love Field and aircraft making an approach to DFW.

I have reviewed those traffic patterns very, very carefully and held extensive discussions. In fact, I went to the tower and the TRACON at DFW to talk with air traffic controllers about this and other safety matters, and remain very deeply concerned about that. I do not think there is the technology today to make such approaches safe, without setting off conflict alerts and causing serious problems for air traffic controllers and pilots, even with TCAS as it now exists.

Second, I have a concern about the genuineness of Southwest Airlines in their desire to compete. I interceded with DFW Airport to make, and received a commitment from them, to make an equal number of gates available to Southwest at DFW, equal to the number they now operate out of Love Airfield, and to do so at the time this occurred, which was a little over 2 years ago, within 3 weeks. They made a commitment to do so, made the offer to Southwest Airlines, but its chairman refused the offer. They do not want to compete at DFW.

Therein is the dilemma. We are not going to get enhanced competition unless Mr. Kelleher is willing to move his airline operations out of Love Field to DFW, where he would have a bigger airport, more space, more gates, growth opportunities, but then he has to compete with American.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN] proceeds on this issue from one perspective, therefore, and we proceed on it from another perspective. As we continue to work on this issue, I think we hopefully will be able to come to an accommodation that will reduce the cost of travel for the gentleman's constituents.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's point. The problem we have with this agreement is that Southwest would have to move the base of operations from Love Field to DFW, an airport they currently do not serve, and it would have been a major capital expenditure for them to do it.

I understand that the gentleman made that offer in good faith and they

chose not to do it. I would still say that it gnaws on me and my constituents that we have to drive 47 miles south to the Oklahoma border, and at that point we are eligible to be served by a low-cost carrier because they can fly into the State just south of us, but they cannot fly into our State.

Something is wrong in our system of free enterprise, which the gentleman and I both extol all the time, that that kind of arbitrary, paternalistic rule is still in effect. One of these days I hope the people will feel that DFW is sufficiently enough built up that it can take the competition from another airport, and we have the technology to not raise any safety issues.

I am not sure those safety issues are necessarily true, because as the head of the Department of Transportation indicated, we could in fact do this without abridging safety. However, I understand the gentleman's concerns, and I look forward to working with him.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to title I.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no objection, the committee will now consider any amendments to title I.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURTON of Indiana: Page 8, after line 22, insert the following:

SEC. 112. EXPLOSIVE DETECTION K-9 TEAMS.

Section 529 of the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982 (49 U.S.C. App. 2225) is amended to read as follows:

SEC. 529. EXPLOSIVE DETECTION K-9 TEAMS.

"(a) GRANTS.—The Secretary shall make grants for expenses of training and evaluation of dogs for the explosive detection K-9 team training program for the purpose of detecting explosives at airports and aboard aircraft. Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Aviation Infrastructure Investment Act, the Secretary shall extend such program to the largest 50 airports in the United States, as determined by the number of passenger enplanements in calendar year 1992.

"(b) FUNDING.—There is authorized to be appropriated from the Trust Fund for carrying out subsection (a) such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1993. Such funds shall remain available until expended."

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I will offer two amendments. One is to title I and one is to title II. It goes back to 1989. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR] and the ranking Republican and I talked about this. We have been talking about this for the past 3 to 4 years, now.

The necessity for taking this kind of action, I think, is much more apparent today than it was about 3 or 4 years ago. We had the World Trade Center bombing. We saw some terrorist activity that destroyed a very, very important structure, at least almost destroyed it, and caused a lot of personal injury and property damage.

One of the concerns that I have had since 1989 was the possibility of terrorists with plastic explosives getting onto commercial aircraft in this country, with small detonating devices that are not picked up by a metal detector, something about the size of the gentleman's watch, and putting that detonating device into the plastic on the plane and the timer goes off and it kills a bunch of innocent people flying across this country.

One of the ways to guard against this was to build and put in all the airports around the country things called thermal neutron analysis devices, which cost a great deal of money. I think that is what they were called, TNA's.

The other alternative, instead of spending all that money, was to put sniffer dogs at the airports. These sniffer dogs are being used right now to detect narcotics, they are being used by police agencies around the country to detect plastic explosives and other explosive devices, and they have been very effective.

The problem with them is that they are good for about 45 minutes, and then they have to have another team come on. What we suggested in 1989 was two teams of German Shepherds or other dogs or animals that can do this job for the 25 major airports around the country, and the cost of that for the training and getting them implemented with the people that would be taking them around to the airports was about $2 million. This $2 million takes into account the initial cost of training the dogs, which costs about $10,000 for the teams, including the dogs and their handlers.

□ 1440

Mr. Chairman, a lot of people might say, "My gosh, do we really need to do this?"

There have been meetings around the world of terrorist groups in places like Khartoum involving a number of countries, and their total objective is to try to cause problems for their enemies, including the United States of America.

These are fringe groups. These are not large ethnic or religious groups but fringe groups that are doing this. I want to emphasize that very thoroughly, because there are a lot of people who may have the same religious beliefs as some of these groups that are not involved in this kind of activity but are tarred with the same brush. But there are fringe lunatic groups that are planning to do this.

So since we know that they have done this to the World Trade Center and since we know there have been terrorist activities that have destroyed planes and other aircraft around the world, it seems to me the prudent thing for this Congress to do since it costs so little is to try to protect people flying across this country on commercial aircraft from our major airports or the major international airports.

So I would just like to say to the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking Republican that I hope they will take a serious look at this because I think we would be penny-wise and pound-foolish to not do something of this nature, and I would ask the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR] if he would engage in a colloquy with me for just a moment.

I understand the gentleman has some objection to these amendments right now because he has not had time to really take a close look at them, but I also understand that he has said he would take a serious look at these to see if he thinks it is necessary when he goes to conference.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I compliment the gentleman on his perseverance—I will not say doggedness, but his perseverance—in persisting on this issue. The gentleman has raised it as far back as 1989 when our subcommittee held hearings on security issues and brought legislation to the House floor. We had a dialogue about this matter, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER] and I made a commitment to inquire of the FAA, and we did have the FAA come up and visit with us. We have never had testimony at a hearing on sniffer dogs, but the extensive discussions we have had brought evidence, as the gentleman has already said, that the endurance of the dogs is not sufficient to sustain through hours and hours of sniffing baggage flowing through an airport.

Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield and allow me to continue, I will see that the gentleman gets sufficient time if his time runs out.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] has now expired.

(On request of Mr. OBERSTAR, and by unanimous consent, Mr. BURTON of Indiana was allowed to proceed for 4 additional minutes.)

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, security experts today that we have

talked with about this matter say there is, of course some deterrence quality from the appearance of dogs at airports or in key areas, but technology has really advanced significantly, and while TNA is still not quite experimental, it is not a fully operational device yet, but it is the best technology for detecting the plastic explosives.

There are sniffer electronic systems that can detect explosives. We have not visited this issue in hearings, and we would have welcomed the gentleman's appearance and we would have had the FAA at the same hearings. I would like to suggest that we again bring the FAA to our committee office with the gentleman in attendance and explore this issue more fully.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to do that, and I appreciate the gentleman's willingness to do it.

Let me just say that the technology to which the gentleman refers has been questioned by a number of people, as the gentleman knows. There are a number of people, including scientists and others, who feel that this is not as effective as it should be and the technology has to evolve further.

Mr. OBERSTAR. And that is why it is not fully operational at this time.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. That is right. And in the interim it seems to me, since there has been a manifestation, a very real manifestation, of terrorism within the United States, at the World Trade Center and other areas, that we need to be very prudent and do something as a stopgap measure until we get this technology to protect the major airports and the people going across this country on commercial aircraft. So I do appreciate my colleague's saying that he would do this.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the ranking member of the subcommittee.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to join in this and indicate that I think the gentleman has brought a matter of real concern to us. I think the gentleman has also correctly pointed out that recent events certainly give some urgency to the need to be ensuring that we have proper security measures at our airports.

I would share with the chairman of the subcommittee his concern that TNA clearly is not the final answer. It is an evolving technology. There are other technologies evolving as well. I would join with the gentleman and say that we ought to sit down and say, "OK, can we work it out and have an interim kind of a thing here that would address the concern that you and I both have?"

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Yes, I agree. And in closing, let me just say: I really appreciate both the chairman and the ranking Republican agreeing to meetings on trying to work this thing out. We may have to spend $4 or $5 million, but as I said before, the amount of money we are talking about in the overall scheme of things is very small compared to the protection we can provide to the American traveling public.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much, and I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to engage the manager of the bill in a colloquy on an airport situation in my district that is of great concern to me and my constituents.

The Berz-Macomb Airport is a privately owned airport in Macomb County, MI.

The operation of this airport affects rapidly developing residential neighborhoods in both Macomb and Shelby Townships—two of the fastest growing residential areas in Michigan.

There are already significant environmental problems associated with the present level of airport operations, which are a continuing threat to the quality of life in these communities.

I do not believe that Berz-Macomb should be considered as a candidate for expansion or for any further development.

As the FAA makes determinations about where to spend its very limited resources for airport development, it would be unwise to allocate dollars for any expansion of Berz-Macomb.

The high population density and type of community development here indicate that this area is not compatible with further airport expansion.

The people in this community and community leaders including myself are determined to oppose any further development at Berz-Macomb.

Expansion of Berz-Macomb would be a detriment to our community and would be strongly opposed by the local citizens.

The allocation of any Federal funds for this purpose would be a serious mistake and an unwise use of tax dollars.

I would appreciate the bill manager's comments on the situation at Berz-Macomb.

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

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

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

I concur in the gentleman's assessments. The gentleman has provided the subcommittee with extensive documentation on the Berz-Macomb Airport problem. This is one of the classic situations in the country where typically local government by inaction or by inattentiveness has allowed population to encroach upon an airport, and then the airport finds it wants to expand but its expansion means unacceptable noise levels to airport neighbors.

If I recall rightly, this airport is less than 40 miles from the Detroit-Wayne County Airport, the major airport of Detroit.

Mr. BONIOR. That is right.

Mr. OBERSTAR. It does not seem reasonable for this facility to seek expansion when there is already a sizable airport, one of the Nation's most competitive airports, nearby. The AIP dollars, as we saw in the exchange just a little bit ago with the chairman of the Transportation Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, are too scarce to squander on expansion of facilities where such expansion does not make sense locally and does not contribute to the national portfolio of airport capacity enhancement.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's comments, and I thank him for his concern with this issue.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments to title I?

If not, are there further amendments to title II?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LIGHTFOOT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LIGHTFOOT: At the end of title II of the bill add the following:

SEC. 212. CHILD RESTRAINT SYSTEMS ON COMMERCIAL AIRCRAFT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 601 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. App. 1421) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(g) CHILD RESTRAINT SYSTEMS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall issue regulations requiring the use of child safety restraint systems approved by the Secretary on any aircraft operated by an air carrier in providing interstate air transportation, intrastate transportation, or overseas air transportation. Such regulations shall establish age or weight limits for children who are to use such systems.".

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents contained in the first section of such Act is amended by inserting at the end of the matter relating to section 601 the following new item:

"(g) Child restraint systems.".

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

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

There was no objection.

□ 1450

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to join with my colleague from Washington State, JOLENE

UNSOELD, in offering an amendment which will protect, in fact, the smallest, most vulnerable, of our Nation's airline passengers. The Lightfoot-Unsoeld amendment will require the use of child safety restraint systems on commercial aircraft. It's very simple, only one page.

Under current FAA regulations adults are required to be restrained during takeoff, landing, and turbulent conditions. Under current FAA regulations your baggage must be secured at your feet of in an overhead compartment. Under current FAA regulations your pet, traveling by air, must be safety secured in a cage yes, even cadavers must be safely secured in place.

Yet under current FAA regulations, infants under the age of 2 may sit in the lap of the parent and must take his or her chances that it will be a smooth flight. Sadly, despite aviation's enviable safety record, our tiniest passengers have been put at needless risk.

I first became involved in this issue back in 1989 after the Sioux City crash. In that crash, of four children on the aircraft, one child died and two were injured.

One child was found 15 rows from where they had actually been seated, in an overhead baggage compartment, only because someone heard it cry.

Their lives may have been saved or injuries minimized by the use of a child safety seat.

Children are at risk in more than just plane crashes. Early this year, a flight from Miami to San Francisco encountered turbulence so severe that 26 people were injured. Nine people were hospitalized including one person who suffered a broken leg. Sadly, two infants, seated on their parents' lap were among the injured. The children could have been spared with the use of a simple child safety restraint system.

The Lighfoot-Unsoeld amendment is supported by the National Transportation Safety Board, our country's leading safety experts, the Air Transport Association, which represents all the airlines, the Aviation Consumer Action Project, which basically represents airline passengers, the Air Line Pilots Association, which is the pilots on the airlines, and the Association of Flight Attendants, those folks who work with airline passengers every day and every night of the year.

Who would oppose legislation endorsed by safety professionals, consumers, aviation management, and aviation labor? Sadly, it is the FAA. The FAA has objected to protecting the lives of children on aircraft because they believe it would lead to ticket price increases and ultimately force young families to drive.

The FAA's conclusions were reached via a $63,000 tax-supported contract study they commissioned. However, the National Transportation Safety Board analyzed the FAA's study and concluded the results were flawed in the major assumptions used to reach its conclusions. The FAA provided the contractor bad numbers and, coupled with the contractor's inexperience with aviation, other errors were made. Simply put, garbage in, garbage out.

Further, General Motors Research Institute also looked into the issue and concluded it is twice as safe for families with young children to drive 300 miles as it is to fly and just as safe to drive as to fly 700 miles.

The Lightfoot-Unsoeld amendment has been worded to give the Secretary of Transportation the broadest possible latitude in setting the rules requiring child safety restraints. But it is a violation of an infant's basic rights when we give them one level of protection and adults another much higher level. After all, a child cannot be taken to or from the airport without a safety seat, why should they fly without one?

This House has had a long and honorable history of demanding from the FAA a higher level of protection for the flying public. This House has taken the lead in issues the flying public now takes for granted like floor level lighting, protective breathing devices, and smoke detectors. Today we can close one of the final loopholes in aviation safety by giving our children the protection they deserve.

After all, if you cannot take them to the airport, or take them away from the airport without the use of a safety seat, why in the world should they be the only thing on a commercial aircraft that is not required to be tied down?

I think one of the things that leads to some misconception of the arguments that we have heard is that the airlines then will suddenly start charging for seats.

It has been suggested to us by the airline industry that child safety seats very well could be one of the best market promotion tools they have, offering reduced fares for adults, kids fly free during off-peak hours, just as one example. It seems to me that anything that the airlines can do to enhance the use of commercial aircraft certainly accrues to their benefit and they obviously are not going to get out and promote something that is detrimental to getting people to ride on airplanes.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think the time has come, we have labored over this for a number of years. I am extremely pleased that JOLENE UNSOELD has offered her very able assistance on this particular package. I believe today we can finish one loophole that has caused us a great deal of concern and problems over the years.

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

Mrs. UNSOELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, imagine yourself flying with an unrestrained infant when an emergency hits. You are told to wrap the baby in pillows, place it on the floor between your legs, and—without removing your seat belt—brace it with your body. Without an infant restraint system, this is the best you can do to protect your child. Tragically, that's rarely good enough.

Mr. Chairman, listen to the story of a woman in her own words on the plane that crashed in Sioux City, IA, in 1989.

I can still remember the look in the flight attendant's eyes as we both knew this baby had a slim chance of surviving the crash landing. Picture me—a person only 5 feet 3 inches tall—trying to bend over to reach the floor to hold onto my baby, a task that was almost physically impossible. Imagine the sickening feeling of realizing our baby was being sucked out of my grasp as the plane flipped over. There has never been such a feeling of helplessness and terror in my life.

It is a miracle that her daughter survived.

You may think a larger person—a stronger person—could have held on to that baby. Think again. During a crash landing, a child as small as 30 pounds can be thrown forward with 1,000 pounds of force—1,000 pounds.

Clearly, the Federal Aviation Administration recognizes the risk parents take by flying with infants on their laps. That's why the FAA recommends infants be secured during takeoff and landing. But they cannot bring themselves to require it. That is right—they require that you, the other passengers, the flight attendants, the pilot, the bags in the overhead compartment and even the soda cans in the kitchen be secured, but not your infant. This is crazy Mr. Chairman, and it can be deadly.

All we are asking is that children under the age of 2 be given the same protections as you or I. Please support the youngest and most vulnerable of your constituents. Please think of their future. Please support the Lightfoot-Unsoeld amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBERSTAR AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LIGHTFOOT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBERSTAR as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. LIGHTFOOT: At the end of title II of the bill add the following:

SEC. 212. CHILD RESTRAINT SYSTEMS ON COMMERCIAL AIRCRAFT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 601 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. App. 1421) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(g) CHILD RESTRAINT SYSTEMS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall issue regulations requiring an air carrier to provide, upon the request of a revenue passenger on behalf of a revenue child passenger, a child safety restraint system approved by the Secretary on any aircraft operated by such air carrier in providing interstate air transportation, intrastate transportation, or

overseas air transportation. Such regulations shall establish age or weight limits for children who may use such systems.".

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents contained in the first section of such Act is amended by inserting at the end of the matter relating to section 601 the following new item.

"(g) Child restraint systems."

Mr. OBERSTAR (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. LIGHTFOOT be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I respect very deeply and very greatly the sincerity, genuineness with which both the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT] and the gentlewoman [Mrs. UNSOELD] have pursued this issue. When the gentleman from Iowa served on the Subcommittee on Aviation some years ago, he asked Mr. CLINGER and me to hold a hearing on the subject of child restraints, and we conducted that hearing, accumulating many pages of documentation from expert witnesses, extensive review of the subject matter from all parties both for, against, neutral, expert witnesses.

You know, when we started out with this issue, I thought this has got to be the simplest thing in the world we can do to save lives and require child safety restraints onboard aircraft.

At the end of the hearing, frankly, my views were changed. We heard the powerful and heartwrenching statements that the gentlewoman from Washington referred to.

□ 1500

We also received testimony and carefully reviewed studies that suggested young families who would be required to buy a seat for their child would most likely abandon air travel, get in their cars and drive to reduce the cost of travel, putting themselves and their children at greater risk.

If you look at the stark contrast between highway safety records and aviation safety records, you see very quickly the great disparity that exists between the two modes. The number of passengers who would die in highway accidents would be far greater than the number of infant lives saved in the situation where the law might require the purchase of an airline ticket for a safety seat for the child.

A study done by the University of Maryland and included in our documentation concluded:

Given that highway travel is less safe than air travel, the mandatory use of child safety belts in air transport will result in an increase in the number of lives lost.

Accident analyses that we have had completed for the subcommittee's purposes indicated that over a 10-year period, three infant lives were lost in aviation because the child was unrestrained, only three in 10 years.

The same analysis of how many families would be diverted to the highways if they had to purchase a ticket indicates that some 300,000 families would make that choice.

The result if you took that option, according to this analysis, would be 115 lives lost over 10 years, compared to 3 lives lost in the 10-year period of unrestrained children on board aircraft.

Far more significant for safety of passengers aboard aircraft in the event of a tragedy has been the subcommittee's insistence that the FAA proceed with its seat strengthening requirement for airlines, to strengthen from 9 G's to 16 G's the force resistance of airline seats.

As the Sioux City crash indicated, typically in a crash of that type the seats just accordion forward and lives are lost by the impact. In that terrible tragedy, lives were saved because seats stayed in place due to the seat strengthening requirements and the modifications of aircraft that have taken place over the years and are continuing to take place as new aircraft come on board and older aircraft are modified to meet that standard.

I do not think it makes sense to require families to pay out an awful lot of money, but I do think that they ought to have the choice.

The amendment that I have offered as a substitute for the gentleman's amendment would give parents that choice. If they choose to buy a ticket for a child and want a child restraint seat, the air carrier is required to provide an approved child safety restraint device or seat for that child passenger.

I think this substitute amendment reinstitutes in the equation the element of choice and puts the choice on the passenger, on the parent, rather than forcing or imposing a requirement on the airline and upon all the traveling public at great cost, with rather minimal benefit.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the Chair advise the Member, the Chair has been advised that there will be objections to extensions of time ultimately, other than just a few minutes for each Member. The Chair would just advise the Members let us try to keep it as short as possible if we can.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota to proceed for 1 additional minute?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield to the gentleman from Nevada.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, I just was curious, in this provision as I understand it, under the gentleman's provisions unless the passenger pays for an additional seat, the airline is not obligated to provide a child restraint seat.

What about the fact, as often happens, I have a grandchild 18 months old, often when they fly out here my daughter and my son-in-law often have the middle seat that is empty because the plane is not full. Would the airline be required to provide a seat in that case, even though they did not buy the seat, even though it is available and they have restraint seats?

Mr. OBERSTAR. Under my provision, the airline would be required to provide a child restraint seat for a ticketed child.

Mr. BILBRAY. But when there is an open seat, I can understand the argument, the fact that some parents will not travel, as the gentleman said, with two seats, I mean buying an additional seat, but if there are open seats and often airlines fly with open seats and sometimes the center seat is open and they have their child in it, why not require at least in that particular case where there is an open seat that the airline would be required to provide the child restraint seat.

Mr. OBERSTAR. That is still an option for the airline under the circumstance to allow the child to do that.

Mr. BILBRAY. I understand it is an option, but why not require it?

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Lightfoot-Unsoeld amendment. This amendment, which would require the use of child safety restraint systems on commercial aircraft, takes an important step toward maintaining safety in the skies.

On January 25, 1990, a B–707 crashed in Cove Neck, NY. Of the seven infants on board, six were injured and one was killed. On July 19, 1989, a DC–10 crashed in Sioux City, IA. Of the three infants and one small child on the plane, one infant was killed and the two other infants and the small child were injured. On November 15, 1987, a DC–9 crashed in Denver, CO. A 6-month-old infant was one of the 25 passengers killed. None of these children were using an FAA-approved child-restraint device.

Mr. Chairman, these are only some of the statistics from some of the recent airline crashes. There are vast statistics of injuries sustained by infants during turbulence. We have all heard, at one time or another, a horror story about an infant being pulled from his parents' arms and propelled through the cabin in a crash or turbulence.

It is sad that a society which takes such pride in the safety and well-being of its children could have overlooked this vital safety measure for so long. There are safety requirements for infants and small children riding in cars

and safety requirements for children riding on bikes, but there are no specific safety requirements for infants and small children on commercial aircraft. Ironically, passengers on aircraft are allowed to hold children on their laps, but they are not allowed to hold their briefcases, which may weigh much less than a child.

In recent years, the FAA has developed many new regulations aimed at improving occupant protection and cabin safety. None, however, have included mandatory infant and child restraints. Although a voluntary policy was instituted, the National Transportation Safety Board [NTSB] stated in 1990 testimony before the Subcommittee on Aviation, that it had been ineffective. The time has come to require a mandatory policy of compliance to ensure the safety of our children.

Mr. Chairman, I am an original cosponsor of H.R. 1533, a bill identical to this amendment. It was one of the first bills I signed onto as a Member of Congress. I am a cosponsor because I feel very strongly about the safety of children, perhaps because of my two very young daughters.

This amendment would afford infants and children the same level of protection we offer all other passengers on airplanes. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this important child safety issue.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would say at the outset that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR] and I are good friends. There are a number of issues that we have agreed upon and still agree upon, but apparently we have a little difference of opinion on this particular one.

As the chairman pointed out, we did have a hearing on child safety seats, but at the time the FAA brought that study to us, the very day of the hearing, which did not give any of the groups who were in opposition to the proposal an opportunity to analyze it.

Then the Public Works Committee asked the NTSB to do an analysis of the study and they said, I will use a couple quotes:

> The Board found several errors in the study's analysis of fatalities and injuries under (2) because it was, first of all, prepared by persons with no knowledge of aircraft crash worthiness, kinematics and injury mechanicals.

The NTSB also included a sample of accidents examined by the contractor was not valid to demonstrate the effectiveness of child safety seats.

□ 1510

In essence what they did, they used all highway statistics. That includes everyone that is killed inside the city limits of a community. I say to my colleagues, "If you have driven around the Beltway of Washington, DC, that's a lot more dangerous than it is going on I-80 in Chicago to Omaha, NE, and I think, if you're going to compare apples to apples, then you have to compare interstate highway miles only, and that's basically what the GM folks came up with."

The gentleman also mentioned, and I keep hearing this statement come up by those who are not really in love with our approach here, that we are going to require parents to buy a ticket. That is not true. There is nothing in this amendment that says anything about requiring anyone to buy a ticket. It simply says that child safety seats will be used on commercial aircraft, and, as the gentleman from Nevada mentioned a moment ago, current practice is to allow parents who have children, if there are vacant seats on the aircraft, allow those children to occupy those seats. There is absolutely no reason to believe that that would change.

Again we talk about, as you know, the number of lives. We are not just talking about crashes here. I have been flying for, I guess, 20-some-odd years. I got a commercial rating, and there are a lot of hazards with aviation that are not confined just to crashes. In fact, somebody once said that a good landing is a controlled crash one walks away from, but, be that as it may, a lot of accidents occur, a lot of injuries occur, when aircraft come in contact with what is called clear air turbulence. At this point in time we still do not have the kind of technology we need to accurately predict where that might be, and, when one is riding on an airplane and when the captain says, "Even though the seatbelt light is turned off, please keep your belts fastened while you are in the seat," it is not just some rhetoric they are going through. It is for very valid safety reasons.

I was in an aircraft or got to see an aircraft after it landed that had gone through some clear air turbulence over the State of Kansas last year. It happened right after the meal, and they just served lasagna, and it was not a pretty sight, and there were several people who were injured who were up and walking around at the time they hit the turbulence.

I would say again, with the greatest of respect for the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR], my basic disagreements with him on his substitute would be that we are going to force the airlines now to provide the seat, and at a time when we are worried about the viability of airlines it does not seem to me that it is appropriate that we force them to come up with some additional kinds of equipment which they have no way of predicting when it would be needed. Parents who travel now because of the laws in all 50 of our States own DOT approved child safety seats. They bring the child to the airport in that safety seat, they leave the airport with that child in the safety seat, and it just seems that it is logical for them to be allowed to use that safety seat while they are en route in the aircraft, and that is all we are merely asking to do.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR] and against the mandatory requirement. The anecdotal evidence here is always touching, wrenching, when we talk about anybody being killed, particularly infants, but I would remind my colleagues that we charge the FAA with the safety provisions. It is up to the FAA to set these standards, and the FAA is opposed to this mandatory provision introduced by my good friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT].

In fact, Mr. Chairman, the one study that is available, and there may well be flaws in it, but the one study that is available says that more lives will be lost by passing this because people will move into the automobile with their infants, and I would suggest to my good friend that I think it is a bit disingenuous to say that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT] does not require people to buy seats for infants because the amendment does indeed require a safety seat be used, and how can one fulfill that requirement unless they buy a seat?

The evidence is clear. In fact, the FAA says that the cost will be about $250 million a year of increased costs for parents to do this, and the evidence is very unclear. In fact, the only evidence that we have in terms of statistical studies shows that this could have a perverse effect of actually increasing total fatalities in transportation.

So, Mr. Chairman, for all of those reasons I certainly understand the well-meaning intent of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT], my good friend, but I believe the hard evidence suggests that we should not place this mandate, one more mandate, on the American people when indeed we have the FAA in place and charged with the responsibility of setting the safety standards.

So, I, therefore, urge support for the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR].

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like at this time to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR] based on the fact of talking about empty seats that are available to parents, as I brought up earlier, and

whether or not a legislative history can be created and the fact that the committee would urge the Secretary to pass regulations that would provide that, when empty seats are available, as often happens, that child restraint seats be made available at the airline for those infants at that time.

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

Mr. BILBRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has made a very useful suggestion in the course of our earlier exchange, and I think that clearly in the course of rulemaking, as this amendment provides and directs the Secretary to accomplish, that in the course of rulemaking the Secretary can direct the making available of seats that are not purchased at the time of flight, available for child restraint systems, as the gentleman has suggested. I would say that my substitute offers a way to accommodate both the concerns of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT] and those of the FAA. Passengers who cannot afford to buy a seat for their child would be able to do so, and they would get a restraint system, but under my substitute passengers who could not afford an infant seat would not be required to do so. They would not be forced at the highways, but, when seats are available, as the gentleman has suggested under rulemaking, the Secretary can direct that such seats be made available.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, what I was hoping that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR] would do on behalf of the committee was to urge the Secretary to do so, not just——

Mr. OBERSTAR. We will do so.

Mr. BILBRAY. So not just say he can do such.

Mr. OBERSTAR. We will do so, and, when this legislation gets through conference and we bring it back, we will pursue that approach that the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BILBRAY] suggests.

Mrs. UNSOELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have appreciated all the work that the chairman has done in this committee, and I am particularly appreciative of his high regard for life and, in fact, the sacred quality of life. We require infant restraints in automobiles. I would plead with the chairman to keep in mind that sacred quality of life and provide the same protection in this instance that is in force in others.

Bucking the safety issue to FAA, as was suggested by a colleague on this other side of the aisle, is really shirking our responsibility. The Government is repleat with examples of agencies, regulatory agencies, that become captive to those they regulate, and it is the role of Congress to redirect policy or to remind agencies of their responsibility.

I would plead with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR] to endorse this proposal because of his high regard for life.

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

Mrs. UNSOELD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the very genuine and sincere approach the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. UNSOELD] has taken and her enormous sensitivity to life. In so many respects and so many ways she has been an advocate for quality of life.

But in the highway program, Mr. Chairman, there is no Federal law requiring child safety seats on board automobiles.

Mrs. UNSOELD. Mr. Chairman, I used "we" loosely. It is required in many States.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Yes, but with this amendment we would be going further than Federal highway safety law does today for the purposes of aviation

Mrs. UNSOELD. It is a little difficult to keep a plane within the State's borders.

Mr. OBERSTAR. But we are still doing more than Federal highway safety laws do today, and we are leaving the element of choice, as there is in most States and under most laws, for the automobile, and still only less than half of parents choose to use child safety restraints in automobiles. I think we are actually going further in this language for aviation than Federal law does, than State law does.

□ 1520

Mrs. UNSOELD. Mr. Chairman, you have the wrong committee for me to help you work on that issue. But I would urge you to please give consideration to those infants and those under 2 years old, who are so helpless and are dependent upon us adults to make the decisions for them that are going to protect them. They should be as safe as the pop cans on the planes.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Lightfoot-Unsoeld child safety restraint amendment to the Aviation Infrastructure Investment Act. As a cosponsor of H.R. 1533, the bill on which this amendment is modeled, I support the use of child safety restraints for children under 2 years old on commercial flights.

Presently, children under the age of 2 years are held in their parents' laps on commercial flights. These children are more at risk than any other airplane passengers, who are restrained in their seats. It is absurd that present policy treats the safety of an infant with less regard than the safety of an adult. Young children traveling in airplanes should be provided with safety features which are provided for adults—that is, an effective restraint such as an infant seat. As we all know, children in cars must be strapped into an infant seat. Young children traveling in airplanes should be afforded the same level of safety as children traveling in cars.

The Association of Flight Attendants is among the supporters of this amendment. Flight attendants are responsible for the safety of their passengers, yet they cannot protect unrestrained infants in the event of severe turbulence or—even worse—an accident.

This amendment does not mandate one type of safety restraint, but would give the Secretary of Transportation ample latitude in setting requirements for proper child restraints on commercial flights.

Mr. Chairman, the Lightfoot-Unsoeld amendment is an important amendment protecting our youngest children. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment to the Aviation Infrastructure Investment Act.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 270, noes 155, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 487]

AYES—270

Allard	Collins (IL)	Glickman
Andrews (ME)	Collins (MI)	Gonzalez
Andrews (TX)	Combest	Goodlatte
Applegate	Cooper	Gordon
Archer	Coppersmith	Goss
Armey	Costello	Grams
Bacchus (FL)	Coyne	Gunderson
Bachus (AL)	Cramer	Hall (OH)
Baesler	Crane	Hall (TX)
Baker (CA)	Danner	Hamburg
Barcia	de Lugo (VI)	Hamilton
Barlow	Deal	Hefner
Barrett (WI)	DeLay	Hilliard
Barton	Derrick	Hoagland
Bateman	Deutsch	Hobson
Beilenson	Dickey	Hochbrueckner
Bentley	Dicks	Hoke
Bereuter	Dingell	Horn
Bevill	Dixon	Houghton
Bilbray	Doolittle	Hoyer
Bilirakis	Dreier	Huffington
Bishop	Duncan	Hughes
Blackwell	Durbin	Hutto
Blute	Edwards (CA)	Inhofe
Boehlert	Edwards (TX)	Istook
Bonior	Emerson	Johnson (CT)
Borski	English (OK)	Johnson (SD)
Boucher	Ewing	Johnson, E. B.
Brewster	Farr	Johnson, Sam
Brooks	Fawell	Kanjorski
Browder	Fazio	Kaptur
Brown (CA)	Fields (TX)	Kildee
Brown (FL)	Fingerhut	Kim
Brown (OH)	Foglietta	Kleczka
Bryant	Ford (MI)	Klein
Bunning	Ford (TN)	Kolbe
Buyer	Fowler	Kyl
Calvert	Franks (CT)	LaFalce
Camp	Frost	Lancaster
Canady	Gallo	Lantos
Cantwell	Gejdenson	LaRocco
Carr	Gekas	Laughlin
Castle	Gephardt	Levin
Chapman	Geren	Levy
Clay	Gibbons	Lewis (FL)
Clement	Gilchrest	Lipinski
Clyburn	Gillmor	Lloyd
Collins (GA)	Gilman	Machtley

Mann
Manton
Manzullo
Martinez
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCurdy
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Norton (DC)
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Ridge
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Sabo
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schumer
Sharp
Shaw
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Smith (NJ)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Sundquist
Swett
Synar
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Upton
Valentine
Vento
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Watt
Waxman
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wise
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zimmer

NOES—155

Abercrombie
Andrews (NJ)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barca
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Becerra
Bliley
Boehner
Bonilla
Burton
Byrne
Callahan
Cardin
Clayton
Clinger
Coble
Coleman
Condit
Conyers
Cox
Crapo
Cunningham
Darden
DeFazio
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart
Dooley
Dornan
Dunn
Engel
English (AZ)
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fish
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Furse
Gallegly
Gingrich
Goodling
Grandy
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings
Hayes
Hefley
Herger
Hinchey
Hoekstra
Holden
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Inslee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnston
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
King
Kingston
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kopetski
Kreidler
Lambert
Lazio
Leach
Lehman
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Matsui
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHale
McKinney
McMillan
Mfume
Michel
Mink
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Nussle
Olver
Orton
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Pombo
Reynolds
Roemer
Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sanders
Schenk
Schroeder
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shays
Shepherd
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Stark
Strickland
Stump
Swift
Talent
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thompson
Underwood (GU)
Unsoeld
Velazquez
Visclosky
Walker
Walsh
Washington
Waters
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Zeliff

NOT VOTING—13

Ackerman
Berman
de la Garza
Dellums
Faleomavaega (AS)
Flake
Green
Lewis (CA)
McDermott
McNulty
Murphy
Quillen
Wilson

□ 1543

Messrs. ROSTENKOWSKI, JEFFERSON, McHALE, SCOTT, HEFLEY, REYNOLDS, and SMITH of Michigan changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Miss COLLINS of Michigan and Messrs. COMBEST, BAESLER, DE LUGO, HOAGLAND, TORKILDSEN, DREIER, GILCHREST, NEAL of Massachusetts, GOODLATTE, PORTER, WAXMAN, and GOSS changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COLEMAN). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT], as amended.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 374, noes 48, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 488]

AYES—374

Abercrombie
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Archer
Bacchus (FL)
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentley
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blackwell
Blute
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Buyer
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Cunningham
Danner
Darden
de Lugo (VI)
Deal
DeLauro
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Dreier
Duncan
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Herger
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Huffington
Hughes
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inhofe
Inslee
Istook
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kildee
Kim
King
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Klug
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kreidler
Kyl
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Levy
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McKinney
McMillan
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Norton (DC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Ridge
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Synar
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Underwood (GU)
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walsh
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—48

Allard
Armey
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Bartlett
Bliley
Boehner
Bonilla
Burton
Callahan
Coble
Condit
Cox
Crapo
DeFazio
DeLay
Doolittle
Dornan
Dunn
Goodling
Hancock
Hefley
Hoekstra
Hoke
Hunter
Inglis
Kanjorski
Kingston
Knollenberg
Lightfoot

Linder	Pombo	Smith (MI)
Mica	Ramstad	Stenholm
Michel	Roberts	Stump
Myers	Rohrabacher	Taylor (NC)
Nussle	Royce	Upton
Penny	Sarpalius	Walker

NOT VOTING—16

Ackerman	Flake	Quillen
Berman	Green	Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Brown (CA)	Kennelly	Wilson
de la Garza	Lewis (CA)	
Dellums	McDermott	
Faleomavaega (AS)	McNulty	
	Murphy	

□ 1602

So the amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was annonced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. DANNER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. DANNER: Page 12, before line 8, insert the following:

SEC. 203. PROCESSING FEES.

Section 313(f) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. App. 1354(f)) is amended—

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

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

"(3) FOREIGN REPAIR STATION CERTIFICATION AND INSPECTION FEES.—The Administrator shall establish and collect fees for certification and inspection of repair stations outside of the United States equivalent to the costs of providing the certification and inspection services.".

Redesignate subsequent sections of title II of the bill accordingly.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

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

Ms. DANNER. I yield to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR].

Mr. OBERSTAR. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we have examined this amendment. It deals with fees on foreign repair stations, to recover the costs of FAA certification and inspection of repair stations in other countries. We accept the amendment.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield to me?

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

Mr. CLINGER. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, we have had a chance to see the amendment on this side. I think it makes eminent good sense. It was a recommendation of the National Performance Review. It is a sensible amendment. We are delighted to accept it.

Mr. DANNER. Mr. chairman, my amendment takes language from Vice President GORE's Reinventing Government report and codifies his recommendation by calling on the Federal government to start charging fees for the services it provides. This is a good government amendment and the beginning of what I hope will be further action to enact Mr. GORE's recommendations so we may create a government that works better and costs less.

Specifically, the amendment will require the Federal Aviation Administration to recoup the expenses it incurs when it sends FAA inspectors to certify and do spot checks of foreign repair stations.

I believe it is financially responsible to charge these facilities for the full expense the Federal Government incurs for FAA certification and surveillance. With my amendment, the FAA will now be required to charge for all the expenses it incurs for these inspection.

In speaking with the airlines, the FAA and air cargo groups, none felt the additional costs will be significant or have an adverse impact on their operations.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of this good Government amendment and thank the chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee and his staff for their support on this matter.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlemen, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri [Ms. DANNER].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBERSTAR

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

The clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBERSTAR: Page 26, line 1, strike "June 1" and insert "January 15".

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to accelerate the date by which the FAA is to complete the study required by section 210 of the bill for a system for allocating slots for international service at O'Hare Airport.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I rise in very strong support of this amendment, and I just wish to indicate that it will accelerate the time in which there will be a report due. It moves the time up by 6 months, to January. I think it is an excellent amendment, and we are happy to support it.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MORAN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MORAN: Page 24, after line 18, insert the following:

(4) NONAPPLICABILITY TO WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT.—This subsection shall not apply to operations at Washington National Airport.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 20 minutes, to be equally divided between the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] and myself.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, this bill includes a provision that would require the FAA to review the slot restrictions that currently exist at four high-density airports: O'Hare, J.F.K., LaGuardia, and Washington National Airports.

My amendment would delete Washington National Airport from that review. The reasons are very clear.

First of all, there has been an ironclad commitment that was signed by all the parties, including the local Governments in this region, that the slot restrictions at National Airport would not be changed. We currently have 62 takeoffs and landings at National Airport, more than 1 a minute; 37 commercial slots. The principal concern is one of safety, safety for airline passengers, safety for the residents who live in this very populous metropolitan area.

Mr. Chairman, any breach of that commitment would be unconscionable, and that is exactly the intent of this review.

You would not do the review of the slot restrictions unless there was an intent to lift or remove restrictions on these high-density airports.

Mr. Chairman, $1.5 billion has been invested in a capital improvement program at Washington National Airport. That capital improvement program is based upon the assumption that those slot restrictions will not change.

Mr. Chairman, National Airport is not the only airport, not the only access that people in the Washington metropolitan area have available to them. The fact is that Washington/Dulles Airport, which is undergoing a $1 billion expansion, has plenty of capacity; Baltimore-Washington International Airport [BWI], has underutilized capacity. It does not make sense to divert flights from those airports to Washington National Airport.

We sit right in the heart of a very populous area. This is a sensitive area, as well, from a political standpoint, as the chairman and my colleagues would understand.

I would like to posit one further reason why this amendment should pass, and that is that if it does not, it is going to be interpreted as one more action that the Congress has taken for its own convenience. Rightfully or wrongfully, that is the way it will be interpreted.

Mr. Chairman, we have a commitment that the slot restrictions at National Airport will not be changed. It is inappropriate to conduct this review.

I ask my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Moran amendment to eliminate Washington National Airport from the review of slot restrictions at our Nation's high density airports.

The existing slot rule at National Airport was a compact between Federal, local, and airport officials. Its establishment by the Federal Aviation Administration was in response to the many appeals of citizens and local elected officials for relief from airport noise. Its preservation is essential to the promises that were made during the development of legislation providing for the transfer of National and Dulles airports from FAA control to the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority. Indeed, the rule allowing only 37 commercial slots per hour has been established by the Washington Metropolitan Airport Act itself.

Over the past 5 years, there have been legislative and administrative attempts to alter the slot rule at National Airport. In the past, these attempts have been cited as necessary for airline competition. However, I want to emphasize again, that any efforts to alter the slot rule would be a breach of the good faith agreement that led to legislation transferring control of National and Dulles airports from the FAA to a local authority. Changes in the slot rule would destroy years of hard work by citizens, by Members of Congress, and airport officials to provide genuine relief to the surrounding communities impacted by the traffic in and out of National Airport.

My constituents in Montgomery County, MD, are hard-hit when it comes to airport noise. They are impacted by flights, not only from Washington National Airport, but from Dulles and Baltimore-Washington International Airport, as well, It would be simply unfair to expect my Montgomery County Community to bear the brunt of any additional noise as a result of any tampering with the existing slot rule.

I urge my colleagues to support the Moran Amendment that would delete Washington National Airport from the FAA study of the slot rule at high density airports.

□ 1610

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose this amendment as strongly as I can. It would exclude, make an exception and exclude National Airpcrt from a study provision, and I think it has to be emphasized this is a study provision in this bill, which requires the Secretary to study and provide recommendations on the efficacy of the High Density Rule. That is what it does.

If there were to be any changes whatever in any of the slot-controlled airports, be it National, O'Hare, LaGuardia, there would be required new legislation which would come before this body and be subject to a full debate at that time.

But, Mr. Chairman, since this slot-control rule was enacted in 1969, there have been enormous changes in our aviation world, refinements, improvements. The technology has improved dramatically. Our ability to control aircraft has improved dramatically.

It seems to us that it is time, it is a reasonable period of time to at least take a look at this and see if in fact the improvements in technology, the improvements in our ability to control aircraft have reached a stage where we could review this and perhaps make changes in the slot control group.

I would also point out that we have had dramatic improvements in our ability to control noisy aircraft. It will not be too much longer that we are going to have an absolute prohibition on the use of the noisier aircraft. We move to stage 3.

I know that is a concern of those who are in favor of this amendment, but we have made strides in all these areas.

All we are asking and all we are proposing is that we have an opportunity to study this question. If it turns out there is no merit in what we are proposing, then obviously there will not be legislation proposed, but I do think it is a little harsh to say that we cannot even look at it. We cannot even consider whether or not changes that have existed would make it feasible to make those changes.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would urge opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. CLINGER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, one of the concerns that we have in support of the Moran amendment is that the study, what assurances do we have that the agreements that were reached in 1986 when the National Airport was transferred to the Authority, there were arrangements made between the jurisdictions, Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia, as to the number of flights.

Will the study be mindful of he commitments that were made in 1986? It seems to me the study is just going to be looking at the congestion-noise issues and would not take into consideration commitments that have been previously made by the local jurisdictions. That is one of our concerns.

What assurances can the gentleman give us that that would also be part of the study?

Mr. CLINGER. I think clearly we are going to have a study which is obviously going to be mindful of this. At the moment, as the gentleman knows, by law there is a limitation of 37 slots. So that is clearly a part of the mix. That was part of the agreement that was made. That would have to be a part of any consideration of a study that would be made in regard to this issue.

Mr. CARDIN. Would the study take into consideration commitments that were given when the current arrangements at National Airport were established in 1986?

Mr. CLINGER. In 1986?

Mr. CARDIN. Yes.

Mr. CLINGER. It is part of the law. That is in the law now. That would have to be a part of the consideration of any study that would be undertaken.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would again urge opposition to this amendment which simply calls for a study, nothing beyond that.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say to my colleagues that I rise to strongly support the Moran amendment and to say to my colleagues, you should not want to touch this one with a 10-foot pole. Not only does it break a promise that there would be no increase in the number of slots at National Airport, because it says there may well be an increase in the number of slots at National Airport, but National Airport is nationally regarded as the plantation of the Congress itself. National Airport is seen, and I might say not without cause, as an airport the Congress has kept close to itself for its own convenience as, if you will forgive me, a perk of the Congress.

National Airport was handed over to local control in the late eighties with a promise not to change the number of slots.

Who wants this change? It is the big airlines who want this change. They have been trying for years to expand the number of slots at National Airport. If you vote against the Moran amendment, you will be seen by your constituents as voting for your own convenience, as voting to expand slots so that you can more easily come in and go out of National Airport. That may not be what you mean, but that is how it will be read to mean.

To throw National Airport into any group of airports like this is to forget what the history of National Airport has been. Members had control of National Airport itself until the courts threw out that control only within the last couple of years.

This very evening by coincidence, Mr. Chairman, I am going to an FAA noise hearing in the District of Columbia about a promise that has not been kept on noise in this region, despite the number of slots we now have.

The gentleman says what harm can it do to study the number of slots? We have not done anything about the number of slots.

The gentleman forgets that we have outstanding bonds, may have more,

that we are in the middle of construction. Do we want to send a signal that this construction may be undone, despite the millions of dollars that are tied up in it by a study that has now been thrown on the table out of nowhere by the Congress and again it will be interpreted that we are doing the bidding of the airlines and that we are doing our own bidding.

I do not mean to suggest that is what this bill is about, but it is time that this Congress understood the appearances it gives when it takes actions like this.

I am asking that we omit National Airport. It is not just another airport. It is an airport fraught with history, a history in which this Congress is deeply implicated.

National Airport is not a perk. If you vote against the Moran amendment and it appears to be a perk and it looks as though we want to expand the number of slots for our own convenience and that we are not treating National Airport as we treat all other airports. We do not need to send that signal during this Congress.

Mr. Chairman, vote for the Moran amendment.

□ 1620

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise against the amendment, in opposition to what the committee has done, and in strong support for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

For those of my colleagues who are new here since 1986, this airport used to be the airport that everyone thought that Congress controlled. The Congress did a bold act, and, quite frankly, when the Congress ran this airport, it was the worst run airport in the Nation. The congestion was a mess. They could not even connect the metro to the terminal. It was a fiasco.

So, working together in a bipartisan manner, Mr. Chairman, we developed a program, Maryland, Virginia, and the entire country, of slot limits on this airport.

Now what my colleagues will be voting on today—think of two words. This is special interest legislation for an airline or two to come in here, and, second, this is what I call the aluminum sky policy. They want to pour every aircraft that they can into this airport regardless of anything.

Now what are the meanings? One, congestion at the airport, as the gentlewoman said, this airport is being planned for the limits that we have, but for those of my colleagues who are new, it was a snowy day, it was a snowy day in Washington, when an Air Florida airplane hit the 14th Street Bridge, and many people died. If my colleagues recall, Lenny Scutnick was the one who was the hero who saved many, many people.

They want to bring in as many as they possibly can. They do not care how much noise comes up into Georgetown.

Let me just say for the Members who are listening:

This airport is not in my congressional district. Now it used to be in my congressional district. I helped fashion a compromise with the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] and the other Members from this region, and the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA]. It was bipartisan. But now they want to come in, and they want to pour them in.

Now, if FAA wants to do this and they say it is just a study, well, that is the way this thing begins.

Lastly, the Congress does not have the right to do this. I say to my colleagues, "You wouldn't want this done in your own airport in your own region. Think in terms of the gentleman from Virginia who represents this airport, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia who represents this airport. You don't have any right to come in and tell them what their slot limits should be. Let's respect what was done in the past."

Now, Mr. Chairman, most businessmen come and say they can never rely on what the Congress does because they do something 1 year, and then they change the tax laws 4 or 5 years later. This would be doing the same thing. It is the aluminum sky policy to bring congestion and, I believe, perhaps dangerous.

The last point is the Airline Pilots Association took a poll about 2 months ago, and National Airport, this airport that they want to bring more aircraft in, was voted as the most dangerous airport in the Nation—the most dangerous airport in the Nation. Now, my colleagues' families come through this airport, my colleagues' staff comes through this airport, people come through this airport that live in this region. It is wrong. It is unfair. I strongly urge my colleagues to support the gentleman's amendment to keep the agreement that was fashioned after so many years of animosity that completely works, and I urge a yes vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

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

Mr. Chairman, we need some truth in amending here, and accuracy in amending.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, this amendment strikes that language unnecessarily. It proposes to remove a study of the slot or the high-density rule that happens to include National Airport. It does not, the provision in the bill does not, have implementing language. No administrative action can result from the study to be undertaken. This study, I would say to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], was not stimulated by some airline. In fact, I would suspect that the airlines would not like to have an increase in the number of slots at National because they like the control, they like to have those slots priced very high, and they like to limit the number of the operations there because it increases their bottom line. The Presidential Commission on Airlines recommended a study of the high-density rule. We did not focus on National Airport.

Second, I want to point out that in the law, the high-density rule, the administrator may not increase the number of instruments flight rule, takeoffs and landings, authorized for air carriers by the high-density rule at Washington National Airport and may not decrease the number of such takeoffs and landings except for reasons of safety.

Mr. Chairman, we have to study the high-density rule to determine whether the Nation's and the world's busiest airport, O'Hare, can make adjustments in the way that airport operates to accommodate the increasing number of international arrivals, the increasing numbers of commuters, the increased numbers of essential service operations that want to use that airport, and, if we have service to Chicago out of National, as we do, then National has to be included in the study.

But make no mistake about it. Let us be honest. The provision in the bill does not change this law. It does not change the law.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman says it does not change the law, but it provides for the study which will lead to that.

Second, this is——

Mr. OBERSTAR. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I have the time. "Lead to" means another act of Congress.

The gentleman had plenty of time.

If any other act were ever proposed to move then against any such act——

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBERSTAR. And there would be hearings, there would be full action by the committee, before any such action would be taken.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. I think, if I tell the gentleman the difference here that the Congress has enacted on the other airports, we are not trying to kill the study for the other airports. We are not trying to kill the study for the three other airports. The Congress, working under the leadership of the gentleman

from California [Mr. MINETA] fashioned this compromise——

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I reclaim my time. The gentleman refused to accede to a limitation on time. We could have had this debate all concluded by now. But I insist on pointing out that this is a study. It does not single out National Airport. It deals with the four slot-controlled airports. If we are going to improve air traffic in this country, we have got to look at the totality. We cannot say, "Study the high-density rule, but, by the way, don't include one-fourth of it." That does not make any sense.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, when this study is complete, it has to be submitted to the White House, to the Congress; that is, to this body, to the other body. No action can be taken to implement one whit of a recommendation, and before any further action be taken, this Subcommittee on Aviation would hold hearings, we would explore the issue publicly, but I repeat: The focus is not on National Airport. There is no intention here to change the high-density rule at National Airport. But we do have to study it as part of the total air system in America.

Mr. Chairman, no airport is an isolated island. Do not make it out to be something that it is not. Never fear to study, but never study out of fear.

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

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

Mr. CLINGER. In regard to that, in regard to the study that has been proposed here, it is suggested that somehow it is going to be made in a vacuum, that there is going to be somebody who is going to rule on high that this has to be changed. But I would call the attention of the Members of the legislation which says:

> In conducting the study under this subsection, the Secretary of Transportation shall consult with officials of airports subject to the high density rule, the cities in which such airports are located, representatives of citizens living in the vicinity of such airports, air carriers now serving such airports or interested in inaugurating such service.

So, this is going to be a very comprehensive study, and everybody is going to have an opportunity to be heard and to have their concerns considered.

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

Mr. Chairman, first I would like to thank the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR] for his comments. I certainly feel better listening to his explanation of the committee's action of requesting a study, and I know that the gentleman is sincere, and I know that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is sincere, in looking at the total needs of our air traffic in this country.

But let me tell my colleagues why I hope this Committee will adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN]. I think it is very important that this amendment be adopted. It is important that we look at the high density rules and the impact that the high density rules have on the three airports that were mentioned other than National.

□ 1630

But if you include National in the review, I am afraid that it will become a political issue, and not an issue on the policies of where additional flights may in fact be slotted.

The history at National Airport and the number of slots involves a great deal of political compromise. The three jurisdictions involved, all their representatives support the slot agreements that were reached in 1986. For, you see, two of the regional airports are under the Authority; one is not. There are different funding mechanisms involved here and different considerations.

So I think it is very important that we go forward with the study that the chairman wants to see. That study should look at safety issues, customer convenience issues, and noise issues. But if you include National in the study, I am afraid it is going to be a political review.

Now, the question I asked the gentleman from Pennsylvania is, in the study, would the understandings that were reached in 1986 concerning the number of flights out of National be part of the study? Because the number of flights at National is involved in the political arrangements reached on the running of the three airports, and it should be part of the considerations. But if you start looking at that, I think you compromise the other study.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for your comments and the way your committee is going about this review. But for the sake of the work of your committee, I hope this Committee will adopt the Moran amendment.

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

Mr. CARDIN. I will be glad to yield to my friend from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's thoughtful analysis of the subject. But how can you proceed on a study of the high-density rule that covers four major airports in America without at least including the traffic that originates and terminates at National Airport, when traffic goes from this airport to those other three?

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I interpret the Moran amendment to allow the study to look at all flights going into the other three airports, including those originating at National Airport, as part of its study. If we need to clarify that, I am sure we would be supportive of a clarifying amendment to make it clear that the study would look at flights that are at National Airport that involve the other three airports.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Moran amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to join my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN], in saying how much respect we have for the chairman of the subcommittee, as well as for the chairman of the full committee. In particular, I worked closely with the chairman of the full committee, who was then chairman of the subcommittee, that worked so hard on the agreement to put National Airport and Dulles Airport under the Authority. I was opposed to that initially and served on the Holton Commission. Senator SARBANES, my colleague, sat on that commission as well. As you will remember, rare for Senator SARBANES, there was a minifilibuster in the Senate which placed the legislation in jeopardy.

In the course of the consideration, there was clearly an agreement. That agreement, as the chairman has so ably expressed, incorporated into the statute the limitation on slots.

Mr. Chairman, the reason for the Moran amendment, which I very strongly support, is that we ought not in any way to implicitly or explicitly, and I agree with the chairman, we do not explicitly do that, send a message that in the course of a study, that the slot limitation at National should not be perceived to be, in effect, inviolate.

The Chairman and the ranking member ask why, if this is just a study, is the Moran amendment necessary? It is necessary because it is important for us to send the message to those who do this study of the three other airports involved, that that study ought not be premised or based in its conclusions in any way that the slots at National can be modified.

Now, clearly we believe they ought not to be. But can be. If this is a part of the study, logically that will be part of the consideration. It is inevitable that that will occur.

Therefore, this amendment is not irrelevant, but is in fact on point. It is to restore the views of this Congress that in putting the Authority together, we made an agreement, and we have not changed that agreement. That agreement was that the slots will be limited. There is no such agreement with respect to the other three airports.

I would suggest further to my good friend, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR], who so ably chairs this subcommittee, that the Moran amendment does not in any way preclude consideration by the study of what the flights are into or out of National, just as it will not preclude, although other airports are not referenced in the study, flights into

Heathrow or out of Heathrow, or into Los Angeles International or out of Los Angeles International. Obviously, in the course of that study they will have to be considered.

What the Moran amendment, however, clearly enunciates, is that we have not changed our policy.

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

Mr. HOYER. I will be glad to yield to my friend from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. But the language of this amendment is that this provision shall not apply to operations at National Airport. It takes National out of the equation. Furthermore, I say to the gentleman, that a study is not a threat. It does not provide any implementation authority. It does not amend the basic law. The basic law directs that the FAA shall not increase or decrease operations at National.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time to just respond to my friend, I understand that. Let me reiterate that I do not believe the Moran language in any way precludes studies, the studies including the flights and the relevance those flights have to the other three airports. Clearly they will have to look at other airports which are not mentioned in this legislation either to determine that.

What it will do, in my opinion, is it will raise the specter that possibly these will be changed. That specter ought not to be raised. Why? Because this region, in the consideration of that legislation, agreed to the Authority concept and the Authority reality on the basis of this agreement. We think that ought not be changed.

Mr. Chairman, we would ask our colleagues to support that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. MFUME). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 110, noes 294, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 489]

AYES—110

Abercrombie
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Bartlett
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentley
Bevill
Blackwell
Bliley
Bonilla
Boucher
Brown (OH)
Byrne
Cardin
Clayton
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Cooper
Derrick
Dooley
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English (AZ)
Eshoo
Fields (LA)
Fingerhut
Foglietta
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Harman
Hastings
Hefley
Hefner
Hinchey
Hoagland
Horn
Hoyer
Huffington
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kennedy
Kennelly
Klein
Lancaster
Lantos
Lehman
McDermott
McKinney
McMillan
Meek
Meyers
Mfume
Mink
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Myers
Nadler
Norton (DC)
Owens
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Pickett
Price (NC)
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sawyer
Scott
Sharp
Shepherd
Sisisky
Smith (IA)
Spratt
Stokes
Stupak
Swift
Tanner
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Underwood (GU)
Unsoeld
Velazquez
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Williams
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn

NOES—294

Allard
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonior
Borski
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Carr
Castle
Clay
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Conyers
Coppersmith
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Danner
Darden
de Lugo (VI)
Deal
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Emerson
English (OK)
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (TX)
Filner
Fish
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gekas
Geren
Gibbons
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Gunderson
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hayes
Herger
Hilliard
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Hughes
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Inslee
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Kaptur
Kasich
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kreidler
Kyl
LaFalce
Lambert
LaRocco
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Levy
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Meehan
Menendez
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Moorhead
Murtha
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickle
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Poshard
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Ravenel
Richardson
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Royce
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Saxton
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Studds
Stump
Sundquist
Swett
Synar
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Torres
Traficant
Tucker
Upton
Valentine
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Weldon
Whitten
Wise
Wyden
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—34

Ackerman
Berman
Bryant
Chapman
de la Garza
DeFazio
Dixon
Faleomavaega (AS)
Flake
Gillmor
Green
Greenwood
Houghton
Hunter
Laughlin
Lewis (CA)
Machtley
Markey
McNulty
Miller (CA)
Murphy
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Ridge
Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Schaefer
Torricelli
Towns
Walsh
Washington
Waters
Wilson
Yates

□ 1700

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Quillen for, with Mr. DeFazio against.

Messrs. TRAFICANT, HAYES, TAUZIN, BARCIA of Michigan, OLVER, and EMERSON changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland and Mr. SAWYER changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1700

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the remainder of the bill and any amendments thereto be limited to a total of 1 hour and 15 minutes, of which 1 hour shall be for an amendment, if offered, by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], with 30 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], and 30 minutes to be controlled by myself.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. BARLOW] having assumed the chair, Mr. COLEMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill

(H.R. 2739) to amend the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1994, 1995, and 1996, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, due to a recent series of previously scheduled town hall meetings and individual meetings with constituents I was unable to register my votes.

Had I been present:

On October 7: Rollcall votes 488 and 489. I would have voted "aye" on No. 488 and "no" on No. 489.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time that I might inquire of the distinguished majority leader the program for next week, and I am happy to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

Mr. GEPHARDT. I thank the gentleman for yielding, Mr. Speaker.

Obviously there are no more votes today. There will not be votes on tomorrow. There will not be votes on Monday, October 11, which of course is Columbus Day. In fact, the House will not be in session on Monday.

On Tuesday, October 12, the House will meet at 12 noon and will begin consideration of 10 bills under suspension of the rules. The bills are:

H.J. Res. 228, Romania MFN;

H. Con. Res. 113, relating to the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation Organization;

H. Con. Res. 140, commemorating the 60th anniversary of the Ukraine famine;

H.R. 2650, to designate portions of the Maurice River and its tributaries in New Jersey as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Systems;

H.R. 914, Red River Designation Act of 1993;

H.R. 1425, American Indian Agriculture Act of 1993;

H.R. 2399, Catawba Indian Tribe of South Carolina Lands Claims Settlement Act of 1993;

H.R. 1102, Court Arbitration Authorization Act of 1993;

H.R. 2632, Patent and Trademark Office Authorization Act of 1993; and

H.R. 2840, Copyright Royalty Tribunal Reform Act of 1993.

Recorded votes on those bills will be postponed until the end of those suspensions, and we expect no votes until 4 p.m. on Tuesday.

We will also be taking up H.R. 2446, military construction appropriations conference report, and H.R. 2445, a motion to go to conference on energy and water development appropriations.

On Wednesday, October 13, and the balance of the week, the House will meet at 10 a.m. Bills to be considered will be H.R. 1804, Goals 2000: Educate America Act, subject to a rule; H.R. 2739, Aviation Infrastructure Investment Act of 1993 to complete consideration; H.R. 3167, the unemployment compensation program extension, subject to a rule; H.R. 1845, National Biological Survey Act of 1993 to complete consideration; H.R. 2351, the Arts, Humanities, and Museums Amendments of 1993, modified open rule, 1 hour of debate; and H.R. 2151, the Maritime Security and Competitiveness Act of 1993, subject to a rule.

We do have a number of bills in conference that are appropriaton bills, the D.C., appropriation, Commerce, Justice and State appropriation, Interior appropriation, VA-HUD appropriation, and Transportation appropriation, and some of those or all of those could be available during the week.

Mr. MICHEL. The gentleman will recall our earlier conversation this morning about the number of items that we are going to have to contend with before we adjourn this session of Congress. And with the hope that that could be done by Thanksgiving, as distinguished from spilling over into December, I think we were in agreement that we wanted to admonish our Members, or at least remind our Members that we are going to have to have an accelerated schedule around here, which does not call for our being back in our districts on Mondays and Fridays maybe as much as we have in the past. It ought to be probably a 5-day workweek. And I think if we would alert the Members to that early enough, that the prize for doing that is having an adjournment that we can maybe before Thanksgiving.

If the majority leader would sustain or corroborate what this Member feels about it, why may be we can spark a fire here.

Mr. GEPHARDT. The gentleman stated correctly our goal which we talked about together. We do hope to be able to finish our work by Thanksgiving. In fact, a number of days before Thanksgiving so that Members can get back to their districts on time. We realize that the Wednesday before Thanksgiving is a very hard day to travel, so we would like to be able to get done much prior to that.

If we do that, it means that there has to be a number of Monday and Friday activities here. Next Friday we are going to be here. The week after that, October 18, we intend to be here, a Monday, and October 22, a Friday. Then the next week, October 25 and 29 we intend to be here on Monday and again on Friday. And Members should expect that we are trying to get all the appropriation bills done on time. The continuing appropriation runs out on October 21. So we will be having a lot of activity coming up to that date.

So the gentleman has stated it correctly. If we are going to reach the goal of getting out on or before or about November 22 for this year, this session of Congress, then we have to work Mondays and Fridays between now and then.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the majority leader, because I think the members all appreciate knowing specifically the dates that he enumerated, the Fridays and Mondays when we are expected to be here. I know the gentleman has the same complaint that I have, "Why didn't you tell me? I planned this or that for such and such a date." And we are trying to give all Members notice that we have just got to be working those days. If there is cooperation of the membership, we can meet our target date, and I thank the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished minority leader yield?

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

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the majority leader knows, the unemployment benefits last extension ran out on October 2, which was last week. And the Ways and Means Committee promptly reported a bill to the Rules Committee, and the Rules Committee reported a bill to the floor to solve that problem and extend benefits from October 2 for the next 4 months.

We have yet to see this bill come to the floor. The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee did an excellent job in coming up with a funding mechanism. It is a paid-for bill; it is as noncontroversial bill that sailed through the Ways and Means Committee. I am wondering, since these benefits expired on October 2, and the soonest we can take this bill up under the schedule here is October 13, I would just question the majority leader as to what is the holdup of this noncontroversial measure?

Mr. GEPHARDT. If the gentleman will yield further, obviously it is not as noncontroversial as the gentleman would state. There are difficulties that we are trying to surmount. We are talking with the members of the committee. We are talking with other people on this side, and we will bring the bill to the floor as quickly as we possible can.

Mr. SANTORUM. If the gentleman will continue to yield, what we have heard on this side is that there is a problem with one of the funding provisions having to do with welfare funds for aliens, and that the provision of giving money to aliens is holding up benefits for citizens who pay taxes into the unemployment compensation fund.

Is that an accurate assessment of the problem with the funding mechanism?

Mr. GEPHARDT. There are a variety of problems, that not being the only

one, and we are trying to work our way through all of the problems.

Mr. SANTORUM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, if there are no other requests, I yield back the balance of my extended minute.

□ 1710

ETHANOL IS GOOD FOR THIS COUNTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I take this 5-minute special order to have the opportunity to talk about something that is very important in my district. I think it is very important in the United States and in the Midwest particularly.

Since I took office in July 1991, I have spent a great deal of time trying to assure that ethanol will receive fair treatment in the Clean Air Act regulations.

Ethanol, of course, is the alternate fuel.

Reformulated gasoline, RFG, that program requires a different gasoline to be sold in the summer in cities with the worst smog problems. When the Clean Air Act was amended in 1990, Congress clearly intended that ethanol, which is a renewable fuel made from corn, particularly from corn, would be able to compete in the RFG Program.

Now, that was not stated that ethanol would be the only ingredient to be put in the reformulated fuel program, but that it would be one of those elements.

However, the EPA issued regulations last year which would have prevented ethanol from competing in this program. Despite attempts by President Bush to settle this matter last fall, the issue is still very much unresolved.

The EPA is under a Federal court order to announce its final decision in December 1993. In a recent letter which I had from President Clinton in response to my correspondence to him about the urgency of this matter, the President seems to be distancing himself from the decision of the EPA and in the letter he indicated that whatever regulations the EPA is to recommend, it will be outside of his control.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the President made some commitments during his campaign. When he campaigned in the Midwest in the Corn States, he made commitments about ethanol. The President has certainly intervened in a number of other instances where regulatory decisions were being considered—food safety, wetlands, the Northwest forests—and the bottom line is that the decision made by the EPA on this issue will say a lot about how important agriculture and rural America is to the President.

The facts are that ethanol is good for the environment. A recent study by the Council on Great Lakes Governors confirmed that ethanol is just as effective in fighting smog as is its main competitor, MTBE.

Ethanol will create jobs for American agriculture and in rural America. Currently, 1 out of every 7 bushels of corn in Illinois is used for ethanol production. Inclusion in the RFG Program could add more than 20 cents a bushel to the price of corn.

Ethanol is good for energy security because it is a renewable fuel. MTBE is derived from methanol and is mostly imported. Ethanol is domestically produced from domestically grown crops.

Ethanol is good for America. The EPA and President Clinton should assure that it is able to compete as one of those elements in the Clean Air Act programs.

Mr. Speaker, it will create hundreds of jobs, it will help bring prosperity back to the farm, to the cornbelt and to the Midwest, and I ask the President and the EPA to look with every haste at coming to a conclusion that will include ethanol.

BAD ADVICE FROM MORTON HALPERIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, if reports in today's Washington Times are true, then we now have evidence that Mr. Morton Halperin, the administration's designee as Assistant Defense Secretary for Democracy and Human Rights, is singularly unsuited to any position of authority or counsel to deal with the security needs of the United States of America.

The news this week is filled with horror stories from Somalia which stem from the Clinton administration's approaches to the problems of that country.

The news that the Defense Department twice turned down requests from its own generals relayed through Gen. Colin Powell to send armored personnel carriers to protect our troops in Somalia is disturbing, to say the least.

Several months ago an American soldier there told the Washington Post, and I quote, "We aren't doing nothing for the Somalis but dodging bullets." And they should not be dodging bullets anyway. They would not be, had we maintained our original mission to provide neutral security for the delivery of food to the starving Somalis. But at the very least, if our generals say they need armament to keep our troops from getting killed by those bullets, then they darned well should be provided with that armament.

According to the Washington Times, which I include for the record, Halperin, although not yet confirmed in his post, was one of the few Defense Department officials who most strongly urged that armament not be sent, for the ridiculous and spurious reason that to send it "would appear too offensive." That is from the Washington Times today, that it "would appear too offensive."

Too offensive? We are talking about protecting the American soldiers in a hostile environment. What is really offensive to me, as I am sure it is to all Americans, is the thought of U.S. soldiers getting killed who might otherwise have easily been protected. And the bad advice came from Morton Halperin. This is the same Morton Halperin who reportedly was a prime mover behind the ill-conceived Presidential Directive 13, which would have made U.S. military forces subservient to the whim of the United Nations.

It is just such thinking which expanded the Somali mission into something called nation-building in the first place. In fact, it is such thinking which has marked the statements and writings of Morton Halperin for two decades, in his seemingly endless quest to have the United States give up its sovereignty on military matters in favor of multinational authority.

For example, in the left-wing publication, The Nation, Halperin wrote on June 9, 1979, that:

> All of the genuine security needs of the United States can be met by a simple rule which permits us to intervene only when invited to do so by a foreign government.

If we had followed that advice, we would not had saved our medical students in Grenada, nor would we have stopped the Communists from using immense stores of arms there to foster revolution throughout the Americas.

If we had followed that advice, we would never have tracked down, and toppled from illegitimate power, that drug-running thug, Manuel Noriega.

Adopting Halperin's approach is just stupid and dangerous, as we are now coming to realize. It is also immoral.

The list of other Halperin idiocies is long and well documented. Halperin wrote in 1976 that "covert actions and spies should be banned and the CIA's clandestine Service Branch disbanded," and in 1987 he repeated the call to "abolish covert operations."

And just this summer he wrote that "The United States should explicitly surrender the right to intervene unilaterally in the internal affairs of other countries by overt military means or by covert operations."

Mr. Speaker, if we had followed that advice, we never would have won the cold war, and millions of people who now are free would instead still be shackled in brutal oppression and slavery.

Even a novice to intelligence activities understands that wars can be avoided with properly directed covert action.

Now is the time—indeed, it is well past time—for Mr. Clinton and his Defense Secretary, Les Aspin, to withdraw Mr. Halperin's name from Senate consideration, to completely sever all Defense Department ties, formal and informal, with Mr. Halperin, and to convince the American people that U.S. troops will only be deployed in the interest of the United States, not at the whim of the ineffective and often counterproductive United Nations.

Unfortunately, the deaths of our soldiers who were denied the protection of necessary armament make it abundantly clear that either Mr. Halperin does not care about or he does not understand the needs of the troops in the field, and so he should not be confirmed as an Assistant Secretary of Defense or any other functionary of the U.S. Department of Defense.

Mr. Speaker, I include the article from the Washington Times by Bill Gertz, as follows:

ASPIN UNDER FIRE FOR SAYING NO TO EARLIER ARMS REQUESTS

(By Bill Gertz)

Gen. Colin Powell twice last month asked Defense Secretary Les Aspin for tanks and armored vehicles to protect U.S. forces in Somalia but was rebuffed for political reasons.

Defense officials close to the decision said yesterday that military leaders wanted to deploy the armor in early September but Pentagon civilians opposed it because they feared Congress' reaction.

"It was politics, pure and simple," said one official.

Meanwhile in Mogadishu, the Army major who is the chief spokesman for the U.N. mission in Somalia said U.S. forces have switched from peacekeeping to a "fugitive hunt" for Somali warlords—a job they are not trained for.

"We have this fugitive hunt—this is not a military operation," said Maj. David Stockwell. "So the military winds up taking casualties and looking inept. If there is a problem, maybe it is a problem with the mission."

In a telephone interview that echoed with the sound of automatic-weapons fire in the background, Maj. Stockwell said U.S. forces needed tanks and armored personnel carriers Sunday to speed up the rescue of two downed helicopters and 70 Army Rangers pinned down by Somali gunfire and rocket attacks.

"If U.S. forces had armor, they could have reacted more quickly, since they have common communications, training and tactics," the major said. Instead, they had to wait four hours for Pakistani and Malaysian armored vehicles.

On Capitol Hill yesterday, members of Congress criticized Mr. Aspin for not sending the armor. Sen. Alfonse M. D'Amato, New York Republican, called the inaction "unconscionable," while Rep. James T. Walsh, New York Republican, called on Mr. Aspin to resign.

Military officials close to the operation said Army Maj. Gen. Thomas M. Montgomery, deputy commander of U.N. forces and commander of U.S. forces in Somalia, sought tanks and armored vehicles for his troops in early September.

Gen. Montgomery sent the request to Gen. Joseph P. Hoar, commander of the Central Command, who relayed it to Gen. Powell.

Gen. Powell, who retired last week as chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, appealed to Mr. Aspin that the tanks and armored vehicles were needed as part of force-protection operations, military officials said.

"Powell brought the request to Aspin's attention on two separate occasions," one official said.

An Aspin spokesman declined comment yesterday.

Pentagon officials told reporters Tuesday that Mr. Aspin deferred a decision on the matter because he received conflicting advice from his advisers. Air Force Maj. Tom LaRock, a Pentagon spokesman, said deployment decisions "are classified and come to Secretary Aspin on a daily basis."

"He bases his decisions on the best military and diplomatic information available at the time," Maj. LaRock said.

But Pentagon sources said military leaders, including Gen. Powell pressed for the armor.

An Army official said Pentagon civilians—including Deputy Undersecretary of Defense Frank Wisner, designated Assistant Defense Secretary Morton Halperin and other Aspin aides—opposed the military's request because they feared it "would appear too offensive-oriented."

"A month later you wonder why it wasn't already there," the official said. "General Montgomery obviously saw this coming."

Maj. Stockwell said that the first group of 14 armored vehicles began arriving in Mogadishu yesterday. Four tanks also will be sent.

He said the military's mission in Somalia needs to be changed or clarified to avoid a repeat of Sunday's costly events.

Twelve U.S. soldiers were killed and 78 wounded in a Somali guerrilla attack. The remains of two soldiers are in Somalia custody, and one U.S. helicopter pilot has been captured. At least six other soldiers are missing.

The U.N. spokesman's unusually blunt comments are likely to spur demands in Congress that the Clinton administration clarify its Somalia policy and set a deadline to bring troops home.

Maj. Stockwell said "we are undertaking efforts" to retrieve Army Chief Warrant Officer Michael Durant, a helicopter pilot captured by Somalia on Sunday. But no contacts with the Somalis holding him have been made. U.N. forces also are trying to recover the remains of the two soldiers displayed on videotape, he said.

Maj. Stockwell said a rescue force had to shoot its way into the sites of the downed aircraft and stranded Rangers and it suffered a number of casualties in the process.

"The Rangers, who were pinned down, took most of their casualties early on and fended off fire that was unbelievably thick," Maj. Stockwell said. "We resupplied them with water, ammunition and food and supplied air cover. There must have been several hundred militias firing at 70 guys."

The Rangers had surrounded the downed helicopter and informed the U.S. commander that they did not require immediate evacuation from the scene, Maj. Stockwell said, adding that gave Gen. Montgomery time to organize the rescue force.

Maj. Stockwell, an Army Ranger, defended Gen. Montgomery's quick actions to mount the multinational operation that fought its way through Mogadishu for several hours to rescue U.S. servicemen.

Under the U.N. command structure, none of the multinational forces are required to take part in dangerous "quick reaction" missions and they cannot be ordered to do so, Maj. Stockwell said.

The U.N. forces have "all the responsibility but very little authority," he said.

Sunday's rescue force had to blast through Somali street barricades and overcome heavy fire from small arms, machine guns and grenade launchers en route to the two crashed helicopters.

The helicopters were shot down during a "search and seizure" operation to nab aides to Somali warlord Mohamed Farrah Aidid. Two of his top aides and 17 other Aidid guerrillas were captured.

THE SITUATION IN SOMALIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my dismay and distress over the deteriorating situation in Somalia.

When United States military forces were first sent to Somalia to join the United Nations peacekeeping mission in December 1992, the objective for the United States forces appeared both clear and limited: To deliver food and humanitarian aid to Somalia's starving masses. In deploying the first American forces to Somalia, President George Bush indicated he expected the forces to achieve this objective quickly and then return home.

Because the American forces achieved the objective of alleviating the misery in Somalia, the United States had begun the process of withdrawing its forces. However, as the U.S. forces were being withdrawn, the U.S. role there was being recast from humanitarian to a militant and political one. This was a terrible mistake.

While the United States Congress supported the use of American forces to deliver food and humanitarian aid and thereby alleviate the immediate problem in Somalia, the Congress did not endorse the use of United States forces to fight one or another of Somalia's warring clans. Nor did the U.S. Congress endorse the use of U.S. forces to capture and punish General Mohammed Farah Aideed, leader of the most powerful of the warring clans. Finally, the Congress did not at anytime endorse the use of U.S. forces to build a nation where none now exists.

Neither the United Nations nor the United States can influence the outcome of the ongoing Somalia power struggle. For this reason and also because the United States position with regard to Somalia has grown unclear, unrealistic, and untenable, the United States should leave Somalia immediately and allow the Somalis to find their way to establishing their own indigenous government.

CHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes in lieu of my previously approved 60-minute special order.

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

There was no objection.

NO PRINCIPLES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, there is an old term in politics for people who keep switching principles to keep in the limelight on important issues. They are allied political prostitutes. Anyone earning that name is quickly shunned from substantive issues.

The Wall Street Journal points out some of these people who have switched principles in an article "Some Former Foes of NAFTA Join Administration, Find Discomfort in Clash of Past, Present Views." This article only confirms the suspicions of the American public that those serving in Government or former Government officials are nothing more than hired guns for special interests.

I can understand lobbying—but an individual switching principles for a buck is not respected—unless he or she always was just an opportunist and nothing more.

One person named in the article is Michael Waldman, who is in charge of President Clinton's communication strategy on the NAFTA. What is so surprising is that Michael Waldman was director of Public Citizen's Congress Watch. In that capacity he wrote many anti-NAFTA pieces.

I applaud his former boss, Ralph Nader, who claims that "everytime he—meaning Waldman—talks on NAFTA his prior words will be paraded in front of him."

Ralph Nader has the right idea—hold these people accountable for their words and views.

Chuck Fox is another escape from the anti-NAFTA forces. He worked for Friends of the Earth, and strongly opposed the North American Free-Trade Agreement. Previously, he helped develop opposition to NAFTA. Now he is pushing the agreement as a special assistant at the Environmental Protection Agency.

In fact, he is assigned to the war room and is locating and coordinating support among the environmentalists, in support of the agreement. He claims the agreement is a precedent-setting green trade agreement. How can he say that when the Canadian Provinces have the opportunity to opt out of the agreement? It is time that former organization people and Federal officials do not get away with selective memory. The American people are the big losers in the process.

Another official who has switched sides, according to the Wall Street Journal, is Ron Brown, Secretary of Commerce. Remember, Mr. Brown was chairman of the Democrats national committee. In that position he spoke against NAFTA because his principal goal was to elect Democrats.

Now—I submit to you—it is either a good agreement or it isn't. You can't have it both ways. As Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Brown is supporting the agreement because he claims it creates jobs and his principal goal is to promote economic growth. On the surface, this at best looks like the actions of political opportunism. The job growth, I question.

What is lacking though in the debate about NAFTA—or any other trade agreement is leadership. The one person who has stood up for principle in this debate against the pressure of his party is the distinguished majority leader, Congressman RICHARD GEPHARDT.

What should we call those who are paid and switch from the antiforces to the proforces arguing any side of the issue? How can the American people trust their judgment—or believe they are hearing the truth?

In the article, Lori Wallach of Public Citizen summed it up best. She said,

> When you look at those folks in those jobs you can come to only two conclusions: Their heart is not in it, or they have no principles.

The American people deserve better than this. We are debating the future of American—indeed changing the very legal map of the country and our constitutional protections. There is no place for hired guns or political prostitutes in this debate.

THE NORTH AMERICAN FREE-TRADE AGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I am here once again this evening to talk about the North American Free-Trade Agreement.

The longer this debate goes on and the more I listen to the arguments of the NAFTA supporters, I cannot help but think of that old story about an admiral on a battleship steaming along on a dark sea when he sees lights dead ahead.

The admiral says, "Signal him to alter his course."

The signalman sends out a signal, and back comes the message, "You alter your course."

"Tell him he is under orders to alter his course. I am an admiral."

Back comes the message, "I am a seaman first class. You alter your course."

Now the admiral is getting upset. He says, "Tell that pipsqueak to move or we will blow him out of the water. We are on a fully armed Navy destroyer."

And the message comes back, "You better move. I am on a lighthouse."

Mr. Speaker, sometimes those of us who oppose NAFTA feel like that lighthouse. We are trying to change the course and steer America away from NAFTA before our economy, our jobs, and our standard of living ends up on the rocks, because I think when all is said and done the debate over NAFTA comes down to one thing, jobs, jobs and the standard of living that those jobs make possible.

The one argument that I have heard time and again on this floor from supporters of NAFTA is this, they admit that NAFTA will cause job dislocation in the short term, but they say that the jobs that will move south of the border will be low-wage, low-skilled jobs, not the high-wage, high-skilled jobs needed to compete in the future, because they say Mexico does not have the capacity to handle high-skilled jobs.

□ 1730

Well, I would like to direct their attention, and the attention of people who share that opinion, to an article that appeared in yesterday's edition of the Washington Post on the business page, an article which in its own words illustrates some of the economic pressures central to the debate over NAFTA. This article ran in the business section. The headlines read, and I quote, "A High-Tech, Low-Wage Lure, Hughes' Move to Mexico Illustrates a Thorny NAFTA Issue."

Mr. Speaker, it tells a story of Hughes Aircraft Company, a high-technology defense contractor in Newport Beach, CA. They make microcircuits for missiles, jet fighters, and other defense systems, which is difficult work by anybody's standards.

The article begins, and I quote,

> When former Hughes Aircraft Co. project manager William Lewis was assigned the task in 1988 of defending a company decision to transfer high-technology U.S. defense work from Newport Beach, Calif., to a Hughes plant here in Mexico, he was suspicious.
>
> "I had to live the lie," Lewis said in a telephone interview, referring to claims that jobs wouldn't be lost. "I knew that somewhere down the line, people would lose their jobs because of this."

And they did, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, within months after the decision was made Hughes Aircraft closed its doors in Newport Beach for good, and hundreds of workers lost their jobs to Mexico. But the thing is they were not low-skilled jobs or low-wage jobs. These were high-precision, high-skilled, microcircuit jobs that started people off at $17 an hour.

And how did they end up in Mexico? Well, Mr. Speaker, they ended up in Mexico for the same reason that 500,000 other American jobs migrated to Mexico in the past 10 years, the same reason that thousands more will go if NAFTA passes. It is because Mexico has lax environmental laws, no health and safety laws, a corrupt judicial system, a 58-cent-an-hour minimum wage

just beckoning companies to move south, and NAFTA does nothing to change that. It just makes it easier for companies to move.

Mr. Speaker, if my colleagues do not believe me or the article in the Washington Post, maybe they will believe the Mexican Government. This is an ad they are running in major business publications, or did run in major business publications, throughout the United States. It says, "You can't cut labor costs 300 percent in 90 minutes. Yes, you can in Yucatan, a place in Mexico." This ad goes on to say, "Come on down where we pay a dollar an hour in wages and benefits, or less than a dollar an hour in wages and benefits." On this side of the ad it says, "You can save $15,000 per worker, and you and your plant manager can live well, and your company will be more competitive," that is, American jobs will be gone. And then there is a number to call.

Of course we called the number, Mr. Speaker, and of course they had been flooded from this ad by inquiries by American companies just eager to go south.

Hughes moved to Tijuana for one simple reason, because Mexican workers earn less in an entire day than workers in Newport Beach make in an hour. Workers in Newport Beach started out, as I said, at $17 an hour, but, as the story points out, the starting wage in Tijuana for a line operator, the people manning the microscopes and chip assembly lines, is 20 Mexican pesos a day, or about $6.40 a day. Six dollars and forty cents a day, and NAFTA will encourage more of the same.

But, if my colleagues listen to the arguments of NAFTA supporters, that is not supposed to happen because Mexican workers cannot do high-skilled work. Indeed the story points out that only a few years ago companies like Hughes had seemed immune to the southbound trend of lower technology industries. After all, they say, the precision work performed by defense contractors was regarded as too sensitive to delegate to workers in a developing country such as Mexico.

But the story points out, high-technology companies, such as Hughes, are finding that with proper training and supervision Mexican workers are just as capable as their United States counterparts in manufacturing the complex microchips that go into aerospace and defense products. The story says that inside dust-free production rooms at the Hughes plant in Tijuana, Mexicans from dirt-poor neighborhoods don smocks and surgical masks each day to operate 100,000 dollars' worth of machines, and do my colleagues know what they do? They produce and test tiny microcircuits whose construction is so intricate, so delicate, that microscopes are required to examine wiring one-eighth the thickness of a human hair.

Mr. Speaker, does that sound like low-skilled work? Does that sound like easy work that anybody can do? Of course not, and it is exactly the kind of high-skilled jobs that everybody agrees America needs to compete in the future.

I am not saying that our future lies in defense contracts, but we are clearly beginning the process of conversion in this country. But if Mexican workers can do this kind of work, what does that mean for the future of jobs at American electronics companies? In the future of jobs at computer plants and assembly plants that will rely on the same kind of high-skilled labor, what happens to those jobs if NAFTA makes it easier for them to move to Mexico?

Mr. Speaker, it is simple questions like this that NAFTA supporters cannot answer. Never mind the fact that Hughes and the U.S. Government were using U.S. tax dollars through defense contracts to take away American jobs. That is a whole separate issue. The fact is Mexico is spending a record $30 million to hire lobbyists to sell NAFTA, and the American companies are pitching in a few million dollars' worth more, and they still cannot answer some very basic, simple questions like:

Why would an employer pay $17 an hour when NAFTA will make it easier for him or her to pay 58 cents an hour?

Simple questions, Mr. Speaker.

They tell us that NAFTA will help Mexican workers to buy our products. But we have to ask ourselves this: How are they supposed to buy American cars when a week's wage will barely allow them to buy a set of spark plugs?

Simple questions.

Supporters say NAFTA will help Mexican workers. They say, as their productivity rises, wages will rise.

Well, let us look at the facts. Since 1979, and this is a startling fact, productivity in Mexico has gone up dramatically, but wages have gone down at least 25 percent, and, if one looks at the bureau of statistics, government bureau of statistics in Mexico, and our Bureau of Labor Statistics, they say 32 percent. Why should it be any different under NAFTA, and who is getting all of these profits?

Simple questions, Mr. Speaker.

NAFTA supporters claim that each Mexican buys $450 worth of American goods. But that is only true if my colleagues believe the average Mexican is buying robots for his home and large industrial equipment for his basement, if he has one. I say to my colleagues, "The truth is, if you look at that figure that they talked about in terms of $5 billion in surplus in exports to Mexico, 85 percent of the goods Mexico buys are parts and machines for factories that they are going to build. We are literally shipping our factories to Mexico, and our jobs will follow. Why don't they ever mention that?"

Simple questions.

Lobbyists concede that NAFTA will send many jobs to Mexico, but they say, "Down the road, down the road, others will take its place."

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Ohio, who has been exceptionally articulate and well versed on this issue, and I thank him for his leadership.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

I want to go back to some of the things the gentleman said about wages and the incredible wage differential between Mexican wages and American wages and how the differential has only gotten worse. In fact, as productivity in Mexico has gone up so that their workers are producing more and more efficiently, their wages have actually gone down. At the same time, and this has a major bearing on the number of multinational corporations that will continue to go and go in a greater rate to Mexico under NAFTA, it is what happened this week on some issues on worker safety.

In Mexico, Mr. Speaker, Mexican workers not only are not paid very much. Their environmental laws are not only weak, those that are in effect are unenforced. The whole issue of Mexican worker safety is a major, major problem in Mexico.

This week our U.S. Trade Representative dismissed, even mocked, the U.S. Trade Representative's responsibility to enforce existing U.S. trade law. Specifically our Trade Representative dismissed a 43-page petition which detailed systematic workers rights violations in Mexico.

□ 1740

He accepted the GSP's problems that were cited in countries like Pakistan, Costa Rica, Paraguay, Peru, the Dominican Republic, and the Republic of Haiti, but he simply threw out the 43-page petition in great detail outlining the Mexican worker violations by Mexican employers or by multinational company employers in Mexico.

His doing that simply is saying we do not care what Mexico does to its workers. Now, that is not only a bad thing for Mexico and Mexican workers, but what that means in terms of NAFTA is that, first, of all, American companies closed down places in Macomb County, MI, and Lorain County, OH. They close the plant down and move to Mexico because, first, the wages are so much lower in Mexico; second, the environmental laws are so much poorer in Mexico; and, third, the American Government clearly, the United States Trade Representative clearly does not care that workers are being exploited by avoiding labor laws, child labor laws, worker safety laws, occupational

hazard laws, and all those kinds of things.

So this decision by the United States Trade Representatives, in violation of American law, says again to an employer, go ahead and go to Mexico. You can pay less wages. You do not have to worry about the minimum wage. You do not have to worry about protecting workers. You do not have to worry about the health of workers.

You have to in this country. So if you have got to follow OSHA in this country, and you have got to pay a minimum wage, and you have got to pay a decent wage, and you have got to follow environmental laws, you do not have to do any of that in Mexico.

So it is not just the wage differential that you cite where you say you cannot cut labor costs 300 percent in 90 minutes, yes, you can, in Yucatan. It is also environmental laws, it is worker safety laws, it is all the things that our country stands for. This Congress has fought, and DAVID BONIOR, the majority whip, has been one of the leaders, in fighting for safety in the workplace, for good environmental laws. We are just throwing that out the window and saying go to Mexico. You do not have to follow any of that stuff.

Mr. BONIOR. What is so disturbing about this is that corporations that normally behave in a fair and decent manner here in the United States, although many of them have to be pulled to the table and recognize the rights of neighbors and workers to a decent and clean standard of living, nevertheless, they have accepted that principle, at least recently, have gone down there, without any feeling, or understanding, corporate ethic, or sensibility.

The people of Mexico, they have gone down there. If you look at the maquiladora areas along the border of the United States and Mexico, Matamoros, Tijuana and other places, there are 500 corporations along those borders where they assemble parts and basically ship things right back to the United States or overseas, where the Mexican consumer does not really see it. It is just a place to assemble and ship and export;

If you look at those places, the wages are phathetically low, as you mentioned. The environmental standards are ungodly in many instances. People living in filth, living with toxic chemicals, polluted streams and rivers where they get their water and where they bathe. It is absolutely a horror story out of a Third World nightmare that goes on. Normal corporations that consider these things in this country do not think anything about their lack of ethics in Mexico. And that is disturbing, because these often are the same corporations who are trying to extend NAFTA. They are part of NAFTA–USA, or whatever they call themselves, the people that are behind this NAFTA project.

And you are absolutely right. The people who work so hard in this country to give us decent wage standards, child protection laws, clean environmental laws, health and safety benefits, you know, the labor union gets a bad rap in this Chamber and in this country now. They are not in vogue anymore. They only represent, what, 17 percent of the people now in the country.

But people have to understand a lot of the wonderful standards that have been brought to this country in terms of health care and in terms of clean environment and in terms of worker rights and the right to petition your employer, the right to a decent wage, the right to safe working conditions, are the product of people like A. Phillip Randolph, and Gumpers, and Meany, and all the labor people in this country who sweated and were literally beaten on the picket lines over the centuries, to get us to the point where we have a relatively good decent place where our workers and families live today.

If this treaty goes through, what we will be doing is lowering our standard to meet the Mexican standard. And the Mexican standard, which as you have correctly pointed out and which I have tried to, is pathetically low. It is taking us back. It is not moving us forward to the future.

My bottom line on NAFTA, and I think yours and others in this chamber, is their standards should have to come up to ours. Not only these environmental standards and worker standards and wage standards, but the democratization standards which we have talked a good deal about on this floor.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the gentleman will yield, you are exactly correct in that we in this country proudly over the last particularly 30 and 40 years have come to a consensus. I mean, we argue about our environmental regulations, too stringent or not stringent enough; our worker safety regulations, too stringent, or not stringent enough; or public health standards, clean water, and clean air. Do we go too far, or not quite far enough. All of those kinds of discussions.

But we have reached a consensus in this country, local health departments, State governments, this Government in Washington, all of us have reached some general consensus that we have good solid clean air, clean water, safe drinking water laws, that we have good public health laws, that we take care of our children and our families and our neighborhoods and our environment that way.

That is why those groups that fought, that is why we owe so much to those groups that you mentioned, to organize labor groups and environmental groups, to farmers and all of us who have been part of that.

Now, what we do with NAFTA though is erode those. NAFTA in some cases can override some of those state laws and some of those perhaps even county health department laws. It can override. It will do what you say it will. It will harmonize downward.

They love to talk about harmonization of standards. But I heard, I believe it was Mr. Kantor, the other day talking about harmonizing upward Mexican standards.

Well, the word "harmonize" means they go up and we go down. It means a pulling on our wage rates, our wage levels down, which means a worse standard of living for us. It means a pulling down of our environmental standards. It means a dilution of pulling down of child labor laws and other kinds of labor standards.

The agreement is not constructed in a way that it pulls Mexico up. It really does not do that. As you said so well, with all these multinational corporations in Mexico, while productivity has gone up, wages have still gone down. It is because it is a government they have that is not free. As you said so many times, you cannot have free trade without trading with a free government, without free elections.

What NAFTA does, more than anything, is put an American Government Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval on the behavior of the Mexican Government, on those kind of "Yes, you can, Yucatan" ads. It puts a Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval on Mexican antidemocracy standards and all the things they have done to have one-party rule in that country. It puts our Government's Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval on their keeping their wage rates down and wrecking the environment and hurting workers, and all the things the Mexican Government has done that our country blessedly has risen above over the years and reached that consensus. NAFTA is just bad news in that way, absolutely.

Mr. BONIOR. That is one of the most distressing points of this whole debate, is we will be rewarding the people who have perpetrated these bad environmental laws, these antidemocratization standards, these phony unions they have down there. We will be saying to them because you have done this, because you have a political system where 58 opposition leaders were assassinated over the last 10 years by the state police, because you have a political system where 23 journalists were killed in the last 4 years under Salinas, we are going to reward you.

We should be doing what the Europeans have done to countries that wanted to enter the European Community. The European Community has taken 30 years and spent over $100 million between 1989 and 1993 to integrate countries whose political and economic systems were a lot closer than ours is to Mexico. When countries like Spain,

Portugal, and Greece, whose democratization standards and standard of living were not quite the same as the French, the British, the Germans, when they wanted to enter the EC they were told you have got to meet two criteria. It is written right into the EC documents. A, you have got to raise your standard up, and you have got to increase your democratization. When they did that, then their acceptance was embraced, or will be embraced.

□ 1750

And it is what we are doing to Turkey today. We ought to be engaged in that same type of a process. Yet we are trying to do the same thing that the Europeans have taken 40, 45 years, spent hundreds of millions of dollars, as I said, in the last 4 years. We are trying to do this within months, without spending a dime.

We cannot get people to come forward and say, how are we going to pay for NAFTA. When you say, what do you mean pay for NAFTA? Well, you are going to lose $2.5 to $3 billion in tariff revenue. You have got border cleanup that is going to cost in the billions of dollars. You have got infrastructure, roads, bridges, and highways that are going to cost. Texas alone wants $10 billion for infrastructure improvement.

You have got worker retraining that is going to cost billions of dollars, it has been guesstimated, where the cost is anywhere between 40 and 50 billion. And we cannot even get them to come here and suggest to us how we are going to pay the next tranche of extension of unemployment benefits for people who have been out of work for a long time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, that is exactly right. All the reasons that the majority whip and so many others in this Chamber in both parties oppose NAFTA are very valid.

One of the reasons that has only more recently been discussed is plain and simple, NAFTA is a $50 billion new Government program.

We could not get the votes in this Chamber to pass a stimulus package, to create jobs in our country. We are having trouble getting the votes for an unemployment compensation benefits for our workers, many of whom will be put out of work more, if NAFTA passes. We cannot get enough deficit reduction in this Chamber because people on both sides of the aisle sometimes fail. We cannot do a lot of the things we need to do.

But the Members that support NAFTA, who say we have to have deficit reduction, who say this, who say that, who will not vote for programs for our own workers to retrain them and our own workers for investment in their futures and highways and bridges and schools and vocational training, want to vote for NAFTA and say, do not worry about it. We will come up with the $50 billion later.

They are not being honest. They are not being truthful. They are not being straightforward, and they are selling the American people a bill of goods with a $50 billion new Government program.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], who is one of the strongest supporters of NAFTA, an articulate spokesman, always a challenge to deal with on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, how about upstairs in the Rules Committee?

Mr. BONIOR. A challenge that is not quite so daunting up there.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my very dear friend, the gentleman from Mt. Clemens, and my friend, the gentleman from Lorain. I have the utmost regard for both. Frankly, I have the utmost regard for all the Members who have been involved in this debate.

I would just like to take one moment to respond to some of these things.

I do not want to take a lot of your time. I am going to be going through some specifics myself in a few minutes, when you all complete. I would be happy to let you-all challenge any of the things that I have to say.

The only thing that I would like to point to is, we have regularly seen this chart, "Yes, you can, Yucatan," night after night after night.

I am not going to stand here as an apologist for that. The fact of the matter is, we have seen behavior that has taken place during the 60-year history of one-party control, the Institutional Revolutionary Party's control of Mexico, that I would not support. And my friend from Mt. Clemens would not support, and my friend from Lorain would not support. No one in this Congress would support it, but we must acknowledge that since the last part of the Miguel de la Madrid administration, when President Miguel de la Madrid joined the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and then, of course, the full presidency of President Salinas, I am not going to stand as an apologist of the killing of 23 journalists or any other human rights violations which have taken place, but I would argue that as serious as those are, they pale in comparison to the behavioral pattern that we have seen in the past.

So what my friend talks about, the fact that in Europe years were spent trying to overcome some of the problems that existed between countries, we have seen over the past 6 years tremendous improvements in moving in the direction of a free market.

We have seen improvements in moving in the direction towards greater political pluralism. There are still problems in Mexico.

I stand here and say, yes, there are problems in Mexico. But I happen to believe that implementation of a North American Free-Trade Agreement will help move us in the direction of improving those rather than maintaining the status quo.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his contribution.

I would rebut this arguments by suggesting that when I started this debate, frankly, I had been under the impression that the Madrid government and now the government of President Salinas was an improvement over the past. You read about it all the time. You heard about it.

But when you look at the statistics, the human rights reports that were written by Amnesty International, the numbers that I cited with respect to opposition leaders, 58 assassinated by the state police. Twenty-three journalists, actually, there are more than 23, there were 61 journalists killed in the last 10 years, 23 in the last 4 years.

You look at the wage scale. I agree with you, they have moved to a free economy, but who has it benefited? Basically, a few rich. Mexico has increased the number of billionaires, "b," not "m," "b," from 2 to 13 in the last few years, the fastest growth of any country on Earth.

Mr. DREIER. The middle class and the upper-middle class in Mexico has increased to almost the same size as the Canadian middle- and upper-middle class. We have seen an explosion in the increase in middle-income wage earners in Mexico over the past 6 years. That cannot be ignored. We have seen real improvement and change.

Mr. BONIOR. The fact of the matter is that half of the people in Mexico live in poverty. The fact of the matter is that real wages now are lower than they were in 1979. That is not me saying it. Those are statistics that come from the Mexican Government. They come from our own Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Yes, in the last 5 years they have increased somewhat, because 1987 was the worst year in Mexican history in terms of wages. They bottomed out.

Mr. DREIER. The last 5 years wages rates have gone up at a higher rate than productivity has gone up. In the last 5 years wages rates have exceeded productivity.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Kantor came in front of our committee the other day and sang this same song, which is tiresome at best, that productivity has exceeded wage rates. By any measurement, there is one example that they can use to build their case, but by any other measurement you make, if you go back 7 years, if you go back 9 years, 10 years, 12 years, that is simply not the case.

If you go back those 12 years to the year 1980 or 1981, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] said, wage rates have dropped 30 percent and productivity has gone up 40 percent. That is clearly an economy that is run from the top down with no democracy injected into it, not real capitalism. It is statism.

In any free society, as productivity goes up, wages roughly shadow, within a point or two, or three, or four, or five, roughly shadow those wages. So all those businesses have gone, all those American companies have moved to Mexico, stealing American jobs, hiring mostly young women in Mexico that they use for a few years and then get rid of them and hire more young women, hire them at very low wage rates. They cannot build any decent kind of standard of living to buy much.

Mr. BONIOR. They live in corrugated cardboard huts. It is unbelievable, the poverty line.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And the whole point of NAFTA, the major selling block, the major fundamental foundation of the pro-NAFTA people in selling their case is, if we pass NAFTA, a big middle class will be born in Mexico and will grow, and grow, and grow, and they will be able to buy American products.

As long as they do not have free elections and a billion dollars to bargain collectively and form unions and as long as they do not have any kind of wage standards and labor standards to allow people to join the middle class, that is not going to happen. It is only going to make the 36 families that we have talked about on this floor many times——

Mr. BONIOR. That own 54 percent of the wealth.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is not doing anybody any good except them.

It is hurting Mexican workers. It is hurting American workers. It is hurting Mexican workers, who get peanuts for what they do. It is hurting American workers who always live under the hammer of an employer saying, if you do not take this give back, if you do not take this pay cut, if you do not let your health benefits be slashed, we are going to move to Mexico.

So as an employee, I will say, probably, "Well, I will take the give back."

Mr. BONIOR. Take this poster. And they will put it up on a bulletin board. They will not have to pay anything to their employees in American factories. That is what American employers are going to do.

□ 1800

The message is quite clear here. They can do it for a lot less.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If they are doing that during the NAFTA debate, you can bet those are going to proliferate, and Chihuahua is going to do it, and every state in Mexico is going to start doing that stuff. Yucatan is just a little bolder and a little more brazen than others. You can bet those are going to paper the country with those kinds of solicitations.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR. If the gentleman will let me finish my statement, I will be happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would first like to ask my friend, I would like to explore with my friend this issue of wage rates versus productivity.

We talk about looking at these snapshot timeframes, where we can look at 5 years, 7 years, 12 years. What I would like to ask my friends is whether or not they are aware of the developments that took place in Mexico between 1979 and 1981.

Of course, we know that during that time there was a tremendous oil boom that took place. We saw a surge in oil prices. At the same time, there was a flow of very unwise foreign lending which came in and artificially led wage rates to be increased. It seems to me we need to recognize that with that snapshot, following those developments, unwise foreign lending, then if you look at the tremendous socialistic policies that were put into place by President Jose Lopez Portillo, it created that tremendous crash. We have now seen that overcome dramatically. That is why I like to look at history and learn from history.

Mr. BONIOR. I do, as well. I think it is important to note here what happened. There was this tremendous boom in Mexico, lots of oil and gas, in the timeframe that the gentleman mentioned. What happened to all of those revenues? Were they put into nutrition programs for the kids in Mexican schools? Did they build sewer and water treatment facilities? Did they provide decent educational facilities?

Mr. DREIER. No, wage rates were artificially high.

Mr. BONIOR. They did not do any of that. Do you know what happened? It went into the pockets of a few wealthy people. That is what happened.

Mr. DREIER. Wage rates were high under that situation. Since that time, since the mid-1980's, we have seen a tremendous increase, not in the 36 families' net worth; yes, it is great, but we have seen an increase in the size of the middle- and upper-middle class. In excess of 20 million of the 88 million Mexicans fall within that category, 28 million in Canada.

It is very clear that it is a growing bloc, and we cannot ignore it, because those are the ones that have the purchasing power who will be able to buy more U.S.-manufactured goods, products, when we bring about a NAFTA.

I am here just to march in lock-step with my good friend, Mickey Kantor, and your President, Bill Clinton.

Mr. BONIOR. He is my good friend, too.

Mr. Speaker, a good middle-class job, a real good middle-class job, is to work in their Ford factory, the Escort factory, that moved, by the way, from Michigan to Mexico and took a lot of jobs with it, thousands of jobs. It is the Hermosilla plant. They pay about $2.30 an hour, benefit package and everything. Compare that to what an auto-worker makes in this country. That is not enough to buy, as I said earlier, a decent set of spark plugs and other things for an automobile, let alone someone can afford to purchase an automobile.

We ought to really tell it like it is. This agreement was not meant to help American workers. It was not meant to help Mexican workers. It was negotiated so a few rich people on both sides of the border could get richer, richer on the backs of working people. I do not care what the $30 million hired guns try to tell us that are running around this town, that have money, $30 million from Mexico, to come and influence this vote. This NAFTA is nothing but a job-stealing, worker-exploiting, community-busting agreement. We have got to do everything we can to educate the American public and our colleagues to defeat it.

The question that supporters of NAFTA never ask is the most obvious one: What happens to the workers that get left behind? They say, "Well, you know, we are going to create these jobs, and, you know, they will be rehired again."

What happens when communities see plants leave? What happens when families are forced to pick up the pieces? NAFTA supporters predict, they predict that hundreds of new jobs will be created down the road. They cannot really say when, but they say, "Trust us. Everything is going to work out fine." The point is, these are only theories.

As one writer wrote:

> American workers are being asked to jeopardize the job they have now and opt for two in the bush, when nobody can really say when or what kind of jobs are coming along.

Mr. Speaker, American workers are not stupid. That is why this thing is so unpopular in the polls. They know what will happen. They have seen it right before their eyes for the past 12 years. People in my district know that when a plant closes, it is just not the workers who are affected, it is everybody. It hits the dentist, it hits the doctor, it hits the florist, it hits the grocer, it hits the person who runs the gas station. The movie theaters see shorter lines. The grocery stores see fewer customers. The neighborhood restaurants see empty tables.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield on that point, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is not only that NAFTA is a job killer for people who work in factories, as the gentleman from Michigan said. It is absolutely a small business killer, too.

There are several ways that small business gets hurt from NAFTA. One is, I was talking to a plant owner, I went to the plant and was talking to the owners in a community in my district called Avon. In Avon there is a

plant that employs about 100 people. It is owned locally, owned by three brothers. Those brothers told me that one of their competitors, which happens to be a European company, but a large multinational company, is going to build a plant, if NAFTA passes, in Mexico. They have the capital, this European company has the capital to put a plant in Mexico.

My friends in Avon do not have the money to be able to do this, so they cannot go to Mexico. It is small. The plant can go to Mexico and hire people at 80 cents an hour, evade environmental laws, pay no attention to worker safety, and those kinds of things for people, and simply out-compete, because of the big, big, big differential in costs with the small business in my district.

Other kinds of small businesses, as you say, that get hurt are those small businesses that supply the larger businesses. There are two Ford plants in my district. One of them makes the Thunderbird. That Thunderbird is also made in Mexico, a small plant in Mexico. Today, anyway, it is a small plant. If NAFTA passes, if they begin to shift production from the Lorraine Ford plant assembling Thunderbirds to Mexico, that means the small suppliers around Lorraine County, in northeast Ohio and Medina County and that area, those small suppliers that have grown up, if you will, around that Ford plant, that might have 10 workers or 40 workers, they are job shops, machine shops, they are parts shops, they are all different kinds of people that build things and make things to supply the Ford plant. Those people are not big enough to go down to Mexico to supply Ford in Mexico, so that kind of small business group is hurt badly by NAFTA.

The third group is what you say, the florists, the realtors, the dentists, the self-employed persons, the movie theater owner, that simply sees less money in their community, and they are hurt by NAFTA just as much.

When we talk about NAFTA being a job-killer, it devastates small businesses and it can hurt communities.

Mr. BONIOR. We know from direct experience in our own States how devastating that can be. I could name a dozen towns that were once great in Ohio, and the gentleman could probably name a dozen in Michigan, and they were once great. I will not do it, because I do not want to embarrass the people who are trying to valiantly to make a comeback, and some are, who have in the last 15 years been absolutely devastated; great places at one time, and you can see the life blood sucked out of them because of dislocation.

Do the Members know what happens to workers who are left behind? We do not need to read about this in books. We do not need to read theories of what will happen from some economist who sits in a designer chair in some climate-controlled office, because the gentleman and I have lived it. We have seen it.

When I drive home from Washington, and occasionally I do that, maybe once or twice a year, instead of flying, I go through those Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Michigan towns. I have seen the devastation. We have seen what happens to workers who are left behind.

My district office sometimes helps displaced workers find new jobs. In Michigan, the autoworkers who lost their $15 an hour jobs are not seeing these new exports create high-paying jobs. They are not seeing the yellow brick road promised by NAFTA supporters. Most of them are lucky if they can find a job for $6 an hour.

These are the fathers of four who are forced, and we see it every day, they are forced to deliver pizzas. They are the steel workers, as someone once said, with fingers too big to use a computer, and who are waiting to be trained, retrained for work. They are the fathers and mothers and brothers and sisters who sit down with the Yellow Pages and make hundreds of calls every day, trying to get an interview somewhere.

Mr. Speaker, these are parents who have mortgages to pay, families to feed, clothes to buy for their kids. This is not some kind of theory, it is real life. Is this the direction that we want our country to go in? Is this the high-wage, high-skilled path to the future that our opponents talk about?

I think we all agree that we need an agreement with Mexico and Latin America, but can we not do better than this? Of course we can, but why should that matter to people like, for instance, Bob Novak. If he is wrong about NAFTA, he is not going to lose his job. If NAFTA takes Americans' jobs, Lee Iacocca is going to go right on cashing in on his stock options and making millions.

If NAFTA forces our standard of living down, all of these former Presidents who were at the White House supporting NAFTA the other day, they are not going to feel it. They are going to get $75,000 a pop for a speech that is shorter than we have been talking here this evening.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And not as good, I might add, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. BONIOR. And not as good, the gentleman is correct, I say immodestly.

What the NAFTA debate comes down to is this. Under no conceivable circumstance would any of the people who support NAFTA be hurt if NAFTA goes through, but American workers will. We have seen that happen. We have seen the lives of our fathers and our brothers, our sisters, our neighbors destroyed over the past 10 years.

□ 1810

We have seen entire communities laid to waste in the dust of factories who have headed south. We have seen our standard of living driven down in this country, and that is why we are not going to let this agreement go through. And that is why there is so much support to kill NAFTA.

There is a general sense out there that this is a screwing, that the American people are not being treated fairly.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the gentleman will yield, it is interesting that the supporters of NAFTA trot out their six Presidents, and then they trot out their newspaper publishers, and then they trot out their Harvard economists, particularly the economists that they love from the east coast and the west coast, not so many economists from the middle of the country and Middle America, and they trot out some of their friends in academia, all of the people that, as you say, will not be hurt by NAFTA. But the interesting thing about this debate is the more the people in this country know about NAFTA, the less they like it. The more that workers hear about it, the less they like it. The more that small businesses hear about it, the less they like it. And that is because, and we can feel that in this Congress more and more where Members are coming out in opposition to NAFTA, because they are getting more and more mail from home, and they are going home like in the August work recess when we were out of session and people came back here and could not believe how many talked to them about what a bad deal NAFTA was for those businesses, for their workplaces, for their communities, for their schools, for their children, and for their way of life. Over and over again it is clear that the public is just sweeping across this institution, writing letters and saying no to NAFTA. And it is just real clear that we are winning this fight in large part not because of the newspapers, or not because of anything that any of us are doing, but because the public is overwhelmingly opposed to this agreement and think it is a bad deal.

Mr. BONIOR. Let me just finish my statement and conclude by suggesting to my friend that over the past 80 years people like our parents and grandparents have worked too hard, and they have fought too long to raise the standard of living in this country. Great people in the consumer movement, in the environmental movement, in the labor movement, people like Walter Reuther, and A. Philip Randolph and others have worked so hard so that people can own enough money to raise their families, to educate their kids, to buy a car, buy a home, take a nice vacation and retire in dignity with good health. That is the American dream for many of the people that we

represent. And we cannot afford an agreement that will take us back to the Dark Ages and bring our standard of living down. We need to be moving forward.

My bottom line, as I said earlier to my friend from Ohio, my bottom line on Mexican trade is if we are going to have an agreement with Mexico it should be one that raises their standards to our level, not lower ours to theirs. Only then can we compete on the quality of the product and not on the misery and the suffering of the people who make it. And only then can we create the kind of future that we want for our communities and for our country. And only then can we avoid that lighthouse that I have talked about earlier, and have an agreement that will benefit the people of America and the people of Mexico.

We can do it. We can make this a real agreement that helps people. But you have to have people involved. You just cannot have the top corporate elite in both countries involved. You have to bring people to the table who have a stake.

We are their voices here. We are their voices, the voices of the people who are left out, who were not at the table when this thing was put together, and we will say no on their behalf. And then we will come together to form a common and decent market for workers in all of the Americas.

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

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H. Con. Res. 161. Concurrent resolution providing for an adjournment of the House from Thursday, October 7, 1993 or Friday, October 8, 1993 to Tuesday, October 12, 1993 and an adjournment or recess of the Senate from Thursday, October 7, 1993 to Wednesday, October 13, 1993.

HAITI

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARLOW). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, we are 23 days away from a major human rights victory in Haiti. We are 23 days away from the restoration of democracy in Haiti, 23 days away from the return of constitutional government in Haiti. In accordance with an agreement that was signed on Governors Island with the United States and the United Nations, and the illegal representatives of the illegal Government of Haiti, plus the legal Government of Haiti, the return of President Aristide, the lawfully elected President of Haiti, elected by 70 percent of the voters, will take place on October 30, just 23 days away.

The timetable was moving forward. Whether or not we complete all of the steps in the sequence and arrive at the final solution on October 30 will depend on the resolve of the President of United States.

All parties to the agreement except one are cooperating and fulfilling and enforcing the agreement. The one party to the agreement that is not fully living up to the agreement is the illegal government that was installed as a result of the coup d'etat against President Aristide 2 years ago, although they did go to Governors Island, and they did agree that they would relinquish power by October 30. There are elements among the military, the army, and the police who are in Haiti, and the police are just a unit of the army, there are elements there who are insisting that they will not abide by the agreement. They are terrorizing the population, and they have murdered some people within the last month-and-a-half.

We are about to witness a major achievement which will set a precedent for the new world order if we pursue this agreement to its logical conclusion. But the handful of thugs, the handful of people who have the guns, you know in Haiti the army is 7,000 men only against a nation of 7 million, and 70 percent of those 70 million people voted for a President, and it is 70 percent of the population against the rest of the population, but the army has the guns. The handful of people who are terrorizing the population, they have the guns. And without threatening war, without intervention, without a United Nations special peacekeeping force, carefully and diligently, diplomats have worked out a situation whereby the army promised to back down. The army promised by October 30 that it would cooperate with the restoration of constitutional government.

Elements of the army now threaten to torpedo that agreement, and the only voice that they will listen to at this point is the voice of President Clinton. Whether or not this agreement succeeds or not, whether or not this process succeeds or not is now very much in the hands of the President. They only understand the language of firmness, the language of commitment. We do not have to threaten to send necessary troops. We just have to repeatedly let them know that this Government will not tolerate a torpedoing or a sabotaging of this agreement.

So we are urging the President at this point to take whatever actions are necessary to impress upon the handful of army commanders who are still leading a violent group against the population, to impress upon them the fact that the United States is very serious about guaranteeing that this agreement is enforced.

About 10 days ago a CODEL of Representatives of the House went to Haiti under the leadership of Congressman RANGEL. I was a member of the CODEL. And we went there because we were requested by President Aristide and the leaders of the Haitian legal Government, the constitutional Government, to show a presence as soon as possible. They had undergone a month-and-a-half of escalation of violence, 100-some people has been killed, and people maimed, and beaten, and finally a close friend and supporter of President Artistide had been dragged out of a church and murdered.

□ 1820

So they asked us to go right away in the hope that we would express by our presence the fact that the United States was still firmly committed to this agreement. I think our trip was successful. I think it was successful in that we went and we made a firm statement about the need to stop the violence and stop the killing. President Clinton gave us a letter to give to Prime Minister Malval. Prime Minister Malval was recently installed by President Aristide as one of the steps toward restoring constitutional government.

The letter from President Clinton to Prime Minister Malval said quite clearly that the United States was still firmly committed to the enforcement of the agreement and that it would hold the coup leaders responsible for any further violence.

Our presence there I think had some effect for some short period of time. The killings stopped for about a week. The violence stopped for about a week. But now the violence has resumed again in the last few days. The killings and threats have begun again.

It is necessary for the President to send a strong message again that we intend to support this agreement all the way to October 30.

I think it would be a major achievement not only by the Clinton administration but by the Organization of American States, a major achievement by the United Nations, a major achievement in this new world order, it will be an unprecedented situation where the legally elected president or leader of a republic in this hemisphere was returned to power as a result of pressure brought by the international community and the United States.

That has never happened before. It has never happened before. The coup leaders, the military juntas across the western hemisphere and across the world have had their way. Now in this new world order committed to democracy, committed to human rights, the international community of the United

Nations and the community of nations within this hemisphere, under the Organization of American States, have made it clear that we stand firmly behind constitutional governments and against military juntas who are in power as a result of illegal coups d'etat.

This agreement that is moving forward and will culminate in the return of President Aristide by October 30 is the result of actions by President Clinton which were very vital. The situation was turned around a few months ago when President Clinton decided that he would issue an order to freeze the assets of all the coup leaders and people who supported the coup, all the assets that they had in this country would be frozen. The President decided to deny visas to those people who supported the coup and the President decided to go to the United Nations and request effective sanctions from the international community. This is after more than a year and a half of making statements—true, under President Bush we made statements that we supported the democratically elected Government of Haiti, we supported President Aristide. We made statements like that. We refuse to recognize the military junta under President Bush. But we never took any steps beyond that. It was President Clinton who turned the situation around by freezing the assets, denying visas, and going to the United Nations and calling for strong action by the entire international community.

Yes, there had been some efforts to impose sanctions by the Organization of American States. But that had fallen flat. Nobody was serious about that. Other nations outside of the Western Hemisphere did not abide by it. So the coup leaders had no threat to the economy, no threat to the loss of vital materials such as oil until the President turned the situation around by calling for United Nations strong sanctions, which were instituted. Less than 2 months after the institution of the strong actions by the United Nations, the coup leaders came to the Governors Island to negotiate. They were willing to negotiate because the country was running out of oil, the most vital ingredient, and there were other serious hardships resulting from an embargo imposed by the international community.

The coup leaders came to Governors Island, and they agreed to a process which called for the restoration of democracy in Haiti by October 30.

As I said before, this agreement sets a major precedent. We did not restore constitutional government by sending in a major invasion force, we did not restore constitutional government by taking sides in a civil war. It was all negotiated.

It would be almost a miracle if, on October 30, this process does achieve the restoration of democracy with the return of President Aristide.

I congratulate President Clinton, I congratulate him on being willing to take the critical steps to turn the situation around, of stepping out to initiate a foreign policy which is a foreign policy very much in the interest of the American people. It is in the interest of American people to have democracy in this hemisphere, everywhere. Free-market democracies are very much in the interests of the American people. They have a direct bearing on what we do, on our economy, on our trade. There are numerous ways where the existence of free-market democracies are directly related to the prosperity and welfare of the people of this country. Free-market democracies that are achieved without war, without an investment in military operations which might result in the loss of lives, is also far more desirable than other ways to achieve democracy through more difficult means.

So it is a major precedent. It has a direct bearing on the lives of the people of this country. Many people have tried to wed the Haitian situation to the Somali situation.

Somalia was a case where we went in to bring humanitarian relief to individual human beings. Somalia is a case unprecedented, probably, in this century, where there was a complete breakdown of law and order within a society; not a civil war. You did not have one ethnic group fighting another, or one faction—one religion fighting another. Somalia was a situation where people all speak the same language, they are all the same race, they are not broken up into different ethnic groups within that race. They are all the same religion. Yet they broke up into various factions, fighting for the most selfish of reasons. And the government just disintegrated.

We did not go in to do anything except to bring relief to individuals who were just starving to death because of this chaos and because food supplies were being captured by armed gangs and could not reach people, even humanitarian aid sent from around the world.

Somalia at this point, with two-thirds of the country secured, two-thirds of the country on its way to recovery, there is no starvation in two-thirds of the country. Crops are growing again, farmers are working their fields again. Law and order has been restored to Somalia. But yet you have remaining a hot spot, one situation in Mogadishu, which has exploded and resulted in the loss of lives not only of American boys but also numerous other U.N. soldiers, and of course many innocent civilians, Somalians.

It is a most unfortunate situation. It is mostly successful, but the remaining situation leads many Americans to conclude that we should never go outside of our borders to try to help anybody; that it is not in our interest, we have nothing to gain from Somalia. Somalia does not have any oil, does not have any uranium, is not strategically located, there is no more cold war, so we do not care whether it falls into the hands of the Soviet Union or some other bloc. It is strictly a humanitarian gesture, for the most noble of reasons we have gone into Somalia. It is most unfortunate that one tiny faction with guns, one hard-headed, selfish, brutal, mad-dog faction has caused all this trouble. We should not equate that with Haiti, however. Haiti is a totally different situation. Haiti is not broken up into factions. Haiti is a situation where 70 percent of the people on election day, an election supervised by international observers, 70 percent agreed they wanted one man for President. That man was in the office of President for 7 months. During the 7 months that President Aristide was in office, most of the Haitian people who had been trying to get out of Haiti to come to the United States by any means necessary, using boats, rickety ships, so desperately that they would take any kind of risk, they stopped. It stopped.

□ 1830

For 7 months there were almost no Haitians attempting to enter the United States. They had hope. Not only had they voted for this man, 70 percent, they believed in him. They did not have any foreign aid program overnight. They did not have any discovery of oil overnight. They were not suddenly wealthy overnight. Nothing happened, except they felt they had a government that believed in trying to do what it could to help all the people in Haiti. This is after decades of oppression, decades of oppression under Duvalier's, Papa Doc Duvalier, Baby Doc Duvalier, who along with an elite group of people in Haiti, an elite group of people in the United States who owned some businesses there and helped to run the country from here, they ran the country of Haiti, a country of 6 million people. They ran the country as if it was a giant plantation.

The elite lived very well, but the great majority of the people lived in the most degrading kinds of conditions and turned Haiti into the poorest country in this hemisphere, one of the poorest countries in the world. All that happened before Aristide was elected. Once he was elected and the people saw they had hope they stopped trying to enter the United States illegally. We did not have a problem of large numbers of illegal Haitian refugees. We did not have a problem which made us behave in an inhumane way by denying people the right to enter the country in order to seek asylum. Many of the problems as a result of the desperate attempt of people to get out of Haiti

did not exist, and they will not exist again if President Aristide is returned. If President Aristide is returned and a stable government restored, the democracy which the Haitian people have fought for begins to blossom, you will have the creation of a new market. Instead of the Haitian populace becoming a burden on the United States or the Western Hemisphere, you will have the flowering of a new economy in Haiti which will create a new market and new kinds of relationships with all their governments within this hemisphere and the economies in this hemisphere. We would be on the side of promoting human rights. We would be on the side of promoting democracy. We would be on the side of promoting prosperity for the Haitians, a people who have fought hard and long for this democracy.

The Haitian people are to be congratulated. I first should congratulate President Clinton. He was a key force that turned this situation around.

We certainly should congratulate President Aristide. President Aristide has maintained from the very beginning that he would not countenance violence, that he would insist on a peaceful solution to the problem. With 6 or 7 million people in Haiti against an army of 7,000, even if they did not have guns and you started a guerrilla warfare, you probably ultimately after the deaths of thousands of people would be able to overwhelm the military thugs and take back the country.

President Aristide insisted that he did not want sacrifices in that kind of guerrilla warfare.

He is to be congratulated for having faith in the United Nations and in the United States and going to Governor's Island to sign an agreement which had very unusual elements in it. The agreement signed at Governor's Island provides that the people who staged the coup would be in charge right up until the very end of the process for restoring the constitutional government, right up to the end.

General Cédras and Police Chief Michel Francois, right up to the very end they would be in charge of the army, of maintaining law and order. Right up until the very end they would be expected to make certain that the transition takes place.

In the Governor's Island agreement, President Aristide was called upon to appoint a Prime Minister, but the Prime Minister could not walk into his office without having the army or the police escort him there safely. The Prime Minister could not appoint a Cabinet without the members of that Cabinet having the army or the police to protect their offices and allow them to go in and take control of their departments. All of this was in the hands of the very people who staged the coup in the first place. It took a lot of faith to believe that such a plan would work.

At the very end of the plan, by the time President Aristide returned, basically the country is still in the hands of the army and the police. The U.N. observers will be there by October 30, but there are only going to be 1,500 U.N. observers, unarmed observers, observers who have no mandate to interfere in any way in the implementation of justice in the country, along with trained police from Canada, from France that are supposed to train the army and the police and convert the coup leaders, the terrorists into a civilian force and a peaceful army that will continue with the same people basically. It takes a lot of faith to sign an agreement like that. That is the agreement that President Aristide signed. It is up to the United States and the United Nations to enforce that agreement now.

I congratulate President Aristide for having that kind of faith. He has done everything he was supposed to do to live up to this agreement.

Now I congratulate the Haitian people. The Haitian people are to be congratulated above all. They have exhibited a great hunger and thirst for democracy from the very beginning. The Haitian people, without a single set of guns or tanks or armored cars, rose up to express their discontent with dictator Duvalier and after days and days of peaceful demonstrations they forced Duvalier to leave Haiti, and that set off a chain reaction that led to the establishment of a new constitution. Nobody believed they would ever write a constitution. All kinds of efforts were put forth to prevent them from developing a constitution. They wrote the Constitution. They had an election to approve the Constitution. The Constitution was approved.

They held elections. They held their first elections. At their first elections the army came in and shot people down at the polls. Nevertheless, they resolved to hold another election. They held another election and the army rigged the election by forcing every voter to hand their ballots to a soldier first before it was cast.

Finally, they had an election that was supervised by the international community and that is the election that elected President Aristide.

It has taken many, many years to reach this point.

Finally, they elected President Aristide. After 7 months he was overthrown, and now within 23 days President Aristide will be returning to Haiti. That is 23 days away from a major human rights victory, 23 days away from a major victory for democracy, 23 days away from a major return to constitutional government which has set a new precedent for this New World order.

The members of the Codel that went to visit Haiti less than 10 days ago have called upon President Clinton to meet with us to discuss the situation for the next 23 days.

In the last few days it has deteriorated and people have been killed. There are threats.

We worry about a mad dog faction staging a massacre at the last minute. We call upon President Clinton to do whatever is necessary to see to it that is prevented.

The Congressional Black Caucus also calls upon President Clinton to appoint a White House coordinator for the Haitian initiatives.

Beyond October 30, humanitarian aid will have to be offered. The police training process goes forward. Road building, economic development, a number of things are going to happen to rebuild the country of Haiti under President Aristide.

We call upon the President to appoint a White House coordinator for Haitian initiatives. That person would expedite the flow of decisionmaking which would facilitate the reconstruction of Haiti.

We call upon the President to also expedite the appointment of a new Ambassador to Haiti. We understand a candidate has been nominated, William Lucey Swing. His nomination is pending before the Senate.

We would like to see the new Ambassador to Haiti installed in Haiti before October 30. That again sends a signal to the thugs, it sends a signal to the opposition to the accord, the agreement.

We would like to other nations like France have their Ambassadors in place in Haiti before October 30.

□ 1840

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of other steps that the Congressional Black Caucus has voted to take in support of the restoration of democracy in Haiti, but I would like to conclude with my appeal to the American people to understand that here is a victory for nonviolence, here is a victory for a peaceful process whereby we have restored constitutional government, here is an opportunity to make certain that this nation will never again have to face a situation where illegal military forces take over.

We call upon the American people to establish a people-to-people relationship with Haiti. There are churches in Haiti which need aid; there are hospitals in Haiti which need aid. There are organizations in this country, nonprofit organizations, that know very well how nonprofit organizations have to operate in order to exist. Schools need help. We would like for churches here to adopt churches there, schools here to adopt schools there, hospitals here to adopt hospitals there.

Haiti has been isolated although it is only 500 miles away from the shores of the United States. It has been basically isolated from the benefits of American

democracy, from the interchange that is necessary. If we have an interchange, person to person, from here on, then we will never have to worry about having to fight dictators in Haiti again, we will never have to worry about having to go through a long tortuous process of diplomacy to restore a constitutionally elected government.

Mr. Speaker, we are 23 days away from victory, 23 days away from what will set a new precedent in this new world order. What we have done in Haiti we should do again and again in this hemisphere to send a clear message that we are in support of democracy, and we do not have to have guns and military intervention to enforce that democracy. It is 23 days away.

I salute the people of Haiti, I salute President Aristide, and I salute President Clinton for his very aggressive and forward-looking foreign policy initiative with respect to Haiti. In 23 days we will have a major victory for all of us.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I rise to join my honorable colleagues, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], to address the long anticipated return to Haiti of President Jean-Bertrand Aristide on October 30, 1993.

Although we are aware of the immense difficulties that lie ahead for the President and his supporters, we also see the hope and the energy which the Haitian people now share in shouldering the task of making a new nation.

We believe that the recently formed coalitions supporting President Aristide, including community activists, dedicated supporters of democratic government, and business leaders give a positive signal that he will have the necessary support for a strong, new beginning for his democratically based Government.

The poverty in Haiti is crushing, but President Aristide is full of plans and hope, shared cautiously by many Haitian business leaders, that it is possible for the economy to recover, for human rights to be respected and protected, for corruption to be controlled, and further deterioration of the environment to be arrested.

I ask my colleagues to consider the most practical support that we can now give Haiti during its most energetic and optimistic period. Monetary assistance given in peacetime for bootstrapping operations is much cheaper than military remedies taken after civilian control is lost.

I ask that my colleagues join me in extending our strongest good wishes to President Jean-Bertrand Aristide for a successful return to Haiti and his Presidency, and that we commit ourselves to assisting our friend and neighbor in the Caribbean to achieve a healthy initiation into democracy and economic health.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my very dear friend, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], the distinguished minority whip, be able to precede me with his 6-minute presentation.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF CANDIDATE FOR LEADER OF THE HOUSE REPUBLICAN PARTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] is recognized for 6 minutes.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to put into the RECORD my statement from today when I announced for leader of the House Republican Party. Many of my colleagues suggested that it contained information important to all Members of the House, and to our staff and, frankly, to the American people. I said at that time, with 75 Members of the House gathered over in front of the Capitol:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN NEWT GINGRICH

We are gathered in front of the world's best known symbol of freedom, the U.S. Capitol. As Republicans we represent a party founded 139 years ago on the principles of free men, free labor, and free soil.

We Republicans believe in freedom, free speech, free elections, free markets, and the rights and responsibilities of free men and women. These are the practical principles that have allowed more people to achieve more prosperity than any system in history.

In our efforts to form a more perfect union and to guarantee every person their rights to "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" we Americans have accomplished an enormous amount.

Prosperity beyond expectation, opportunity beyond belief, scientific and technological achievements beyond anyone's dream. These have been the achievements of that amazingly diverse people called Americans.

Yet, today we are reminded by tragedies in Somalia and Bosnia, in Haiti and Russia that freedom is not automatic or easy. Even here in our nation's capital the sounds of gunfire and the sights of drugs, decay and death remind us that freedom can be lost.

As Republicans we know that no civilization can survive with twelve-year-olds having babies, fifteen-year-olds killing each other, seventeen-year-olds dying of AIDS and eighteen-year-olds getting diplomas they can't read.

As Republicans we know the welfare state has failed. Since we believe "all men are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights" we know this failure occurred because of a basic misunderstanding of human nature. We Republicans know that if you reduce a citizen to a client, subordinate them to a bureaucrat and subject them to rules that are anti-family, anti-work, anti-property and anti-opportunity you will create social pathologies. That is exactly what has occurred. The violence, degradation and brutality portrayed on the evening television news are the natural products of the current system's distortion of human nature.

With this failure, our generation has, in Franklin Delano Roosevelt's phrase, a rendezvous with destiny. Our generation must replace the welfare state with an opportunity society.

We Republicans are committed to developing a replacement which will:

Create new economic growth with better jobs and more take home pay.

Establish a system of health which uses individual responsibility, market incentives, malpractice reform, and classic American principles to give the American people the best care at the lowest cost with the maximum choice.

Create new approaches to education and training that will guarantee the best learning in the world so we can have the best jobs in the world.

Develop and implement a workfare replacement for the welfare system, establish enterprize zones to encourage job creation and empower the poor so we can work with them to truly save the inner city.

Adopt thorough reforms of the criminal justice system to end the plague of violent crime and drug addiction that threatens every American.

Establish and enforce new standards of conduct for our campaign system, the lobbying process, and the legislative and executive branches. Honest self government is the foundation of our entire process of freedom under the law.

Apply the principles of quality and the information revolution to thoroughly rethink and rebuild every process government administration so we can dramatically improve services while radically lowering costs.

Establish priorities and create new approaches so we can move systematically and methodically first to a balanced budget and then to pay down the national debt.

Maintain a powerful military while rethinking its structure and overhauling its administrative overhead to lower its cost.

Work with the President to develop and implement a sound, sustainable foreign policy that protects America while enlarging the opportunities for freedom whenever practical.

These are enormous challenges. They must be met if we are to renew American civilization and maintain our freedom, our prosperity, and our safety.

We House Republicans face an extraordinary challenge in seeking to replace the welfare state and to help the American people create an opportunity society.

Yet challenges are not new to America nor to House Republicans. We all stand on the shoulders of Bob Michel, our Leader and we know the challenges he faced. The son of first generation immigrants to America, a World War II combat infantryman with a purple heart and a medal for capturing 28 German soldiers. Bob Michel has served his country in war and peace. He has worked with nine Presidents. As our Leader he has been vital to Presidents Reagan, Bush and Clinton.

As my colleague, my Leader, my mentor, and my friend Bob Michel has taught me much about the burdens of leadership, the challenges of honest self-government and the joys and tribulations of the collegial legislative process.

Bob Michel's announced retirement will create a large challenge for House Republicans. Frankly I cannot meet that challenge by myself. No younger Member could provide the wisdom, courage and experience that 50 years, a half century, of public service taught the Leader from Peoria.

However, with the help of my colleagues, with the already committed support of over 100 members of the House Republican Conference, I believe we can build a team that can fulfill our rendezvous with destiny.

With their help, with their commitment, with their talents, I am convinced we can renew American civilization. Together we can reestablish safety for all Americans, economic opportunity for all Americans, learning for all Americans and health care for all Americans.

Together we can rebuild the process of self-government so every American can pursue happiness within the rule of law.

Together we can enlarge the frontiers of freedom so our children and grandchildren can live in a world of prosperity, safety, and freedom.

Within that spirit, for that purpose, and to achieve those goals, I am a candidate for Leader of the House Republican Party.

□ 1850

THE TRUE FACTS ABOUT THE NORTH AMERICAN FREE-TRADE AGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARLOW). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I have taken out the time this evening to speak specifically about an issue which is going to be hotly debated for the next month and a half at least here in the House of Representatives, on radio talk shows, on television programs, on the floor of the other body, on the floor of this body, in committee here, and throughout the world, and that is the North American Free-Trade Agreement.

Earlier this evening we heard from two of my very distinguished colleagues, Representative SHERROD BROWN from Lorain, OH, and our distinguished majority whip, my friend from Mount Clemens, MI, Mr. BONIOR. They stand here as two articulate, committed opponents of the North American Free-Trade Agreement.

But, quite frankly, as I listen to people talk about NAFTA, most of them have indicated that while they may be leaning against the North American Free-Trade Agreement vote that is coming before us, they believe that it is the right thing to do. The reason they are leaning against it is the very simple fact that so many things have been said about it that are untrue that it has instilled in the American people a great sense of fear, and that sense of fear has led many Americans to believe strongly in the need to defeat the North American Free-Trade Agreement. So it has led them to call our offices, send letters, march in front of offices, and fall in line with Ross Perot, who has authored a book, along with Pat Choate, that has at least 193 inaccuracies.

So the American people have really come down on the side of fear, rather than facts. Tragically, many of my colleagues who have engaged in this debate here in the House have really perpetuated that, I am sorry to say.

As I was pointing out to my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], earlier, he was standing here next to the chart that he stands next to regularly. He carries it around, he points to it, as most opponents do. It is the chart that is an advertisement that I wish did not exist. It talks about how United States businesses should take advantage of low wage rates in the Yucatan. That is about the only thing they can point to.

When it comes down to it, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the North American Free-Trade Agreement is going to enhance the standard of living and the quality of life, both in Mexico, and, contrary to what many would lead you to believe, right here in the United States.

Earlier we were talking about the fact that we should renegotiate the North American Free-Trade Agreement. Mr. BONIOR talked about the need to bring about a NAFTA that we can get behind. Unfortunately, what has happened is there is not a realization that we cannot negotiate another North American Free-Trade Agreement.

Why? Because the forces that have now come out in opposition to the North American Free-Trade Agreement are so schizophrenic that they represent extremes. In fact, if you look at the opposition to the North American Free-Trade Agreement, you see Jesse Jackson and Pat Buchanan; you see my former Governor in California, Jerry Brown, and Ross Perot. It is an amazing litany of people who are opposed for different reasons.

The point that I make is that they oppose this for so many different reasons, many of which are unfounded, that they could never come together on an agreement.

I argue that the skill that has gone into this agreement, while not perfect, it is still lightyears ahead of the status quo.

Now, what is the goal of implementing a free-trade agreement like this? It is to help the consumer gain the ability to purchase the best quality product at the lowest possible price. And that is what we are really here to discuss. As that happens, as people are able to purchase the best quality products at the lowest possible price, it naturally brings out an increase in economic growth.

Now, as we look at this debate, the opponents would love to see us argue that there are winners and losers. While as we watch this baseball series continue as we head toward the World Series, there are winners and losers in many areas. There are winners and losers in sports; there are winners and losers in war; there are winners and losers in political battles that exist.

But, Mr. Speaker, in the area of trade, as barriers are reduced, trade is a win-win situation. I stand strongly convinced that the people whom I represent in southern California will benefit greatly, almost immediately, from implementation of the North American Free-Trade Agreement.

What I would like to do, since so many of my colleagues point to this single chart, Mr. Speaker, I would like to get specific and talk about the issue of free trade itself.

Mr. Speaker, the very distinguished gentleman from Florida who chairs the Trade Subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means, SAM GIBBONS, wanted to be here this evening to participate. But since a number of our other colleagues took time, he had to go off to a meeting at which he was talking about tax and trade policy with some people and was unable to join us.

So I would like to make, if I could, very briefly, the argument that SAM GIBBONS makes, because clearly implementation of the North American Free-Trade Agreement is a bipartisan issue.

Mr. Speaker, I am a Republican. I support the North American Free-Trade Agreement. SAM GIBBONS is a committed, loyal Democrat. He is a free-trade Democrat who recognizes that diminishing barriers is the wave of the future.

We are also joined by another free trader, a new Member of Congress, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. COPPERSMITH], my friend from Phoenix, who joined us here last night, and I know is going to have quite a bit to offer in just a few minutes.

But I would like to take, Mr. Speaker, the arguments that have been provided regularly by Mr. GIBBONS in press conferences and meetings that we have had in which we have talked about NAFTA.

What the gentleman says is that if you look at the past several decades, what we have seen is one-way free trade. Now, what exactly does that mean? It means basically that the Mexican producers have had virtual tariff-free access to the American consumer. They have been able to, with very little in tariffs, sell their products to the United States, whereas we have had very punitive tariff barriers which have prevented the flow of United States products from the United States to Mexico.

So if you look at this, we have had one-way free trade. Mexicans have been able to sell their goods and services here in the United States, and yet we have had what on average is a 10-percent tariff on United States-manufactured goods which we have attempted to export into Mexico.

Now, if you look at the developments which have taken place in the past several years, it is amazing. My friends, Messrs. BROWN and BONIOR, argued about the problems that exist in Mexico.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I will say that I am in no way an apologist for

the problems that exist in Mexico. I do believe that we must recognize and all should acknowledge that over the past 6 years we have seen tremendous improvements, and we have already seen some improvements in that one-way free-trade system. But NAFTA is going to finally bring about the ultimate, and that is a zero-zero tariff.

Now, what has happened in that 6-year period? Well, in the mid-1980s, 1986, actually, we had a $5.7 billion trade deficit with Mexico. Basically we saw the United States purchasing $5.7 billion more in goods and services manufactured by the Mexican people than they were buying from us.

During the latter part of the 1980's we have witnessed the greatest market-oriented approach taken by a government in Mexico in the past six decades. What has happened is President Salinas has privatized the telephone industry, privatized the banking industry, and moved boldly toward political reform.

Contrary to what many people have argued, political reform has seen the opposition PAN party, the National Action Party, win mayorships throughout the country, and governorships, too. This was unheard of under the one-party control system that the PRE party has had in the past.

So, while not perfect, I am convinced that we have seen and history has now shown in the past 6 years that there has been tremendous improvement.

What has that done? It has strengthened the economy of Mexico, and we have seen some improvement in the tariff barriers which exist in Mexico. That improvement has obviously been beneficial and it has created what we have now, and that is a $5.4 billion trade surplus with Mexico.

Basically, the Mexican people, who are so often labeled poor and unable to purchase anything, the Mexican people, who now have a middle class which is in excess of 20 million, virtually the size of the Canadian middle class, are not simply, people who live in cardboard boxes, as is so often described by opponents to NAFTA.

□ 1900

I acknowledge that there are people who live in cardboard boxes, but I believe that NAFTA is going to be one of the things that will help to create economic opportunities so that they can emerge from that substandard quality of life.

So what we have come to today is we have found that the Mexican people, last year, were able to purchase $5.4 billion more in goods and services from the United States than we were from them because of not only the move toward privatization, which President Salinas has led, but also toward a slight reduction in tariff barriers.

But, Mr. Speaker, we still have an incredibly high tariff barrier, and I would like to ask you, Mr. Speaker, to focus on these charts here.

First of all, if you look at the average tariff, the average tariff on computers being sold from the United States into Mexico averages between 10 and 20 percent. Mr. Speaker, one incredible example that I have shared with our colleagues here before is the fact that in California we have heard that IBM has indicated that if NAFTA passes, we will see a tremendous improvement and an opportunity for IBM made and Tandy and other companies to sell their computers in Mexico. If NAFTA fails, IBM will have no choice other than to move facilities, which it has presently in my State of California and in other States, to Mexico. Why? Because it is essential for them to be able to gain access to the 88 million consumers in Mexico.

Right now, the tariff is between 10 and 20 percent on computers going into Mexico from the United States. And the average tariff that we have on their computers coming from Mexico into the United States is between 3.7 and 3.9 percent.

When NAFTA is completely implemented, what will happen, Mr. Speaker? We will see a complete zeroing of those.

Now, one of the things that has been said very clearly is that if NAFTA is defeated, the cork on the champagne bottles will be popping. Where? In Japan and Germany and other spots which would love to have the opportunity to move to Mexico and gain access to Mexico so that they can use it as an export platform into the United States.

Mr. Speaker, if we pass NAFTA, we reduce the tariff barrier, which is between 10 and 20 percent on computers, down to zero for United States-manufactured computers going into Mexico. And we create this relationship of free trade with our neighbor that we share a 2,000-mile border with.

But, Mr. Speaker, Japan, Germany, other countries will still have the same 10- to 20-percent tariff barriers as they attempt to sell into Mexico.

Let us look at computer chips. Right now, on average, there is a 10-percent tariff on computer chips from the United States going into Mexico. Right now, there is zero tariff on computer chips coming from Mexico into the United States.

On electronic products, the average Mexican tariff, 2.6 percent; the average United States tariff, 2.4 percent.

Let us look at the tariff on cars. That is something that is so often discussed here. I think my friend from Phoenix and I discussed this last night. We have often quoted the Big 3 auto makers who have referred to the fact that they know we are only able to sell 1,000 United States-manufactured automobiles in Mexico per year. In the first year, it has been projected that we will see 60,000 automobiles sold. That is a sixtyfold increase. Then there was this incredible figure given by Bill Hoagland, the executive vice president of General Motors, who referred to the fact that in the first year we will create 15,000 United States automaker jobs, and we will see a dramatic increase of thousands and thousands of United States-made automobiles going to Mexico.

Again, last night my friend from San Diego, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], as we were in this exchange here, referred to the fact that the average Mexican income is $2,500. How can they afford to purchase automobiles. The average Mexican income is not the determinant here. We have to recognize that what happens, Mr. Speaker, is you see the middle- and upper-middle-class, which is growing to, as I said, in excess of 20 million citizens, those are the people who are in a position to purchase these kinds of automobiles.

The tariff right now is 20 percent. The United States tariff on Mexican-manufactured automobiles coming in is only 2 percent. It will be eliminated under a North American Free-Trade Agreement with zeroing out.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to may friend, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. COPPERSMITH].

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me and just want to follow up on this.

Essentially, we sell more cars, United States manufacturers sell more cars in Japan, which is a market that is essentially closed to United States auto makers. The Japanese drive on the left and there are other reasons why it has been very difficult. There is a tremendous demand for these products in Mexico, but the current Mexican tariff acts as a significant barrier.

It is essentially a 20-percent tax that a Mexican consumer must pay, whereas, the effect of the United States tariff is only 2.2 percent, I believe, on the chart. And it is a significant problem.

I would also like to point out, the gentleman raised the point that averages can be deceiving. We all know the story of the person who drowned in a body of water that had an average depth of 6 inches. The point is not what is the average, and the point is also, as I think you raised earlier, is not just what the historical trend has been but where it is going.

Last night you gave one example of comparing Mexican wage rates and, by using 1980, you can get an artificially distorted figure. So opponents are using a figure that was artificially inflated for a number of historical reasons. We can go into it again or not, depending upon the time.

So looking at wage rates from 1980 gives you a distorted picture, rather than looking at what has happened over the past 6 years.

I think it is even more important, as you focus on the fact that there is this large Mexican middle class that is growing, that you need to keep in mind that economic growth is not necessarily going to come from the developed countries, from the G–7 group, our trading partners in Europe and Japan. Those are fully developed economies. And while they will grow and we hope they will grow rapidly, they still will not grow nearly as rapidly as the developing economies such as in Mexico.

And where economic growth and growth of exports will come from in the future is going to be that Mexican market. By turning our back on it today, by keeping the status quo, which essentially locks us from one of the fastest growing markets and one of the markets that has been growing faster for exactly the types of exports and jobs that we want to encourage in this country, we are essentially cutting ourselves off from where the growth will come from in the future.

Mr. DREIER. My friend is right on target in that he is focusing not just on Mexico but all of Latin America.

By 1995, we are going to see at least four South American countries proceed with implementation of their own free-trade agreement. We all know that people from Chile have been knocking on our doors. I am sure they probably contacted my friend over the past several years. They have contacted me saying, will you sign on in support of a United States-Chile free-trade agreement? People know that the diminution of barriers is the wave of the future, and that is what we are trying to recognize here.

I have these charts, and we can briefly go through them. I would like my friend to interject at any point here.

The point that I am making is what I call the brilliant SAM GIBBONS line. SAM GIBBONS likes to talk about one-way free trade. And our good friend, Mr. GIBBONS, talks about the fact that they have had virtually unlimited one-way free trade.

I think that this chart, these charts that I have here best outline what I call the great SAM GIBBONS thesis.

I was talking about cars earlier, which is the example that is so often used. My friend mentioned that. We have a 2.2 percent tariff on Mexican-manufactured cars coming into the United States, and they have a 20 percent tariff on cars that are manufactured in the United States going into Mexico. And people will be able to afford U.S.-manufactured automobiles. After all, we know that that decision that was made by the United Auto Workers and General Motors to move their plant from Mexico back to Lansing, MI, was a clear demonstration that they believe that they are going to find a greater level of productivity right here in the United States. And they are still going to have that wonderful consumer market, which is big and growing, in Mexico.

Look at light trucks. Light trucks, 20 percent tariff on United States-manufactured light trucks going into Mexico; a 2.2 percent tariff on Mexican-manufactured trucks coming into the United States.

□ 1910

Auto parts. That is another big industry we hear about. We constantly hear about this auto parts industry which is going to be devastated with the implementation of the North American Free-Trade Agreement.

Right now, under the present status quo, we have a 13.1 percent tariff on United States-manufactured auto parts going into Mexico, a four-tenths of 1 percent tariff on Mexican-manufactured auto parts coming to the United States. Look at the incredible disparity that is there, nearly, what would that be, about a 26 times difference there.

Mr. COPPERSMITH. If the gentleman would yield, actually, it is higher there. It is 33 to 1. We have talked about how the average Mexican tariff is two and one-half times the average United States tariff, but these are good examples about how in specific industries, and specific industries that are quite important in terms of jobs, in terms of growth, that number can be higher. With cars and light trucks, it is a 9 to 1 ratio, and with auto parts, it is even worse, at a 33 to 1.

What people need to remember, what people need to know, is that in many ways NAFTA requires far more of the Mexican Government than it requires of the United States. It opens up opportunities to the United States as well as opportunities to Mexico, possibly to a far greater degree in exactly the kinds of industries that will lead the way to the 21st century.

Mr. DREIER. If I could even expand on my friend's points, look at chemicals: a 10 to 20 percent Mexican tariff; zero to 4 percent. I can certainly understand why the chemical industry and the workers in the chemical industry very much support the North American Free-Trade Agreement.

Why? Is it wrong for them to want to have more consumers of their product? I do not think so. If we bring about a North American Free-Trade Agreement, we are going to greatly expand the number of consumers in Mexico who will be able to be purchasing items made by the chemical industry here in the United States.

Pharmaceuticals. It is incredible when we look at the pharmaceuticals industry, a 15 percent average Mexican tariff and a 3.5 percent average United States tariff; basically, the SAM GIBBONS thesis once again proved, one-way free trade. Mexican goods are able to flow into the United States, and yet we have that average 15 percent tariff seriously jeopardizing the flow of pharmaceuticals into Mexico.

Look at the textile and apparel industry. That is one of the most interesting ones of all. One night I read here, Mr. Speaker, a letter that came from some people in the textile industry in the Southeastern part of this country. That, by the way, is one of the very interesting arguments as it relates to trade.

Professor Michael Porter from Harvard University did a fascinating study about the fact that we have seen trading blocs emerge from within the United States, and specialization take place in different regions of this country. He likes to point to the fact that in the early part of this century there were many people in the Northeastern part of this country who decided that the Northeast would be devastated. Why? Because the textile industry was relocating from that part of the United States to the Southeastern part: Georgia, the Carolinas, other States in the Southeast.

We all know what happened. There was a natural shift that took place. That obviously is what is going to happen with us here. The textile and apparel industry recognizes today that much of their threat comes not from the Americas, but from the Pacific rim.

In NAFTA is defeated, we will see countries in the Pacific rim, Japan, Singapore, Taiwan, others, hoping to use Mexico as an export platform into the United States. If that happens, the chance for it will be enhanced.

If NAFTA is passed, the now average 14- to 20-percent tariff on U.S.-manufactured textiles and apparel will go down to zero. The average tariff of 6 percent of Mexican-manufactured textiles and apparel will also go down to zero, so there will be a natural benefit to the United States.

Let me underscore once again, from the Pacific rim, they will still be forced to deal with a 14- to 20-percent average tariff, so we will be benefiting this region and we will not be allowing those in the Pacific rim to take advantage.

As I said, they would very much like to see us defeat NAFTA, but my friend, the gentleman from Phoenix, and I are going to do everything we can to make sure that it does not happen.

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. COPPERSMITH. As the gentleman points out right now, and as the chairman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] points out, we have one-way free trade. It only stand to reason that if there is two-way free trade between both markets, that there will be an expansion for the United States.

It is a point that I think we can look at by just looking at the record, by

looking at history. People, I think, when they realize and study, will realize that the whole trend of history is that lowered tariff barriers, expansion of trade, benefits both parties; that is, it is a win-win situation.

Here we are showing exactly where the win comes from for the United States. We have also got a track record to show as Mexico lowered its tariffs as part of the 1986-87 economic reforms, our exports to Mexico increased considerably, and the great majority of those exports, however we calculate the numbers, whether we use the Mexican Government's statistics or the United States Government's statistics, for goods that are consumed in Mexico, our exports to Mexico have increased tremendously, to over $40.6 billion in 1992. That means jobs here.

By increasing that, by seeing where the trend is going, it results in jobs here in those specific sectors that will benefit the most from reducing tariff barriers and expanding.

It bears repeating, and I do not know how many times I will have to repeat it, but we will try, we will keep repeating it, that free trade, expanded trade, creates a win-win situation. The rising tide will lift all boats. Mexico will gain and the United States will gain.

Mr. DREIER. John F. Kennedy's great quote.

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Indeed, Mexico will gain, the United States will gain, and both will gain at the same time.

In many ways, people, I think especially those opposed to NAFTA, and who give their reasons, are really arguing illogically, because in many ways we want Mexico to gain. If Mexico gains, we will gain, even if it is a relative wash here, because the immigration problems are really economically driven. If Mexico's economy continues to improve, long term, that is the best solution.

Second, there are empirical studies that show that when countries reach a per capita income of about $5,000 per year, there are more resources and more public demand to deal with environmental problems.

It is hard for me to see how we can have concern for the Mexicans by basically saying the prescription is to prevent them from having jobs, even if we maybe disagree with the types of jobs they have; to prevent them from raising their standard of living so they can deal with their environmental problems that affect our border States so much, and prevent them from developing the kind of economy that can reduce the immigration pressures and create a larger and expanding market for United States products in these sectors and in others.

Mr. DREIER. Let me, if I could, just continue with our one-way free trade arrangement, and realize how we are struggling to create two-way free trade by, again, pointing to the examples. If we look at industrial machinery, in the area of industrial machinery, we have a 10 to 17 percent Mexican tariff on average today. The United States tariff on Mexican industrial machinery coming into the United States, between zero percent and 2 percent, so obviously, we have this wall which is much higher, and once again, industrial machinery that would be coming to Mexico from the Pacific rim, from Germany, from other countries in the world. We will still be faced with this 10 percent to 17 percent tariff that exists, but it will drop to zero under the North American Free-Trade Agreement for the United States.

Household appliances, that is one of the other areas. Many people talk about the fact that the average middle income wage earner in Mexico cannot afford to buy household appliances. Baloney.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen a tremendous increase in the sale of household appliances. Many of the appliance manufacturers here in the United States have already witnessed an increase in the sale of their appliances in Mexico, and that is even with a 17.1 percent average tariff, whereas the tariff on Mexican-manufactured appliances is only eight-tenths of one percent. We have already seen an increase.

What will happen? Germany, countries in the Pacific rim, Japan, Taiwan, Singapore, Malaysia, Indonesia will still be faced with that 17.1 percent tariff, but for the United States manufacturers, for the workers here in the United States, it comes right down to zero, so that is an incredible disparity there.

Steel mill products. In steel mill products, the average tariff, 10 to 15 percent on United States manufactured steel mill items going into Mexico, and yet a 4 percent average tariff on Mexican items coming here in the steel mill products area.

Then if we can go on to look at flat glass, bearings, machine tools, the average tariff on flat glass, once again, one-way free trade, look at that wall that is incredibly high today. Under NAFTA, we bring it to zero.

□ 1920

Twenty percent is the Mexican tariff on flat glass. The U.S. tariff is only three-tenths of 1 percent, an amazing disparity there, which is almost as high as some of those my friend has referred to.

The bearing industry, look at that, 12-percent tariff to 7-percent tariff. Under NAFTA it comes right down to a zero. Machine tools, 13-percent average Mexican tariff. Mr. Speaker, the average U.S. tariff today is only 2 percent. So the benefit is accrued directly to the United States. The benefit is much greater to the United States than it is to Mexico.

It seems to me that as we look at this argument again that the Mexican people are so poor they cannot afford to purchase these items that are manufactured in the United States, again, it is hogwash. Why? Because while my friend from Lorain, OH, Mr. BROWN, proceeded to talk earlier about the fact that people are so impoverished on one side, and we have only 36 extraordinarily wealthy families, he is ignoring the 20 million Mexicans who buy American products and fall in the middle- to upper-middle area and that group is growing.

I want to see the people who are tragically relegated to living in cardboard boxes, as we have seen in those pictures, have the opportunity to have a decent standard of living. We all want to see that happen. Maintaining the status quo, which has created that situation, is not in any way going to improve their quality of life. Implementing the North American Free-Trade Agreement will.

In Mexico, a middle-class family is one who falls in the following category: They own a home, they take at least a week vacation a year in Mexico, they own a stove and a refrigerator, often manufactured right here in the United States, and 50 percent of them have microwave ovens, 30 percent a videocassette recorder. And this market of the middle- and upper-middle-class Mexican is roughly the same as the middle- and upper-middle-class market that exists in Canada.

So often we hear that we are very happy with the arrangement we have embarked upon with Canada, and yet the arrangement, or the possibility of including Mexico in that would be devastating for us.

I am happy to yield to my friend from Arizona.

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Mr. Speaker, I think the one tariff that we have not explored is what will happen to the relative tariffs on charts, and I think that is an omission that my colleague from Claremont needs to clarify the next time.

But I want to interject with two points here. One is, you talked about a number of household goods. And I think this ties in, and I can tie some personal experience here. I served as a Foreign Service officer and lived overseas for a little over 2 years working at a United States embassy. I think it is difficult for many Americans who have never spent significant time out of the country to understand exactly how powerful an influence the United States is. What a cachet, what desire foreign consumers have for things American. I think maybe you have stories about that in terms of the spread of McDonald's, or of NBA basketball. But I think until you actually spend time overseas, and shop in an overseas supermarket or an overseas market, and understand exactly what power American brands and American quality has overseas, a lot of times we lose

sight of that, and we take for granted the products that our workers produce, their skills, and their abilities.

Mr. DREIER. And Mexico is probably the best example. I know that my friend, coming from Arizona, has certainly traveled throughout Mexico. My being a Representative here from California, I have spent time traveling throughout Mexico. One of the things that I have observed is that the people of Mexico desperately want to have the opportunity to purchase United States-manufactured goods.

Mr. COPPERSMITH. As my friend pointed out, they have the ability to do so, and the middle class in Mexico is growing. It is increasing. While Mexico may represent 5 percent of the gross domestic product of the North American free-trade area, it will account for 15 percent of the economic growth in the years forthcoming.

Mr. DREIER. Absolutely. It is one of the fastest growing, and it is the 13th largest economy on the face of the Earth, and it is one of the fastest growing. That growth is what is creating an opportunity for them to have increased buying power. And it has come about because of privatization. And as that expands, another great line that my hero, SAM GIBBONS, talks about is the fact that there are 500 million people South of our border, and that is a tremendous market for us. And we need to do everything that we possibly can to take advantage of that market. Clearly, if this Congress were to be so stupid as to turn down the North American Free-Trade Agreement, we would basically be slamming the door on the prospect of a half a billion consumers, because defeating NAFTA would clearly create a situation that would open the door to one of the things that was said to me today in one of the many meetings that I attended on NAFTA, which is that basically what we have today is a tax, a tax that prevents the flow of United States goods to Mexico. It is a tax that is being shouldered by the people of Mexico, jeopardizing the flow of United States goods there. And it is the tax which prevents the number of goods that the consumers of Mexico would like to have from getting there.

That is why doing everything that we possibly can to ensure passage of NAFTA is the best route toward increasing opportunity. And I am happy to yield further to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. COPPERSMITH. It goes without saying that right now the Mexican market has a significant barrier to entry for American goods. In Mexico it is only possible for many goods to be sold there to that rapidly growing market if they are manufactured in Mexico.

Under NAFTA, that NAFTA lowers the Mexican tariffs, and it ends the one-way free trade, allows two-way free trade, and allows companies to choose to ship goods from the United States and serve both markets, whereas in many industries, computers being one, companies have to locate in Mexico to serve the Mexican market, the expanding Mexican market.

Mexico has to do much more under NAFTA because it has to lower more significant barriers, 2.5 times on average. We have discussed some of the specific sectors.

What is most interesting is a number of those sectors are exactly the high-tech, high-wage, higher value industries with the jobs that we need to create for the rest of this decade and for the 21st century.

Going back to some historical experience, we have talked about the national figures that as Mexico went through its economic reforms how our trade expanded to approximately $41 billion in the past year. We have experience in Arizona that as that happened our local experience was industries were able to expand their exports to Mexico, and the jobs that were export-related and created by that increase in Mexican demand are exactly the type of jobs that we need to encourage for this decade and for the 21st century. It has been well documented from studies that jobs tied to export pay a significant premium, 10 percent to 15 percent higher than jobs that do not involve it.

Mr. DREIER. Actually 17 percent on average is the wage-rate disparity. I mean, it is that much higher for those involved in the export industry than those who are not involved in the export industry, and that has been the one area where we have seen growth.

Now I know that the economy of Arizona is doing much better than the economy of California. One of the reasons is that many of the great industries in California have moved to Arizona.

Mr. COPPERSMITH. A wonderful trend which I will not debate with my friend here tonight.

Mr. DREIER. But what we have found is that we still have very serious problems, a 9-percent unemployment rate in the State, 10-percent unemployment in Los Angeles County. And the one area where we in California have seen growth is in the export sector. In fact, there is no way that Arizona will ever be able to overcome California as the gateway to the Pacific rim. Clearly, we have a geographic advantage there, and that will continue, and we have been exporting to the Pacific rim. We also have been exporting in great numbers to Mexico, and clearly as we work to enhance opportunities, to find markets throughout the world, which is essential, I would like to use the old line that trade is the currency of friendship. And clearly as we look toward increasing our relationships, strengthening them with our friends and neighbors throughout the world, working to diminish those barriers is the way to do it.

People talk often about, in a pejorative way, Mexico, and we in both of our States have problems of illegal immigration and other things. Clearly, illegal immigration is one of my greatest concerns, and one of the greatest concerns of the constituents whom I represent. And it is my belief that the best way to get at the root of the illegal-immigration problem is to strengthen the economy in both Mexico and the United States. As the economy of Mexico is strengthened, what we will see is people who often leave Mexico seeking economic opportunity, and then sending money back to their families, they would, with NAFTA, and increased opportunities in their own country, be able to stay with their families, which of course is their first choice.

I also should say that I hope very much that we can end the welfare magnet which often draws people across the border, leading them to come here for health care, for education, welfare, and other government services. That happens in large part because this institution has imposed on the States an unfunded Federal mandate which dictates to them the requirements that they provide those government services. I believe we should end those unfunded mandates, and at the same time pass the North American Free-Trade Agreement so that we can enhance economic opportunity within Mexico, so that people will have the incentive to stay with their families and will not be drawn for economic opportunity to the border.

□ 1930

Mr. COPPERSMITH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, moving back to, I think, the point the gentleman raised earlier, which is that the United States can win while Mexico wins through expanded trade and that improvements to the Mexican economy and raising their standard of living not only increases the market for American products but also helps alleviate some of the problems we have discussed that are created by the status quo, the environmental problems, the movement of jobs, movement of people and so on.

There have been many ironies in public life, but I think one of them is that people who argue against the North American Free-Trade Agreement make the argument that is not supported by the great majority of economists who have studied the issue, that it will move jobs to Mexico. But at the same time they can argue with a straight face that somehow NAFTA is a bad deal for Mexican workers. And its that kind of an argument that is a little awkward where we insist that somehow this will benefit Mexico, to then turn around and say, well, it really will not benefit Mexico.

Mr. DREIER. Reclaiming my time, I am very happy that my friend brought up the issue of economists. Now, I do not regularly stand here and argue in behalf of the findings of economists, but I found it very interesting in the exchange that took place between our two colleagues, Messrs. BROWN and BONIOR, in which they referred to the fact that there may be some economists out on the west coast, some economists on the east coast, who support the North American Free-Trade Agreement, but there are very few of them in the Midwest.

I would challenge that by saying that certainly at a great institution like the University of Chicago there are obviously many economists who have come to the conclusion that the North American Free-Trade Agreement is a positive thing and in fact there are 276 economists who have signed a letter to President Clinton stating their strong support and commitment to the North American Free-Trade Agreement, believing that it is going to enhance the job opportunities and economic growth on both sides of the border.

Mr. Speaker, I further yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Earlier this evening the gentleman reminded me that I have quoted from John F. Kennedy, and I would like to quote from Harry Truman, who once—

Mr. DREIER. Let us find a Republican someplace, at some point.

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Well, I think I will leave that task up to the gentleman from California if he really wants to do the heavy lifting.

But I want to quote from Harry Truman, who once asked his advisers if they could find a one-armed economist. They wondered why. And he said, "Because every time I talk to an economist, he says, 'On the one hand, but then on the other hand.'" He thought he could put an end to that problem.

But here you have a situation where the vast majority of economists—this is not a "on the one hand, on the other hand" issue; I think most people, most experts, all living ex-Presidents who have looked at the issue, recognize that this is a good thing for the United States.

It opens up a market that we need to access, it opens up a fast-growing market; exports, where the economic action is going to be during this decade and the 20th century; and it would be a terrible mistake for us to start a round of protectionism, for us to turn our backs on a rapidly growing market and just hand it over to the Europeans and the Japanese.

Mr. DREIER. That is exactly what we would be doing, clearly.

Mr. Speaker, my friend talked last night about this wage situation briefly, and our friend, the majority leader in his speech referred to the fact that wage rates, which is productivity, from 1980 to 1992, was one which has actually seen productivity far exceed wage rates. The fact of the matter is that has not been the case. In the latter 1970's, 1979 to 1981, actually, we saw a surge in oil prices and an unwise foreign lending, which went to Mexico, creating a situation which led wage rates to artificially increase and then during the early part of the 1980's we saw socialist policies which brought about a major collapse. And if you look at the entire time period since the Salinas presidency has been in place, we have seen an increase in wage rates of 26.2 percent and productivity increase by 23.1 percent.

I thank very much my friend for participating in this.

Mr. Speaker, this debate is going to be continuing on for the next 45 days. I actually look forward to the night when I will not be charged with standing here in the well taking my colleagues' and friends' and staff members' time to talk about the North American Free-Trade Agreement. But until we pass this agreement, I am going to be doing everything that I possibly can to argue in behalf of what I believe is the best and most important economic growth package we could possibly put forward.

With that I yield back the balance of my time.

A FURTHER UPDATE ON THE SITUATION IN SOMALIA AS IT AFFECTS THE SITUATION HERE IN THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, again, as I do whenever I take a special order, I want to note, to save my staff from answering a lot of phone calls that are well-meaning but dealing from a lack of knowledge, about the audience that watches these special orders. Going back two speakers ago—and this should have been undone by now—a fine Irish politician from Massachusetts, out of anger at a Member who was heading toward the highest leadership on this side of the aisle come next Congress, out of anger at this Member from Georgia, he asked these six cameras, paid for by the taxpayers, to peruse the House to show an empty Chamber to indicate that we are talking to ourselves or to all our good recorders of official debate here and whoever is sitting in the chair, like yourself, Mr. Speaker, and a few police officers who assure the security of the galleries, and that no one else is listening.

So, I say slowly, and with some accuracy, that over a million fellow American citizens, most of them keenly interested in the political process and what happens in this, the larger Chamber, both physically and in number of Members, the descendant of the Mother of Parliaments in London and certainly arguably the world's most important deliberative body on the planet, the House of Representatives, people who are interested in this are most assuredly voters, all of them taxpayers, interested, and 1 million-plus out of 260 million Americans is a sizable audience.

They are listening intently tonight, given the fact that I could not even call my own office from the cloakroom here because of the calls that have been received throughout the night and the entire day about my special order on yesterday.

I know how keenly and, in some cases, how desperately Americans are trying to find out what is going on in Somalia.

Since I addressed the House almost 24 hours ago from this lectern—and I am using this lectern because I want to be able to spread out my material and try to give some coherence to this special order because I was unable to do that because of the welcome participation of three colleagues trying to get things off their chest about the bloodshed in Somalia.

Now, the most important thing that has happened since I spoke is not the President's speech delivered earlier this evening or this afternoon west coast time, it is that two more Americans have died. One of them died of mortar fire yesterday. That would be No. 24.

No. 25 died of wounds received Sunday in the fire fight to rescue the crew of the first helicopter that was downed. I am sorry I was unable to get the name of the man who died yesterday or even whether he was a marine or a soldier, from a mortar attack by Aideed's forces, and the man who died today from wounds received Sunday. He is a ranger. He died of multiple gunshot wounds to his chest and abdomen.

These men are in the absolute peak of physical condition, probably the reason he was able to have clung to life through Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and today, endured a hospital plane evacuation to our major casualty hospital in Germany, where he died.

□ 1940

His earthly remains will be on the way back probably to Fort Campbell or Fort Drum, NY, or Campbell, KY, at this moment. I hope to be able to go Wednesday to Fort Campbell to offer some congressional presence at the funeral for many of the men from that base who died in Sunday's fire fight.

Now, as I stand here, Mr. Speaker, I am probably, through some unrelenting efforts on my part, the most thoroughly briefed Member of the U.S. Senate or the U.S. House on what happened on Sunday and into the early hours of Monday morning, October 4.

Let me try and relate, and some of the families are watching it at Fort

Campbell, let me try and relate what happened. Then I will discuss the intelligence aspects of it, without giving away any of the honor that has been bestowed on me to serve on the Intelligence Committee. I am not giving away any sources or analyses, just a relation of what has happened and what will be common knowledge over the next few days as this is given to the news media.

Michael Durant, chief warrant officer, 3d class, to use his own words, Black Hawk pilot, should be the major focus of our foreign policy and our military policy right now, to get him out, not only because he is as important to our Nation as is the President himself—that is what a nonroyalist, nonmonarchist, republican form of Government is all about—that every single citizen is equal in stature in his country to the President of the United States; but Michael Durant—and we will get him back. He will probably be nominated, as the senior surviving officer on the scene of the second crash site, he will probably be nominated for the Congressional Medal of Honor, with the two rangers who rapelled down to the site to give added fire power to Michael Durant and his three crew members.

Here is what happened. We felt we had a lead in Somalia on where Aideed was, certainly where most of his lieutenants were. The Olympic Hotel was the highest facility in that area, five stories across the street, was one of Aideed's many safe house areas.

Let me put a footnote on here, having been to Somalia, briefly, so many years ago, almost two decades ago. It blends in my excellent memory in with some other cities in that area; but my daughter, Robin, before she was married years ago in the early eighties went over to help Mother Teresa and some of her young nuns in that area. She went into the International Airport at Mogadishu, went to the AID compound, visited some houses and then went out in the field to some of the camps, that even then were holding off starvation. This would probably have been on my daughter's way back from Sawankhalok Camp in Thailand helping Vietnamese refugees. She came home through Somalia.

She was reminding me what I can see in the photograph, the imagery I have seen today, that every home is a fortress. They are not open areas with lawns or open areas like some other African countries with humble abodes where you can see the people. It is more in the style of an ancient city like Damascus, where the streets are dusty and narrow. Most of the streets around both helicopter crash sites were so narrow you could barely get a jeep through them. Then the highways where you can have traffic intersect these noncompass directed streets. These cities just sort of grow up over centuries.

My daughter, Robin, said, "Remember, every home is a fortress with walls around it."

So that Aideed's allies and forces sympathetic to him, people who want to kill U.N. workers or kill relief workers or create a problem, every home area around this Olympic Hotel is a fortress with people behind the walls. They can pop up, shoot over the wall, shoot through the gates, come out in the streets, create road blocks and ambushes, which is what happened, and then retreat back into their houses.

By the way, the reason my daughter just called me in the Cloakroom is that the Toronto Star reporter, Paul Watson, who was in Mogadishu, was interviewed on CNN immediately following the President's speech, which had many positive aspects to it, particularly extending his grief to the whole Nation, to the families who lost their young heroes in Sunday's and Monday's action and yesterday's mortaring and the man who died in the hospital in Germany from Sunday's combat.

The CNN reporter comes up to interview Paul Watson of the Toronto Star in Mogadishu, because he is the only man available.

Here is what my daughter tells me that Paul Watson said. I would like to interview him and debate him. I offer a challenge through CNN to let me have access to him to debate what he said.

He said, "You know, what happened to the Americans was terrible."

He is one of the ones who wrote about what the President called and what I called last night desecration of the bodies of our heroes.

He said, "You know, we have got to realize that I, Paul Watson, have seen Somali babies in hospitals."

My daughter said, she was alerted to a possible connection that we were killing Somali babies. Therefore, who are we to get too exercised over the abuse and probably torturing to death, given what I said last night and I will say it again: Nobody puts handcuffs on a dead body.

One of the men, the man who was not stripped naked, but the one who had half of his flight suit trousers on, he had a white plastic handcuff which we brought to that area, so they were taken off our men, around one of his wrists. They had been cut. He was obviously handcuffed alive, captured at the scene, and then beaten to death later.

Until I am proven otherwise on that, nobody puts handcuffs on a dead body.

Was Watson indicating that something is equal here?

And the CNN reporter—I am not going to use his name because I have heretofore respected him, he said, "You mean, Paul, there is simply too much focus on the Americans?"

My daughter, Robin, said he used the words "focus on the Americans."

Well, we are Americans. Our President was just speaking to us about the sacrifice of these men, how we had saved under President Bush's Operation Restore Hope close to a million human beings. The country is only half the size of L.A. County in population. It is bigger than the State of California in land mass. There are only 3 million people in Somalia.

Mr. Speaker, if we saved a third of that country from dying a horrible slow death of starvation and if babies have been killed because of fire fights; for example, after they had murdered under Aideed 24 Pakistanis and the crowd overwhelmed them and women had participated in the killing. The next day the Pakistanis were ambushed.

Yes, they fired into a crowd because they knew that their fellow soldiers had been eviscerated. They had been disemboweled, is what I had described to me by people returning from the scene, and they did not want that to happen to them.

But then are the Pakistanis trained for urban containment of rioting?

The death toll in Moscow just went up to 187 from fire fights there around the biggest government building in and around what was once the Evil Empire, and still the biggest building in the largest remaining state of Russia.

When you get fire fights going in the city, of course, women and children, particularly if they are being used as "human shields," which is another description of how the attacks were made on the Nigerians last month and the Pakistanis in the first 2 weeks of June. If that happened, are we going to put a Canadian on the air because no American journalist had the intestinal fortitude as journalists to remain in Somalia?

Remember the scenes of them swarming the beaches when we first arrived the first week in December under Restore Hope, the operation to stop the dying of a million people, a third of the country?

Where is all the press now so that we have to go to a Canadian who is trying to use the old moral equivalency argument that a lot of other Canadians of a liberal stripe used all during the Cuban through Vietnam years, and say that we are focusing too much on Americans?

□ 1950

No, my focus tonight is on Americans. We lost 19 Americans trying to liberate Grenada. We lost 23 in seeking the arrest of the drug warlord and killer Noriega who had killed Major Heraldi, tortured him to death, and shot another freedom-loving Panamanian to death outside his office. Noriega cools his heels in a Miami jail today, but we lost 23 Americans trying to effect the arrest of Noriega, and all of that came to pass after the murder at a checkpoint of a United States officer born in Colombia, but a naturalized

citizen, Lt. Roberto Paz. Add him to the 23 that died. That is 24. So, it is 19 in Grenada, 24 in Panama, including Lieutenant Paz.

Mr. Speaker, we have now passed that today. Twenty-five dead in Somalia.

Enough about Paul Watson and the Toronto Star. Now back to the chronology of what happened Sunday.

We have intelligence reports of a gathering the press reported as 19 of Aideed's henchmen successfully apprehended. It was actually 20. There was a miscount. Our rangers rappelled onto the roof of the Olympic, came down through the floors, moved up a short distance to this safe house of Aideed's forces, where they were gathering like a mafia meeting, and they got 20 of them. One American ranger died in that operation.

Once that had happened, groundfire took down the first American Black Hawk with four crew members about 4:15–4:20. Very bright lighting. He came down hard, but right side, on a roof's edge, and the helicopter toppled into the alley, the rotor blades tearing up the helicopter partially, and it appears one of the crewmen was killed on impact. The other three scrambled out, prepared to defend themselves, and about 90 rangers, and this is what the President alluded to tonight in his speech, moved not too far, several hundred yards, from the safe house in the Olympic Hotel area up to the first crash site, formed a defensive perimeter around the downed chopper and the three surviving of the four crewmen, and then the crowds began to form.

Aideed's people began a major firefight that lasted for hours, from 4:30 in the afternoon well into the night. During this period, as the other ranger Black Hawk helicopters from one of our classified units that the press is printing about all the time now, the 160th out of Fort Campbell, they were circling, trying to offer what air support they could, and within the hour another Black Hawk, Durant's, was hit. They went down to the southwest, about the same equidistance from the Olympic Hotel safe house area, and they hit upright. All four crewmen appeared to have survived.

And then one of the other helicopters that had some rangers on board came over, and two U.S. rangers volunteered, a firefight had not started yet at the second crash site, volunteered to rappel down ropes to the crash site. They went down heavily armored with extra rifles and with much ammunition to develop a holding position for the four down crewmen. They rappelled down safely, and their fate is unknown to this moment.

I started to say it last night: St. John, the Evangelist, 15:13: "Greater love than this has no man that he gives up his life for his friends." That is what these rangers were offering, their lives on a voluntary basis above and beyond the call of duty. Maybe rangers do not think this is above and beyond the call. They are outstanding, exceptionally well trained, the best trained men in the world like our Seals, like the fighter pilots of all services, like these combat helicopter pilots that fly with the 160th Special Operation Aviation Regiment, open parentheses, airborne, close parentheses, and a firefight soon developed there.

Now comes the rescue effort and where our policy was not thought through. There were no armored vehicles, and Mr. Aspin, our Secretary of Defense, has honorably stepped forward today and said, "Yes, I made a wrong call, but nobody had suggested we needed armor for rescue missions." That is sort of a given if you have military experience though. I always think in terms of rescues, having been plucked out of the ocean at 6 miles out with no Mae West and no liferaft. In peacetime I think in terms of all military operations: "What's the backup contingency for rescues if people get in trouble?"

I do not think people were thinking through our mission here if we did not have armor on the ground to go through these medieval streets in Mogadishu to get to a firefight scene, and, by the way, there have been warnings that Aideed was building up his forces far more powerful than we thought, and there have been warnings that he was lusting to take a hostage, a diplomat, of course a high-ranking military person, any U.N. person, to trade for Osman Atto, O-s-m-a-n A-t-t-o, his chief lieutenant, his main financier, some sort of Somali millionaire. It seems hard to comprehend anybody would have money in this country wracked with poverty. It is always on the edge of famine. Since my daughter was there 12 years ago, it has been on the edge of famine. But we hold this key lieutenant. We took him some weeks back, Osman Atto, and he wants him back as of a week ago. We knew he was lusting to take a hostage.

Now he has Michael Duran, and, God willing, he has three more. I will clarify that in a second, but we are not sure.

A resuce was to be run by Malaysian/U.S. forces and some Pakistanis. They had the armored vehicles. What type of armored vehicles? Ancient, obsolete armored vehicles condemned by us because we have Bradley M-2's, fighting vehicles, and M-1 tanks. So, we had none of those available because Colin Powell, who retired 3 days before this loss of 13 Americans, 14 now, he recommended several times over the last few months we must put armor in there to have them available for a worse-case scenario.

So, we joined up some of our other regular Army men and rangers with the rescue force in Malaysian vehicles, and we started up one of the main streets near a major what I call a British roundabout, like the spokes of a wheel where these streets that you can travel or cut through all of these medieval alleyways, and before they had reached the first major intersection, they were ambushed, and a rocket propelled grenade destroyed a big truck which you have seen burning on the evening news, killed a Malaysian, injured some of our men, and the firefight was on at the ambush site. It took them 4 or 5 hours to get to the Olympic Hotel area and the two crash sites.

It is now past 3 o'clock in the morning. In the dead of night they reached site one, relieve our rangers. The commander, Danny McNight, was wounded. Lt. Col. Danny McNight, they have food, water and extra ammunition dropping to them all during this elongated firefight, and they started taking the wounded rangers and the survivors of the first crash out to the north to the main, I think, October 21 Road. That is the name of a road, a revolutionary date, and they got them up to the compound, I think, of the United Arab Emirates U.N. forces, and then began to chopper them out or truck them out in the dead of night to begin the medical evacuation of the most seriously wounded to Germany.

□ 2000

Now they then had to fight their way to the second crash site. When they got to the second crash site, there was no one there. This was where Chief Warrant Officer Black Hawk Pilot Michael Durant had gone down.

They found the signs of, and I am going to not tell everything that was described to me until this comes out, and it will be written about carefully some day, hopefully by, most assuredly by, Michael Durant. But there were signs of a horrendous firefight, where these six American were surrounded. They obviously used their door guns. There were cartridges from NATO 7.62 weapons all over the place. And many cartridges from 9-millimeter handguns, automatics.

I do not know whether the Rangers used Berettas, which is the standard military weapon today, replacing the old reliable Colt .45, or whether they have the option to get the best state-of-art, which is the German Sig-Sauer, which our Seals opt for, because I have seen them with those, and they told me it won the competition, but Beretta was willing to make weapons in New Jersey. The Germans said no, we will not manufacture in the United States.

So maybe it was Sig-Sauers, and maybe Berettas. It does not matter if it was old Browning high powers. There were 9-millimeter cartridges, pistol cartridges, everywhere, which means they were down to fighting with their sidearms.

There was much sign of struggle. There were no bodies of Aideed's people. They were all dragged away. And it appears that the two bodies that were so badly abused were from that site.

I think I am at liberty to say that we have the remains of our heroes who were so horribly pictured on American television over the last 3 days. Those remains are not only back in the arms of their loving fellow countrymen, but they are on American soil as I speak tonight, and the identification process is going on.

As I said this morning, I got a call from my office last night, one of my staffers, as I was doing last night's special order, that an Army wife from Fort Campbell had been told that another Army wife had identified her beloved husband as one of those whose remains were being abused in the street.

So, we are going to get back Warrant Officer Michael Durant. We have the remains of two of the heros from that second site firefight. And, God willing, we will be able to account for, we pray alive, the three missing men from that site.

Now, where do we go from here? What did the President say in his speech?

Immediately after the speech I was stopped by a camera crew that they said was a pool crew out in front in the lobby of the Rayburn Building in front of the Armed Services room. They said, "What do you think?"

I said, "Well, I feel like I wrote the speech, most of it, so obviously I am not going to criticize it in its totality."

I have received some criticism all day yesterday that I had suggested from the well in the morning and in my special order that we put at least 5,000 combat-trained of America's best in that area to seek the release of Mike Durant and to figure out what we were going to do after we had made our men safe, with armor and well-trained people. And I said, and the President used this tonight, "under U.S. control. Not under U.N. control."

I have no contempt for the United Nations, and I am not an anti-U.N. person. And I have never had a bumper sticker on a car that said United States out of the United Nations and United Nations out of the United States.

I believe that world organization has done much good. But they are no good in combat situations, because they always have to rely on the fighting men of individual countries. Nobody has the training, the skill, or the high-technology equipment that the United States does. We have fought for that tooth and nail, conservative Democrats and conservative Republicans, against the handful of liberal Republicans, usually under 5 or 6, certainly under 10, and, many times in the mid-1980's, a majority of Democrats, liberals, trying to hollow out America's forces, not part of the Reagan rebuilding of our forces.

We have brought ourselves to the point where in Desert Shield and Storm we had a 42-day air war and a 100-hour land war. Because of the training of our men and women and our high-technology weapons, we were able to defeat the army of Iraq, which was the fourth, fifth, or sixth in size in the world, with top Soviet equipment. It is fine after the fact to say they did not know how to use it and they were soft enemies for us and it was not a highly achieved victory.

Tell that to the families of the over 200 Americans who died, and tell it to the 199 allies who died at our side in that 28-nation allied group that drove Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait.

But when it comes to the United Nations, in any tough conflict, we are the teeth of the United Nations. Everybody defers to the United States.

What did Clinton say a couple of days ago? That they will not come out of their compounds to fight? What is that, a charge of cowardice against the U.N. forces? When you are being ambushed at every single intersection of every alley way, and you do not have British Challenger tanks, German Leiper tanks, or U.S. Abrams M-1 tanks, maybe you do not want to come out in thin-skinned trucks, which was the lead vehicle smashed in the Malaysian rescue effort.

I said yesterday that greater love hath no man, and that applies to the Malaysian young man who died trying to rescue our Rangers.

The situation there now, when President Clinton calls for a March 31, cutoff date, is probably evolving like this. Did Aideed watch the President's speech in some television safe house in Mogadishu? Undoubtedly. Saddam Hussein used to watch all of President Bush's speeches, and to this day watched CNN and brags that he, what President Bush called the insipient Hitler of the Middle East, that little Hitler, Saddam Hussein, brags today to every visitor that comes through Baghdad that he has outlasted, politically out-survived, George Bush, Margaret Thatcher, Brian Mulroney, the Prime Minister of Japan, and several other leaders of countries that were part of protecting the world's oil reserves and liberating Kuwait from the torture of its people.

After all, when I got home last night my wife said, "How many presidents has Castro politically survived?" And I held up eight fingers.

My wife said, "So we are going to get Aideed. And you, BOB DORNAN, want to get Aideed for what he has done to 25 Americans." And before I could answer, my wife Sally says, "Have we gotten Pol Pot yet for murdering 2 million people?" She knew what the answer was. Have we gotten Idi Amin, who killed 400,000 of his own people? Who dissected his wives, made his children look at it, and engaged in cannibalism? No. Idi Amin, because he professes an Islamic faith, a false profession, he has been given sanctuary for all these years, since his serial killing and mass slaughter, he has been given sanctuary by our good friends, the Saudis. He lives like a Saudi prince in Saudi Arabia somewhere.

How are we doing with Baby Doc Duvalier, living like a king in Cote D'Azure French Riviera with stolen money secreted away in Swiss bank accounts? Money stolen from the impoverished nation of Haiti?

How are we doing with Qadafi, who is still holding back the 2 people who murdered 259 people on Pan Am 003, and 11 innocent Scot citizens on the ground? Two hundred and seventy dead because of Qadafi.

Qadafi set off the bomb in the La Belle disco April 5, 1985. On all the headlines it said American Jimmy Ford, African-American Sergeant Spec. 5, died in the La Belle disco with a Turkish lady who was dating one of our servicemen.

We forgot to ever point out to our fellow Americans that 2 months later, on June 5, in the same German hospital where the American died today from the Somalia firefight, Sergeant Jimmy, also Jimmy Goines, died, with his wife holding one hand and his son holding the other.

□ 2010

Both his legs had been amputated. They were waiting to award him his Purple Heart when he would be well enough to participate in the ceremony. Unfortunately, he died, and it was awarded posthumously. He was killed by Mu'ammar Qadhafi. Both those sergeants and that Turkish lady were killed by him.

How are we doing getting him? He lives like a king in Libya with oil money still flowing into that country. Most of it illegally, and he is sweating the sanctions that the U.N. is about to crank up on him right now. So he may yet deliver his two humble, uneducated killers that ran the plot to blow up 007.

Finally, my wife said to me, who have we gotten, these world serial killers? And I said, well, let us see. The Bolivians got Che Guevara. He is still glorified on some U.S. college campuses by Marxist teachers, and a few posters go up in college dorms with Che Guevara's Argentine face on it for the killing he pulled off in most of Central America and South America.

I said the Romanians managed to get Mr. and Mrs. Ceausescu on Christmas Day a few years back, I guess 1989 it was.

The Israelis got the mass serial killer Adolf Eichmann, who managed to kill a great percentage of the fellow Hungarian Jews of my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS] in

the slaughter that was still going on even though they knew the victory would go to the Allies and not to the Nazis. They got Adolf Eichmann and they got Klaus Barbie. But Klaus Barbie is eating well in a jail somewhere in France. While Jean Melan, who was tortured to death by Klaus Barbie's Gestapo, his relatives have not had the benefit for half a century of that beautiful man's heroism as the leader of the French Underground, the Meke.

Let us see. Who else did we get? Not a good track record at all.

God took out Dr. Mengele in the surf in Brazil. The Ayatollah died in his sleep in Iran, and all those that did the killing in his name are still loose. As a matter of fact, it is Iranian weapons, and they are buying heavy weapons from North Korea. They ship weapons to Sudan, Khartoum and they are driven across Ethiopia on a latitude right into central Somalia. So the killing still goes on from Iran.

My point, in response to my wife's rhetorical challenge to all Americans and all freedom-loving people, is we do not have a very good track record in bringing to justice serial killers who kill in the tens and sometimes hundreds of thousands. We do not have a good track record. So if it comes down to Michael Durant versus Osman Oto, what would the American people say? And that is why we need a clear, concise vision of a foreign policy vis-a-vis the foresaken country of Somalia.

ROBERT BYRD said the other day, one of the senior Senators in the majority party in the Senate, "Americans by the dozens are paying with their lives and limbs for a misplaced policy on the altar of some fuzzy multiculturalism." Senator BYRD is demanding that we are out of this by December.

Representative BENJAMIN GILMAN of New York, my good friend, ranking Republican on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, urged that Congress accelerate its timetable to debate the administrative policy.

We passed a weak resolution here asking that the President tell us by November 15 what is the policy. Is he going to substitute this speech tonight for a real hard policy?

SAM NUNN, who more or less liked the President's speech, said, yesterday, "Right now I am concerned because we do not have sufficient military power to protect our own forces."

As we speak, C-5's are landing, what they call combat offloading. That means almost with the engines running. Not with the big C-5, but the C-130 offloading means your engine is running and you take off as soon as your cargo and pilots are out the back door. In the C-5 case, it is out the giant open nose of a mouth, and we are bringing tanks and supplies in there right now. Senator NUNN says it is very unusual for the United States to be in a position where we cannot really rescue our own forces.

Now I guess we will be able to do that, as Aideed prepares to replace the 80 or so of his henchmen that died in this fire fight. Yes, they had about 500 wounded. That is what this Canadian was prattling on about. I read that last night about Black Hawks, the figure 25.

The Somali capital is going to be torn apart by warlords in the far foreseeable future. That is why we have to have a clear foreign policy.

Tonight CBS, after the President's speech, did a service for me, because I have here the President's remarks from May 5. I asked my staff to get them for me today, because that is the day when George Bush had his involvement here ended.

CBS said tonight there is a poll, a brandnew poll, I forget who CBS joins up with, that says 32 percent of our fellow Americans blame Clinton for this mess in Somalia. But 45 percent, over 32, blame President Bush.

Now, I am not being blindly partisan when I defend my friend President Bush, but the President tonight did give him credit for saving, he called it, "American leadership," a million lives and that the President-elect Clinton signed off on that policy when our forces landed on the beach by the International Airport, a massive lighted beach by our media.

But President Clinton, and I will read his exact words in a minute, ended Operation Restore Hope on May 5 when he used those 24 Marines in combat fatigues. And I repeat what I said last night, nobody in the military goes to the White House in anything but their very best pressed Class A uniform with all the brass shining, all the ribbons attached that you had ever earned anywhere, anytime in your service. I have never seen people in fatigues on the White House lawn or inside.

The word I was groping for last night was props. I said supernumaries. I said extras. Most of you may not know, unless you have been to a Universal Studio tour, that means they were props.

As he stood there, he turned to Scotland-born U.S. Marine Corps Gen. Robert Johnston, who was the Operations Commander under Schwarzkopf in Desert Storm. And he said, "The General has told me, mission accomplished."

Those are the words that came out of the President after he shook the hand of every single one of those picked 24 Marine props to say, hey, I am part of this, even though it was Bush's deal. Here I am. I am part of it. Mission accomplished. We won. We are out of there. Restore Hope is over.

One month to the day later, the 24 Pakistani U.N. troops are ambushed and murdered by Aideed forces, and then we began this gray period where we are the teeth of the United Nations. We are supposed to go out and do their bidding and hunt down Aideed.

Here is something that a 20-year-old infantryman, who refused to give his name, said. He personally believes that it is time to get a clear policy and resolve this thing.

He said, "Yes, we should probably avenge the casualties." That could be your husband, your brother, your father. You raise up your kids decently. You give them birthday parties. You dress them up for all the holidays, Thanksgiving dinner, and then you see this person covered with dust, naked, broken, dragged through the streets. Kids dancing on them, playing around on them.

They went over there on a humanitarian mission to feed them.

□ 2020

This was actually a military family lady. "We have done our part. We have fed them. It is time to come home."

What Americans were saying is that these people do not look hungry in Mogadishu. They never have. They did not look hungry in Addis Ababa just in the north when I went through there, but when I went out to the camps of Insilkia and Ibnet, I saw 100,000 people and 10,000 of them were dead 3 weeks later because they were forced out of the camps by the Marxist government and died on the road.

I physically saw 10,000 human beings from a small knoll. I looked at them. Some of them, I saw their faces as I walked through the camp, and counted 7 dead bodies, 10,000 people dead 3 weeks after I looked at them in this large camp. That was the government killing people while the rest of the free world is trying to figure out how to help them.

One lady named Joyce spoke about the death of her 24-year-old husband, another 75th Ranger Regiment hero. "My husband enjoyed being a Ranger. That was his job. He died for his country. I am sure he has no regrets."

It is up to us to figure out where we are going with this policy. Last night they put the heading on my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as "Operation: No Name." That is the problem when you are letting the U.N. command your troops. I do not have time tonight, but here is a whole report by one of the chiefs of staff of one of our Congress Members who has made himself an expert and chairs our Task Force on Terrorism on all the connections between Aideed. He brought it to my attention, a speech that went unreported right down the road here at the National War College at Fort McNair, by one of Clinton's better appointments, Ambassador Madeleine Albright, our permanent representative to the United Nations.

She said in the speech last month, she heavily hinted that Mogadishu outlaw Mohamed Farah Aideed is being assisted by Islamic, and she said fundamentalists, but I think the word

should be terrorists. The liberal media has so much fun attacking anybody who has fundamentalist Jewish, fundamentalist Protestant, or fundamentalist Catholic beliefs, as I do, in this country, that she should have said, "by Islamic terrorists," who disgrace one of the world's three great religions, Islam.

She said, "In Somalia we have indications that a tactical alliance may be forming between Aideed's faction, terrorists based in Sudan, and the government of Iran."

It is very hard to quantify, by the way, Brent Scowcroft says, "Do not look to scapegoat other people. Aideed is a horror and terror in his own right."

She continued, "I am not going to quantify. Let us just say there are some who have no stake in the international systems, and they operate together to undermine the international community."

Another author, an Arab author, Mohamed Mohad Dessin, wrote a book, "Islamic"—there is that word again—"Fundamentalism, The New Global Threat."

He says that, "Diplomatic visitors report a noticeable increase in Iranian activity in Mogadishu and the Somali capital," and there are terrorist training camps. I wish all Americans could avail themselves of this long report.

I mentioned briefly last night how we were raised in my generation that every American like Michael Durant is as important as the President. I was thinking about this last night.

In the third and fourth grade in New York City at De La Salle, a Christian Brothers school, I had the same teacher, and actually I had him for three grades, Brother William. He taught me the first time about Teddy Roosevelt and a conflict in 1904 where a thug, an outlaw like Aideed named Raisuli, captured, and I have learned since from the Library of Congress not an American but a Greek who had applied for American citizenship.

How is that for Teddy Roosevelt, the President, saying "This guy wants to be an American, so I am treating him like an American." Roosevelt sent the whole fleet available in the Atlantic waters then into the harbor at Tangier, and he told the Sultan of Morocco, "I want Ian Perdicaris alive or Raisuli dead," and they got Mr. Perdicaris out alive.

I was taught that again by the nuns, the Sacred Heart Sisters, that taught me in Beverly Hills Catholic School, Good Shepherd, years later that Teddy Roosevelt, when he said, "I want this one person freed or we are coming after the outlaw to kill him," that is when I picked up in my education that every American citizen anywhere in the world has the full protection of the U.S. Government, which at this point in time happens to be the only superpower in the world.

Here is the wire service story off the wire service machines out here. This is what we tried to ask about today, with no success.

"Gen. Colin Powell was rebuffed twice last month when he recommended sending tanks and armored vehicles along with additional troops to Somalia," a military source asking anonymity, of course, said today.

"As Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Powell passed on the request from a military commander in Somalia." Maj. Gen. Thomas M. Montgomery, commander of United States forces in Somalia, asked for these. It was one of several requests.

Now we are going to have to find out what went wrong there. Why did people in the Pentagon, civilians, McNamara's peace kid types from the 1960's, why did they think we did not have to have the armor as backup protection for our men carrying most of the combat burden now?

If there is an absence of a Clinton doctrine, I am afraid it is because there is a Morton Halperin doctrine. I hope our Republican leader in the Senate, because that is their responsibility for advice and consent, I hope Bob Dole will mobilize his forces, which he was unable to do with Joycelyn Elders, with political correct appointees up and down the line, I hope he can focus on stopping the appointment of Morton Halperin.

This operation, nonoperation, unnamed operation, has the fingerprints of Morton Halperin all over it. It has the fingerprints of the 1960's thinking all over it, that what Senator BYRD called fuzzy multinationalism is the way to go.

Listen to some of the questions I wanted to ask and was unable to ask at this Somali briefing: "What was the extent of involvement by the United Nations command in the planning of Sunday's raid?"

Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARLOW). The Chair advises that the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I will put in all these questions in the RECORD. There are nine of them, with many subquestions. I will include this in the RECORD, and anybody who wants to follow the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, can see how many of these questions the Republican staff on the Committee on Armed Services worked up will get answered by next week:

QUESTIONS/ISSUES FOR SOMALIA BRIEFING

(1) What was the extent of involvement by the UN (UNOSOM II) command in the planning and execution of Sunday's raid?

Was operational control of those U.S. forces involved in any way subordinated to non-U.S. control?

Precisely who is making the call as to where and how U.S. forces are employed against Aideed?

(2) What kind of U.S. force was kept in reserve to support the contingent conducting the raid?

Do U.S. forces routinely depend on non-U.S. forces to provide back-up capability during military operations?

Why did it take up to 7 hours for the UN multi-national contingent to reach the Rangers pinned down in support of the downed helicopter?

(3) It is widely reported that the armored reinforcements going into Somalia were actually requested by General Montgomery back in early September. Is this true, and if so, why were they denied?

(4) President Clinton expressed concern on Monday for the adequacy of the protection for U.S. forces in Somalia. Has the Joint Staff, CENTCOM or anyone else in the command chain expressed concern prior to this past weekend about inadequate available capability to protect our forces?

(5) What capabilities will the mechanized company with one platoon of tanks give the U.S. forces in Somalia?

Tanks are usually very vulnerable when used in city or built-up area as they lose their stand-off and mobility advantage. Why do we think 4 or 5 tanks will give U.S. forces a decisive advantage?

(6) Why were the AC-130s operating in June out of Djibouti withdrawn?

(7) It has been suggested that the force levels we have in Somalia are on the minimal end of the scale for what is required to support continued operations. Given this past weekend's experience do we have enough forces in Somalia, even after the small reinforcements on the way?

Do we have enough forces to enjoy a "decisive" advantage?

Have we moved away from the "decisive force" doctrine?

(8) Who authorized the change in the employment of the U.S. Quick Reaction Force (QRF) from the original concept of a garrisoned reaction capability to their current use as a day-to-day military force?

When the tactical mission changed, did anyone reassess force requirements for the new mission?

(9) Given the vulnerability of our helicopters, why was this operation conducted in broad daylight?

How has the Somali anti-aircraft/air defense capability evolved over the past few months?

Since we don't have the forces to maintain open lines of communication on the ground and air mobility now appears to be in question, how will our forces conduct future operations?

I do at this point want to read something from today's October 7 Washington Post that is stunning. It was the President yesterday being quoted in today's paper. This is the liberal Washington Post, one of America's three great dominating newspapers, all of them liberal on their editorial pages, and all of their reporters, I have never met a conservative reporter. I take it back, yes, at the L.A. Times, one long ago at the L.A. Times, none at the other, and none at the Capital City's paper, the reporters, with the Washington Times, thank God, on its heels all the time.

This is the Post. Listen to this:

The President suggested in an interview with Copley News Service published yesterday that the United Nations had changed its

mission unwisely, failed to provide military operation to back up peacekeepers, and staffed the units with troops untrained for their jobs who refused to venture outside their areas and refused to take orders.

Doesn't this sound like vintage Clinton?

The President also referred to U.N. actions as if he and his U.N. Ambassador has had no role in formulating or approving them. The United States sits on the Security Council and can veto any resolution. The Clinton Administration supported the resolution that established the peacekeeping effort, in line with Clinton's campaign rhetoric of relying more on multinational institutions to address international problems. When the United Nations included efforts to hunt down Aideed and his key aides for the murders of Pakistani troops, the Clinton Administration voted for the resolution. But in the interview, Clinton expressed doubts about the operation. He said, "the Copley interview we were asked to come in and, in effect, be the police officer in this thing, to start this thing going * * * And then the U.N. shifted course and said we ought to stay there until nation-building takes place."

Clinton said he did not want "our young people in harm's way in the absence of the United Nations aggressively proceeding with a plan to turn this country back over to the Somali or to have a long-term peace-keeping strategy that does not involve the United States."

But Clinton made the commitment to leave the troops in Somalia as part of the U.N. force when the mission changed, the key decisionmaking point for the president. At that time, there was no specific date for turning the country back, or any schedule for withdrawing all Americans.

□ 2030

Mr. Speaker, I would like to put in the RECORD at this point reasons why Morton Halperin should not be confirmed as the newly created Under Secretary of State, that is level 2, right under the Secretary, for Democratic Institutions around the world.

THE CASE AGAINST MORTON HELPERIN

Morton Halperin has been nominated to be Assistant Secretary of Defense for Democracy and Peacekeeping, a new position created by the Clinton Administration. Mr. Halperin:

Is a principal architect of Presidential Decision Directive #13, a blueprint for largely subsuming U.S. participation in "peacekeeping" to UN command and control.

Favors considerably augmenting the capabilities and responsibilities of the UN, to include the authority to raise revenues by taxing multilateral transactions such as arms sales, telecommunications, and multinational corporate sales.

Has, since the early 1970s, consistently strongly opposed U.S. covert operations abroad. (He now claims that within the last two years, he has changed his mind.)

Has participated in leadership positions with radical leftist groups engaged in public campaigns to shut down the counterintelligence capabilities of the FBI and Justice Department and to reduce drastically the foreign intelligence capabilities of the CIA.

Considers his role in defeating Senator Dole's constitutional amendment to the Constitution prohibiting the burning of the American flat a crowning career achievement.

Opposes the unilateral use of U.S. force except in very limited circumstances (e.g., opposed American intervention in Grenada and Panama).

Opposes random drug-testing for federal employees, including those in sensitive positions such as air traffic controllers and national security officials.

Consistently excused the actions of the Soviet Union and its client like Cuba at the height of the Cold War, characterizing their intentions as benign.

Spent five months leading Daniel Ellsberg's defense team and testified on Ellsberg's behalf, characterizing the Pentagon Papers as inconsequential to U.S. national security interests.

Flew to the U.K. to testify on behalf of Philip Agee, CIA renegade who exposed the identities of hundreds of American intelligence agents, including Athens CIA Station Chief Richard Welch who was subsequently murdered.

Filed a "friend of the court" brief in defense of David Truong, a Vietnamese expatriate convicted of espionage on behalf of communist Vietnam and theft of government property.

Played an integral role in orchestrating the Clinton Administration's campaign to allow gays in the military.

Considers such issues as mental health, prior arrest record, drug or alcohol abuse, or members in the Communist Party irrelevant questions to be asked for security clearance background checks.

I am going to do a special order, ironically, last week on all of the material that I have called the case against the Helperin nomination. If, as reported in the Washington Times, the Post, and I believe the New York Times, it was Mr. Halperin that advised Mr. Aspin not to send armored vehicles to that area, and if Mr. Aspin is not going to resign, and I do not believe at this point he should, certainly Mr. Aspin should withdraw the Halperin nomination.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARLOW). The gentleman will please not refer to actions of the Senate.

Mr. DORNAN. In closing again, I will put in the RECORD the case against Mr. Halperin.

I want to close by reemphasizing something that the President said that was positive at the end of his speech where he said the Nation is grateful to these men.

All of the analogies to the Ia Drang Valley battle, where we inserted only two companies at first of the 1st Battalion, the 7th Cavalry of the 1st Cavalry Airmobile in that terrible week of November 14 to 18 of 1965, when we lost 304 men on the ground, and one Skyraider Air Force pilot died trying to support them, all the comparisons in the Ia Drang Valley model to November 1965, all of the comparisons to Vietnam in general by the American people in the street, in interviews, I want to point something out to my liberal colleagues. Americans do not question our mission in Vietnam. Rarely do you see that, unless it is some leftover 1960's flower child. Most Americans still agree with Ronald Reagan that Vietnam was a noble cause to save half of Vietnam from the curse of communism that wrecked so much of the world. And we are still reading of the wreckage of lives and the environment. And we still see China hurting the people with communism, and the North Koreans into the mischief, and the China nuclear testing, and North Korea making nuclear weapons. Castro still has 11 million people living in Castro's decaying Communist island prison. And Vietnam, all of it suffering under communism. It was the halfhearted way we pursued the noble cause, the political battles fought and lost here on Capitol Hill, the lack of resolve, no policy, no commitment, McNamara driving a negotiating process with the blood of Americans. In any other democracy McNamara would have resigned in disgrace, not have been given by a President a tax-free $250,000-a-year job in 1960 dollars as head of the World Bank. Maybe a British Secretary or Minister of Foreign Affairs or Defense would resign over an issue like this.

One of the Republican Senators is demanding Les Aspin's resignation. All I am asking Les to do is re-look at this Halperin nomination and reevaluate the flawed 1960's McNamara-type advice. Aspin used to work for McNamara. That is where he started out in public service, one of the whiz kids over there.

Let us have more definitive Reagan doctrine foreign policy. And I will ask to put in again the Cap Weinberger six rules that we should study before we even go into a humanitarian operation.

Outlined by former Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger in a November 28, 1984, speech:

First, is the situation vital to United States or allied national interests?

Second, have all other options already been considered or used?

Third, is there a clear commitment, including allocated resources, to achieving victory?

Fourth, are there clearly defined political and military objectives?

Fifth, will our commitment of forces change if our objectives change?

Sixth, will the American people and Congress support the action?

Let us rethink what we are doing, and let us debate it in this Chamber and in the Senate Chamber at the north end of this building. Let us be careful how we remove ourselves and to set a date certain of March 31. Does this not drive Aideed to go underground, to bury his weapons, so to speak, and wait until we are gone on March 31, and then, according to Clinton, the rest of the U.N. forces, so poorly trained, will flee. That is what Boutros Boutros-Ghali, Secretary of the United Nations said, they will all pull out if we pull out. And then he

goes on with his killing again, and brags to the world that he drove the world's only superpower out of his nation, and the famine starts again, and the brave camera crews, which we do not have any American types these days, and I do not blame them after they tore apart five CNN crew and murdered them right in the street after an incident last month. Then do our cameramen go back and show us those beautiful little faces of those starving African children in Somalia? Where are the cameras in south Sudan where Africans of Christian heritage are being slaughtered in the tens of thousands by those from north Sudan, and the arms flow from there, meanwhile, through terribly suffering Ethiopia into the killing of Somalia.

I will do a special order, Mr. Speaker, on this again next week when we have had a weekend to reflect on what policy should evolve out of all of this in this Chamber and in concert with the executive branch.

COMMUNICATION FROM DIRECTOR, NON-LEGISLATIVE AND FINANCIAL SERVICES OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Leonard P. Wishart III, Director, Office of the Director, Non-Legislative and Financial Services, U.S. House of Representatives:

NON-LEGISLATIVE AND
FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, October 6, 1993.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that a member of my staff has been served with a subpoena issued by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

After consultation with the General Counsel to the House, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and precedents of the House.

Sincerely,
LEONARD P. WISHART III, *Director.*

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE OWEN PICKETT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable OWEN PICKETT, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 4, 1993.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that I have been served with a subpoena issued by the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court, Virginia Beach, Virginia.

After consultation with the General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and precedents of the House.

With kindest regards, I am
Sincerely yours,
OWEN PICKETT,
Member of Congress.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2446

Mr. HEFNER submitted the following conference report and statement on 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:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 103-278)

The Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to 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," 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 2, 5, 8, 18, 19, 41, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, and 48.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 34, 35, 36, 37, and 39, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$562,008,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$247,491,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$102,040,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$25,029,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$1,069,601,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$1,298,486,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$26,337,000*; 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: *$26,496,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, 17, 20, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 33, 38, 40, and 42.

W.G. (BILL) HEFNER,
THOMAS M. FOGLIETTA,
CARRIE P. MEEK,
NORMAN D. DICKS,
JULIAN C. DIXON,
VIC FAZIO,
STENY H. HOYER,
RONALD D. COLEMAN,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
BARBARA F. VUCANOVICH,
SONNY CALLAHAN,
HELEN DELICH BENTLEY,
DAVID L. HOBSON,
JOSEPH MCDADE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JIM SASSER,
DANIEL K. INOUYE,
HARRY REID,
HERB KOHL,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
SLADE GORTON,
TED STEVENS,
MITCH MCCONNELL,
MARK O. HATFIELD,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to 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, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

ITEMS OF GENERAL INTEREST

Reprogramming of Authorized Projects.—The conferees note that funding for many military construction projects could not be accommodated in this conference agreement because of budget constraints. However, the conferees expect that the Department of Defense Authorization Bill for fiscal year 1994, when enacted, will contain authorizations for projects not included in this conference report. In light of this situation, the conferees direct the Department of Defense to give priority consideration to those authorized by unfunded projects in its fiscal year 1995 budget submission for military construction. In addition, the conferees will consider reprogramming requests for such authorized projects that are executable in fiscal year 1994.

Reprogramming Thresholds.—The conferees believe it appropriate to raise the thresholds for both active and reserve components. As a

part of the dual criteria, the current 25 percent threshold will remain for both active and reserve components. However, the conferees agree to increase the dollar amount to $2,000,000 for the active components and $600,000 for the reserve components. The increase for the active components will apply to both military construction and family housing construction programs and will be retroactive for projects funded in prior years.

Famiy Housing Reprogramming Criteria.—To provide the individual services the flexibility to proceed with construction contracts without disruption or delay, the costs associated with environmental hazard remediation such as asbestos removal, radon abatement, lead-based paint removal or abatement, and any other legislated environmental hazard remediation may be excluded, provided that such remediation requirements could not be reasonably anticipated at the time of budget submission. This exclusion applies to projects authorized in the budget year as well as projects authorized in prior years for which construction contracts have not been completed. This exclusion applies to reprogrammings as well as to the calculations to determine the requirement for advance notification to the Committees regarding maintenance and repair expenditures in excess of $15,000 for a military family housing unit, or $25,000 for a General or Flag Officer Quarters. However, the Committees will continue to require an after-the-fact notification where such costs cause the thresholds to be exceeded. The notification shall include work scope, cost break-out and other details pertinent to asbestos and/or lead-based paint removal work and shall be reported on a semi-annual basis.

Family Housing Operation and Maintenance.—The conferees regret the need to reduce the family housing operation and maintenance account. The conference action is driven by budget constraints with regard to outlays. Given the reduced funding available for the family housing program, the services should consider closing units which have deteriorated, especially when they are in localities having adequate and affordable housing in the private community. The conferees expect the Department to adequately provide for maintenance of its housing inventory in future budget submissions.

Recission.—The conferees agree to rescind $277,595,000 from appropriations made in fiscal years 1990, 1991, 1992 and 1993. The rescissions represent the amount for projects at military bases that are no longer needed because of the approved 1993 base realignment and closure recommendation. The rescissions also represent projects that are no longer required because of mission changes and force structure reductions. Below is a summary of the rescissions listed by appropriation account:

Military construction:	
Army	$13,900,000
Navy	122,627,000
Air Force	30,095,000
Defense-wide	15,500,000
Subtotal, military construction	182,122,000
Family housing:	
Navy and Marine Corps	40,371,000
Air Force	55,102,000
Subtotal	95,473,000
Total	277,595,000

Matters Addressed by Only One Committee.—The language and allocations set forth in House Report 103-136 and Senate Report 103-148 should be complied with unless specifically addressed to the contrary in the conference report and statement of the managers. Report language included by the House which is not changed by the report of the Senate or the conference, and Senate report language which is not changed by the conference is approved by the committee of conference. The statement of the managers, while repeating some report language for emphasis, does not intend to negate the language referred to above unless expressly provided herein. In cases in which the House or the Senate have directed the submission of a report from the Department of Defense, such report is to be submitted to both House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

(INCLUDING RESCISSIONS)

Amendment No. 1

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 stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert: *$906,676,000*

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 appropriates $906,676,000 for Military Construction, Army instead of $837,644,000 as proposed by the House and $723,505,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees agree to the following additions and deletions to the amounts and line items as proposed by the House:

Alabama-Fort Rucker:	
Road upgrade	+$1,300,000
Alaska—Fort Richardson:	
Joint mobility center	+10,000,000
Alaska—Fort Wainwright:	
Waste oil burning power plant	+740,000
Colorado—Fitzsimons Army Medical Center:	
Dial center office facility	+4,400,000
Georgia—Fort Gillem:	
Physical fitness center	+2,600,000
Kansas—Fort Riley:	
Barracks and administration renovation	+9,900,000
Battle simulation facility	+4,742,000
Nevada—Hawthorne AAP:	
Rehabilitate rail line	+4,700,000
North Carolina—Fort Bragg: Library	+5,500,000
Overseas Classified: Communications maintenance facility	−3,600,000
Unspecified Worldwide Locations: General reduction	+28,750,000
Various locations:	
Rescission, fiscal year 1992	−4,700,000
Rescission, fiscal year 1993	−9,200,000

The conferees agree to fund all other items in conference at the level proposed by the House, as shown below:

Alabama—Anniston Army Depot: Ammunition demilitarization facility, phase IV	$110,900,000
Alabama—Fort Rucker:	
Personnel services facility	14,400,000
Alaska—Fort Richardson:	
Road improvements	0
Kentucky—Fort Campbell:	
Rail spur	0
Maryland—Edgewood Arsenal: Child development center	1,450,000
New Mexico—White Sands Missile Range: Rehab facilities	0
New York—Fort Drum:	
Range complex	0
North Carolina—Fort Bragg:	
Overhills tract land acquisition	15,000,000
Simmons airfield land acquisition	1,450,000
Oklahoma—Fort Sill:	
Central vehicle wash facility	7,600,000
Environmental training center	3,700,000
Texas—Fort Bliss:	
Tactical equipment shop	12,800,000
Tactical equipment shop	2,800,000
Texas—Fort Hood:	
Battalion command and control building	5,600,000
Deployment storage facility	1,500,000
Texas—Fort Sam Houston:	
Fire station	1,300,000
Utah—Tooele Army Depot:	
Treaty compliance facility	1,500,000
Kwajalein:	
Sewage treatment facility	11,200,000
Unaccompanied personnel housing	10,000,000
Unspecified worldwide locations:	
Planning and design	84,441,000
Unspecified minor construction	12,000,000

New York—Fort Drum.—The conferees agree that a reprogramming request will be considered for two projects at Fort Drum as follows:

Range control	$2,950,000
POL storage	1,550,000

Alaska—Fort Richardson: Road Improvement.—The conferees agree that the Road Improvement project at Fort Richardson, Alaska fits within the definition of Minor Construction. Therefore, the conferees direct the Army to address this project during fiscal year 1994.

Kentucky—Fort Campbell: Rail Spur.—There is a clear division in the community over this project. The conferees direct the Army to hold public hearings to ascertain the real cost of this project and to assure public safety and public concerns are addressed. The Army should consult with the Chamber of Commerce, municipal officials, local farm representatives and the Economic Development Council, and other interested citizens prior to moving forward with this project.

Texas—Fort Bliss: Barracks Modernization.—The conferees understand that there is a shortfall in funds in the amount of $1.4 million to complete a fiscal year 1991 barracks modernization project (project number 33758) at Fort Bliss. The Army is directed to utilize funds from available savings to complete this project and submit a reprogramming request, if necessary.

Amendment No. 2

Earmarks $109,441,000 for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services as proposed by the House instead of $88,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3

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 rescinds a total of $13,900,000. The House bill proposed a general reduction rather than rescissions. The conference agreement rescinds funds for projects that are no longer required due to Base Realignment and Closure, Part III.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY

(INCLUDING RESCISSIONS)

Amendment No. 4

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 stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert: *$681,373,000*

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 appropriates $681,373,000 for Military Construction, Navy instead of $575,971,000 as proposed by the House and $580,033,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees agree to the following additions and deletions to the amounts and line items as proposed by the House:

California—Alameda Naval Air Station: Control tower complex	−$4,700,000
California—El Toro Marines Corps Air Station: Maintenance hangar addition	−1,950,000
California—San Diego Naval Training Center: Fire protection system	−700,000
Connecticut—New London Naval Submarine Base: Pier improvements	+4,200,000
Florida—Cecil Field Naval Air Station: Sanitary wastewater system upgrade	−1,500,000
Hawaii—Barbers Point Naval Air Station: Fire fighting training facility	−1,350,000
Maryland—Indian Head NSWC: Hazardous waste treatment facility	+10,000
Maryland—NAS Patuxent River: Sewage treatment plant	+1,000,000
Maryland—Patuxent River NAWC: Hazardous material storage facility	+3,400,000
Mississippi—CBC Gulfport: Family service center	+2,000,000
Child development center	+2,400,000
Tennessee—Memphis Naval Air Station: Fuels trainer facility	−600,000
Virginia—Norfolk Naval Aviation Depot: Aircraft rework facility—DBOF	−17,800,000
Virginia—Oceana NAS: Replace fuel tank farm	+1,800,000
Virginia—Quantico Marine Corps Combat Dev Command: Rehab instruction space	+5,000,000
Guam—Fleet and Industrial Supply Center: Gas bottle storage facility—DBOF	−1,240,000
Guam—Military Sealift Command Office: Operations building	+2,170,000
Guam—Naval Magazine: Inert storehouses	−3,750,000
Guam—Naval Oceanography Command Center: Oceanography building alterations	−690,000
Guam—Navy Public Works Center:	
Transportation parts storage facility—DBOF	−1,610,000
Waterfront utilities—DBOF	−11,840,000
Unspecified worldwide locations: General reduction	+135,492,000
Various locations:	
Rescission, fiscal year 1990	−7,662,000
Rescission, fiscal year 1991	−14,406,000
Rescission, fiscal year 1992	−62,899,000
Rescission, fiscal year 1993	−37,660,000

The conferees agree to fund all other items in conference at the level proposed by the House, as shown below:

Arizona—MCAS Yuma: Barracks	0
California—Camp Pendleton:	
Emergency off-base water supply main	$750,000
Flood protection-sewage treatment plant	1,000,000
Relocate water wells	1,800,000
Replace drainage structures	3,000,000
Indiana—Crane NSWCD: Ordnance environmnetal test facility	9,600,000
Maryland—Annapolis, Naval Academy: Visitors center	0
Maryland—Patuxent River NAWC:	
Advance system integration facility, phase II	10,000,000
Jet engine test cell	4,900,000
Mississippi—Pascagoula:	
Academic instruction facility	0
Electrical distribution upgrade	0
Mississippi—CBC Gulfport: Warehouse	0
Pennsylvania—Philadelphia Naval Shipyard:	
Asbestos removal facility	2,300,000
Power plant modernization	11,500,000
Guam—Andersen AFB Naval Air Facility:	
Bachelor enlisted quarters renovation	3,560,000
Bachelor officer quarters modernization	3,750,000
Guam—Fleet and Industrial Supply Center: Integrated storage handling facility—DBOF	21,200,000
Guam—Naval Hospital: Child development center	2,460,000
Guam—Naval Station:	
Child development center addition	2,020,000
Explosive ordance disposal operations facility	12,500,000
Guam—Navy Public Works Center: Sewerage treatment plant—DBOF	7,230,000
Italy—Naples Naval Support Activity: Quality of life facilities, phase I	11,740,000
Italy—Sigonella Naval Air Station: Child development center	3,460,000
Spain—Rota Naval Station: Child development center	2,670,000
Unspecified Worldwide Locations: Planning and design	64,373,000

Amendment No. 5

Earmarks $64,373,000 for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services as proposed by the House instead of $59,373,000 as proposed by the Senate.

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 matter inserted by said amendment, insert: *: Provided further, That of the funds appropriated for "Military Construction, Navy" under Public Law 101-148, $7,662,000 is hereby rescinded: Provided further, That of the funds appropriated for "Military Construction, Navy" under Public Law 101-519, $14,406,000 is hereby rescinded: Provided further, That of the funds appropriated for "Military Construction, Navy" under Public Law 102-136, $62,899,000 is hereby rescinded: Provided further, That of the funds appropriated for "Military Construction, Navy" under Public Law 102-380, $37,660,000 is hereby rescinded*

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 rescinds a total of $122,627,000. The House bill proposed a general reduction rather than rescissions. The conference agreement rescinds funds for projects that are no longer required due to Base Realignment and Closure, Part III, as well as funds for projects that are no longer required due to force structure changes or mission changes.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

(INCLUDING RESCISSIONS)

Amendment No. 7

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 stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert: *$1,021,567,000*

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 appropriates $1,021,567,000 for Military Construction, Air Force instead of $913,297,000 as proposed by the House and $963,726,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees agree to the following additions and deletions to the amounts and line items as proposed by the House:

Alaska-Eielson AFB:	
Upgrade water treatment plant	+$3,750,000
Upgrade waste water plant	+1,750,000
Alaska-Elmendorf AFB: Runway repair	+2,500,000
Fort Richardson-Joint mobility center	+5,500,000
Florida-Eglin AFB: Renovate climatic test chamber, phase II	−20,000,000
Georgia-Moody AFB:	
Aircraft pavements	+9,000,000
Large aircraft hangar	+4,700,000
Georgia-Robins AFB: Add/alter logistical systems operations center	+3,000,000
Hawaii—Hickam AFB: Dormitory	+50,000

Louisiana—Barksdale AFB:	
Replace apron/fuel hydrants	+10,000,000
Apron lighting	+1,300,000
New Mexico—Holloman AFB: Fighter maintenance facility	+1,900,000
New Mexico—Kirtland AFB: Upgrade utility system	+8,000,000
North Dakota—Grand Forks AFB: Repair aircraft pavements	+10,200,000
North Dakota—Minot AFB: Repair runway/taxiway	+8,500,000
Ohio—Wright Patterson AFB:	
Acquisition management complex	+14,400,000
Fire station	+1,230,000
Fire protection system	+1,400,000
South Dakota—Ellsworth AFB: Consolidated admin center, phase I	+6,200,000
Tennessee—Memphis Naval Air Station:	
Add/alter high-bay technical training facility	−3,000,000
Alter technical training facility	−2,000,000
Renovate dormitory	−1,200,000
Virginia—Langley AFB: Base civil engineering complex, phase I	+1,300,000
Guam—Anderson AFB: Underground fuel storage tanks	−4,100,000
Oman—Thumrait AB: War readiness material covered storage facility	−1,800,000
Qatar—Doha: War readiness material warehouse	−5,500,000
Unspecified Worldwide Locations: General reduction	+51,190,000
Various locations:	
Rescission, fiscal year 1990	−8,315,000
Rescission, fiscal year 1991	−6,550,000
Rescission, fiscal year 1992	−12,980,000
Rescission, fiscal year 1993	−2,250,000

The conferees agree to fund all other items in conference at the level proposed by the House, as shown below:

Alabama—Maxwell AFB: Upgrade runway	$5,000,000
Arizona—Davis—Monthan AFB: Consolidated parts storage	0
California—Beale AFB: Education center/library	3,100,000
California—McClellan AFB:	
Convert to integrated media center	1,600,000
Repair aircraft parking apron	6,700,000
California—Travis AFB: Add/alter dormitories, phase VI	5,100,000
Florida—Tyndall AFB:	
Add to base supplies and equipment warehouse	3,200,000
Security police operations	2,400,000
Georgia—Moody AFB:	
Mission equipment storage	0
Large aircraft wash rack	0
Georgia—Robins AFB: Hydrant refueling system	0
Maryland—Fort George Meade: Add to operations facility	1,450,000
Nevada—Nellis AFB: Add/alter physical fitness training facility	4,350,000
New Mexico—Cannon AFB: Renovate and expand dormitory	3,100,000
New Mexico—Kirtland AFB: Add/alter base support facilities	0
North Dakota—Grand Forks AFB: Hydrant fuel system	3,250,000
North Dakota—Minot AFB: Fire station	0
Oklahoma—Altus AFB: Drop zone land acquisition	780,000
Oklahoma—Tinker AFB: Consolidated vehicle maintenance facility	0
Oklahoma—Vance AFB: Airfield pavements, phase IV	5,000,000
Texas—Brooks AFB: Center for environmental excellence	8,400,000
Texas—Dyess AFB: Add/alter dormitories	5,200,000
Utah—Hill AFB: Upgrade industrial wastewater collection system	6,200,000
Virginia—Langley AFB: Add/alter operations facility	0
Antigua Island—SLFI—upgrade backup generator	1,000,000
Ascension Island—SLFI—wastewater treatment plant	3,400,000
Diego Garcia:	
GPS instrumentation facility	1,700,000
Satellite tracking storage facility	560,000
Germany—Ramstein AB: Child development center	3,100,000
Greenland—Thule AB: Wastewater treatment plant	5,492,000
Turkey—Incirlik AB: Add/alter dormitories	2,400,000
United Kingdom—RAF Mildenhall: C-130 phase maintenance hangar	4,800,000
Unspecified Worldwide Locations: Planning and design	63,882,000

California—DOD/VA Joint Venture at Travis Air Force Base.—The conferees understand that the Department of Veterans Affairs (DVA) is currently negotiating with the Naval Facilities Command (NAVFAC) to manage the renovation and expansion of the David Grant Medical Center at Travis AFB. Once completed, the joint use facility will provide medical services to veterans in Northern California. The conferees are concerned that the veterans population will continue to be underserved in Northern California until such time as the new hospital additions are completed. Therefore, should the DVA and NAVFAC reach a project management agreement, the conferees expect and strongly encourage NAVFAC to use all means necessary to expedite the completion of the renovation and expansion of the medical center.

Florida—Homestead Air Force Base.—The conferees are concerned about the undue delay by the Air Force in initiating construction of facilities to support the 482nd F-16 Fighter Wing (AFRES) and the 301st Rescue Squadron (AFRES) at Homestead Air Force Base. Funds in the amount of $10 million for planning and $66 million for construction were previously appropriated in the 1992 Supplemental Appropriations Act (P.L. 102-368) for restoring airfield operations at Homestead Air Force Base. The conferees note that progress in restoring operations together with providing for Air Force Reserve facilities consistent with Base Realignment and Closure recommendations has been lacking. Therefore, the conferees direct the Air Force to submit to the Appropriation Subcommittees on Military Construction an expedited plan and schedule for construction of various facilities at Homestead Air Force Base no later than November 20, 1993.

Guam.—The conferees direct the Air Force to report to the Appropriation Subcommittees on Military Construction as to why a consolidation of military air assets on Guam cannot include the integration of the Navy with the Air Force in these times of reduced funding and changing military threats.

Amendment No. 8

Earmarks $63,882,000 for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services as proposed by the House instead of $58,180,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9

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 funds appropriated for "Military Construction, Air Force" under Public Law 101-148, $8,315,000 is hereby rescinded: Provided further, That of the funds appropriated for "Military Construction, Air Force" under Public Law 101-519, $6,550,000 is hereby rescinded: Provided further, That of the funds appropriated for "Military Construction, Air Force" under Public Law 102-136, $12,980,000 is hereby rescinded: Provided further, That of the funds appropriated for "Military Construction, Air Force" under Public Law 102-380, $2,250,000 is hereby rescinded*

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 rescinds a total of $30,095,000. The House bill proposed a general reduction rather than rescissions. The conference agreement rescinds funds for projects that are no longer required due to Base Realignment and Closure, Part III.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, DEFENSE-WIDE

(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

Amendment No. 10

Appropriates $562,008,000 for Military Construction, Defense-Wide, instead of $618,770,000 as proposed by the House and $524,165,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees agree to the following additions and deletions to the amounts and line items as proposed by the House:

Kentucky—Fort Campbell: Expand aircraft ramp, SOF	$+2,650,000
Louisiana—Fort Polk: Elementary school	+4,950,000
Maryland—Forest Glen (WRAIR): Army institute of research, phase II	−33,140,000
Maryland—Fort Meade: Supercomputer facility, phase I	−12,720,000

Ohio—Defense Electronics Supply Center, Dayton: Install gas-fired boilers	−6,000,000
Texas—Fort Sam Houston: Hospital replacement, phase VII	−25,000,000
Puerto Rico—Defense Fuel Support Point Roosevelt Roads: fuel tankage	−5,800,000
Unspecified Worldwide Locations: General reduction	+14,298,000
Planning and Design: Special operations command	+2,000,000
Unspecified Minor Construction: Special operations command	+2,000,000
Various Locations: Rescission, fiscal year 1992	−15,500,000

The conferees agree to fund all other items in conference at the level proposed by the House, shown below:

Alaska—Elmendorf AFB: Hospital replacement, phase II	$37,000,000
Arizona—Yuma Marine Corps Air Station: Add/alter medical/dental clinic	6,000,000
Florida—Eglin Aux Field 9: Add to weapons maintenance shop	580,000
Rhode Island—Newport Naval Education and Training Center: Medical clinic, phase II	4,000,000
Diego Garcia: Fuel tankage	9,558,000
Overseas Classified: Powerhouse	10,755,000
Unspecified Worldwide Locations: Contingency construction	12,200,000
Planning and design:	
Defense level activities	10,305,000
Defense medical support activity	25,865,000
Unspecified Minor Construction:	
Joint Chiefs of Staff	5,975,000
DOD dependent schools	4,000,000
Defense medical support activity	3,757,000

Maryland—Walter Reed Army Institute of Research.—The conferees have provided $15 million in fiscal year 1994 for the next increment for construction of a new facility for the Walter Reed Institute of Research. The fact that this is less than the budget request should in no way be construed as a diminution in support.

The Committees on Appropriations have had a long standing interest in replacing the deplorable and inadequate facilities housing the Walter Reed Institute of Research. The conferees note that the Department has recommended studying the possible reutilization of existing facilities as a possible alternative to construction of a new facility. The conferees are aware that utilization of the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology (AFIP) was considered in 1987 as a possible alternative and was dismissed as having inadequate space and as being unacceptably expensive to modify. The conferees also note that while the National Performance Review recommended closure of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences (USUHS), that facility includes most of the same deficiencies and cost implications as found in AFIP. The conferees wish to point out that ground breaking and award has already been delayed twice from an original date of November 1992 and subsequently June 1993 while the OSD studied and restudied the issue. The conferees are firm in their belief that this issue has been studied enough and want to reiterate that no more delays in award will be tolerated. The conferees therefore direct that an award be made for a new WRAIR not later than December 25, 1993. In addition, the conferees direct the Department to include the next increment of funding in the fiscal year 1995 budget and include the balance if required in the five year defense plan.

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 stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert: *$44,405,000*

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 appropriates $44,405,000 for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services instead of $42,405,000 as proposed by the House and $37,405,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12

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 rescinds $15,500,000. The House bill proposed a general reduction rather than a rescission. The conference agreement rescinds funds for projects that are no longer required due to Base Realignment and Closure, Part III.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

Amendment No. 13

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 stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert: *$302,719,000*

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 appropriates $302,719,000 for Military Construction, Army National Guard instead of $203,980,000 as proposed by the House and $291,250,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees agree to the following additions and deletions to the amounts and items as proposed by the House:

Alabama—Birmingham:	
Aviation support facility	+$4,907,000
Alabama—Montgomery:	
Organizational maintenance shop	+389,000
Arizona—Camp Navajo:	
Water filtration system	+1,000,000
California—Camp Parks/Dublin: Armory and OMS	−9,967,000
California—Van Nuys: Armory addition	+6,518,000
California—Burbank: OMS modification	+905,000
Connecticut—Bradley Field: Aviation facilities	+6,000,000
Florida—Eglin AFB:	
Range, multipurpose complex (MPRC)	−3,825,000
Hawaii—Molokai: Armory	+1,050,000
Hawaii—Oahu: Armory	+4,300,000
Indiana—Camp Atterbury:	
State military facility	+16,000
Indiana—Evansville: Armory and/or OMS	+801,000
Iowa—Camp Dodge:	
Battalion complex, phase II	+3,800,000
Consolidated paint facility	+37,000
Kansas—Fort Riley: Maintenance and training equipment site wash rack	+3,398,000
Kentucky—Fort Knox: Maintenance and training equipment site facility	+10,000,000
Massachusetts—Ayer: Add/alter combined support maintenance shop	+3,002,000
Minnesota—Various Locations: Alter fourteen armories and maintenance shops	−4,527,000
Mississippi—Camp Shelby: Vehicle wash facility	+5,000,000
Mississippi—Jackson: Armory	+2,550,000
Missouri—Fort Leonard Wood: Armory/OMS	+2,349,000
New Mexico—White Sands:	
OMS	+2,940,000
Tactical site	+1,995,000
Maintenance and training equipment site facility	+3,570,000
North Dakota—Bismark: Aviation C–12 hangar	−656,000
Oklahoma—Camp Gruber/Braggs: Modified record fire range	−937,000
Oregon—Camp Withycombe: Support maintenance shop	+7,569,000
Oregon—Pendleton: Aviation support facility	+3,515,000
Pennsylvania—Fort Indiantown Gap:	
Flight simulator and aeromedical physiology complex	−4,584,000
State military facility	+9,200,000
South Carolina—Columbia:	
Combined support/maintenance shop	+8,616,000
Land acquisition	+950,000
South Carolina—Leesburg: Wash rack/fuel facility	+1,009,000
South Carolina—Summerville: OMS	+834,000
South Dakota—Sioux Falls (Joe Foss Field):	
Armory addition	+30,000
Maintenance shop	+1,700,000
Tennessee—Camden: Armory addition	+714,000
Tennessee—Milan: Armory	+1,357,000
Tennessee—Tiptonville: Armory	+1,157,000
Tennessee—Waverly: Armory addition	+587,000
Texas—Corpus Christi:	
Add/Alter armory	+2,719,000
Organizational maintenance shop	+991,000
Texas—San Antonio: Organizational maintenance shop	−1,578,000
Vermont—Jericho: Training facility	+3,200,000
Wisconsin—Camp Williams; Combined maintenance facility	+11,900,000
Wyoming—Camp Guernsey: Barracks renovation	+3,338,000
Unspecified Worldwide Locations—Planning and design	+900,000

The conferees agree to fund all other items in conference at the level proposed by the House, as shown below:

Alabama—Fort McClellan: Training site addition	0
Arizona—Marana: Dining facility/dormitory	$2,919,000
Arkansas—Camp Robinson: Training site, sewer improvement	4,424,000
California—Fort Funston/San Francisco: Military vehicle storage building	739,000
California—Fort Irwin: Maintenance pad covers	1,265,000
Connecticut—Groton: Avation facilities	0
Illinois—Rock Island: Armory	3,310,000
Indiana—Camp Atterbury: Training facilities, phase VIB	7,545,000
Indiana—Indianapolis: Combined support/maintenance facility	0
Indiana—Lafayette: Armory and OMS	3,116,000
Iowa—Des Moines: Remove underground fuel tanks	0
Kansas—Nickell Barracks (Salina): Training site complex, phase I	6,168,000
Kansas—Salina:	
Training site, phase I	0
Training site, phase II	0
Louisiana—Ruston: Armory/OMS	0
Maryland—Hagerstown: Add/alter armory	1,776,000
Minnesota—Inver Grove Heights:	
Armory and OMS	4,571,000
Armory	0
Minnesota—Various Locations: Add/alter seven armories	3,225,000
Mississippi—Camp Shelby: Regional school facility, phase I	6,000,000
Mississippi—Camp McCain: Range and training area improvements	5,500,000
Mississippi—Greenville: Armory	2,230,000
Mississippi—Tupelo: Add/alter Army aviation support facility	3,210,000
Mississippi—Various Locations: Add/alter six armories	5,204,000
Missouri—Poplar Bluff: Armory and OMS	2,842,000
Nebraska—Camp Ashland: Education facility	0
Nevada—Las Vegas/Clark County: Armory, phase II	1,430,000
Oklahoma—Frederick: Armory	1,200,000
Pennsylvania—Johnstown: Addition to joint Armed Forces aviation facility	5,004,000
Armory expansion	3,309,000
South Carolina—Leesburg: Regional NCO academy	0
South Carolina—Eastover: Add/alter armory	0
Tennessee—Elizabethton: Armory storage addition	100,000
Tennessee—Jefferson City: Armory	952,000
Tennessee—Sevierville: Armory	1,352,000
Tennessee—Symrna:	
Armory	3,934,000
Warehouse	710,000
Texas—Lubbock: OMS and AFRC, phase II	1,726,000
Texas—Weslaco: Armory and OMS	5,567,000
Wisconsin—West Bend: Armory	0
Guam—Barrigada: U.S. Property/fiscal office/warehouse, phase II	1,573,000

California—Camp Parks/Dublin-Planning and Design.—The conferees agree that, within planning and design funds for the Army National Guard, $900,000 shall be allocated for design of an armory and an organizational maintenance shop.

Texas—Lubbock: Organizational Maintenance Shops AFRC, Phase II.—The conferees have agreed to provide funding of $1,726,000 for this project but understand that additional funding may be required. If additional funding is required, the Department should request necessary reprogramming of funds.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

Amendment No. 14

Appropriates $247,491,000 for Military Construction, Air National Guard instead of $161,761,000 as proposed by the House and $254,923,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees agree to the following additions and deletions to the amounts and line items as proposed by the House:

Alaska—Eielson AFB: Fuel system maintenance hangar	+$8,900,000
Georgia—Robins AFB: Support and hydrant system	+$5,750,000
Hawaii—NAS Barking Sands: Forward air control point facility	+$8,500,000
Hawaii—Hickam AFB: Consolidated support facility	+$9,700,000
Idaho: Idaho training range	+6,700,000
Kentucky—Standiford (Louisville): Relocation facilities, phase IV	+5,000,000
Massachusetts—Barnes Airport: Alter ops/training facility	+600,000
Massachusetts—Otis ANGB: Communications/electronics facility	+3,000,000
Massachusetts—Worcester ANGB: Base supply warehouse	+390,000
Mississippi—Gulfport Mpt: Troop camp quarters	−5,300,000
Missouri—Rosecrans Memorial Airport (St. Josephs): Jet fuel storage	+4,000,000
Nebraska—Lincoln MAP: Replace heat system	+1,500,000
Nevada—Reno IAP: Aircraft arresting systems	−1,830,000
New Hampshire—Pease AFB: Upgrade KC-135 hydrant refueling system	−5,100,000
Oregon—Portland IAP: Drainage improvements	+350,000
Oregon—Kingsley Field/Klamath Falls: Repair runway/taxiway	+8,500,000
Unspecified Worldwide Locations: General reduction	+35,070,000

The conferees agree to fund all other items in conference at the level proposed by the House, as shown below:

Alabama—Abston ANG station (Montgomery)	0
Alabama—Birmingham MAP: Road relocation	6,300,000
Alabama—Maxwell AFB: Runway extension	0
Georgia—Dobbins AFB (Marietta): Small arms range	0
Illinois—Capital MAP (Springfield): Upgrade runway	2,300,000
Indiana—Hulman Field (Terre Haute) dining hall and medical training facility	3,800,000
Iowa—Des Moines MAP: Jet fuel storage complex	4,000,000
Iowa—Sioux Gateway Airport (Sergeant Bluff): Base civil engineer maintenance complex	2,650,000
Massachusetts—Barnes Airport: Vehicle maintenance shop	0
Ohio—Toledo Express Airport:	
Add/alter operations and training facility	1,800,000
Taxiway and arm/dearm pads	1,950,000
Oregon—Portland IAP: Site restoration	0
South Dakota—Joe Foss Field (Sioux Falls): Power check pad	0
Texas—Kelly AFB (San Antonio): Base supply warehouse	4,300,000
Virginia—Richmond IAP: Fuel storage complex	0
Guam—Andersen AFB: Base supplies and equipment warehouse	400,000
Puerto Rico—Puerto Rico IAP:	
Add/alter F-16 avionics shop	320,000
Alter fuel systems maintenance facility	750,000
Upgrade F-16 aircraft parking ramp security system	2,000,000
Unspecified Worldwide Locations: Planning and design	10,868,000

Idaho—Gowen Field: Idaho Training Range.—The conferees agree to provide funding of $6,700,000 to the Air National Guard for the development of expanded training capabilities for the Air Force's composite wing at Mountain Home Air Force Base. The conferees support the concept of expanded training capabilities for the composite wing and understand that an environmental impact statement is being prepared. However, the conferees direct that none of the funds provided for expansion of training capabilities be obligated until the Secretary of Defense has provided to the Committees on Appropriations certification in writing that the funding is required for training and readiness and is consistent with the full environmental impact statement that reviews alternatives.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY RESERVE

Amendment No. 15

Appropriates $102,040,000 for Military Construction, Army Reserve instead of $87,825,000 as proposed by the House and $124,794,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees agree to the following additions and deletion to the amounts and line items as proposed by the House:

Georgia—Fort McPherson: Command headquarters, phase I	+$15,000,000
South Carolina—Fort Jackson: USARC/OMS/DS shop	−2,728,000
Unspecified Worldwide Locations: Planning and design	+1,943,000

The conferees agree to fund all other items in conference at the level proposed by the House, as shown below:

California-Los Alamitos: Logistic Facility	0
New Jersey—Fort Dix: Upgrade range 65	2,700,000
Washington—Fort Lawton: Reserve center	0

Washington—Fort Lawton (Seattle): Planning and Design.—The conferees agree that, within planning and design funds for the Army Reserve, $1,943,000 shall be allocated for design of a reserve center. The conferees also direct that construction funds for the reserve center be included in the Department's fiscal year 1995 budget submission.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVAL RESERVE

Amendment No. 16

Appropriates $25,029,000 for Military Construction, Naval Reserve instead of $28,647,000 as proposed by the House and $25,013,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees agree to the following additions and deletion to the amounts and line items as proposed by the House:

Maryland—Baltimore: MCRC improvements	+$460,000
Michigan—NRRC Detroit: MCRC repair/construction	+698,000
New Jersey—West Trenton: MCRC replacement conversion	+264,000
Washington—Bangor: Reserve center	+3,000,000
Unspecified Worldwide Locations: General reduction	−8,040,000

The conferees agree to fund all other items in conference at the level proposed by the House, as shown below:

Louisiana—Naval Support Activity New Orleans: Marine Corps reserve force headquarters	$8,700,000
Unspecified Worldwide Locations: Planning and design	1,815,000

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE RESERVE

Amendment No. 17

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 stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert: *$74,486,000*

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 appropriates $74,486,000 for Military Construction, Air Force Reserve instead of $66,136,000 as proposed by the House and $68,427,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees agree to the following additions to the amounts and line items as proposed by the House:

Florida—Homestead AFB: Medical training facility	+$2,750,000
New York—Niagara Falls IAP: Corrosion control facility	+800,000
Unspecified Worldwide Locations: General reduction	+4,800,000

The conferees agree to fund all other items in conference at the level proposed by the House, as shown below:

Georgia—Dobbins AFB: Firing range	$1,900,000
Flight simulation center	6,000,000
Ohio—Youngstown MAP: Munitions maintenance complex	0
Unspecified Worldwide Locations: Planning and design	3,989,000

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION INFRASTRUCTURE

Amendment No. 18

Restores House language stricken by the Senate which appropriates $140,000,000 for North Atlantic Treaty Organization Infrastructure programs.

Amendment No. 19

Deletes Senate language which established a new account for construction outside the United States, appropriated $300,000,000 and included a certification requirement regarding burdensharing.

FAMILY HOUSING, ARMY

Amendment No. 20

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 stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert: *$228,885,000*

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 appropriates $228,885,000 for Construction, Family Housing, Army instead of $218,785,000 as proposed by the House and $228,385,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees agree to the following addition to the amounts and line items as proposed by the House:

Construction improvements	+$10,100,000

The conferees agree to fund the other item in conference at the level proposed by the House, as shown below:

Nevada-Hawthorne AAP: Demolish Abandoned Housing Units	$500,000

Construction Improvements.—Within the total funding amount for Construction Improvements, $4,400,000 shall be allocated to Fort Richardson, Alaska and $5,700,000 for Fort Wainwright, Alaska.

Amendment No. 21

Appropriates $1,069,601,000 for Operation and Maintenance, Family Housing, Army instead of $1,067,922,000 as proposed by the House and $1,125,601,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees agree to the following addition to the amounts and line items as proposed by the House:

General reduction	+$1,679,000

Amendment No. 22

Appropriates a total of $1,298,486,000 for Family Housing, Army instead of $1,286,707,000 as proposed by the House and $1,353,986,000 as proposed by the Senate. This sum is derived from the conference agreement on amendments numbered 20 and 21.

FAMILY HOUSING, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

(INCLUDING RESCISSIONS)

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 sum stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert: *$370,208,000*

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 appropriates $370,208,000 for Construction, Navy and Marine Corps instead of $367,769,000 as proposed by the House and $354,738,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees agree to the following addition and deletions to the amounts and line items as proposed by the House:

Washington-NAS Whidbey Island: 106 units	+$10,000,000
Various locations:	
Rescission, fiscal year 1990	−14,100,000
Rescission, fiscal year 1991	−25,018,000
Rescission, fiscal year 1993	−1,253,000
Construction improvements	−7,561,000

The conferees agree to fund the other item in conference as proposed by the House, as shown below:

United Kingdom: Naval Activities London (purchase 81 leased units)	$15,470,000

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 sum stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert: *$772,055,000*

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 appropriates $772,055,000 for Operation and Maintenance, Family Housing, Navy and Marine Corps instead of $781,952,000 as proposed by the House and $835,055,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees agree to the following deletion to the amounts and line items as proposed by the House:

General reduction	−$9,897,000

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 with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert: *$1,142,263,000*

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 appropriates a total of $1,142,263,000 for Family Housing, Navy and Marine Corps instead of $1,149,721,000 as proposed by the House and $1,189,793,000 as proposed by the Senate. This sum is derived from the conference agreement on amendments numbered 23 and 24.

Amendment No. 26

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 of the funds appropriated for "Family Housing, Navy and Marine Corps" under Public Law 101-148, $14,100,000 is hereby rescinded :Provided further, That of the funds appropriated for "Family Housing, Navy and Marine Corps" under Public Law 101-519, $25,018,000 is hereby rescinded: Provided further, That of the funds appropriated for "Family Housing, Navy and Marine Corps" under Public Law 102-380, $1,253,000 is hereby rescinded*

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 rescinds a total of $40,371,000 previously appropriated for construction of new family housing units and for improvement of existing family housing units. These projects are no longer required due to Base Realignment and Closure, Part III.

FAMILY HOUSING, AIR FORCE
(INCLUDING RESCISSIONS)

Amendment No. 27

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 stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert: *$187,035,000*

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 appropriates $187,035,000 for Construction, Family Housing, Air Force instead of $192,197,000 as proposed by the House and $195,035,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees agree to the following addition and deletions to the amounts and line items as proposed by the House:

Italy—Comiso AB (purchase 460 leased units)	−$20,200,000
Various locations:	
Rescission, fiscal year 1992	−6,400,000
Rescission, fiscal year 1993	−48,702,000
Construction improvements	+15,038,000

The conferees agree to fund the other items in conference at the level proposed by the House, as shown below:

Illinois-Scott AFB: Housing Relocation, Phase II	$10,000,000
Planning	$11,901,000

Construction Improvements.—Within the total funding amount for Construction Improvements, up to $15,100,000 shall be allocated to Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada and $6,900,000 shall be allocated to Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico.

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 with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert: *$790,912,000*

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 appropriates $790,912,000 for Operations and Maintenance, Family Housing, Air Force instead of $805,847,000 as proposed by the House and $853,912,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees agree to the following deletion to the amounts and line items as proposed by the House:

General reduction	−$14,935,000

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 with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert: *$977,947,000*

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 appropriates a total of $977,947,000 for Family Housing, Air Force instead of $998,044,000 as proposed by the House and $1,048,947,000 as proposed by the Senate. This sum is derived from the conference agreement on amendments numbered 27 and 28.

Amendment No. 30

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 rescinds a total of $55,102,000 previously appropriated for construction of new family housing units and for improvement of existing family housing units. These projects are no longer required due to Base Realignment and Closure, Part III.

FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE-WIDE

Amendment No. 31

Appropriates $26,337,000 for Operation and Maintenance, Family Housing, Defense-Wide instead of $25,711,000 as proposed by the House and $27,337,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees agree to the following addition to the amounts and line items as proposed by the House:

General reduction	+$626,000

Amendment No. 32

Appropriates a total of $26,496,000 for Family Housing, Defense-Wide instead of $25,870,000 as proposed by the House and $27,496,000 as proposed by the Senate. This sum is derived from the conference agreement on amendment numbered 31.

HOMEOWNERS ASSISTANCE FUND

Amendment No. 33

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 allows the appropriated amount for Homeowners Assistance Fund, Defense to remain available until expended.

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACCOUNT, PART I

Amendment No. 34

Appropriates $12,830,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $27,870,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees agree that the reduction of $15,040,000 from the House proposed amount shall be applied against the Navy's allocation because of projects no longer needed as a result of the approved 1993 base closure recommendations.

Amendment No. 35

Deletes House language which establishes a minimum funding level for environmental restoration.

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACCOUNT, PART II

Amendment No. 36

Appropriates $1,526,310,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,800,500,000 as proposed by the House. The reduction reflects projects no longer required as a result of approved 1993 base closure recommendations.

Washington—Naval Station Everett: Bachelor Enlisted Quarters.—The conferees direct that within Base Realignment and Closure, Part II funds, $7,450,000 be for the construction of a Bachelor Enlisted Quarters at Naval Station Everett, which is required due to the closure of Sand Point. The conferees urge the Navy to continue to support the ongoing facility requirements at Naval Station Everett, and direct the Navy to include funds for a second Bachelor Enlisted Quarters as part of its fiscal year 1995 Military Construction budget submission.

Amendment No. 37

Deletes House language which restricts appropriated funds to the approved 1991 base realignments and closures.

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACCOUNT, PART III

Amendment No. 38

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 stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert: *$1,144,000,000*

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 appropriates $1,144,000,000 for Base Realignment and Closure, Part III instead of $1,200,000,000 as proposed by the House and $1,197,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

New Jersey—McGuire AFB.—The conferees direct that, within Base Realignment and Closure, Part III funds, the Air Force allocate the funds necessary to start construction at McGuire Air Force Base of housing and dormitory space in order to alleviate the housing shortage that the accelerated realignment at McGuire will create.

Amendment No. 39

Deletes House language which restricts appropriated funds to the approved 1993 base realignments and closures.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 40

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 by said amendment, insert:

SEC. 122. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Army shall transfer, no later than September 30, 1994, without reimbursement or transfer of funds, to the Architect of the Capitol, a portion of the real property, including improvements thereon, consisting of not more than 100 acres located at Fort George G. Meade in Anne Arundel County, Maryland, as determined under subsection (c).

(b) The Architect of the Capitol shall, upon completion of the survey performed pursuant to subsection (c) and the transfer effected pursuant to subsection (a), utilize the transferred property to provide facilities to accommodate the varied long term storage and service needs of the Library of Congress and other Legislative Branch agencies.

(c) The exact acreage and legal description of the property to be transferred under this section shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Architect of the Capitol and the Secretary of the Army, and in consultation with officials of Anne Arundel County, Maryland.

(d) Any real property and improvements thereon transferred pursuant to this section shall be under the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol, subject to the rules and regulations providing for the use of such property as may be approved by the House Office Building Commission and the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration: *Provided* that any existing improvements made available by the Architect to the Librarian of Congress, under the direction of the Joint Committee on the Library, or hereafter erected upon such real property pursuant to law for the purposes of providing for the long term storage and service needs of the Library of Congress shall be subject to the provisions of sections 136, 141 and 167 to 167j of Title 2, United States Code.

(e) Portions of the real property and any improvements thereon transferred pursuant to this section that are not determined to be immediately required for storage or service needs by the Architect are authorized to be leased temporarily to the Secretary of the Army: *Provided*, That nominal lease payments made by the Secretary of the Army shall be credited to the appropriation "Architect of the Capitol, Library Buildings and

Grounds, Structural and Mechanical Care, No Year".

(f) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Architect of the Capitol such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

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 previously recommended transfer of property located at the Army Research Laboratory, Woodbridge Research Facility, Virginia, to the Architect of the Capitol for use of storage and service needs of the Library of Congress and the Legislative Branch agencies has not been endorsed by the conferees. Instead, property in Fort George G. Meade, Maryland, has been identified for such use. The property in Fort George G. Meade identified which would meet the Library's goal is located generally north of State route 32 and south of Rock Avenue and First Street. The Architect is directed to consult with appropriate officials of Anne Arundel County, Maryland, concerning the exact acreage and legal description of the property. The conferees direct that the Architect of the Capitol and Secretary of the Army enter into an agreement to determine the utilities and services to be provided by the Secretary to the property. The conferees further direct that the Architect provide landscaping to maintain an appearance appropriate for the surrounding area.

Amendment No. 41

Deletes Senate language which proposed a general reduction.

Amendment No. 42

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 by said amendment, insert:

SEC. 124. None of the funds appropriated in this Act or any other Act may be used for the purposes of establishing any criminal detention or rehabilitation facility or program at Fort George Meade, Maryland.

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 deletes House language which waives certification requirements for a defense access road at Camp Dodge, Iowa, and inserts language which prohibits the use of funds in this act or any other act during fiscal year 1994 to be used for the purposes of establishing any criminal detention or rehabilitation facility or program at Fort George G. Meade, Maryland.

Amendment No. 43

Restores House language stricken by the Senate regarding compliance with the "Buy American Act".

Amendment No. 44

Restores House language stricken by the Senate regarding in the purchase of American-made equipment and products.

Amendment No. 45

Restores House language stricken by the Senate regarding fraudulent "Made in America" labels.

Amendment No. 46

Deletes language proposed by the Senate which would earmark $4,400,000 for a Dial Central Office Facility at Fitzsimons Medical Center, Colorado. Funding for this project is provided under Military Construction, Army account.

Amendment No. 47

Deletes language proposed by the Senate which would earmark $2,800,000 for an ACMI support facility at the Gulfport-Biloxi Regional Airport, Mississippi.

Amendment No. 48

Deletes language proposed by the Senate regarding land transfer in Hawaii.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE AGREEMENT
ALABAMA		
ARMY		
ANNISTON ARMY DEPOT		
AMMUNITION DEMILITARIZATION FACILITY, PHASE IV....	110,900	110,900
FORT RUCKER		
OPERATIONS FACILITY.....	1,150	1,150
PERSONNEL SERVICES FACILITY.....	---	14,400
PETROLEUM LAB AND FUEL STORAGE.....	5,800	5,800
BARRACKS.....	20,000	20,000
ROAD UPGRADE.....	---	1,300
AIR FORCE		
GUNTER AFB		
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER.....	2,700	2,700
EMERGENCY POWER GENERATOR PLANT.....	1,200	1,200
HAZARDOUS WASTE ACCUMULATION FACILITY.....	310	310
SPILL CONTAINMENT CONTROLS.....	470	470
MAXWELL AFB		
AIR FORCE QUALITY CENTER.....	4,650	4,650
UPGRADE RUNWAY.....	9,200	5,000
SPILL CONTAINMENT CONTROLS.....	970	970
TAXIWAY/RAMP.....	3,800	3,800
UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS.....	1,700	1,700
UPGRADE UTILITY SYSTEMS, PHASE I.....	5,050	5,050
DEFENSE-WIDE		
FORT MCCLELLAN		
FT MCCLELLAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ADDITION.....	2,798	2,798
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
CULLMAN		
ADD/ALTER COMBINED SUPPORT MAINTENANCE SHOP.....	---	5,070
BIRMINGHAM		
AVIATION SUPPORT FACILITY.....	---	4,907
MONTGOMERY		
ORGANIZATIONAL MAINT SHOP.....	---	389
MOBILE		
ORGANIZATIONAL MAINTENANCE SHOP.....	502	502
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
ABSTON ANG STATION (MONTGOMERY)		
COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS TRAINING FACILITY..	693	693
BIRMINGHAM MAP		
AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE HANGAR.....	5,500	5,500
FUEL CELL DOCK.....	4,400	4,400
ROAD RELOCATION.....	---	6,200
DANNELLY FIELD (MONTGOMERY)		
VEHICLE MAINTENANCE COMPLEX.....	1,750	1,750
ARMY RESERVE		
BIRMINGHAM		
BATTLE PROJECTION CENTER.....	4,719	4,719
TOTAL, ALABAMA.....	188,262	216,328
ALASKA		
ARMY		
FORT RICHARDSON		
JOINT MOBILITY CENTER.....	---	10,000
FORT WAINWRIGHT		
WASTE OIL BURNING POWER PLANT.....	---	740
AIR FORCE		
CAPE ROMANZOV AFS		
REPLACE TRAMWAY SYSTEM.....	3,350	3,350

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE AGREEMENT
EIELSON AFB		
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	5,400	5,400
FIRE TRAINING FACILITY	2,400	2,400
UPGRADE WATER TREATMENT PLANT	---	3,750
UPGRADE WASTE WATER PLANT	---	1,750
ELMENDORF AFB		
ADD TO SANITARY SEWER SYSTEM	5,100	5,100
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	5,070	5,070
CORROSION CONTROL FACILITY	5,975	5,975
DINING FACILITY	6,800	6,800
HAZARDOUS WASTE STORAGE FACILITY	3,900	3,900
MUNITIONS EQUIPMENT FACILITY	1,860	1,860
MUNITIONS MAINTENANCE FACILITY	2,100	2,100
RUNWAY REPAIR	---	2,500
FORT RICHARDSON		
JOINT MOBILITY CENTER	---	5,500
DEFENSE-WIDE		
DEF REUTILIZATION & MKTG OFC FAIRBANKS		
COVERED STORAGE	6,500	6,500
ELMENDORF AIR FORCE BASE		
HOSPITAL REPLACEMENT, PHASE II	135,000	37,000
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
KULIS ANGB (ANCHORAGE)		
REPLACE UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANKS	1,100	1,100
EIELSON AFB		
FUEL SYSTEM MAINTENANCE HANGAR	---	8,900
ARMY RESERVE		
FORT RICHARDSON		
ADD/ALTER USARC/OMS/DS-GS/AMSA/STORAGE	10,324	10,324
TOTAL, ALASKA	194,879	130,019
ARIZONA		
ARMY		
FORT HUACHUCA		
BATTALION HEADQUARTERS	4,800	4,800
GENERAL PURPOSE ADMINISTRATIVE FACILITY	4,050	4,050
AIR FORCE		
DAVIS-MONTHAN AFB		
UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	650	650
VEHICLE MAINTENANCE FACILITY	---	5,500
LUKE AFB		
DINING FACILITY	4,700	4,700
FIRE TRAINING FACILITY	800	800
FLOOD CONTROL	---	6,000
UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	1,250	1,250
NAVAJO ARMY DEPOT		
ALTER MINUTEMAN II STORAGE FACILITIES	7,250	7,250
DEFENSE-WIDE		
YUMA MARINE CORPS AIR STATION		
ADD/ALTER MEDICAL/DENTAL CLINIC	---	6,000
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
CAMP NAVAJO		
WATER FILTRATION SYSTEM	---	1,000
MARANA		
OMS	---	553
DINING FACILITY/DORMITORY	---	2,919

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE AGREEMENT
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
TUCSON IAP		
ADD/ALTER COMMUNICATIONS FACILITY	700	700
REPLACE UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANKS	440	440
TOTAL, ARIZONA	24,640	46,612
ARKANSAS		
AIR FORCE		
LITTLE ROCK AFB		
ADD/ALTER ENGINE INSPECTION AND REPAIR SHOP - DBOF	1,200	1,200
ADD/ALTER CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER - DBOF	2,250	2,250
ALTER OPERATIONS CENTER	1,050	1,050
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
CAMP ROBINSON		
ARMORY	3,205	3,205
RANGE, MODIFIED RECORD FIRE	907	907
TRAINING SITE, SEWER IMPROVEMENT	4,223	4,424
TRAINING SITE, UTILITIES RENOVATION	1,275	1,275
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
LITTLE ROCK AFB		
AIRCREW TRAINING FACILITY	3,750	3,750
FT SMITH MAP		
AIRCRAFT CORROSION CONTROL FACILITY	1,100	1,100
TOTAL, ARKANSAS	18,960	19,161
CALIFORNIA		
ARMY		
FT IRWIN		
WHOLE BARRACKS RENEWAL	5,900	5,900
NAVY		
ALAMEDA NAVAL AIR STATION		
CONTROL TOWER COMPLEX	4,700	---
BARSTOW MARINE CORPS LOGISTICS BASE		
INDUSTRIAL WASTE TREATMENT PLANT	8,690	8,690
CAMP PENDLETON MARINE CORPS AIR STATION		
RADAR AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL FACILITY ADDITION	3,850	3,850
CAMP PENDLETON MARINE CORPS BASE		
WEAPONS STORAGE	480	480
AUTOMATED FIELD FIRING RANGE	1,340	1,340
SEWERAGE FACILITY	7,930	7,930
WATER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS	1,380	1,380
EMERGENCY OFF-BASE WATER SUPPLY MAIN	---	750
FLOOD PROTECTION-SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT	---	1,000
RELOCATE WATER WELLS	---	1,800
REPLACE DRAINAGE STRUCTURES	---	3,000
EL TORO MARINE CORPS AIR STATION		
MAINTENANCE HANGAR ADDITION	1,950	---
FALLBROOK NAVAL WEAPONS STATION ANNEX		
HARM MISSILE MAGAZINES - DBOF	4,630	4,630
LEMOORE NAVAL AIR STATION		
FIRE FIGHTING TRAINING FACILITY	1,930	1,930
SAN DIEGO FLEET AND INDUSTRIAL SUPPLY CENTER		
FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEMS - DBOF	2,270	2,270
SAN DIEGO MARINE CORPS RECRUIT DEPOT		
WAREHOUSE	1,130	1,130
SAN DIEGO NAVAL HOSPITAL		
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	2,700	2,700
SAN DIEGO NAVAL TRAINING CENTER		
FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM	700	---

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE AGREEMENT
TWENTYNINE PALMS MARCORP AIR-GRND COMB CTR		
ACADEMIC INSTRUCTION BUILDING ADDITION	600	600
ANTI-ARMOR TRACKING RANGE MODERNIZATION	3,940	3,940
WEAPONS STORAGE	3,360	3,360
AIR FORCE		
BEALE AFB		
EDUCATION CENTER/LIBRARY	---	3,100
EDWARDS AFB		
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	5,900	5,900
UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	5,400	5,400
MCCLELLAN AFB		
FIRE PROTECTION ACFT FACILITIES - DBOF	1,900	1,900
CONVERT TO INTEGRATED MEDIA CENTER	---	1,600
REPAIR AIRCRAFT PARKING APRON	---	6,700
TRAVIS AFB		
ADD/ALTER DORMITORIES, PHASE VI	---	5,100
AIRCRAFT GENERAL PURPOSE MAINTENANCE SHOP	11,200	11,200
UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS - DBOF	2,840	2,840
VANDENBERG AFB		
HARDWARE STORAGE FACILITY	3,500	3,500
SLFI-TPQ-18 RADAR FACILITY	2,408	2,408
SLFI-UPGRADE FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM	1,600	1,600
UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	1,700	1,700
UPGRADE ELECTRICAL SYSTEM	11,520	11,520
DEFENSE-WIDE		
MARCH AFB		
DEFENSE REUTILIZATION/MARKETING OFFICE RELOCATION	630	630
EDWARDS AIR FORCE BASE		
LIFE SAFETY UPGRADE	1,700	1,700
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
FORT FUNSTON/SAN FRANCISCO		
MILITARY VEHICLE STORAGE BUILDING	---	739
FORT IRWIN		
MAINTENANCE PAD COVERS	---	1,265
FRESNO/SHIELDS		
ARMORY AND ORGANIZATIONAL MAINTENANCE SHOP	---	8,147
VAN NUYS		
ARMORY ADDITION	---	6,518
BURBANK		
OMS MODIFICATION	---	905
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
FRESNO ANGB		
REPLACE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	490	490
ONTARIO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT (ANG)		
REPLACE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	310	310
NAVY RESERVE		
NAVAL STATION SAN DIEGO		
CONSTRUCTION BATTALION UNIT FACILITY	1,000	1,000
AIR FORCE RESERVE		
TRAVIS AFB		
AERIAL PORT TRAINING FACILITY	3,050	3,050
ALTER RESERVE OPERATIONS AND TRAINING FACILITY	4,000	4,000
TOTAL, CALIFORNIA	116,628	149,902
COLORADO		
ARMY		
FITZSIMONS ARMY MEDICAL CENTER		
DIAL CENTRAL OFFICE FACILITY	---	4,400

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE AGREEMENT
FORT CARSON		
RANGE CONTROL FACILITY	4,050	4,050
AIR FORCE		
BUCKLEY ANG BASE		
COMMUNICATION DATA PROCESSING FACILITY	39,000	39,000
CHEYENNE MT COMPLEX AFB		
UPGRADE ELECTRICAL SERVICE	4,450	4,450
PETERSON AFB		
ADD/ALTER INTEGRATION SUPPORT FACILITY	16,400	16,400
PRECISION MEASUREMENT EQUIPMENT LABORATORY	2,200	2,200
TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT FACILITY	2,430	2,430
US AIR FORCE ACADEMY		
ADD/ALTER WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT	7,100	7,100
ENHANCED FLIGHT SCREENER HANGARS	3,800	3,800
UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	780	780
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
BUCKLEY ANGB (AURORA)		
F-16 WEAPONS RELEASE SHOP	1,300	1,300
AIR FORCE RESERVE		
PETERSON AFB		
ORGANIZATIONAL MAINTENANCE SUPPORT FACILITY	1,200	1,200
TOTAL, COLORADO	82,710	87,110
CONNECTICUT		
NAVY		
NEW LONDON NAVAL SUBMARINE BASE		
BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS MODERNIZATION	14,800	14,800
ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION IMPROVEMENTS	8,190	8,190
HAZARDOUS WASTE TRANSFER FACILITY	1,450	1,450
INDUSTRIAL WASTE TREATMENT FACILITY	5,700	5,700
PIER IMPROVEMENTS	---	4,200
STEAM TURBINE GENERATOR	6,600	6,600
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
BRADLEY FIELD		
AVIATION FACILITIES	---	6,000
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
BRADLEY FIELD (GRAMBE)		
ADD/ALTER BASE CIVIL ENGINEER FACILITY	510	510
TOTAL, CONNECTICUT	37,250	47,450
DELAWARE		
AIR FORCE		
DOVER AFB		
ADD/ALTER DINING FACILITY - DBOF	2,500	2,500
DORMITORY - DBOF	3,200	4,400
INSTALL EMISSION CONTROL DEVICES	860	860
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
GREATER WILMINGTON AIRPORT		
COMMUNICATIONS FACILITY	900	900
REPLACE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	890	890
TOTAL, DELAWARE	8,350	9,550
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
NAVY		
WASHINGTON COMMANDANT NAVAL DISTRICT		
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	1,480	1,480
FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM	1,630	1,630

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE AGREEMENT
WASHINGTON NAVAL RESEARCH LABORATORY		
NAVAL CENTER FOR SPACE TECHNOLOGY	1,980	1,980
SPECIAL PROJECTS BUILDING	400	400
AIR FORCE		
BOLLING AIR FORCE BASE		
ADD TO CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	2,000	2,000
TOTAL, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	7,490	7,490
FLORIDA		
NAVY		
CECIL FIELD NAVAL AIR STATION		
SANITARY WASTEWATER SYSTEM UPGRADE	1,500	---
JACKSONVILLE NAVAL AIR STATION		
BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS	13,800	13,800
HELICOPTER WASH AND RINSE FACILITY	620	620
MAYPORT NAVAL STATION		
AIR EMISSIONS CONTROL	3,260	3,260
PENSACOLA NAVAL AIR STATION		
RADAR AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL CENTER	1,880	1,880
WATER SURVIVAL TRAINING FACILITY	4,540	4,540
AIR FORCE		
CAPE CANAVERAL AFS		
SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT	11,900	11,900
SLFI-BACKUP POWER	2,500	2,500
SLFI-BACKUP POWER	800	800
SLFI-UPGRADE WATER SUPPLY MAINS	1,200	1,200
UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	400	400
UPGRADE FIRE SYSTEM	2,400	2,400
EGLIN AFB		
AIRCRAFT ENGINE TEST FACILITY	1,600	1,600
RENOVATE CLIMATIC TEST CHAMBER, PHASE II	57,000	37,000
REPLACE POL PIPELINE	3,300	3,300
UPGRADE HYDRANT FUELING SYSTEM	4,550	4,550
VEHICLE MAINTENANCE/WAREHOUSE FACILITIES	2,600	2,600
EGLIN AFB AUXILIARY FIELD 9		
ADD/ALTER DORMITORIES	4,479	4,479
UPGRADE SANITARY SEWAGE SYSTEMS	1,750	1,750
UPGRADE STORM SEWAGE SYSTEM	1,600	1,600
PATRICK AFB		
ALTER MAINTENANCE HANGAR	2,000	2,000
UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	1,850	1,850
TYNDALL AFB		
ADD TO BASE SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT WAREHOUSE	---	3,200
BASE SUPPLY LOGISTICS CENTER	2,600	2,600
SECURITY POLICE OPERATIONS	---	2,400
DEFENSE-WIDE		
EGLIN AUX FIELD 9		
ADD TO SUPPLY WAREHOUSE/WRM STORAGE	1,502	1,502
ADD/ALTER AVIONICS SHOP	4,500	4,500
MH60G HELICOPTER HANGAR	5,700	5,700
MUNITIONS MAINTENANCE FACILITY	2,550	2,550
SQUADRON OPERATIONS FACILITY MC130	2,750	2,750
SQUADRON OPERATIONS FACILITY MH60G	2,250	2,250
ADD TO WEAPONS MAINTENANCE SHOP	330	580
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
EGLIN AFB		
RANGE,MULTIPURPOSE COMPLEX (MPRC)	3,825	---
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
JACKSONVILLE IAP		
REPLACE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	1,150	1,150

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE AGREEMENT
AIR FORCE RESERVE		
HOMESTEAD AFB		
MEDICAL TRAINING FACILITY	---	2,750
MACDILL AFB		
AEROMEDICAL EVACUATION FACILITY	750	750
TOTAL, FLORIDA	153,436	136,711
GEORGIA		
ARMY		
FORT BENNING		
BARRACKS MODERNIZATION	18,500	18,500
MULTIPURPOSE MACHINE GUN RANGE	1,650	1,650
WHOLE BARRACKS RENEWAL	17,500	17,500
FORT GILLEM		
PHYSICAL FITNESS CENTER	---	2,600
FT STEWART/HUNTER AAF		
CARGO HANDLING FACILITY	4,500	4,200
EXPAND AMMUNITION STORAGE AREA	3,600	3,600
HARDSTAND	8,700	9,400
RAILROAD TRACK IMPROVEMENT	2,000	3,100
NAVY		
ALBANY MARINE CORPS LOGISTICS BASE		
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	940	940
KINGS BAY NAVAL SUBMARINE BASE		
DIKES	3,730	3,730
UTILITIES AND SITE IMPROVEMENTS	7,190	7,190
KINGS BAY TRIDENT TRAINING FACILITY		
FIRE FIGHTING TRAINING FACILITY	3,870	3,870
AIR FORCE		
MOODY AFB		
AIRCRAFT PAVEMENTS	---	9,000
LARGE AIRCRAFT HANGAR	---	4,700
ROBINS AFB		
J-STARS ADD/ALTER MAINTENANCE COMPLEX	9,300	9,300
J-STARS ADD/ALTER OPERATIONS COMPLEX	4,100	4,100
J-STARS ADD/ALTER UTILITIES	3,500	3,500
J-STARS SQUADRON OPERATIONS/AIRCRAFT MAINT UNIT	7,500	7,500
ADD/ALTER LOGISTICAL SYSTEMS OPERATIONS CENTER	3,000	3,000
ADD/ALTER DORMITORIES - DBOF	4,300	4,300
AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PAINT FACILITY	970	970
UPGRADE INDSTRL WASTEWATER TRTMNT AND DSPSL PLANT	10,700	10,700
DEFENSE-WIDE		
ROBINS AFB		
LINWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ADDITION	1,580	1,580
ROBINS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ADDITION	1,580	1,580
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
ROBINS AFB		
SUPPORT AND HYDRANT SYSTEM	---	5,750
PETROLEUM OPERATIONS COMPLEX	600	600
REPLACE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	1,150	1,150
LEWIS B. WILSON AIRPORT (ANG) (MACON)		
REPLACE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	340	340
MCCOLLUM ANG STATION (KENNESAW)		
REPLACE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	315	315
SAVANNAH ANG COMMUNICATIONS STATION		
REPLACE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	330	330
SAVANNAH COMBAT READINESS TRAINING SITE		
FIRE DETECTION AND SUPPRESSION SYSTEMS	1,650	1,650
REPLACE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	315	315

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE AGREEMENT
SAVANNAH MAP		
REFUELING VEHICLE PARKING AND OPS COMPLEX	990	990
ARMY RESERVE		
FORT MCPHERSON		
COMMAND HQ, PHASE I	---	15,000
AIR FORCE RESERVE		
DOBBINS AFB		
FIRING RANGE	---	1,900
FLIGHT SIMULATION CENTER	---	6,000
TOTAL, GEORGIA	124,400	170,850
HAWAII		
ARMY		
SCHOFIELD BARRACKS		
MULTI-PURPOSE FAMILY SERVICE CENTER	16,000	16,000
OPERATIONS FACILITY	2,600	2,600
NAVY		
BARBERS POINT NAVAL AIR STATION		
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	2,700	2,700
FIRE FIGHTING TRAINING FACILITY	1,350	---
HONOLULU COMP&TELCOMM AREA MASTER STA EPAC		
BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS MODERNIZATION	4,390	4,390
BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS MODERNIZATION	4,730	4,730
PEARL HARBOR COM OCEANOGRAPHIC SYS PACIFIC		
BERTHING PIER	16,780	16,780
PEARL HARBOR NAV INACTIVE SHIP MAINT FAC		
INACTIVE SHIPS PIER	2,620	2,620
PEARL HARBOR NAVAL SUBMARINE BASE		
BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS COMPLEX	25,500	25,500
ENLISTED MESS HALL MODERNIZATION	2,640	2,640
SUBMARINE BERTING WHARF	26,000	26,000
PEARL HARBOR NAVY PUBLIC WORKS CENTER		
INDUSTRIAL WASTE TREATMENT PLANT - DBOF	18,560	18,560
WASTEWATER COLLECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT - DBOF	8,980	8,980
AIR FORCE		
HICKAM AFB		
DORMITORY	5,950	9,500
MILSTAR COMMUNICATIONS GROUND TERMINAL	2,200	2,200
UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	2,100	2,100
KAENA POINT		
POWER PLANT	7,350	7,350
DEFENSE-WIDE		
DEFENSE FUEL SUPPORT POINT PEARL HARBOR		
POL LABORATORY FACILITY	2,250	2,250
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
MOLOKAI		
ARMORY	---	1,050
OAHU		
ARMORY	---	4,300
KAUAI		
RANGE, KNOWN DISTANCE UPGRADE	334	334
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
HICKAM AFB		
FUEL SYSTEM MAINT AND CORROSION CONTROL FACILITY	5,300	5,300
NAS BARKING SANDS		
FORWARD AIR CONTROL POINT FACILITY	---	8,500
HICKHAM AFB		
CONSOLIDATED SUPPORT FACILITY	---	9,700

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE AGREEMENT
NAVY RESERVE		
NAVAL STATION PEARL HARBOR		
CONSTRUCTION BATTALION UNIT ADDITION	500	500
TOTAL, HAWAII	158,834	184,584
IDAHO		
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
GOWEN FIELD		
COMBAT VEHICLE TRANSITION COMPLEX	5,044	5,044
USPFO ADMIN OFFICE/WAREHOUSE ADDITION	1,391	1,391
HOMEDALE		
ARMORY	1,157	1,157
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
BOISE AIRPORT		
FIRE STATION AND AGE FACILITY	1,750	1,750
GOWEN FIELD		
IDAHO TRAINING RANGE	---	6,700
TOTAL, IDAHO	9,342	16,042
ILLINOIS		
AIR FORCE		
SCOTT AFB		
INTEROPERABILITY TEST AND TRAINING FACILITY	5,000	5,000
MUNITIONS STORAGE FACILITY/LAND ACQUISITION - DBOF	2,450	2,450
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
ROCK ISLAND		
ARMORY	---	3,310
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
CAPITAL MAP (SPRINGFIELD)		
ALTER STORM DRAINAGE DISPOSAL	500	500
UPGRADE RUNWAY	---	2,300
GREATER PEORIA AIRPORT		
ADD/ALTER F-16 AIRCRAFT AVIONICS SHOP	840	840
ARMY RESERVE		
ARGONNE		
USARC/OMS	10,381	10,381
TOTAL, ILLINOIS	19,171	24,781
INDIANA		
NAVY		
CRANE NSWCD		
ORDNANCE ENVIRONMENTAL TEST FACILITY	---	9,600
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
CAMP ATTERBURY		
STATE MILITARY FACILITY	---	5,400
TRAINING FACILITIES, PHASE VIB	---	7,545
RANGE, INF SQUAD BATTLE COURSE	1,156	1,156
RANGE, MOD RECORD FIRE UPGRADE	654	654
EVANSVILLE		
ARMORY AND ORGANIZATIONAL MAINTENANCE SHOP	---	6,050
LAFAYETTE		
ARMORY AND ORGANIZATIONAL MAINTENANCE SHOP	---	3,116
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
HULMAN FIELD (TERRE HAUTE)		
DINING HALL AND MEDICAL TRAINING FACILITY	---	3,800
REPLACE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	950	950

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE AGREEMENT
FT WAYNE MAP		
REPLACE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	1,350	1,350
TOTAL, INDIANA	4,110	39,621
IOWA		
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
CAMP DODGE		
ARMORY	---	4,550
BATTALION COMPLEX, PHASE II	---	3,800
CONSOLIDATED PAINT FACILITY	---	1,500
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
DES MOINES MAP		
ADD/ALTER DINING AND MEDICAL TRAINING FACILITY	1,800	1,800
JET FUEL STORAGE COMPLEX	---	4,000
REPLACE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	880	880
SIOUX GATEWAY AIRPORT (SERGEANT BLUFF)		
BASE CIVIL ENGINEER MAINTENANCE COMPLEX	---	2,650
MUNITIONS MAINTENANCE AND STORAGE COMPLEX	---	2,850
TOTAL, IOWA	2,680	22,030
KANSAS		
ARMY		
FORT RILEY		
BARRACKS & ADMIN RENOVATION	---	9,900
BATTLE SIMULATION FACILITY	---	4,742
AIR FORCE		
MCCONNELL AFB		
CONTROL TOWER CAB	900	900
LAND RESTRICTIVE EASEMENT ACQUISITION	1,000	1,000
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
NICKELL BARRACKS (SALINA)		
TRAINING SITE COMPLEX, PHASE I	---	6,168
FORT RILEY		
MAINTENANCE AND TRAINING EQUIPMENT SITE WASH RACK	---	3,398
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
FORBES FIELD (FORBES)		
REPLACE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	1,400	1,400
MCCONNELL AFB (WITCHITA)		
ALTER MEDICAL TRAINING AND TELECOM	890	890
TOTAL, KANSAS	4,190	28,398
KENTUCKY		
ARMY		
FORT CAMPBELL		
AIRFIELD IMPROVEMENTS	3,950	3,950
DINING FACILITIES MODERNIZATION	3,500	3,500
MOBILIZATION WAREHOUSE	850	850
WHOLE BARRACKS RENEWAL	32,000	32,000
FORT KNOX		
MAINTENANCE FACILITY	12,200	12,200
MULTIPURPOSE TRAINING RANGE	4,150	4,150
WHOLE BARRACKS RENEWAL	25,000	25,000
DEFENSE-WIDE		
FORT CAMPBELL		
EXPAND AIRCRAFT RAMP,SOF	---	2,650
SOF BATTALION HEADQUARTERS BUILDINGS	4,300	4,300
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	8,982	8,982

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE AGREEMENT
LINCOLN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ADDITION	1,900	1,900
MAHAFFEY MIDDLE SCHOOL ADDITION	2,300	2,300
FORT KNOX		
KINGSOLVER/VAN VOORHIS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1,600	1,600
SIX GYMNASIUM ADDITIONS	6,107	6,107
ARMY NATIONAL GAURD		
FORT KNOX		
MAINTENANCE AND TRAINING EQUIPMENT SITE FACILITY	---	10,000
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
STANDIFORD (LOUISVILLE)		
RELOCATION FACILITIES, PHASE IV	---	5,000
TOTAL, KENTUCKY	106,839	124,489
LOUISIANA		
AIR FORCE		
BARKSDALE AFB		
UPGRADE BULK STORAGE BASINS	1,600	1,600
WEAPONS STORAGE AREA SECURITY	960	960
REPLACE APRON/FUEL HYDRANTS	---	10,000
APRON LIGHTING	---	1,300
DEFENSE-WIDE		
FORT POLK		
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	---	4,950
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
HAMMOND COMMUNICATION STATION		
REPLACE UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANKS	350	350
NEW ORLEANS NAS		
REPLACE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	350	350
ARMY RESERVE		
NEW ORLEANS		
LAND ACQUISITION	645	645
NAVY RESERVE		
NAVAL AIR STATION NEW ORLEANS		
ORDNANCE COMPLEX	1,900	1,900
NAVAL SUPPORT ACTIVITY NEW ORLEANS		
MARINE CORPS RESERVE FORCE HEADQUARTERS	---	8,700
AIR FORCE RESERVE		
BARKSDALE AFB		
WELDING AND MACHINE SHOP	600	600
TOTAL, LOUISIANA	6,405	31,355
MAINE		
NAVY		
KITTERY PORTSMOUTH NAVAL SHIPYARD		
HAZARDOUS WASTE STORAGE FACILITY - DBOF	4,780	4,780
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
NORWAY		
ARMORY EXPANSION/REHABILITATION	1,380	1,380
TOTAL, MAINE	6,160	6,160
MARYLAND		
ARMY		
ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND		
APPLIED INSTRUCTION FACILITY	14,000	14,000
TARGET ASSEMBLY AND STORAGE FACILITY	1,800	1,800
UPGRADE RANGE COMPLEX	4,450	4,450
EDGEWOOD ARSENAL		
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	---	1,450

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE AGREEMENT
NAVY		
ANNAPOLIS, NAVAL ACADEMY		
PHYSICAL THERAPY/TRAINING/MEETING CENTER	---	6,500
BETHESDA NATIONAL NAVAL MEDICAL CENTER		
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	3,090	3,090
INDIAN HEAD NSWC		
HAZARDOUS WASTE TREATMENT FACILITY	---	3,400
NAS PATUXENT RIVER		
SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT	---	1,000
PATUXENT RIVER NAWC		
ADVANCE SYSTEM INTEGRATION FACILITY, PHASE II	---	10,000
HAZARDOUS MATERIAL STORAGE FACILITY	---	3,400
JET ENGINE TEST CELL	---	4,900
AIR FORCE		
ANDREWS AFB		
AIR FREIGHT TERMINAL - DBOF	4,400	4,400
FIRE TRAINING FACILITY - DBOF	1,000	1,000
UPGRADE COMPOSITE ADMIN FACILITY - DBOF	9,940	9,940
UPGRADE SANITARY SEWER SYSTEMS	2,650	2,650
FORT GEORGE MEADE		
ADD TO OPERATIONS FACILITY	1,450	1,450
DEFENSE-WIDE		
FORT DETRICK		
BIOLOGICAL INCINERATOR	4,300	4,300
FOREST GLEN (WRAIR)		
ARMY INSTITUTE OF RESEARCH, PHASE II	48,140	15,000
FORT MEADE		
OPS BLDG 1 ROADWAY STRUCTURAL ENHANCEMENT	5,910	5,910
SUPERCOMPUTER FACILITY, PHASE I	52,720	35,000
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
HAGERSTOWN		
ADD/ALTER ARMORY	---	1,776
TOWSON		
ADD/ALTER ARMORY	2,823	2,823
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
ANDREWS AFB (CAMP SPRINGS)		
ADD/ALTER AVIONICS AND ECM POD FACILITY	1,100	1,100
REPLACE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	890	890
GLENN L MARTIN AIRPORT (BALTIMORE)		
REPLACE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	1,000	1,000
NAVY RESERVE		
NAF WASHINGTON		
EQUIPMENT OPERATIONS FACILITY	2,500	2,500
BALTIMORE		
MCRC IMPROVEMENTS	---	460
AIR FORCE RESERVE		
ANDREWS AFB		
CONSTRUCT AIRCRAFT PARKING APRON	8,000	8,000
REPLACE AIRCRAFT PARKING APRON	13,373	13,373
TOTAL, MARYLAND	183,536	165,562
MASSACHUSETTS		
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
AYER		
ADD/ALTER COMBINED SUPPORT MAINTENANCE SHOP	---	3,002
AIR FORCE RESERVE		
WESTOVER AFB		
MEDICAL TRAINING FACILITY	2,600	2,600

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE AGREEMENT
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
BARNES AIRPORT		
ALTER OPS/TRAINING FACILITY	---	600
OTIS ANGB		
COMMUNICATIONS/ELECTRONICS FACILITY	---	3,000
WORCESTER ANGB		
BASE SUPPLY WAREHOUSE	---	390
TOTAL, MASSACHUSETTS	2,600	9,592
MICHIGAN		
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
ALPENA COUNTY REGIONAL AIRPORT		
UPGRADE WATER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	1,400	1,400
SELFRIDGE ANGB (MT CLEMENS)		
REPLACE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	710	710
WK KELLOGG REGIONAL AIRPORT (KELLOGG)		
ADD/ALTER FUEL CELL AND CORROSION CONTROL FACILITY	1,100	1,100
NAVY RESERVE		
NRRC DETROIT		
RESERVE CENTER ADDITION	3,100	3,100
MCRC REPAIR/CONSTRUCTION	---	698
TOTAL, MICHIGAN	6,310	7,008
MINNESOTA		
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
CAMP RIPLEY		
ORGANIZATIONAL MAINTENANCE SHOPS	2,625	2,625
RANGE, MULTI-PURPOSE (HEAVY)	3,185	3,185
INVER GROVE HEIGHTS		
ARMORY AND ORGANIZATIONAL MAINTENANCE SHOP	---	4,571
VARIOUS LOCATIONS		
ADD/ALTER SEVEN ARMORIES	---	3,225
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
DULUTH ANGB		
REPLACE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	1,000	1,000
TOTAL, MINNESOTA	6,810	14,606
MISSISSIPPI		
NAVY		
CBC GULFPORT		
FAMILY SERVICE CENTER	---	2,000
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	---	2,400
AIR FORCE		
COLUMBUS AFB		
UPGRADE AIRFIELD LIGHTING	2,900	2,900
KEESLER AFB		
FIRE TRAINING FACILITY	690	690
UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	600	600
UPGRADE SANITARY SEWER SYSTEM	2,920	2,920
UPGRADE STUDENT DORMITORY	4,500	4,500
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
CAMP SHELBY		
REGIONAL SCHOOL FACILITY, PHASE I	---	6,000
VEHICLE WASH FACILITY	---	5,000
CAMP MCCAIN		
RANGE AND TRAINING AREA IMPROVEMENTS	---	5,500
GREENVILLE		
ARMORY	---	2,230

69-059 O—97 Vol. 139 (Pt. 17) 8

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE AGREEMENT
JACKSON		
ARMORY	---	2,550
TUPELO		
ADD/ALTER ARMY AVIATION SUPPORT FACILITY	---	3,210
VARIOUS LOCATIONS		
ADD/ALTER SIX ARMORIES	---	5,204
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
ALLEN C THOMPSON FIELD (JACKSON)		
REPLACE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	730	730
GULFPORT MPT		
REPLACE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	335	335
UPGRADE ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	850	850
TOTAL, MISSISSIPPI	13,525	47,619
MISSOURI		
ARMY		
FORT LEONARD WOOD		
OPERATIONS FACILITY	1,000	1,000
AIR FORCE		
WHITEMAN AFB		
B-2 ADD/ALTER MUNITIONS STORAGE FACILITY	3,338	3,338
B-2 AIRCRAFT APRON/TAXIWAY UPGRADE	3,400	3,400
B-2 AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE DOCK	14,500	14,500
B-2 DEFENSE ACCESS ROADS	7,150	7,150
B-2 HYDRANT FUELING SYSTEM LOOP, PHASE II	2,700	2,700
B-2 UPGRADE BASE ROADS	5,900	5,900
B-2 UTILITY UPGRADE / LAND ACQUISITION	4,850	4,850
B-2 VEHICLE MAINTENANCE FACILITY	1,700	1,700
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
FORT CROWDER		
TROOP MEDICAL TRAINING FACILITY	386	386
FORT LEONARD WOOD		
ARMORY/OMS	---	2,349
POPLAR BLUFF		
ARMORY AND ORGANIZATIONAL MAINTENANCE SHOP	---	2,842
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
JEFFERSON BARRACKS ANG SITE (ST LOUIS)		
ALTER COMMUNICATIONS ELECTRONICS TRAINING FACILITY	2,800	2,800
UPGRADE DINING HALL	720	720
ROSECRANS MEMORIAL AIRPORT (ST JOSEPHS)		
REPLACE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	1,250	1,250
JET FUEL STORAGE	---	4,000
TOTAL, MISSOURI	49,694	58,885
MONTANA		
AIR FORCE		
MALMSTROM AFB		
BASE ENGINEERING COMPLEX - DBOF	6,200	6,200
UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	1,500	1,500
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
FT WM HENRY HARRISON		
MEDICAL UNIT TRAINING FACILITY	501	501
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
GREAT FALLS IAP		
MEDICAL TRAINING AND DINING HALL	2,900	2,900
REPLACE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	400	400
TOTAL, MONTANA	11,501	11,501

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE AGREEMENT
NEBRASKA		
AIR FORCE		
OFFUTT AFB		
ADD TO EMERGENCY BACK-UP POWER	2,300	2,300
REPAIR AIRFIELD PAVEMENTS AND LIGHTING	8,700	8,700
DEFENSE-WIDE		
OFFUTT AIR FORCE BASE		
LIFE SAFETY UPGRADE	1,100	1,100
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
LINCOLN MAP		
ALTER MAINTENANCE HANGAR	---	7,300
REPLACE HEAT SYSTEM	---	1,500
FIRE STATION	1,850	1,850
TOTAL, NEBRASKA	13,950	22,750
NEVADA		
ARMY		
HAWTHORNE AAP		
CONTAINER HOLDING PADS	7,000	7,000
REHABILITATE RAIL LINE	---	4,700
NAVY		
FALLON NAVAL AIR STATION		
DIXIE VALLEY LAND ACQUISITION	---	1,600
AIR FORCE		
NELLIS AFB		
ADD/ALTER PHYSICAL FITNESS TRAINING FACILITY	---	4,350
BOMBER LIVE ORDNANCE LOADING APRON	---	4,100
UPGRADE POL TANKS	1,650	1,650
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
LAS VEGAS/CLARK COUNTY		
ARMORY, PHASE II	---	1,430
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
RENO IAP		
AIRCRAFT ARRESTING SYSTEMS	1,830	---
FLIGHT SIMULATOR BUILDING	---	400
REPLACE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	460	460
TOTAL, NEVADA	10,940	25,690
NEW HAMPSHIRE		
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
PEASE AFB		
UPGRADE KC-135 HYDRANT REFUELING SYSTEM	5,100	---
NEW JERSEY		
ARMY		
FORT MONMOUTH		
SATELLITE CONTROL SYSTEM	7,500	7,500
PICATINNY ARSENAL		
ADVANCED WARHEAD DEVELOPMENT FACILITY	---	4,400
EXPLOSIVES DEVELOPMENT FACILITY	---	6,100
NAVY		
EARLE NAVAL WEAPONS STATION		
EXPLOSIVES HOLDING YARD - DBOF	1,290	1,290
HAZARDOUS WASTE STORAGE FACILITY - DBOF	870	870
MATERIALS HNDLG EQUIP SERV CTR ALT - DBOF	420	420
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
ATLANTIC CITY AIRPORT		
FIRE STATION	1,350	1,350
REPLACE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	1,900	1,900

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE AGREEMENT
ARMY RESERVE		
FORT DIX		
UPGRADE RANGE 65	---	2,700
NAVY RESERVE		
NRC KEARNY		
INSTALL AIR CONDITIONING	800	800
WEST TRENTON		
MCRC REPLACEMENT CONVERSION	---	264
TOTAL, NEW JERSEY	14,130	27,594
NEW MEXICO		
ARMY		
WHITE SANDS MISSILE RANGE		
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	---	3,300
TARGET TRACK	2,900	2,900
AIR FORCE		
CANNON AFB		
BASE CIVIL ENGINEERING COMPLEX	6,150	6,150
FIRE TRAINING FACILITY	1,000	1,000
RENOVATE AND EXPAND DORMITORY	---	3,100
SOUND SUPPRESSOR SUPPORT PAD	665	665
UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	1,100	1,100
HOLLOMAN AFB		
ADD/ALTER DORMITORIES	6,400	6,400
SEWER EFFLUENT SYSTEM	1,800	1,800
FIGHTER MAINTENANCE FACILITY	---	1,900
UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	1,000	1,000
KIRTLAND AFB		
AEROSPACE ENGINEERING FACILITY	3,167	3,167
ALTER DORMITORY	5,100	5,100
COMPOSITE MATERIALS LABORATORY	5,750	5,750
SPACE STRUCTURES LABORATORY	6,200	6,200
UPGRADE ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	6,844	6,844
UPGRADE UTILITY SYSTEM	---	8,000
DEFENSE-WIDE		
CANNON AIR FORCE BASE		
ADD/ALTER HOSPITAL AND LIFE SAFETY/SEISMIC UPGRADE	13,600	13,600
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
WHITE SANDS		
OMS	---	2,940
TACTICAL SITE	---	1,995
MAINTENANCE AND TRAINING EQUIPMENT SITE FACILITY	---	3,570
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
KIRTLAND AFB (KIRTLAND)		
ALTER MAINTENANCE SHOPS	345	345
ALTER OPERATIONAL TRAINING FACILITY	390	390
POWER CHECK PAD WITH SOUND SUPPRESSOR	800	800
AIR FORCE RESERVE		
KIRTLAND AFB		
CIVIL ENGINEERING TRAINING FACILITY	900	900
TOTAL, NEW MEXICO	64,111	88,916
NEW YORK		
ARMY		
U S MILITARY ACADEMY		
WHOLE BARRACKS RENEWAL	13,800	13,800

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE AGREEMENT
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
GABRESKI AIRPORT (WEST HAMPTON BEACH)		
WASTE WATER TREATMENT PLANT	---	2,700
HANCOCK FIELD (SYRACUSE)		
FIRE STATION	1,350	1,350
NIAGARA FALLS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT		
ALTER KC-135 OPERATIONS FACILITIES	1,650	1,650
SCHENECTADY AIRPORT		
REPLACE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	1,050	1,050
STEWART AIRPORT (NEWBURGH)		
INDUSTRIAL WASTE HOLDING POND	320	320
AIR FORCE RESERVE		
NIAGARA FALLS IAP		
BASE COMMUNICATIONS CENTER	1,300	1,300
CORROSION CONTROL FACILITY	---	800
TOTAL, NEW YORK	19,470	22,970
NORTH CAROLINA		
ARMY		
FORT BRAGG		
OVERHILLS TRACT LAND ACQUISITION	---	15,000
SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT UPGRADE	540	540
SIMMONS AIRFIELD LAND ACQUISITION	---	1,450
TACTICAL EQUIPMENT SHOP	7,100	7,100
TACTICAL EQUIPMENT SHOP	23,000	23,000
WHOLE BRIGADE BARRACKS COMPLEX	71,600	71,600
LIBRARY	---	5,500
NAVY		
CAMP LEJEUNE MARINE CORPS BASE		
LANDFILL	7,690	7,690
MULTI-PURPOSE TRAINING RANGE	5,300	5,300
WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT, PHASE I	28,300	28,300
CAMP LEJEUNE NAVAL HOSPITAL		
BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS	2,370	2,370
CHERRY POINT MARINE CORPS AIR STATION		
AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE TRAINING FACILITY	4,040	4,040
COMMUNICATIONS CENTER	3,460	3,460
AIR FORCE		
POPE AFB		
ADD/ALTER DORMITORIES	4,300	4,300
DINING FACILITY	4,300	4,300
SEYMOUR JOHNSON AFB		
ADD/ALTER DORMITORIES	4,900	4,900
MUNITIONS MAINTENANCE SUPPORT FACILITY	480	480
DEFENSE-WIDE		
FORT BRAGG		
MEDICAL TRAINING FACILITY	18,450	18,450
SOF BARRACKS COMPLEX	20,000	20,000
FT BRAGG ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	8,838	8,838
HOSPITAL REPLACEMENT, PHASE II	195,000	35,000
CAMP LEJEUNE MARINE CORPS BASE		
AUDITORIUM/BAND ROOM, HIGH SCHOOL	1,465	1,465
MULTI-PURPOSE ROOM, STONE STREET ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	328	328
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
FAYETTEVILLE		
ORGANIZATIONAL MAINTENANCE SHOP	473	473
ARMY RESERVE		
MOREHEAD CITY		
ADD/ALTER USARC/OMS/AREA MAINT SPT ACTIVITY	9,335	9,335
TOTAL, NORTH CAROLINA	421,269	283,219

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE AGREEMENT
NORTH DAKOTA		
AIR FORCE		
GRAND FORKS AFB		
HYDRANT FUEL SYSTEM	---	3,250
REPAIR AIRCRAFT PAVEMENTS	---	10,200
UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	2,600	2,600
MINOT AFB		
REPAIR RUNWAY/TAXIWAY	---	8,500
UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	2,000	2,000
DEFENSE-WIDE		
GRAND FORKS AIR FORCE BASE		
LIFE SAFETY UPGRADE	860	860
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
BISMARCK		
AVIATION C-12 HANGAR	1,297	1,300
CAMP GRAFTON (DEVILS LAKE)		
RANGE, MODIFIED RECORD FIRE	1,038	1,038
HEATING PLANT ADDITION	1,826	1,826
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
HECTOR FIELD (FARGO)		
UPGRADE STORM DRAINAGE	400	400
TOTAL, NORTH DAKOTA	10,021	31,974
OHIO		
AIR FORCE		
WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB		
ADD/ALTER ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT COMPLEX, PHASE II	12,850	12,850
ADD TO AVIONICS RESEARCH LAB, PHASE II	5,650	5,650
RENOVATE ELECTRIC SUBSTATIONS	4,450	4,450
SEAL FUEL CONTAINMENT DIKES	1,500	1,500
UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	3,200	3,200
ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT COMPLEX	---	14,400
FIRE STATION	---	1,230
FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM	---	1,400
DEFENSE-WIDE		
DEFENSE ELECTRONICS SUPPLY CENTER, DAYTON		
INSTALL GAS-FIRED BOILERS	6,000	---
DEFENSE CONSTRUCTION SUPPLY CENTER, COLUMBUS		
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	3,100	3,100
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
RICKENBACKER AIRPORT		
CONSOLIDATED DINING FACILITY	---	1,250
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
MANSFIELD LAHM AIRPORT		
MEDICAL TRAINING AND DINING FACILITY	---	2,900
TOLEDO EXPRESS AIRPORT		
ADD/ALTER OPERATIONS AND TRAINING FACILITY	---	1,800
FIRE SUPPRESSION SYSTEMS	---	1,100
TAXIWAY AND ARM/DEARM PADS	---	1,950
ARMY RESERVE		
COLUMBUS		
USARC/OMS/AMSA/DS-GS SHOP	14,701	14,701
AIR FORCE RESERVE		
YOUNGSTOWN MAP		
SHORTFIELD LANDING ZONE	---	6,400
WIDEN AIRCRAFT PARKING APRON	1,450	1,450
TOTAL, OHIO	52,901	79,331

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE AGREEMENT
OKLAHOMA		
ARMY		
FORT SILL		
CENTRAL VEHICLE WASH FACILITY	---	7,600
ENVIRONMENTAL TRAINING CENTER	---	3,700
WHOLE BARRACKS RENEWAL	15,700	15,700
AIR FORCE		
ALTUS AFB		
C-17 ADD TO AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE FACILITY - DBOF	3,300	3,300
C-17 ADD TO FLIGHT SIMULATION TRNG FACILITY - DBOF	2,850	2,850
C-17 FIRE STATION - DBOF	780	780
DROP ZONE LAND ACQUISITION	---	780
TINKER AFB		
ALTER HYDRANT FUELING SYSTEM	4,129	4,129
ENGINEERING AND CONTRACT SUPPORT FACILITY	5,900	5,900
INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER REGIONAL CONNECTION - DBOF	5,400	5,400
MILSTAR COMMUNICATIONS GROUND TERMINAL	800	---
SEAL FUEL CONTAINMENT DIKES	620	620
UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	4,700	4,700
VANCE AFB		
AIRFIELD PAVEMENTS, PHASE IV	---	5,000
T-1 SPECIALIZED UPT MAINTENANCE SUPPORT	2,700	2,700
UPGRADE AIRFIELD LIGHTING	3,300	3,300
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
FREDERICK		
ARMORY	---	1,200
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
TULSA IAP		
ADD/ALTER FIRE STATION	460	460
WILL ROGERS WORLD AIRPORT (OKLAHOMA CITY)		
COMPOSITE SUPPORT FACILITY	3,900	3,900
MOBILITY EQUIPMENT STORAGE WAREHOUSE	950	950
TOTAL, OKLAHOMA	55,489	72,969
OREGON		
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
CAMP WITHYCOMBE		
SUPPORT MAINTENANCE SHOP	---	7,569
PENDLETON		
AVIATION SUPPORT FACILITY	---	3,515
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
PORTLAND IAP		
ADD/ALTER FIRE STATION	500	500
DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS	600	950
KINGSLEY FIELD/KLAMATH FALLS		
REPAIR RUNWAY/TAXIWAY	---	8,500
TOTAL, OREGON	1,100	21,034
PENNSYLVANIA		
ARMY		
TOBYHANNA ARMY DEPOT		
WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT	750	750
NAVY		
PHILADELPHIA NAV INACTIVE SHIP MAINT FAC		
BERTHING WHARF IMPROVEMENTS, PHASE II	8,660	8,660
PHILADELPHIA NAVY AVIATION SUPPLY OFFICE		
ELECTRICAL DISTRIB SYSTEM UPGRADE - DBOF	1,900	1,900
PHILADELPHIA NAVAL SHIPYARD		
ASBESTOS REMOVAL FACILITY	---	2,300
POWER PLANT MODERNIZATION	---	11,500

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE AGREEMENT
DEFENSE-WIDE		
OLMSTEAD FIELD, HARRISBURG IAP		
SOF AVIONICS/ECM POD FACILITY	1,300	1,300
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
FORT INDIANTOWN GAP		
STATE MILITARY FACILITY	---	9,200
JOHNSTOWN		
ADDITION TO JOINT ARMED FORCES AVIATION FACILITY	---	5,004
ARMORY EXPANSION	---	3,309
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
FT INDIANTOWN GAP ANG COMMUNICATIONS SITE (LICKDALE)		
CIVIL ENGINEERING MAINTENANCE SHOPS	850	850
STATE COLLEGE		
COMMUNICATIONS ELECTRONICS TRAINING COMPLEX	---	9,700
AIR FORCE RESERVE		
GREATER PITTSBURGH IAP		
BASE CIVIL ENGINEERING COMPLEX	---	3,100
JET FUEL STORAGE COMPLEX	4,300	4,300
OFF BASE FIRING RANGE	1,300	1,300
TOTAL, PENNSYLVANIA	19,060	63,173
RHODE ISLAND		
NAVY		
NEWPORT NAVAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING CENTER		
BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS	7,500	7,500
ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM UPGRADE, PHASE II	3,800	3,800
DEFENSE-WIDE		
NEWPORT NAVAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING CENTER		
MEDICAL CLINIC, PHASE II	---	4,000
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
COVENTRY AGS		
REPLACE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	840	840
NORTH SMITHFIELD ANGS (SLATERSVILLE)		
REPLACE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	550	550
QUONSET STATE AIRPORT (WARWICK)		
BASE ENGINEER MAINTENANCE FACILITY	2,750	2,750
REPLACE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	890	890
NAVY RESERVE		
NETC NEWPORT		
CONSTRUCTION BATTALION UNIT ADDITION	500	500
TOTAL, RHODE ISLAND	16,830	20,830
SOUTH CAROLINA		
ARMY		
FORT JACKSON		
OPERATIONS FACILITY	1,100	1,100
RANGE UPGRADE	1,600	1,600
NAVY		
BEAUFORT MARINE CORPS AIR STATION		
BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS, PHASE II	8,390	8,390
JET FUEL DELIVERY SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT	2,510	2,510
CHARLESTON NAVAL WEAPONS STATION		
FIRE PROTECTION PIPELINE - DBOF	580	580
AIR FORCE		
CHARLESTON AFB		
FIRE TRAINING FACILITY - DBOF	1,100	1,100
SHAW AFB		
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	2,650	2,650
CONTROL TOWER	2,700	2,700
UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	520	520

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE AGREEMENT
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
COLUMBIA		
COMBINED SUPPORT/MAINTENANCE SHOP	---	8,616
LAND ACQUISITION	---	950
LEESBURG		
WASH RACK/FUEL FACILITY	---	1,009
SUMMERVILLE		
OMS	---	834
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
MCENTIRE ANGB (EASTOVER)		
REPLACE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	1,750	1,750
UPGRADE AIRFIELD LIGHTING AND PAVEMENT	4,200	4,200
ARMY RESERVE		
FORT JACKSON		
USARC/OMS/DS SHOP	10,428	10,428
TOTAL, SOUTH CAROLINA	37,528	48,937
SOUTH DAKOTA		
AIR FORCE		
ELLSWORTH AFB		
CONSOLIDATED ADMIN CENTER, PHASE I	---	6,200
ALTER AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE DOCK	630	630
DEFENSE-WIDE		
ELLSWORTH AIR FORCE BASE		
LIFE SAFETY UPGRADE	1,400	1,400
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
SIOUX FALLS (JOE FOSS FIELD)		
ARMORY ADDITION	---	3,700
MAINTENANCE SHOP	---	1,700
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
JOE FOSS FIELD (SIOUX FALLS)		
ADD/ALTER FUEL SYSTEMS MAINTENANCE/CORROSION DOCK	1,700	1,700
ALTER COMPOSITE OPERATIONS AND TRAINING FACILITY	350	350
TOTAL, SOUTH DAKOTA	4,080	15,680
TENNESSEE		
NAVY		
MEMPHIS NAVAL AIR STATION		
FIRE ALARM SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS	1,100	1,100
FUELS TRAINER FACILITY	600	---
POTABLE WATER SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS	350	350
AIR FORCE		
ARNOLD ENGINEERING DEV CENTER		
UPGRADE SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT	1,500	1,500
MEMPHIS NAVAL AIR STATION		
ADD/ALTER HIGH-BAY TECHNICAL TRAINING FACILITY	3,000	---
ALTER TECHNICAL TRAINING FACILITY	2,000	---
RENOVATE DORMITORY	1,200	---
DEFENSE-WIDE		
MILLINGTON NAVAL AIR STATION		
HOSPITAL LIFE SAFETY/SEISMIC UPGRADE, PHASE II	5,000	5,000
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
CAMDEN		
ARMORY ADDITION	---	714
ELIZABETHTON		
ARMORY STORAGE ADDITION	---	100
JEFFERSON CITY		
ARMORY	---	952
MILAN		
ARMORY	---	1,357

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE AGREEMENT
SEVIERVILLE		
ARMORY	---	1,352
SMYRNA		
ARMORY	---	3,934
WAREHOUSE	---	710
TIPTONVILLE		
ARMORY	---	1,157
WAVERLY		
ARMORY ADDITION	---	587
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
ALCOA AIR NATIONAL GUARD STATION		
ADD/ALTER COMMUNICATIONS ELECTRONICS TRNG FACILITY	1,300	1,300
MCGHEE-TYSON AIRPORT (ALCOA)		
PMEC ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT FACILITY	2,200	2,200
REPLACE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	1,100	1,100
NASHVILLE MAP		
REPLACE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	1,000	1,000
NAVY RESERVE		
NMCRC CHATTANOOGA		
RESERVE CENTER REPLACEMENT	3,690	3,690
TOTAL, TENNESSEE	24,040	28,103
TEXAS		
ARMY		
FORT BLISS		
CONSOLIDATED MAINTENANCE FACILITY	14,000	14,000
TACTICAL EQUIPMENT SHOP	---	12,800
TACTICAL EQUIPMENT SHOP	---	2,800
FORT HOOD		
BATTALION COMMAND AND CONTROL BUILDING	---	5,600
CLOSE COMBAT TACTICAL TRAINER FACILITY	7,500	7,500
COLD/DRY STORAGE FACILITY	13,400	13,400
DEPLOYMENT STORAGE FACILITY	---	1,500
TACTICAL EQUIPMENT SHOP	5,300	5,300
TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT FACILITY	5,200	5,200
WHOLE BARRACKS RENEWAL	18,000	18,000
FORT SAM HOUSTON		
FIRE STATION	---	1,300
MULTI-PURPOSE FAMILY SERVICE CENTER	4,351	4,351
NAVY		
CORPUS CHRISTI NAVAL AIR STATION		
BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS IMPROVEMENTS	1,670	1,670
AIR FORCE		
BROOKS AFB		
CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL EXCELLENCE	---	8,400
DYESS AFB		
ADD/ALTER DORMITORIES	---	5,200
UPGRADE HYDRANT FUELING SYSTEM, PHASE II	9,500	9,500
WEAPONS STORAGE AREA SECURITY	890	890
GOODFELLOW AFB		
BASE CIVIL ENGINEERING COMPLEX	3,700	3,700
KELLY AFB		
ADD/ALTER DORMITORIES - DBOF	2,000	2,000
ALTER WEAPON SYSTEM SUPPORT CTR, PHASE II - DBOF	7,800	7,800
C-17 ADD/ALTER NDI FACILITY - DBOF	4,900	4,900
C-17 ALTER DEPOT AVIONICS FACILITY - DBOF	731	731
C-17 ENGINEERING TEST LABORATORY	2,600	2,600
UPGRADE SANITARY SEWER MAINS	3,000	3,000
UPGRADE STORM DRAINAGE SYSTEM, PHASE I	2,900	2,900
UPGRADE TAXIWAY	3,550	3,550

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE AGREEMENT
LACKLAND AFB		
ALTER BASE SUPPORT FACILITY	5,400	5,400
BASE CONTRACTING CENTER	2,450	2,450
MISSION SUPPORT CENTER	7,543	7,543
TRAINING SERVICES FACILITIES	5,800	5,800
DORMITORY	8,900	8,900
LACKLAND TRAINING ANNEX		
VEHICLE MAINTENANCE FACILITY	1,200	---
LAUGHLIN AFB		
FIRE STATION	2,400	2,400
UPGRADE AIRFIELD LIGHTING	3,000	3,000
UPGRADE AIRFIELD PAVEMENT	3,250	3,250
RANDOLPH AFB		
CONTROL TOWER	2,800	2,800
UPGRADE ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	2,500	2,500
REESE AFB		
UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	900	900
SHEPPARD AFB		
ADD/ALTER CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	780	780
ENJJPT ALTER FLIGHT TRAINING FACILITY	2,200	2,200
FIRE TRAINING FACILITY	850	850
DORMITORY	14,200	14,200
DEFENSE-WIDE		
FORT SAM HOUSTON		
COMBAT MEDIC TRAINING COMPLEX	1,400	1,400
HOSPITAL REPLACEMENT, PHASE VII	75,000	50,000
NCO ACADEMY-AMEDD CENTER AND SCHOOL	3,400	3,400
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
CORPUS CHRISTI		
ADD/ALTER ARMORY	---	2,719
ORGANIZATIONAL MAINTENANCE SHOP	---	991
LUBBOCK		
ORGANIZATIONAL MAINTENANCE SHOPS & AFRC, PHASE II	---	1,726
WESLACO		
ARMORY AND ORGANIZATIONAL MAINTENANCE SHOP	---	5,567
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
ELLINGTON FIELD (HOUSTON)		
REPLACE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	1,600	1,600
KELLY AFB (SAN ANTONIO)		
BASE SUPPLY WAREHOUSE	---	4,300
REPLACE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	560	560
AIR FORCE RESERVE		
KELLY AFB		
RED HORSE STRUCTURAL/UTILITY FACILITY	2,300	2,300
TOTAL, TEXAS	259,425	286,128
UTAH		
ARMY		
DUGWAY PROVING GROUND		
LIFE SCIENCES TEST FACILITY	16,500	16,500
TOOELE ARMY DEPOT		
TREATY COMPLIANCE FACILITY	1,500	1,500
AIR FORCE		
HILL AFB		
FIRE TRAINING FACILITY - DBOF	880	880
UPGRADE INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER COLLECTION SYSTEM	---	6,200
UPGRADE INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER TRTMNT PLANT - DBOF	5,100	5,100
UPGRADE WATER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	2,400	2,400
DEFENSE-WIDE		
DEFENSE REUTILIZATION AND MKTG OFC HILL AFB		
FIRE PROTECTION AND OPEN STORAGE	1,700	1,700

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE AGREEMENT
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
CAMP WILLIAMS		
RANGE, INFANTRY SQUAD BATTLE COURSE	1,066	1,066
RANGE, MOUT ASSAULT COURSE	850	850
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
SALT LAKE CITY IAP		
ADD/ALTER COMMUNICATION AND ELECTRONICS FACILITY	850	850
ALTER COMPOSITE SUPPORT FACILITY	950	950
SITE RESTORATION	2,000	2,000
TOTAL, UTAH	33,796	39,996
VERMONT		
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
CAMP JOHNSON		
ORGANIZATIONAL MAINTENANCE SHOP	1,002	1,002
JERICHO		
TRAINING SITE SUPPORT FACILITY	304	304
TRAINING FACILITY	---	3,200
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
BURLINGTON IAP		
FIRE STATION	1,500	1,500
TOTAL, VERMONT	2,806	6,006
VIRGINIA		
ARMY		
FORT BELVOIR		
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	---	8,000
OPERATIONS FACILITY	860	860
FORT LEE		
APPLIED INSTRUCTION FACILITY	12,600	12,600
WHOLE BARRACKS RENEWAL	20,000	20,000
FORT MYER		
WHOLE BARRACKS RENEWAL	6,800	6,800
NAVY		
CHESAPEAKE MARINE CORPS SEC FORCE BATTN NW		
ACADEMIC INSTRUCTION BUILDING	2,320	2,320
INDOOR RANGE COMPLEX	3,060	3,060
CRANEY ISLAND FLT AND INDUS SUPPLY CTR ANNEX		
WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT MODS - DBOF	11,740	11,740
NORFOLK CDR OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVAL FORCE		
OPERATIONS TEST AND EVALUATION MANAGEMENT CENTER	8,100	8,100
NORFOLK NAVAL AIR STATION		
BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS	12,270	12,270
NORFOLK NAVAL AVIATION DEPOT		
AIRCRAFT REWORK FACILITY - DBOF	17,800	---
NORFOLK NAVY PUBLIC WORKS CENTER		
TRASH RECYCLE FACILITY ADDITION - DBOF	5,330	5,330
OCEANA NAS		
REPLACE FUEL TANK FARM	---	1,800
PORTSMOUTH NORFOLK NAVAL SHIPYARD		
BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS	13,420	13,420
QUANTICO MARINE CORPS COMBAT DEV COMMAND		
ANTI-ARMOR TRACKING AND LIVE FIRE RANGE	3,600	3,600
REHAB INSTRUCTIONAL SPACE	---	5,000
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	3,850	3,850
WALLOPS IS NAVAL SURFACE WEAPONS CTR DET		
SHIP SELF-DEFENSE ENGINEERING FACILITY	10,170	10,170

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE AGREEMENT
AIR FORCE		
LANGLEY AFB		
ADD/ALTER OPERATIONS FACILITY	5,373	---
BASE CIVIL ENGINEERING COMPLEX, PHASE I	4,000	5,300
FIRE STATION	3,850	3,850
RESTORE KING STREET BRIDGE	4,100	4,100
UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	500	500
DEFENSE-WIDE		
FORT BELVOIR		
ADMINISTRATIVE BUILDING	5,200	5,200
DEFENSE GENERAL SUPPLY CENTER		
ALTER HAZARDOUS MATERIAL WAREHOUSE	2,900	2,900
HAZARDOUS MATERIAL PROCESSING FACILITY	4,600	4,600
SHEDS FOR OIL STORAGE	9,500	9,500
FORT EUSTIS		
LIFE SAFETY UPGRADE	3,650	3,650
NAVAL AMPHIBIOUS BASE, LITTLE CREEK		
SOF SPECBOATRON PATROL COASTAL SUPPORT	7,500	7,500
PORTSMOUTH NAVAL HOSPITAL		
HOSPITAL REPLACEMENT, PHASE V	211,900	20,000
QUANTICO MARINE CORPS COMBAT DEV COMMAND		
QUANTICO HIGH SCHOOL ADDITION	422	422
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
CAMP PENDLETON ANGB (VIRGINIA BEACH)		
BASE CIVIL ENGINEER MAINTENANCE/STORAGE FACILITY	1,150	1,150
RICHARD E BYRD IAP (SANDSTON)		
ADD/ALTER FUEL SYSTEMS MAINTENANCE DOCK	1,300	1,300
REPLACE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	1,100	1,100
NAVY RESERVE		
MCRC DAM NECK (CAMP PENDLETON)		
ELECTRONICS MAINTENANCE SHOP	1,000	1,000
TOTAL, VIRGINIA	399,965	200,992
WASHINGTON		
ARMY		
FORT LEWIS		
INCINERATOR BUILDING COMPLETION	14,200	14,200
NAVY		
BANGOR NAVAL SUBMARINE BASE		
MESS HALL ADDITION	1,720	1,720
OILY WASTE TREATMENT FACILITY	1,380	1,380
EVERETT NAVAL STATION		
BREAKWATER	22,200	22,200
STEAM PLANT	11,800	11,800
KEYPORT NAVAL UNDERSEA WARFARE CENTER DIV		
HAZARDOUS WASTE STORAGE FACILITY - DBOF	8,980	8,980
AIR FORCE		
FAIRCHILD AFB		
INTELLIGENCE TECHNICAL TRAINING FACILITY	3,500	3,500
MCCHORD AFB		
ADD/ALTER DORMITORIES - DBOF	6,500	6,500
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER COMPLEX - DBOF	4,400	4,400
DEFENSE-WIDE		
FAIRCHILD AIR FORCE BASE		
UTILITY/LIFE SAFETY UPGRADE	8,250	8,250
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
YAKIMA TRAINING CENTER (YAKIMA)		
RANGE, MACHINE GUN MODIFICATION	1,527	1,527

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE AGREEMENT
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
BELLINGHAM MUNICIPAL AIRPORT ANG		
REPLACE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	420	420
CAMP MURRAY ANGS (TACOMA)		
REPLACE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	380	380
FOUR LAKES COMMUNICATIONS STATION (CHENEY)		
REPLACE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	360	360
PAINE FIELD ANG STATION (EVERETT)		
REPLACE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	320	320
SEATTLE AIR NATIONAL GUARD BASE		
REPLACE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	320	320
ARMY RESERVE		
FORT LEWIS		
USARC/OMS/AMSA/ECS/WAREHOUSE	14,703	14,703
NAVY RESERVE		
JOINT TRAINING CENTER EVERETT		
RESERVE CENTER REPLACEMENT	2,550	2,550
BANGOR		
RESERVE CENTER	---	3,000
TOTAL, WASHINGTON	103,510	106,510
WEST VIRGINIA		
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
E WV REGIONAL APT (MARTINSBURG)		
ADD TO AERIAL PORT TRAINING FACILITY	390	390
YEAGER AIRPORT (CHARLESTON)		
REPLACE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	370	370
TOTAL, WEST VIRGINIA	760	760
WISCONSIN		
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
CAMP WILLIAMS		
COMBINED MAINTENANCE FACILITY	---	11,900
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
BILLY MITCHELL FIELD (MILWAUKEE)		
REPLACE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	600	600
TRUAX FIELD (MADISON)		
FIRE STATION	1,400	1,400
VOLK FIELD (CAMP DOUGLAS)		
REPLACE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	510	510
NAVY RESERVE		
NMCRC GREEN BAY		
RESERVE CENTER ADDITION	650	650
AIR FORCE RESERVE		
BILLY MITCHELL FIELD		
ADD FIRE PROTECTION TO AIRCRAFT HANGARS	1,500	1,500
UPGRADE BASE FUELS COMPLEX	1,800	1,800
TOTAL, WISCONSIN	6,460	18,360
WYOMING		
AIR FORCE		
F E WARREN AFB		
REMOTE MISSILE CREW FACILITIES	3,800	3,800
RENOVATE SECURITY POLICE OPERATIONS	6,000	6,000
UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	2,200	2,200
WEAPONS STORAGE AREA SECURITY	640	640

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE AGREEMENT
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
CAMP GUERNSEY		
BARRACKS RENOVATION	---	3,338
TOTAL, WYOMING	12,640	15,978
CONUS CLASSIFIED		
ARMY		
CLASSIFIED LOCATIONS		
CLASSIFIED PROJECTS	3,000	1,852
AIR FORCE		
CLASSIFIED LOCATION		
OMEGA FACILITIES	2,600	2,600
SPECIAL TACTICAL UNIT DETACHMENT FACILITY	5,540	5,540
DEFENSE-WIDE		
CLASSIFIED LOCATION		
SITE IMPROVEMENTS	5,600	5,600
TOTAL, CONUS CLASSIFIED	16,740	15,592
CONUS VARIOUS		
NAVY		
CONUS VARIOUS		
WASTEWATER COLLECTION & TREATMENT SYSTEM	3,260	3,260
ANTIGUA		
AIR FORCE		
ANTIGUA ISLAND		
SLFI-UPGRADE BACKUP GENERATOR	1,000	1,000
ASCENSION ISLAND		
AIR FORCE		
ASCENSION ISLAND		
SLFI-WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT	3,400	3,400
DIEGO GARCIA		
AIR FORCE		
DIEGO GARCIA		
GPS INSTRUMENTATION FACILITY	1,700	1,700
SATELLITE TRACKING STORAGE FACILITY	560	560
DEFENSE-WIDE		
DIEGO GARCIA		
FUEL TANKAGE	9,558	9,558
TOTAL, DIEGO GARCIA	11,818	11,818
GERMANY		
AIR FORCE		
RAMSTEIN AB		
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	3,100	3,100
GREENLAND		
AIR FORCE		
THULE AB		
WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT	5,492	5,492
TOTAL, GREENLAND	5,492	5,492

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE AGREEMENT
GUAM		
NAVY		
ANDERSON AIR FORCE BASE NAVAL AIR FACILITY		
BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS RENOVATION	3,560	3,560
BACHELOR OFFICER QUARTERS MODERNIZATION	3,750	3,750
FLEET AND INDUSTRIAL SUPPLY CENTER		
GAS BOTTLE STORAGE FACILITY - DBOF	1,240	---
INTEGRATED STORAGE HANDLING FACILITY - DBOF	21,200	21,200
MILITARY SEALIFT COMMAND OFFICE		
MILITARY SEALIFT COMMAND OPERATIONS BLDG	2,170	---
NAVAL HOSPITAL		
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	2,460	2,460
NAVAL MAGAZINE		
INERT STOREHOUSES	3,750	---
NAVAL OCEANOGRAPHY COMMAND CENTER		
OCEANOGRAPHY BUILDING ALTERATIONS	690	---
NAVAL STATION		
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER ADDITION	2,020	2,020
EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL OPERATIONS FACILITY	12,500	12,500
NAVY PUBLIC WORKS CENTER		
SEWERAGE TREATMENT PLANT - DBOF	7,230	7,230
TRANSPORTATION PARTS STORAGE FACILITY - DBOF	1,610	---
WATERFRONT UTILITIES - DBOF	11,840	---
AIR FORCE		
ANDERSEN AFB		
UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	4,100	---
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
BARRIGADA		
U.S. PROPERTY/FISCAL OFFICE/WAREHOUSE, PHASE II	---	1,573
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
ANDERSON AFB		
BASE SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT WAREHOUSE	400	400
TOTAL, GUAM	78,520	54,693
ITALY		
NAVY		
NAPLES NAVAL SUPPORT ACTIVITY		
QUALITY OF LIFE FACILITIES, PHASE I	11,740	11,740
SIGONELLA NAVAL AIR STATION		
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	3,460	3,460
TOTAL, ITALY	15,200	15,200
KWAJALEIN		
ARMY		
KWAJALEIN		
SEWAGE TREATMENT FACILITY	11,200	11,200
UNACCOMPANIED PERSONNEL HOUSING	10,000	10,000
TOTAL, KWAJALEIN	21,200	21,200
OMAN		
AIR FORCE		
THUMRAIT AB		
WAR READINESS MATERIEL COVERED STORAGE FACILITY	1,800	---
PUERTO RICO		
DEFENSE-WIDE		
DEFENSE FUEL SUPPORT POINT ROOSEVELT ROADS		
FUEL TANKAGE	5,800	---

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE AGREEMENT
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
PUERTO RICO IAP		
ADD/ALTER F-16 AVIONICS SHOP	320	320
ALTER FUEL SYSTEMS MAINTENANCE FACILITY	750	750
UPGRADE F-16 AIRCRAFT PARKING RAMP SECURITY SYSTEM	2,000	2,000
TOTAL, PUERTO RICO	8,870	3,070
QATAR		
AIR FORCE		
DOHA		
WAR READINESS MATERIEL WAREHOUSE	5,500	---
SPAIN		
NAVY		
ROTA NAVAL STATION		
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	2,670	2,670
TURKEY		
AIR FORCE		
INCIRLIK AB		
ADD/ALTER DORMITORIES	2,400	2,400
UNITED KINGDOM		
AIR FORCE		
RAF MILDENHALL		
C-130 PHASE MAINTENANCE HANGAR	4,800	4,800
OVERSEAS CLASSIFIED		
ARMY		
OVERSEAS CLASSIFIED		
COMMUNICATIONS MAINTENANCE FACILITY	3,600	---
DEFENSE-WIDE		
OVERSEAS CLASSIFIED		
POWERHOUSE	10,755	10,755
TOTAL, OVERSEAS CLASSIFIED	14,355	10,755
NATO		
NATO INFRASTRUCTURE	240,000	140,000
WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED		
ARMY		
UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS		
HOST NATION SUPPORT	25,000	25,000
PLANNING AND DESIGN	84,441	84,441
UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	12,000	12,000
NAVY		
UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS		
PLANNING AND DESIGN	64,373	64,373
UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	5,500	5,500
AIR FORCE		
UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS		
GENERAL REDUCTION	---	-6,700
PLANNING AND DESIGN	63,180	63,882
UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	6,844	6,844
DEFENSE-WIDE		
UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS		
CONTINGENCY CONSTRUCTION	12,200	12,200
ENERGY CONSERVATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	50,000	50,000

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE AGREEMENT
PLANNING AND DESIGN		
SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	5,700	7,700
STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE ORGANIZATION	535	535
DEFENSE LEVEL ACTIVITIES	10,305	10,305
DEFENSE MEDICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITY	25,865	25,865
SUBTOTAL, PLANNING AND DESIGN	42,405	44,405
UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION		
ON-SITE INSPECTION AGENCY	812	812
SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	2,922	4,922
STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE ORGANIZATION	2,192	2,192
DEFENSE LEVEL ACTIVITIES	2,000	2,000
JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	5,975	5,975
DOD DEPENDENT SCHOOLS	4,000	4,000
DEFENSE MEDICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITY	3,757	3,757
SUBTOTAL, UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	21,658	23,658
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS		
PLANNING AND DESIGN	522	10,271
UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	5,000	5,000
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS		
GENERAL REDUCTION	---	-5,740
PLANNING AND DESIGN	9,900	10,868
UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	4,000	4,000
ARMY RESERVE		
UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS		
PLANNING AND DESIGN	4,897	7,004
UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	2,100	2,100
NAVY RESERVE		
UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS		
GENERAL REDUCTION	---	-9,140
PLANNING AND DESIGN	1,359	1,815
UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	1,042	1,042
AIR FORCE RESERVE		
UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS		
GENERAL REDUCTION	---	-2,780
PLANNING AND DESIGN	3,400	3,989
UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	3,904	3,904
TOTAL, WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	423,725	417,936
WORLDWIDE VARIOUS		
ARMY		
VARIOUS LOCATIONS		
RESCISSION, FISCAL YEAR 1992	---	-4,700
RESCISSION, FISCAL YEAR 1993	---	-9,200
NAVY		
LAND ACQUISITION		
LAND ACQUISITION	1,340	1,340
VARIOUS LOCATIONS		
HOST NATION INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT	2,960	2,960
RESCISSION, FISCAL YEAR 1990	---	-7,662
RESCISSION, FISCAL YEAR 1991	---	-14,406
RESCISSION, FISCAL YEAR 1992	---	-62,899
RESCISSION, FISCAL YEAR 1993	---	-37,660

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE AGREEMENT
AIR FORCE		
VARIOUS LOCATIONS		
RESCISSION, FISCAL YEAR 1990	---	-8,315
RESCISSION, FISCAL YEAR 1991	---	-6,550
RESCISSION, FISCAL YEAR 1992	---	-12,980
RESCISSION, FISCAL YEAR 1993	---	-2,250
DEFENSE-WIDE		
VARIOUS LOCATIONS		
RESCISSION, FISCAL YEAR 1992	---	-15,500
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
UNSPECIFIED LOCATIONS		
INDOOR RANGE MODERNIZATION	637	637
VARIOUS LOCATIONS		
ARMORY UNIT STORAGE BUILDINGS	750	750
TOTAL, WORLDWIDE VARIOUS	5,687	-176,435
FAMILY HOUSING, ARMY		
CALIFORNIA		
FORT IRWIN (220 UNITS)	25,000	25,000
HAWAII		
SCHOFIELD BARRACKS (260 UNITS)	39,000	39,000
SCHOFIELD BARRACKS (88 UNITS)	13,000	13,000
MARYLAND		
FORT MEADE (275 UNITS)	26,000	26,000
NEVADA		
HAWTHORNE AAP		
DEMOLISH ABANDONED HOUSING UNITS	---	500
NEW YORK		
U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY (100 UNITS)	15,000	15,000
NORTH CAROLINA		
FORT BRAGG (224 UNITS)	18,000	18,000
WISCONSIN		
FORT MCCOY (16 UNITS)	2,950	2,950
CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENTS	67,530	77,630
PLANNING	11,805	11,805
SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION	218,285	228,885
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE		
FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT	41,707	41,707
MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT	81,163	81,163
MISCELLANEOUS ACCOUNT	1,840	1,840
SERVICES ACCOUNT	62,447	62,447
UTILITIES ACCOUNT	281,348	281,348
LEASING	268,139	268,139
MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	388,528	388,528
INTEREST PAYMENTS	17	17
GENERAL REDUCTION	---	-56,000
SUBTOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	1,125,189	1,069,189
PLUS APPROPRIATION FOR DEBT REDUCTION	412	412
TOTAL, FAMILY HOUSING, ARMY	1,343,886	1,298,486

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE AGREEMENT
FAMILY HOUSING, NAVY		
CALIFORNIA		
PUBLIC WORKS CENTER SAN DIEGO (318 UNITS)	36,571	36,571
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
PUBLIC WORKS CENTER WASHINGTON DC (188 UNITS)	21,556	21,556
FLORIDA		
PUBLIC WORKS CENTER PENSACOLA (SELF-HELP CENTER/ WAREHOUSE)	300	300
GEORGIA		
NAVAL SUBMARINE SUPPORT BASE KINGS BAY (FAMILY HOUSING OFFICE/SELF-HELP CENTER/WAREHOUSE)	790	790
MAINE		
NAS BRUNSWICK (20 MOBILE HOME SPACES)	490	490
VIRGINIA		
NAVAL AIR STATION OCEANA (COMMUNITY CENTER)	860	860
NAVAL COMPLEX NORFOLK (392 UNITS)	50,674	50,674
WASHINGTON		
NAVAL SUBMARINE BASE BANGOR (290 UNITS)	27,438	27,438
NAS WHIDBEY ISLAND (106 UNITS)	---	10,000
SCOTLAND		
NAVAL SECURITY GROUP ACTIVITY EDZELL (40 UNITS)	6,000	---
UNITED KINGDOM		
NAVAL ACTIVITIES LONDON (PURCHASE 81 LEASED UNITS)	15,470	15,470
VARIOUS LOCATIONS		
RESCISSION, FISCAL YEAR 1990	---	-14,100
RESCISSION, FISCAL YEAR 1991	---	-25,018
RESCISSION, FISCAL YEAR 1993	---	-1,253
CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENTS	190,696	183,135
PLANNING	22,924	22,924
SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION	373,769	329,837
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE		
FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT	36,904	36,904
MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT	87,769	87,769
MISCELLANEOUS ACCOUNT	1,133	1,133
SERVICES ACCOUNT	45,347	45,347
UTILITIES ACCOUNT	194,952	194,952
LEASING	113,308	113,308
MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	355,554	355,554
MORTGAGE INSURANCE PREMIUMS	88	88
GENERAL REDUCTION	---	-63,000
SUBTOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	835,055	772,055
TOTAL, FAMILY HOUSING, NAVY	1,208,824	1,101,892
FAMILY HOUSING, AIR FORCE		
ALABAMA		
MAXWELL AFB (55 UNITS)	4,080	4,080
ARKANSAS		
LITTLE ROCK AFB (HOUSING OFFICE/MAINT FACILITY)	980	980
CALIFORNIA		
VANDENBERG AFB (166 UNITS)	21,907	21,907
FLORIDA		
PATRICK AFB (155 UNITS)	15,388	15,388
TYNDALL AFB (INFRASTRUCTURE FOR FUTURE 450 UNITS)	5,732	5,732
GEORGIA		
ROBINS AFB (118 UNITS)	7,424	7,424

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE AGREEMENT
ILLINOIS		
SCOTT AFB		
HOUSING RELOCATION, PHASE II	---	10,000
LOUISIANA		
BARKSDALE AFB (118 UNITS)	8,578	8,578
MASSACHUSETTS		
HANSCOM AFB (48 UNITS)	5,135	5,135
MONTANA		
MALMSTROM AFB (HOUSING OFFICE)	581	581
TEXAS		
DYESS AFB (MAINTENANCE FACILITY)	281	281
LACKLAND AFB (111 UNITS)	8,770	8,770
VIRGINIA		
LANGLEY AFB (HOUSING OFFICE)	452	452
WASHINGTON		
FAIRCHILD AFB (1 UNIT)	184	184
WYOMING		
F E WARREN AFB (104 UNITS)	10,572	10,572
ITALY		
COMISO AB (PURCHASE 460 LEASED UNITS)	20,200	---
VARIOUS LOCATIONS		
RESCISSION, FISCAL YEAR 1992	---	-6,400
RESCISSION, FISCAL YEAR 1993	---	-48,702
CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENTS	53,070	75,070
PLANNING	9,901	11,901
SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION	173,235	131,933
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE		
FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT	43,543	43,543
MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT	44,282	44,282
MISCELLANEOUS ACCOUNT	4,639	4,639
SERVICES ACCOUNT	28,183	28,183
UTILITIES ACCOUNT	211,036	211,036
LEASING	118,266	118,266
MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	403,942	403,942
MORTGAGE INSURANCE PREMIUMS	21	21
GENERAL REDUCTION	---	-63,000
SUBTOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	853,912	790,912
TOTAL, FAMILY HOUSING, AIR FORCE	1,027,147	922,845
FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE-WIDE		
CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENTS	159	159
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE		
FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT	1,977	1,977
MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT	220	220
MISCELLANEOUS ACCOUNT	26	26
SERVICES ACCOUNT	416	416
UTILITIES ACCOUNT	898	898

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE AGREEMENT
LEASING	22,882	22,882
MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	918	918
GENERAL REDUCTION	---	-1,000
SUBTOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	27,337	26,337
TOTAL, FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE AGENCIES	27,496	26,496
HOMEOWNERS ASSISTANCE FUND		
OPERATING EXPENSES	151,400	151,400
BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACCOUNT, PART I		
BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACCOUNT, PART I	27,870	12,830
BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACCOUNT, PART II		
BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACCOUNT, PART II	1,800,500	1,526,310
BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACCOUNT, PART III		
BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACCOUNT, PART III	1,200,000	1,144,000
TOTAL, BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACCOUNTS	3,028,370	2,683,140

CONFERENCE TOTAL—WITH COMPARISONS

The total new budget (obligational) authority for the fiscal year 1994 recommended by the Committee of Conference, with comparisons to the fiscal year 1993 amount, the 1994 budget estimates, and the House and Senate bills for 1994 follow:

New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1993	$8,396,345,000
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1994	10,794,341,000
House bill, fiscal year 1994	10,273,731,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1994	9,753,477,000
Conference agreement, fiscal year 1994	10,065,114,000
Conference agreement compared with:	
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1993	+1,668,769,000
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1994	−729,227,000
House bill, fiscal year 1994	−208,617,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1994	+311,637,000

W.G. (BILL) HEFNER,
THOMAS M. FOGLIETTA,
CARRIE P. MEEK,
NORMAN D. DICKS,
JULIAN C. DIXON,
VIC FAZIO,
STENY H. HOYER,
RONALD D. COLEMAN,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
BARBARA F. VUCANOVICH,
SONNY CALLAHAN,
HELEN DELICH BENTLEY,
DAVID L. HOBSON,
JOSEPH MCDADE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JIM SASSER,
DANIEL K. INOUYE,
HARRY REID,
HERB KOHL,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
SLADE GORTON,
TED STEVENS,
MITCH MCCONNELL,
MARK O. HATFIELD,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MCNULTY (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today after 2 p.m., on account of personal business.

Mr. ACKERMAN (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of official business.

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. GOODLATTE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. BENTLEY, for 60 minutes, on November 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19.

Mr. LIVINGSTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DORNAN, for 60 minutes, today and on November 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. OBERSTAR) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. MINK, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 60 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. DREIER) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LEACH, for 60 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. DORNAN) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. TUCKER, for 60 minutes, on October 13.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GOODLATTE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ZELIFF in two instances.
Mr. DUNCAN.
Mr. KING.
Mr. GILMAN.
Mr. HUNTER.
Ms. SNOWE.
Mr. GEKAS.
Mr. FAWELL.
Mr. SUNDQUIST.
Mr. MOORHEAD.
Mr. OXLEY.
Mr. SKEEN.
Mr. REGULA.
Mr. RAMSTAD.
Mr. CRANE.
Mr. EVERETT in two instances.
Mrs. BENTLEY in three instances.
Mr. CASTLE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. OBERSTAR) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SAWYER.
Mr. CLAY.
Mr. MARTINEZ.
Mr. NADLER.
Mr. HOYER.
Mr. DELLUMS.
Mr. MILLER of California.
Mr. COLEMAN.
Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER in two instances.
Mr. HOAGLAND.
Mr. CONDIT.
Mr. KILDEE.
Mr. BREWSTER.
Mr. BEILENSON.
Mr. KREIDLER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DORNAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SERRANO.
Mr. TRAFICANT.
Ms. ESHOO.
Mr. LAZIO.
Mr. KLEIN.
Mr. THOMAS of California.
Mr. PALLONE.
Mr. BLACKWELL.
Mr. BROWN of California.
Mrs. BENTLEY.
Mr. LIPINSKI.
Ms. LONG.
Ms. KAPTUR.
Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois.
Mr. BARCIA of Michigan.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROSE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2685. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to extend the Federal Physicians Comparability Allowance Act of 1978, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1508. An act to amend the definition of a rural community for eligibility for economic recovery funds, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY, OCTOBER 12, 1993

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 161, of the 103d Congress, the House stands adjourned until 12 noon, Tuesday, October 12, 1993.

Thereupon (at 8 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 161, the House adjourned until Tuesday, October 12, 1993, at 12 noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1997. A letter from the Resolution Trust Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's statements of financial position for the 6-month period ending June 30, 1993; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1998. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting notification that the Department's report on "Federal Government's Energy Management and Conservation Program," will be delayed; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1999. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of the Secretary's determination and justification to exercise the authority granted him under section 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, authorizing funds for a voluntary contribution to the United Nations Transition Authority in Cambodia, pursuant to 22

U.S.C. 2261; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2000. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed license for the export of defense equipment sold commercially to Egypt (Transmittal No. OTC-37-93), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2001. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting his certification that the amounts appropriated for the Board for International Broadcasting for grants to Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, Inc., are less than the amount necessary to maintain the budgeted level of operation because of exchange rate losses in the third quarter of fiscal year 1993, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2877(a)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

20020. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "Federal Workforce Restructuring Act of 1993"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HEFNER: Committee of Conference. Conference report on H.R. 2446. A bill making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-278). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI: Committee on Ways and Means. House Joint Resolution 228. Resolution to approve the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment with respect to the products of Romania (Rept. 103-279). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI: Committee on Ways and Means. House Concurrent Resolution 113. Resolution relating to the Asia Pacific economic cooperation organization (Rept. 103-280 Pt. 1). 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. GONZALEZ (for himself and Mr. NEAL of North Carolina):

H.R. 3235. A bill to amend subchapter II of chapter 53 of title 31, United States Code, to improve enforcement of antimoney laundering laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BEILENSON:

H.R. 3236. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to authorize a State to include in highway construction contracts a guaranty or warranty clause for materials and workmanship; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. BONILLA (for himself, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. POMBO, and Ms. DUNN):

H.R. 3237. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the expense treatment under section 179 of such Code for the first 3 years a business is in existence and to allow an income tax credit for one-half of an individual's self-employment taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BREWSTER (for himself, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. CAMP):

H.R. 3238. A bill to clarify the tax treatment of certain environmental cleanup costs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. BYRNE:

H.R. 3239. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny any deduction for certain oil cleanup costs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVANS:

H.R. 3240. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to eliminate the terms for appointment for members of the Board of Veterans' Appeals and to ensure pay equity between those members and administrative law judges; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MCCRERY:

H.R. 3241. A bill to assure that advertisements by States for participation in their lotteries are subject to regulation by the Federal Trade Commission; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 3242. A bill to prohibit for a 5-year period the award of contracts for the procurement of milk products for schools and military bases to companies convicted of violating any of the antitrust laws in connection with a contract with the Department of Defense or with any school or other institution eligible for payments under the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 or the National School Lunch Act; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor and Armed Services.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. LANCASTER, and Mr. VALENTINE):

H.R. 3243. A bill to suspend temporarily the duties on sumatriptan succinate (bulk and dosage forms); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

H.R. 3244. A bill relating to the discount factors applicable to medical malpractice companies under section 846 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3245. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the tax on firearms; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SAWYER (for himself, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, and Mr. PETRI):

H.R. 3246. A bill to provide that the provisions of chapters 83 and 84 of title 5, United States Code, relating to reemployed annuitants shall not apply with respect to postal retirees who are reemployed, on a temporary basis, to serve as rural letter carriers or rural postmasters; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. SCHROEDER (for herself and Miss COLLINS of Michigan):

H.R. 3247. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to carry out certain obligations of the United States under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights by prohibiting the practice of female circumcision, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. LEACH, and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 3248. A bill to provide for fair trade in financial services; jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa:

H.R. 3249. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants for the development of rural telemedicine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself, Mr. HALL of Texas, and Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina):

H.R. 3250. A bill to repeal the retroactive application of the income, estate, and gift tax rates made by the budget reconciliation act and reduce administrative expenses for agencies by $3 billion for each of the fiscal years 1994, 1995, and 1996; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Government Operations.

By Mr. TORKILDSEN (for himself, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. CANADY, Mr. COPPERSMITH, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. KLUG, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. GOSS, Mr. LEVY, and Mrs. THURMAN):

H.R. 3251. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to extend the provisions which currently suspend payment of old-age, survivors, and disability insurance benefits to individuals imprisoned upon conviction of a felony so as to apply to all individuals imprisoned throughout at least 1 month upon conviction of any criminal offense, and to amend title XVI of such act to suspend a payment of supplemental security income benefits to such individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VENTO:

H.R. 3252. A bill to provide for the conservation, management, or study of certain rivers, parks, trails, and historic sites, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. LONG:

H.R. 3253. A bill to rename Huntington Lake, IN, the "J. Edward Roush Lake"; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. ROTH:

H.J. Res. 275. Joint resolution to require the withdrawal of American forces from Somalia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STUDDS:

H. Con. Res. 161. Concurrent resolution providing for an adjournment of the House from Thursday, October 7, 1993, or Friday, October 8, 1993, to Tuesday, October 12, 1993, and adjournment or recess of the Senate from Thursday, October 7, 1993, to Wednesday, October 13, 1993; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LAROCCO, and Mr. SANDERS):

H. Con. Res. 162. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should report to Congress pursuant to section 4(a)(1) of the War Powers Resolution as it applies to the use of United States Armed Forces in Somalia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CAMP:

H. Con. Res. 163. Concurrent resolution concerning the release of the American hostages in Somalia and United States Armed Forces withdrawal; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WALKER:

H. Res. 272. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to create the Committee on the Investigation of Corrupt Practices; to the Committee on Rules.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 28: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
H.R. 50: Mr. RUSH, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. YATES.
H.R. 322: Mrs. MORELLA and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 393: Mr. HUGHES.
H.R. 429: Mr. MCCRERY.
H.R. 466: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mrs. CLAYTON.
H.R. 546: Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 654: Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. STUMP, Mr. WOLF, Mr. FILNER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. MCDADE.
H.R. 760: Mr. FIELDS of Texas.
H.R. 830: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRAMS, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM.
H.R. 886: Mr. KINGSTON and Mr. GEKAS.
H.R. 944: Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 957: Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. PELOSI, and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1048: Mr. COPPERSMITH, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Mr. HOAGLAND.
H.R. 1172: Mr. FARR.
H.R. 1276: Mr. MACHTLEY.
H.R. 1302: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 1322: Mr. WYNN, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HORN, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. BONILLA, and Mr. LEVY.
H.R. 1362: Mr. BARLOW and Mr. WYNN.
H.R. 1399: Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 1423: Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. GINGRICH, Ms. SHEPHERD, and Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 1457: Mr. STRICKLAND and Mr. WASHINGTON.
H.R. 1470: Mr. RIDGE and Mr. SANTORUM.
H.R. 1493: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 1552: Mr. GEJDENSON and Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 1627: Mr. ARCHER.
H.R. 1786: Mr. WYNN.
H.R. 1886: Mr. TORKILDSEN.
H.R. 1933: Mr. SANDERS.
H.R. 2152: Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 2171: Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, and Mr. SUNDQUIST.
H.R. 2173: Mr. MANTON
H.R. 2211: Mr. DOOLITTLE and Mr. LEWIS of California.
H.R. 2292: Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 2319: Mr. DEAL, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. WYNN.
H.R. 2394: Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 2395: Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 2476: Mr. KOPETSKI.
H.R. 2484: Mr. WYNN.
H.R. 2547: Mr. SISISKY.
H.R. 2623: Mr. CALLAHAN, Ms. FURSE, and Mr. LAUGHLIN.
H.R. 2663: Mr. QUILLEN.
H.R. 2721: Ms. FURSE and Mr. WYNN.
H.R. 2788: Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO.
H.R. 2834: Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. FURSE, and Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida.
H.R. 2835: Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. FURSE, and Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida.
H.R. 2847: Mr. PORTER.
H.R. 2873: Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. HOBSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. LAUGHLIN.
H.R. 2896: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. ZELIFF, and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 2959: Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. GOSS, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. HANCOCK, and Mr. GALLO.
H.R. 2971: Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. BISHOP, and Mr. WYNN.
H.R. 3039: Mr. COBLE.
H.R. 3041: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 3078: Ms. LONG.
H.R. 3080: Mr. PORTER.
H.R. 3087: Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. KING, Mr. TANNER, and Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 3102: Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. WISE, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. PETRI, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. COPPERSMITH.
H.R. 3125: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 3132: Mr. FORD of Tennessee and Mr. MILLER of California.
H.R. 3136: Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 3182: Mr. BONIOR.
H.R. 3208: Mr. BONIOR.
H.R. 3212: Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. GOSS, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. KIM, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, and Mr. HASTERT.
H.R. 3213: Mr. HANSEN and Mr. PICKETT.
H.R. 3222: Mr. SABO.
H.J. Res. 1: Mr. BECERRA and Mr. STUDDS.
H.J. Res. 113: Mr. TEJEDA.
H.J. Res. 131: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. VALENTINE, and Mr. BROWDER.
H.J. Res. 178: Mr. STARK, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. REED, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. HYDE, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, and Mr. GLICKMAN.
H.J. Res. 188: Mr. COPPERSMITH, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. MINGE, and Ms. WATERS.
H.J. Res. 194: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H.J. Res. 216: Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. PARKER, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EWING, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. TANNER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. STUMP, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. CHAPMAN, and Mr. KILDEE.
H.J. Res. 218: Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. SHAW, Mr. WYNN, Mr. REED, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. MCNULTY, and Mr. LEVIN.
H.J. Res. 234: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. DIXON, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FARR, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. NADLER.
H. Con. Res. 3: Mr. SKEEN, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, and Mr. MACHTLEY.
H. Con. Res. 14: Mr. INSLEE, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin, Mr. KLINK, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. REGULA, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. HERGER, Mr. DIXON, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MINGE, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. KYL, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. SPRATT, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. CANADY, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. LOWEY, and Mr. STRICKLAND.
H. Con. Res. 56: Mr. WYNN.
H. Con. Res. 84: Mr. MARTINEZ and Ms. NORTON.
H. Con. Res. 135: Mr. PICKETT, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. ACKERMAN.
H. Con. Res. 147: Mr. SHAYS.
H. Res. 38: Mr. TORRES and Mr. FILNER.
H. Res. 148: Mr. STRICKLAND.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 44: Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma.
H.R. 2872: Mr. PORTER.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS

Under clause 3, rule XXVII the following discharge petitions were filed:

Petition 6, October 7, 1993, by Mr. SENSENBRENNER on H.R. 1025 has been signed by the following Members: F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., John Edward Porter, Marjorie Margolies-Mezvinsky, Henry J. Hyde, and Porter J. Goss.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 1 by Mr. SOLOMON on H.R. 493: Bill Emerson, Craig Thomas, F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., Dave Camp, Dick Swett, and Bob Franks.

Petition 3 by Mr. MCCOLLUM on House Joint Resolution 38: Jon Kyl, Dave Camp, and Dick Swett.

Petition 4 by Mr. HOEKSTRA on House Joint Resolution 9: Craig Thomas, Stephen Horn, Mel Hancock, John J. Duncan, Jr., Tom Lewis, F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., Peter Blute, Dave Camp, Richard H. Baker, Dan Miller, Rod Grams, Ernest J. Istook, Jr., Barbara F. Vucanovich, and Gary A. Franks.

Petition 5 by Mr. STEARNS on House Joint Resolution 156: Mel Hancock, Jack Quinn, Peter Blute, and Rod Grams.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2739

By Ms. DANNER:

—Page 12, before line 8, insert the following:

SEC. 203. PROCESSING FEES.

Section 313(f) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. App. 1354(f)) is amended—

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

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

"(3) FOREIGN REPAIR STATION CERTIFICATION AND INSPECTION FEES.—The Administrator shall establish and collect fees for certification and inspection of repair stations outside of the United States equivalent to the costs of providing the certification and inspection services.".

Redesignate subsequent sections of title II of the bill accordingly.