SENATE—*Tuesday, October 19, 1993*

(Legislative day of Wednesday, October 13, 1993)

The Senate met at 9:40 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Honorable GEORGE J. MITCHELL, a Senator from the State of Maine.

(Mr. FEINGOLD assumed the chair.)

PRAYER

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

Let us pray:

Commit thy works unto the Lord, and thy thoughts shall be established.—Proverbs 16:3.

Gracious God, our Heavenly Father, we pray for our leadership. As time moves relentlessly and the end of the session nears, pressure increases and issues abound. We thank Thee for leadership which is fair and patient and resourceful. We pray for special grace and wisdom for leadership which has to juggle so many balls in the air at the same time. Grant our leaders daily refreshing and encourage the staffs who work hard to lift burdens. Help us all, Lord, to appreciate our leadership, to be grateful and supportive.

In the name of Jesus who said, "come unto me all ye who labor and are heavy laden and I will give you rest." Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore [Mr. BYRD].

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, October 19, 1993.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, section 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable RUSSELL D. FEINGOLD, a Senator from the State of Wisconsin, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
President pro tempore.

Mr. FEINGOLD thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994—CONFERENCE REPORT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to the conference report accompanying H.R. 2446. The report will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (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; having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses this report, signed by all of the conferees.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of October 7, 1993.)

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I am pleased to bring before the Senate the conference report on the military construction appropriations bill for fiscal year 1994.

Mr. President, the conference report is within the 602(b) budget allocation for both budget authority and outlays. I am pleased to report that the conference agreement is also below the President's budget request by $729 million.

Mr. President, there were more than 350 differences between the House and Senate approved versions of the appropriations bill and report. Those differences totaled $1.1 billion.

The conferees were able to work out an agreement to bring the bill back below the President's budget estimates. The conferees had to make some very difficult decisions. Most members have had to take cuts in their own States. The conferees were unable to fund every project and stay within the 602(b) budget allocation.

Mr. President, the conference report represents a fair compromise. It is under budget and I recommend its approval.

Mr. President, I want to thank my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Washington, for his support and contributions to the subcommittee this year.

Mr. President, I yield to the ranking minority member for any comments he might have.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, my sincere thanks to my colleague from Tennessee. Senator SASSER has provided a thoughtful and quality product. I greatly appreciate his work in this area.

I am, however, very concerned that while we have accomplished a lot, much is still unfunded. We must help the services get their needs met with regard to family housing. While this bill helps in many ways, in this area we can do more. I hope that during this year we will find ways to help our men and women in the services to improve living conditions for their families.

We were obviously not able to meet all the requests of our colleagues. I daresay we have made every effort. I have received calls from Senators concerned about unfunded projects. This bill shows the beginning of the pain we are all going to feel with a declining defense budget.

In my estimation, next year there is more pain to come. This bill is going to get more and more difficult as defense spending continues to be reduced. Fewer and fewer colleagues are going to see the benefits of this bill that we saw in the past.

Mr. President, before I close, again I want to express my thanks to the chairman, Senator SASSER, to the other members of the subcommittee, the subcommittee staff, Mike Walker, Jim Morhard on this side, for their efforts on the bill.

It is a good, fair bill, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

There is one project for which I think my friend from Tennessee is already aware. It is a rehabilitation of facilities at the White Sands Missile Test Range.

Mr. SASSER. Yes, I am aware of this project. It was taken out in conference because of it being a rehab project and therefore should have been in the operations and maintenance account.

Mr. GORTON. I understand that it was not a prejudicial reduction. Is that correct?

Mr. SASSER. Yes, that is correct. I would expect the department to fund this project out of the correct account in fiscal year 1994.

Mr. GORTON. The conferees failed to provide any funding to upgrade the hydrant refueling system at Pease AFB in New Hampshire. Could the chairman of the subcommittee tell us why this project was not funded?

Mr. SASSER. As the Senator from New Hampshire is aware the Senate

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

bill provided $5.6 million for eight fueling points. The House bill provided $5.1 million, the budget request, for four fueling points. As with all items in conference, the conferees requested updated project data and justification for this project. The official form 1391, provided the conference, indicated that $5.6 million would provide only four points. In addition the conference was advised that given the size of the air guard unit, no more than four points were required. Since we were unable to validate a requirement for eight points, the Senate conferees receded on an eight-point project. The House conferees, within their rights, receded on the four-point project.

Mr. SMITH. It is my understanding that the National Guard Bureau is reviewing the potential need for an eight-point project. If such a requirement is validated by the Bureau how would you recommend we proceed?

Mr. SASSER. Unfortunately, the conference has concluded and the official justification material provided to conference supported only four points. If the Department were to subsequently validate an eight-point project based upon new requirements, such a project could be included in the fiscal year 1995 budget request.

Mr. SMITH. Would there be any circumstance under which such a project could be funded in fiscal year 1994?

Mr. SASSER. As the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire is aware the Department of Defense may submit a request for reprogramming at any time during the fiscal year. It would be my view that if such a request were made, based upon a new validated requirement, that such a request would receive careful consideration by the subcommittee.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the distinguished chairman for his clarification and for his willingness to consider a reprogramming for this project should an eight-point project be validated as a requirement of the Air National Guard during fiscal year 1994.

Mr. GORTON. May I inquire of the chairman if a reprogramming would also be considered for a four-point project if the Department determined that to be the appropriate sized project?

Mr. SASSER. Yes, I assure the distinguished ranking member that we would also carefully consider a reprogramming for a four-point system if the eight-point system cannot be validated.

Mr. GORTON. I thank the Senator for the clarification.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, the Senate is now considering the conference report accompanying H.R. 2446, the fiscal year 1994 military construction appropriations bill.

The bill provides a total of $10.1 billion in budget authority and $2.4 billion in new outlays for the military construction and family housing programs of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1994.

When outlays from prior-year budget authority and other completed actions are taken into account, the bill totals $10.1 billion in budget authority and $8.8 billion in outlays for fiscal year 1994.

Mr. President, I understand that the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee has filed a revised subcommittee allocation to accommodate this bill. With that reallocation, I will support the conference report.

Mr. President, the final bill has come back approximately $271 million above the Senate-passed bill. The reallocation will accommodate this change. Even with this reallocation, however, the final bill is fully $729.2 million in budget authority below the President's budget request, and $208.6 million in budget authority below the House-passed bill.

To achieve these reductions and to delete the Senate-passed 4 percent across-the-board reduction was a very difficult task for the distinguished subcommittee chairman and ranking Republican member.

I want to convey my thanks to them for the support they gave to several priority New Mexico projects. I understand that one item that was dropped—$2.5 million for the White Sands Missile Range—was done so without prejudice because it more properly should be funded through the Department of Defense O&M accounts.

I thank the conferees for the attention they gave to some critical infrastructure work at Kirtland Air Force Base. I deeply regret that the full Senate package was not kept intact, but I appreciate the committee's acknowledgement that such projects should retain priority.

I shall continue to work on these very important projects.

I urge the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, and Members of the Senate, under a previous agreement entered, the Senate is now considering the conference report on the military construction appropriations bill and will shortly vote on that measure.

Following that vote, the Senate will resume consideration of the Department of Defense appropriations bill. It is my hope that we can complete action on that bill this evening. Of course, I have had the same hope and expressed it several previous evenings. But I hope that this hope is more realistic than the previous hopes.

We have a large number of appropriations conference reports to take up and complete prior to the expiration of the pending continuing resolution, which will expire at midnight on Thursday. So my hope is that we can complete action on receipt of those several measures from the House as soon as is possible, and I hope we can get the cooperation of all Senators in that regard.

In any event, that time deadline means that it is likely that the Senate will be in session into the evening tonight, tomorrow, and Thursday, with the strong likelihood of a session, including votes, on Friday until the middle of that day. That, of course, depends upon events between now and then.

For the information of Senators with respect to the schedule, it is my intention to proceed to crime legislation and education legislation in the near future. We have a number of other important measures to take up before the sine die adjournment, which I still hope we can reach by Thanksgiving.

Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry. Am I correct in my understanding that the time for the two leaders has been reserved for their use later in the day and that the Journal of the proceedings has been approved to date?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is correct.

Mr. MITCHELL. In that event, the hour of 9:45 having been reached, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAMPBELL). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 94, nays 5, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 316 Leg.]

YEAS—94

Akaka	Ford	Metzenbaum
Baucus	Glenn	Mikulski
Bennett	Gorton	Mitchell
Biden	Graham	Moseley-Braun
Bingaman	Gramm	Moynihan
Bond	Grassley	Murkowski
Boren	Harkin	Murray
Boxer	Hatch	Nickles
Bradley	Hatfield	Nunn
Breaux	Heflin	Packwood
Bryan	Helms	Pell
Burns	Hollings	Pressler
Byrd	Hutchison	Pryor
Campbell	Inouye	Reid
Chafee	Jeffords	Riegle
Coats	Johnston	Robb
Cochran	Kassebaum	Rockefeller
Cohen	Kempthorne	Roth
Conrad	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Coverdell	Kerrey	Sasser
Craig	Kerry	Shelby
D'Amato	Kohl	Simon
Danforth	Lautenberg	Simpson
Daschle	Leahy	Specter
DeConcini	Levin	Stevens
Dodd	Lieberman	Thurmond
Dole	Lott	Wallop
Domenici	Lugar	Warner
Dorgan	Mack	Wellstone
Durenberger	Mathews	Wofford
Exon	McCain	
Feinstein	McConnell	

NAYS—5

Brown Feingold Smith
Faircloth Gregg

NOT VOTING—1

Bumpers

So the conference report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is laid on the table, the Senate concurs en bloc to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate, and the motion to reconsider both actions en bloc is laid on the table.

The Senate concurred en bloc to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 1, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 13, 17, 20, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 38, 40, and 42, as follows:

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "$906,676,000".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "$681,373,000".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein 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, 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 102-519, $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".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert "$1,021,567,000".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein 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".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "$44,405,000".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "$302,719,000".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "$74,486,000".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "$228,885,000".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "$370,208,000".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "$772,055,000".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "$1,142,263,000".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert ": *Provided further*, 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".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "$187,035,000".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "$790,912,000".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "$977,947,000".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "$1,144,000,000".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein 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.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein 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.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT OF 1994

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of H.R. 3116, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3116) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

Nickles/Cochran amendment No. 1051 (to committee amendment on page 154, lines 7–22), to prohibit the use of funds to support United States Armed Forces personnel in certain international operations.

AMENDMENT NO. 1051

Mr. INOUYE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] is recognized.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES] to the last committee amendment.

Mr. INOUYE. I thank the Chair.

Mr. NICKLES addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma, [Mr. NICKLES] is recognized.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry: What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma to the committee amendment.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator Hutchison be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I inquire of the chairman of the Appropriations subcommittee what his desires are. We have been on the amendment for some time.

Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. I might inquire of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee chairman what his desires are. Our amendment, I understand, is pending. We have the yeas and nays ordered. I am ready to vote on it.

I have a few more comments, and I would like to respond to a couple of comments that President Clinton had in a letter. But it is my hope that we can vote pretty quickly.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I am well aware that the Senator from Oklahoma desires to have a vote immediately, and I can understand that. We have had a lengthy debate on this matter. But I should advise the Senate that at this moment discussions are being held involving the administration and involving the leadership of the Senate, studying the Nickles amendment and hoping to come forth with some adequate response thereto.

So I hope we can continue our debate on the Nickles amendment. But I feel confident that by midafternoon we should be voting on this matter.

Mr. NICKLES. I thank my friend and colleague.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator GREGG, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator's amendment be deleted from the accepted list of amendments.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, by inadvertence on my part, an amendment that was proposed to be submitted by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. KERREY] was left off the accepted list. I ask unanimous consent that inadvertence be corrected and that Mr. KERREY be permitted to submit an amendment.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, in looking at a letter that the President sent to the leader, or to Bob DOLE, dated October 18, he has one paragraph that refers to my amendment. It says:

The amendment regarding command and control of U.S. forces, which already has been introduced, would insert Congress into the detailed execution of military contingency planning in an unprecedented manner. The amendment would make it unreasonably difficult for me or any President to operate militarily with other nations when it is in our interest to do so—and as we have done effectively for half a century through NATO.

Mr. President, let me just touch on that comment. That is totally incorrect. Neither the amendment that I have now pending, which explicitly excludes NATO, nor the amendment that I originally introduced would affect NATO. NATO has always been under U.S. command.

My amendment only says we will not have U.S. combat troops under U.N. operational command with a foreign commander. So it does not have any impact whatsoever on NATO. So the President just clearly is wrong, by this statement—either by my first amendment, original amendment, or by the amendment that I have now submitted. NATO is totally, completely excluded from this amendment.

We also state, "Any prospective standing United Nations international armed force." So, again, NATO is just not included.

It could lead to an all-or-nothing approach that causes the United States to shoulder the entire burden of a conflict even when a multinational approach would be most effective from the standpoint of military planning, burden sharing, and other American national interests.

Again, that is not correct. This amendment would not prevent a Persian Gulf-type operation. That was a multinational effort. That was a multinational effort that had burden sharing in it; significant costs were picked up by other countries, et cetera. This amendment would not prohibit that.

So, again, I just say that this part of the President's letter which deals with my amendment is just totally inaccurate and misleading. And I regret that. I do not mind debating this amendment, but I would like people to know what the facts are, and the facts are we limit U.N. operations for combat troops. We do not limit U.N. operations for peacekeeping operations, for logistics operations, for medical, or for humanitarian needs.

This amendment would limit U.N. operations for combat with a foreign commander. That is not to take away from the Presidential prerogatives, but it is more or less to reassert and make sure those prerogatives are not assigned to the U.N. Secretary General or to the United Nations. If we are talking about combat, that is another matter and that is a matter, I think, constitutionally should remain with the Commander in Chief and should not be delegated.

So this amendment in no way undermines NATO, in no way undermines Korea, in no way undermines any type of bilateral arrangement we would want to make with any country. It only limits U.N. operations that are with combat forces, if those forces are under a foreign commander.

I will underline, most people paid attention to the "foreign commander"—do you have something against foreign commanders? A lot of foreign commanders might be involved with NATO.

We might have foreign commanders involved with Korea. If we are talking about combat troops, what I do not want to have is us involved in a commitment to the United Nations and then find out that we have assigned combat responsibilities to U.N. command.

I will tell you, the U.N. command is understaffed and overworked and overburdened, I guess, with roles. They have over 80,000 peacekeeping troops that are involved right now in 14 different operations around the world and they have 80—80—managers. A little over half of those are military. That is the reason why the phones are not answered on weekends. That is why the phones are not answered at night.

The President said, "We want to beef up the peacekeeping operations at NATO," and that certainly needs to be done. But I am afraid he also wants to do it so we can expand the role of these peacekeeping operations to go well beyond humanitarian, well beyond peacekeeping, well beyond border monitoring, but into peacemaking, peace enforcing.

That is a significant expansion of the U.N. role. That is a significant expansion of U.N. peacekeeping role. I hope my colleagues are aware of that. I hope my colleagues are aware that this administration is now talking about a new Assistant Secretary of Defense for Peacekeeping. I hope that my colleagues are aware that in the United Nations, our Ambassador to the United Nations has been talking about an expanding role for peacekeeping forces, as well as the President. That is my concern.

I hope my colleagues also are aware that the U.N. Secretary General has been calling for an international standing army. I have serious reservations.

This amendment would prohibit that, and my colleagues need to know that. This amendment would prohibit the United States from committing U.S. combat troops to an international standing army that is without a mission, that is looking for a fire to put out, looking for a problem to solve. So they need to be aware. That is really what the amendment is all about: Trying to make sure that we do not turn control of U.S. combat troops over to the United Nations. I see that as a serious mistake.

It would allow humanitarian efforts. It would allow peacekeeping efforts, in the traditional sense, as we have done. So I wanted, Mr. President, just to clarify that the President's remarks concerning at least this Senator's amendment were totally inaccurate.

Mr. WARNER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, will the distinguished proponent of the amendment, the Senator from Oklahoma, entertain a question?

Mr. NICKLES. I will be happy to.

Mr. WARNER. Yesterday, I had the opportunity to have a brief colloquy with the Senator about his amendment. I continue to have concerns about it.

I want to clarify the concerns the Senator apparently has with respect to U.S. forces serving under a foreign commander. This most often occurs down in the lower ranks, perhaps at the company or battalion level. Throughout the military history of our country, we have had our troops respond to a battalion commander, perhaps a regimental commander, indeed in some cases a company commander of other nations, particularly Great Britain, France, and allies with whom and in whom we have had many operations through these years.

It is my understanding that this amendment would prohibit that.

Mr. NICKLES. The Senator is incorrect. Let me read this section. It says:

> . . . when such forces are under United Nations operational or tactical control.

That is paramount. In other words, if the United States wanted to do something—you mentioned under French or under Italian—those are usually under NATO alliance. NATO would be exempt. We could also have our troops involved bilaterally or multilaterally. But the prohibition is really on U.N. operations.

Mr. President, I mentioned this yesterday but I did not emphasize it, and maybe I will try to do so today. U.N. operations has a peacekeeping force right now that is comprised of 80,000 troops. They have 80—only 80—people who are involved in management. About 45 of those I believe are military. So we have had U.N. peacekeeping forces commanders in Yugoslavia try to get some answers from the United Nations and they said, "Hey, they don't answer the telephone after 5 o'clock; the phone isn't answered on weekends." And, of course, they have contingencies and have problems.

So my amendment is directed not so much at foreign commanders, but as under U.N. operations with foreign command, that basically just excludes us and it says, "Wait a minute, if you are talking about U.S. combat forces, then we are going to prohibit that unless we have congressional approval."

You could have, to answer the Senator's question very specifically, a situation if we are doing something bilaterally with Britain or with the Italians or something like that, that would be permissible. What would not be permissible would be to have it under U.N. operational control with foreign command.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished colleague for that clarification. It would be my hope that we are not trying to cast general criticism toward all foreign commanders. Our military colleges and universities, as you know, are privileged to have many young officers from allied and friendly countries who come and train with us and go on to become very responsible, highly professional military persons in their countries.

Mr. NICKLES. I appreciate the Senator raising that because that is certainly my intention.

Mr. WARNER. Let me speak to another area that concerns me and that is when the Senator precisely wants to prohibit our Armed Forces serving in a situation of combat. My concern is that peacekeeping missions can overnight turn into a combat situation. So if we were to follow the letter of the law, so to speak, in your amendment, you permit, without enactment of a statute approving it, use of U.S. forces under U.N. control for "medical, logistics, communications, humanitarian"—humanitarian is a very broad one —"training, temporary observer or liaison activities." But those missions, within a matter of a few minutes, can be transformed from "peacekeeping," by which we mean there is a permissive, noncombat-type environment to "peacemaking," by which we mean there is an unstable, hostile environment or even outright combat.

Peacemaking includes trying to employ the use of arms either to defend yourself or to stop the other person from interfering with the peacekeeping operations. How does the Senator deal with that? You are permitting our people to go into a situation under U.N. control because it is "merely" peacekeeping, but within 15 minutes it can be transformed into peacemaking.

Mr. NICKLES. To respond to my friend and colleague's question, we have examined all the U.N. peacekeeping roles going all the way back to 1945 to present time. I think there are 27. I might also mention that it took 40 years to do the first 13, and in the last 8 years we have done 14. So we have seen a very expanding role for the United Nations. None of those 27 activities would have been prohibited under my amendment. But if we want to take a scenario and say, what happens if you have a peacekeeping operation, that is, Somalia, for example——

Mr. WARNER. Let us take Bosnia. That thing is so volatile.

Mr. NICKLES. Somalia is almost a better example because you do have a peacekeeping operation, you have logistics. All the logistics people in Somalia are under U.N. command. I do not know if the Senator is aware of that. But the Rangers have always been under U.S. command.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I am fully aware of the current command and control arrangements in Somalia.

Mr. NICKLES. When the tragedy resulted and when the President decided he wanted to send in a few thousand more troops, he reasserted that all the combat troops were going to be under

U.S. command. So he is basically doing in Somalia what I am saying that we should do in this amendment.

My point is, if you have a humanitarian measure that goes awry, or if you have a humanitarian or peacekeeping effort that becomes entangled in some type of an armed conflict where our troops are—well, one, they always have a right of engagement. We never take that away from our commanders. If they are fired upon, their troops are in danger, they are able to protect their troops to the best of their ability and they are able to do that, period. But if you have the peacekeeping force, and they are fired upon, and they are engaged in hostilities and going to be engaged in combat, the President has two options. The President can assert United States control over those combat operations, as President Clinton did in Somalia, and this amendment would not be triggered whatsoever. If he is going to stay engaged in combat and keep it under U.N. command and under foreign command, then he would have to seek authorization from Congress. And he would have 30 days to do so.

Mr. WARNER. I might also suggest to the Senator, we are using rather loosely the words "command," and so forth. Technically, as I understand Somalia, the United States logistics forces are under operational control of the U.N. commander, but they still are under the command of our Commander in Chief. I would like to bring that to the Senator's attention and perhaps later on, if this amendment moves, we can work out the clarification of that language, which I think would be helpful.

So often when you put troops in for a humanitarian mission, such as logistic troops, what we would call peacekeeping troops, you should collocate with them, or at a short distance, troops that can come in and rescue them, troops trained specifically for combat operations, if the operation suddenly changes from one of peacekeeping to peacemaking. Peacemaking is really a euphemism for having a fight.

The Senator feels that his amendment allows our troops to serve for peacekeeping under a foreign commander, but if in 10 minutes it goes to peacemaking, what happens under the Senator's amendment such that our troops are not under a foreign commander? Just how does that work?

Mr. NICKLES. Again, let me remind my colleague, there are two steps. One, it would have to be under a U.N. operation and a foreign commander. So the Senator will have a better understanding, the United Nations is a bureaucracy, and I fault the United Nations greatly for the disaster that occurred in Somalia, as well as I fault our commanders and our civilian commanders. I think we made a serious mistake, and we can go through that in chronological order if we want.

But we had a superior force there, and it was under U.S. command, not under U.N. command. It was under U.S. command. That force was reduced significantly. And when we were down to about 4,000 troops, and after the earlier disaster, the United Nations changed the role or the mission: Capture General Aideed. Then we were at 4,000 troops, and we became engaged in combat.

I might mention our forces were still under U.S. command, and so there is that responsibility. That is important because not only is it the chain of command but it is also chain of responsibility. And we did have a disaster. We lost 18 lives. We have 60 some wounded. It was a real disaster. It should not have happened.

I might mention, too, that our military was giving advice not to have this be our mission in Somalia. And so we allowed the political hierarchy, I guess, to consent to changing the mission and make it a U.N. mission that expanded it from humanitarian to combat. I think that was a serious mistake.

Then we did not provide the commander in the field with the necessary military equipment he requested. That is a second major error and one that, unfortunately, resulted in lost lives. So I think that was a mistake.

But to answer specifically the Senator's question, what happens when you have a humanitarian effort that is good intentioned, well-intentioned, supported by all, that goes sour and turns into a combat situation, the President has a couple of options.

He could, one, put the combat operations under his direct control, eliminate the problem. He would not have to do that unless the original operation was under U.N. operation and under foreign command. In other words, if you have U.S. combat troops all of a sudden under U.N. command where really the United States is not directly engaged in direct operation or control, the President can assert that. We have U.S. lives that are at stake, at risk, so the President as Commander in Chief would assert that control. He could do that. Or he would also have the option to come to Congress and say I believe it is in our best interests to leave it under foreign command, and here is his request. He requests a waiver. My guess is he would probably get it, our not wanting to pull the rug out from under our troops.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I wish to come back to a practical situation. This amendment says, "None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this act or any other act may be used to support U.S. Armed Forces personnel, other than those engaged in medical, logistics, communications, humanitarian, training, temporary observer, or liaison activities," and so forth.

Let us say we have one of these missions just quoted, call it humanitarian, and we have perhaps 500 troops somewhere abroad building roads, working in hospitals, and doing all of those things to try to help some tragic situation, and they are under the control, let us say, of a Pakistani colonel.

Mr. NICKLES. Under the United Nations.

Mr. WARNER. Under the United Nations. All of a sudden they are faced with a combat situation to protect themselves. The Senator says the President takes control, comes back to the Congress. I say to the Senator, that Pakistani colonel has to make a combat decision in 15 minutes.

Mr. NICKLES. He could do it.

Mr. WARNER. He does not have time for the President of the United States to bring an American colonel in.

Mr. NICKLES. He would not have to.

Mr. WARNER. What does this Pakistani colonel do?

Mr. NICKLES. If the Senator will yield——

Mr. WARNER. Yes.

Mr. NICKLES. I mentioned earlier we still have rules of engagement, and we would have the right to protect and defend our troops, anytime they are fired upon under any circumstance, which is what we have everywhere in the world under any circumstance.

Mr. WARNER. Then what do we do if we fly in some combat troops to rescue them? Do we put an American colonel in charge and tell the Pakistani you are relieved of command?

Mr. NICKLES. Under rules of engagement, U.S. forces have the right, the responsibility, I believe, and the authority to protect those troops. If they are engaged—if they find themselves under fire, in combat for whatever reason, they have the ability to protect themselves, to extricate themselves from the situation.

Mr. WARNER. I understand that, but the U.S. troops on the humanitarian mission are doctors and engineers.

Mr. NICKLES. Whatever was necessary to protect those troops, they could do it if they found themselves——

Mr. WARNER. Who is "they," Mr. President? Who is "they"? You have the troops—let us say there are 500 troops. They are engineers, they are doctors, they are nurses, they are sanitation experts, and they are just working on trying to improve some area of the world. It is a U.N. mission, it is under a Pakistani colonel, and there are other nations involved in this, with their doctors and their sanitation experts. There are four or five nations in there. And suddenly this thing evolves into a conflict. Now, exactly what transpires?

Mr. NICKLES. To answer the Senator's question, those would be U.S. forces that are under fire.

Mr. WARNER. Right.

Mr. NICKLES. You have the operational situation where we always have the rules of engagement. If you are

fired upon or if your lives are threatened, if our nurses or doctors or whatever would be so, we would have the authority—the military commander would have the authority without getting the President's permission to rescue or defend or protect those lives.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, which military command is the Senator talking about?

Mr. NICKLES. Our military command. It might be the joint command. But if you have United States forces anywhere—the Senator knows this—whether you are in Korea or any place else, if you have those forces fired upon or engaged in some type of hostilities, they have the right to protect themselves, and whatever forces are in that area would be able to assist to extricate themselves from whatever hostilities they would be engaged in.

Now, if you are talking about a longer run situation; that is, Somalia, we had troops—let us take the Somalia case. We had Rangers there. Now, those Rangers were under U.S. control. They were fired upon. Our commander had the right to use whatever military force he deemed necessary to rescue our forces. Unfortunately, he did not have the tools necessary because that was declined from the political side, and that was a mistake. But he does have the right of engagement to protect, or extricate our personnel from that engagement. And that would be the case not just in Somalia but any case anywhere in the world. That is standard U.S. military policy.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I would like to understand. I would like to return to this hypothetical. We have 500 doctors, sanitation experts, logisticians, road building experts, and a firefight begins to imperil their lives.

The U.N. Pakistani colonel in the humanitarian operation can be in operational control not only of the United States forces, but some Pakistani forces, Italian forces, and maybe some French forces. That Pakistani colonel has to have a plan and he has to execute it. Suddenly if the United States comes in and says "We are going to take care of our own," do we leave the other U.N. forces? What do we say to the Pakistani colonel, "Pack up and go home"?

It is not as simple as I think the Senator is trying to put forth in this amendment. This is a very complicated amendment. It gives this Senator and I think some others great concern as to their command and control.

I share the Senator's view that the United Nations today is moving too quickly, is not adequately staffed, not adequately equipped, and does not have the experience. There are certain parts of the Senator's amendment which I support and support strongly.

But when we begin to say that under this amendment we can do certain things with the U.N. but not others, I am saying those humanitarian efforts within 5 minutes can be converted into combat, or "peacemaking" efforts to use that term, and we may not have in position, if this amendment were the law, the command and control arrangements nor the backup for a proper rescue.

Mr. NICKLES. If the Senator will yield, I think he made the case for my amendment. That is why, frankly, we are trying to avoid situations where we put U.S. combat forces into situations in likelihood of combat where you have the U.N. control with a foreign commander. That is what I am trying to avoid because that is a scenario you are going to find happen if you have this administration wanting to do a very expansive peacekeeping operation where they have talked repeatedly about expanding the peacekeeping role throughout the world. That is going to happen.

So what I am saying is if you do get into combat situations, the President should assert himself as Commander in Chief so you do not have these blank lines of deployment. Who is responsible? We have never in our 48-year history in the United Nations committed U.S. combat forces to the United Nations unless we have had a U.S. control. I do not think we should now.

This administration is talking about doing it. I do not think we should do that. I am not talking about the change. It is the administration that has been talking about the change. We have never committed U.S. troops to an international peacekeeping armed force. This administration has been talking about it. The U.N. Secretary General is talking about it. This amendment would prohibit that.

So it does have some significance. But, basically, the changes that are proposed by the administration by advancing their role in peacekeeping and now talking about not just peacekeeping but, for the Senator's edification, they are also talking about peacemaking and peace enforcing.

So they are talking about a much expanded role in peacekeeping. I am trying to say, no, we have not been doing that. The United States has never done that. We never assigned U.S. combat forces who are away under U.N. operations and foreign command where we do not have direct control. This administration would like to do that—or at least it has been reported as recently as the President's speech of the 27th—this expanded role. That is what I am trying to protect.

So I think the Senator is very close to my position although it has not quite——

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I will summarize my concern with the amendment. I agree with the Senator that the United Nations is not ready. I agree with the Senator that we should not be giving the President any encouragement to do these various things about the U.N. army, and so forth, like that. We are in complete agreement on that.

Where we disagree is the Senator from Oklahoma explicitly gives the President authority to send our troops under a foreign U.N. command and control situation for humanitarian and other purposes. I am saying the history has shown us that those types of missions within a matter of minutes can become combat situations. And the amendment, in my judgment, does not adequately protect our troops put in that situation under a foreign commander. It might change in 15 minutes.

Mr. NICKLES. If the Senator will yield.

I appreciate what the Senator is saying, that my amendment is not strong enough and does not go far enough, and maybe he is right. But my point is that we are already doing that. Maybe we should restrict that. I am not going that far.

I told several of my colleagues who have acted like this amendment is draconian or far-reaching, I said, "Wait a minute. It is not." It would not change what is happening in Somalia because they have United States combat troops, rangers, under United States operations and control. The Senator is aware of that. Frankly, it will not change what we are trying to do in Haiti. This amendment would not change that.

My amendment will not, unless they are talking about moving in combat forces. But that was not historically our intention. I am pleased the President has backed off from doing that because I think that was a mistake. But of the 14 peacekeeping operations that are now ongoing throughout the world, most of which are humanitarian or border monitoring, we are engaged in some of those to a very minor degree. For the most part, my amendment would not prohibit those. But we are already engaged in it. That is my point. We are already engaged in monitoring those. We are still engaged in some humanitarian efforts in Somalia. My amendment would not change that.

So it does not at all encompass, as some people would say or some people might like, but we are already doing it. The Senator yesterday raised the question: Well, constitutionally we cannot even assign troops to the U.N. peacekeeping efforts.

We are already doing it. My amendment does not really touch that. But it does have a restriction that says when you are talking about combat, when you are talking about assigning combat, that is when we should say "Wait." If you are going to put combat troops under the United Nations which is understaffed, which is undermanned but say, OK, that does not decide what it wants to do. But when you have a U.N. representative in Somalia that

goes public with the press conference, now our role and our mission is to go get General Aideed, that one press conference could have easily cost a lot of American lives. He probably could have been captured if that was our role without telling the world about it. Once you tell the world about it, the cost of getting him went up significantly. And, unfortunately, we had a loss of life in the process.

So we have restricted this to in every way trying not to be intrusive on the President's rights but more to assert the President's rights so if he is talking about inserting combat troops, he should be the Commander in Chief, not the Secretary General.

I thank my friend from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. I thank my friend from Oklahoma.

Our difference is that peacekeeping can turn into peacemaking within a matter of minutes.

I find in this amendment, which is an attempt to codify the various things we are doing now, there is too big of a loophole to satisfy this Senator. That is the reason that at the present time I have concerns about the amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I appreciate my colleague's comments and statements.

I might mention, we do not codify anything. We are not legislating. What we do say is none of the funds shall be used to support U.S. combat troops under U.N. command with a foreign commander. But we are not codifying and saying it is OK; Mr. President, if you want to send them in for humanitarian training, we do not authorize anything. That is the Armed Services Committee. That is not the Appropriations Committee. The Appropriations Committee in this case, we do have the power of the purse. Some people say constitutionally, yes, we have the power of the purse. This says no combat troops. But we are not saying that it is not OK for the President to send out *x* number of troops for humanitarian, *x* number of troops for medical, *x* number of troops for observer status. A lot of those are observers. We do not touch that.

We just say we are not going to fund the combat troops; we do not want to have U.S. combat troops under U.N. control, foreign commander, where really the United States is out of the loop. We think the Commander in Chief should be in the loop. He should take control. He should not assign control. He should delegate control when you are talking about combat forces, risking the lives of men and women for our country. But we are not authorizing. We are not saying it is OK. We are not saying *x* number, you can double or triple humanitarian or training or observer troops. We just do not restrict that. So I want to make sure that that point is clear.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I thank the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. SPECTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I am concerned about a series of amendments which are being considered by the Senate which have very grave overtones for limiting Executive power in the context of this defense appropriations bill.

An amendment by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Senator BYRD] was adopted last week; an earlier amendment by Senator BYRD was adopted in September which placed certain limitations on the President with regard to Somalia. Last week we rejected an amendment by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Senator MCCAIN] which would have called for an immediate pullout of troops in Somalia.

Today, we are considering an amendment by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma which would limit Executive authority on U.S. forces under foreign command.

There has also been comment about an amendment, soon to be offered, on the Haiti situation. In the context of this floor debate, without having hearings and without extensive deliberation, there is a real danger that the Senate, the Congress, may be going too far in limiting executive authority. In the passions of the moment we are influenced by the very serious situation which we confronted in Somalia which has resulted in the loss of American lives.

I believe that this problem is materially compounded by the President who, regrettably, has been indecisive, vacillating, and has changed positions. This makes the Presidency a weak institution at the moment—or at least this President a weak President at the moment—and it invites action by the Congress to try to correct the situation by legislating foreign policy.

It is fortuitous that we have on the floor at this moment the defense appropriations bill, which provides a vehicle for limiting funding and provides the strongest constitutional approach that Congress has to try to influence foreign policy by cutting off funds.

The War Powers Act which sought to address these issues by requiring withdrawal of troops within 60 days after the hostilities, unless authorized by the Congress, or unless the date was established was very carefully crafted after very extensive consideration by the Congress. The amendments which we have been considering in the course of the last several weeks and are considering again today, and perhaps later today or tomorrow on Haiti, go considerably further in limiting executive authority.

I do believe that the strongest constitutional case can be made in the present context on limiting expenditures, because Congress traditionally has the power of the purse. But that is by no means clear. The President has authority as Commander in Chief. Therefore, a constitutional question is presented under these two express provisions of the Constitution, and it is questionable as to how it would come out if submitted as a court case.

I think it is regrettable that there has never been a decision under the War Powers Act by the Supreme Court of the United States, because if it had been established that Congress had the authority to influence foreign policy by compelling the withdrawal of troops after 60 days when they were in hostilities, we might not be facing this situation.

Back in 1983 or 1984, an effort was made, when Senator Howard Baker was the majority leader, to have a constitutional test. Extensive legal papers were prepared, and there was an effort to get a joint submission by the executive branch and at least the Senate—the House had not been consulted to the best of my knowledge—before getting a Presidential agreement for such a submission. But the President declined to do so. To this moment, it is unclear whether the War Powers Act is constitutional. So we are confronted today with these efforts through the appropriations process to limit Presidential authority.

I supported Senator BYRD's amendment last week, which called for a limiting of mission and the withdrawal of forces on or before March 31, which had the agreement of the President. I supported that amendment in contrast to Senator MCCAIN's amendment, which called for immediate withdrawal from Somalia, because, as I said on the Senate floor last Thursday night, I thought the institution of the Presidency was an issue. I think the institution of the Presidency is an issue on the amendment which is now pending by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma.

It is my view on this amendment, after listening to the debate, that there is not an appropriate balance of responsibility between the President and the Congress and that the amendment is too broad in its terms when it makes a provision which says none of the funds appropriated "under this act or any other act." This will probably have the effect of making the amendment permanent law, thus precluding the use of U.S. forces under U.N. control.

There has been significant precedent, Mr. President, for having U.S. troops under control other than U.S. control. In World War I, Marshal Foch of France controlled United States forces. In the Battle of the Bulge, General Montgomery controlled U.S. forces.

There are and have been U.S. forces under control—although not in combat roles at the present time—of the United Nations in a variety of situations.

Our forces may not be in combat roles, but they are present in the western Sahara, Cambodia, Kuwait, the former Yugoslavia, and in the Sinai.

I believe there are strong U.S. policy reasons to encourage participation by other nations in the onerous duties of being the peacekeeper around the world. The issue is open for debate as to what is the appropriate role of the United States. And it is very difficult, if not impossible, for the United States to be the policemen of the world.

So it is in our interest to try to get other nations to do more. In the 40-plus years that NATO has been in existence, we have constantly argued that our partners in the North Atlantic Alliance ought to do more. I have attended many of those North Atlantic assembly meetings where the debate is hot and heavy, with the U.S. position being advanced that other nations are doing an insufficient amount of burdensharing. When we have problems in the Persian Gulf, Bosnia, or Somalia, it is in the United States interest that other nations make a much greater contribution than they have been willing to make up until the present time.

If the United States is to take the position that our forces will not serve under any command other than a U.S. command, how can we ask other nations to make material contributions to those forces and ask them at the same time for their personnel to be under the command of another nation? It is obviously an impossibility to have many nations, with many command forces, operating on the same battlefield without having anarchy.

So it is a fundamental matter. If we are looking for help from other nations—which we are, and certainly should be, because the United States has had to bear too much of the burden—it is, I think, unrealistic to put a limitation on the ability of the President to supply forces that may serve under a foreign command.

Mr. NICKLES. Will the Senator yield for a second?

Mr. SPECTER. Yes.

Mr. NICKLES. Was the Senator aware of the fact that NATO is totally excluded from this amendment, as is Korea? And so the point that the Senator was making really would not apply in that case. What we are really directing this at is under U.N. operations.

I want to make sure the Senator is aware that NATO would not be infringed in any way by this amendment.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I am pleased to respond to my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma that I am aware of that. I have studied his amendment in detail. There are certain aspects of it I would like to discuss with my distinguished colleague.

I make the reference to NATO as an analogy, that there can be a NATO command, where U.S. forces would be under command other than that of the United States.

It is a matter of principle that we ask other nations to submit their forces to the command of the United States. Where the United Nations may be called upon to respond in Somalia or Bosnia, or who knows what problem may arise in the future, if we seek support from other countries, it is inappropriate for us to say we will not have our forces under a command other than United States command if we expect other countries to be under such a command.

My references to NATO are by way of analogy where we have submitted ourselves to an organization, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, where our forces may be subject to another command. That is a very strong argument for not precluding the possibility of having our forces under another command.

I realize, in making this argument, that it is not a popular argument with the American people, especially at a time when American soldiers have been killed in Somalia. I am also aware that there have been significant mistakes made by the United Nations, although there have also been serious mistakes made by the United States. There is a strong ring of patriotism to say that we ought not to be exposing American lives unless they are under U.S. command. I am not saying that we should be exposing them to commands of the United Nations, but I am saying that on October 19, 1993, the Senate of the United States ought not to pass a law which will permanently bind U.S. Presidents from making a decision in the future on this subject.

I believe it is a decision which has to be made with the utmost of care before American soldiers are placed under command of anyone other than U.S. commanders, but we have to expect the President of the United States to discharge those responsibilities with care and with responsibility.

There is a great temptation for the Senate today to try to exercise greater authority on foreign policy because of the serious errors which have been made and because there has been so much indecision and vacillation on Bosnia, Somalia, and Haiti. The temptation is great today for the Senate to exercise authorities beyond the range of constitutional prudence or beyond the range of public policy prudence. That is why I think we ought to pause and look very carefully at precisely what we are undertaking to do.

This has not been an easy question because we have had wars which have not been declared by Congress. Korea was a war never declared by Congress. Vietnam was a war never declared by Congress, although that legal issue is muddied perhaps by the Gulf of Tonkin resolution.

As we have wrestled with the provisions of the War Powers Act —and the constitutionality of that has not yet been decided—we are searching for other avenues to try to exert appropriate congressional responsibility. I do believe that it is very, very important for Congress to exercise its authority when the United States is confronted with a situation which is in the category of a war. The Congress has the sole authority under the Constitution to declare war.

Back in late 1990, when the United Nations resolution had made the demand on Iraq to vacate Kuwait by January 15, I took the floor and pressed hard to have a decision made by the United States as to whether we would use force. That was a very difficult time in U.S. foreign policy because President Bush said that he had the authority to proceed by complying with the United Nations resolution and supplying U.S. forces. Both the House and the Senate were not scheduled to debate the issue at the time.

It was only on January 3, 1991, when the distinguished Senator from Iowa, Senator HARKIN, raised the issue on the swearing-in day that the Senate was compelled to take up the issue on January 10 as to whether the Congress would authorize the use of force. We then had a very, very extensive debate in the Senate on that subject which was followed by a 52-to-47 vote authorizing the use of force.

I thought that the Senate's action in 1991 was appropriate and was necessary because that situation was really tantamount to a declaration of war and was within the constitutional prerogative.

It seems to me that when Senator BYRD offered his resolution on Somalia, after we had had a long, drawn-out period, it was appropriate for there to be a cutoff date unless there was a specific authorization by the Congress to permit the retention of the U.S. troops engaging in hostility. That is an issue that has to be considered by the Congress.

In my reading of the amendment which has been offered by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, I note that there are exceptions to having U.S. troops under U.N. command. If it is a part of any prospective standing U.N. international armed force, that is an exception. Of course, there is no standing U.N. international armed force at the present time.

A question which I have for my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma relates to that provision. I think it would be useful for this RECORD to have a fuller description of what the author of the amendment has in mind on that specific subject.

(Mr. MATHEWS assumed the chair.)

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I would like to respond.

One, we prohibit the U.S. combat forces from participating in a U.N.

international combat force. We prohibit that. That is a very important part of this amendment.

So it is not an exemption. There are exceptions to the rule. It is a prohibition. If you looked at the amendment structured that way, it says, no funds shall be used or committed to U.S. combat forces, and then we also state, any part of any prospective standing U.N. international armed force.

The U.N. Secretary General would like to create an international armed force peacekeeping body, whatever you want to call it, looking for fires to put out without a mission specific, without a country specific, without a region specific. I think that is a mistake. So that is the reason that section is in there.

There are also people in this administration who have been advocating that position as well, I believe, including candidate Bill Clinton. I think he has moderated or come out against that position recently.

The reason that was in there, I tell my colleague—and excuse the long answer, if this is longer than he wants—under Presidential Decision Directive 13, there we are contemplating a standing force. I think they now have decided that it would not be prudent. But I think it would be very imprudent, and that is the reason it is in there.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have a followup question with respect to the standing U.N. international armed force, whether that could be authorized by the Congress.

In posing that question I know that the answer is obvious. It could be authorized by the Congress because we have full plenary authority in that situation.

In subsection (a)(1) of the amendment, the prohibition against having U.S. forces under U.N. operation and tactical control has an exception if certain conditions are met, including a joint resolution authorizing the placing of such forces under foreign command.

Simply for the purpose of clarification, I ask my colleague from Oklahoma if there could not be a United Nations international armed force if there were a similar joint resolution by the Congress authorizing such a force?

Mr. NICKLES. I do not think that would be the case. My guess is that the President and Congress could create a U.S. participation in an international armed force but it would have to be done by treaty, or at least that is my guess, and certainly would require Senate authorization, if not confirmation, of that treaty. That is a very significant proposal.

One of the concerns I have about the first section, the exceptions, I might relate to my colleagues, is to allow the President some latitude, if he did find himself involved in a situation where a peacekeeping force became engaged in combat, so the President could respond, ask for a waiver, and declare an emergency, and then Congress could authorize that within 30 days. That is why the exceptions are there.

The essence of the second part of that is we do not want U.S. combat forces assigned to an international peacekeeping—not peacekeeping—to an international U.N.-controlled armed force; very simple, very direct.

It is one sentence, but it is a powerful sentence. If you read it in context, it says none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this act to fund any part of any prospective standing U.N. international armed force.

Mr. SPECTER. Well, Mr. President, if the Nickles amendment were adopted, became the law of the land, it would be an act of Congress prohibiting U.S. participation in "any prospective standing U.N. international armed force," and that could be altered by another act of Congress. So we could change that with this prohibition, and we could authorize by an act of Congress such participation.

My colleague from Oklahoma raises an interesting legal issue as to whether that would require a treaty and a two-thirds approval by the Senate or simply a majority vote of the Congress, which we need not debate at any length today.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield to me for a further response on that point?

Mr. SPECTER. I would, on the condition that I do not lose my right to the floor, since I think I am only permitted to yield for a question.

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

Mr. COCHRAN. I thank the Senator for yielding.

As I understand the use of the language in the amendment, I think the intent, certainly on the part of this Senator as an original cosponsor of the amendment, is to make sure that the executive understands that he does not have the authority to use any funds appropriated in this bill only to fund any U.S. participation in a standing army controlled and directed by the United Nations. That is purely and simply the limitation, as I understand it.

Therefore, any legislative act that might be enacted subsequent to this date would certainly control authority over the troops if we decided to grant that authority, to legislate the authority for the President, and it would be an amendment to the bill that we are now considering.

So this is a bill that will fund the Department of Defense's program for the next fiscal year that begins October 1, 1993. That is the limitation that is contained in this amendment, and it can be changed by changing the law.

But what we do not want to see happen is to drift into a situation where we have this new assistant Secretary of Defense for Democracy and Peacekeeping who makes pronouncements and suggestions like those we have heard from other administration officials, including the President, that they are considering new initiatives in this entire area, and a new attitude toward multilateralism.

It makes me wonder, without the benefit of hearings where we listen to what the specific plans or proposals are, that if we do not act in the way this amendment suggests we act, the administration could go forward with some of these suggestions, and we could wake up one morning and see the United States as a part of some international standing army or rapid reaction force without having been consulted, without having had the opportunity to debate this matter in the Senate. That is what this amendment seeks to address.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I would ask my distinguished colleague from Mississippi what is the import of the language "or any other act"? Because in the amendment the language reads "None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this act or any other act may be used to support U.S. Armed Forces personnel" under U.N. control or "any prospective standing U.N. international armed force."

Mr. COCHRAN. I suppose it means under any other appropriations bills, such as the foreign aid bill, which we passed the other day, or any other bills that the Congress has already acted upon this year that applied to the fiscal year beginning October 1.

My friend may want to respond to that question.

Mr. NICKLES. The Senator is exactly correct.

Also, for my colleague's information, originally the peacekeeping forces were funded out of the foreign operations bill and this amendment was drafted with that intent. Now that has been moved over to the defense bill.

But we would not want someone to say, "Wait a minute. In a previous year's appropriations bill, we had another $100 million left over and therefore we will allocate a certain percentage of that unused or unallocated amount for the establishment of an international peacekeeping force."

Mr. SPECTER. Well, if the provision of "or any other act" is intended to apply to all appropriations bills for the next fiscal year, the fiscal year we are in currently, then that might be more clearly specified, because it raises a concern on my part where it says "any other act" that it could apply in the future.

We have had, in the history of the Congress, considerable legislation on appropriations bills where we have attached provisions to appropriations

bills which have stood long beyond the context of the next fiscal year. This provision might well be read to preclude the President from spending money in 1996, 1997 or thereafter under the prohibitions of this act.

Mr. NICKLES. To further clarify, that is not the authors' intention. I think this appropriations bill says "None of the funds appropriated." I do not think you could place a restriction in an appropriations bill for fiscal year 1994 that would have a restriction that would be applied beyond the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. SPECTER. Well, as I say, I do believe that there have been provisions of appropriations bills which have extended beyond the life of the fiscal year for which they were intended and that a reading of the phrase, "any other act," could be very broad indeed.

I have one other subject which I think is worthy of a moment's discussion with the distinguished authors of the bill. The subject relates to having U.S. forces under U.N. command, and whether it would not be sufficient to rely upon the War Powers Act as opposed to new legislation such as this amendment.

The amendment does have a provision that the President can act if national security interests justify a waiver of the prohibitions, the President declares that an emergency exists, informs Congress of his action and the reasons therefor, and within 30 days of such declarations there is a joint resolution authorizing such actions.

Now, if the 30-day provision had been 60 days, it would have the substantive effect of being very close to the War Powers Act, where, after U.S. forces are introduced into hostilities, they are to be withdrawn unless authorized by Congress to remain there before the expiration of 60 days.

My question to my colleague from Oklahoma is whether the thrust of his amendment with the 60-day provision would be satisfied by the War Powers Act if the War Powers Act was constitutional and was complied with by the President.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, to respond to my colleague, this is just the opposite of the War Powers Act. The War Powers Act was really kind of trying to restrict the President from getting engaged in international conflicts without congressional authorization or approval within 60 days.

What we are trying to do is reassert and not infringe—I think the Senator said impede—the President's ability. We do not want to impede the President's ability to do anything with U.S. forces. We just want to make sure he keeps control over U.S. forces.

And so we are not trying to take away his authority. We are trying to make sure he does not delegate his authority to the United Nations.

Mr. SPECTER. But, my colleague——

Mr. NICKLES. But it is not even analogous to the war powers.

Mr. SPECTER. But is not an indispensable part of his authority his right to delegate that authority?

Mr. NICKLES. I seriously question whether—that is the essential part of this amendment. Many of us do not believe that. The President should not delegate combat forces to the United Nations. That is what this amendment is about. We do not think he should delegate them to the United Nations. We do not think he should delegate U.S. combat forces to an international standing army under U.N. control.

We do not impede the President's ability. We just say do not give it away, do not give away your constitutional responsibility. Do not give away our constitutional responsibilities.

So the war powers and this are totally different issues. We are trying to make sure the President does not delegate that authority to the United Nations, which has very lofty, utopian-type goals, but they are engaged in 14 conflicts around the world. They have 80,000 troops, and they only have 80 supervisors.

Mr. SPECTER. Is the Senator not authorizing or permitting, under his amendment, the President to delegate this authority to place U.S. forces under——

Mr. NICKLES. No.

Mr. SPECTER. Wait a minute. You have not heard the question yet. I will repeat it so you have the full question.

Mr. NICKLES. Thank you.

Mr. SPECTER. Is the Senator not permitting, under his amendment, the President to delegate to the U.N. authority over U.S. troops for 30 days?

Mr. NICKLES. If the Senator will yield, we do not. We restrict the President from getting our troops involved in combat. We do not restrict the President as far as humanitarian and other provisions.

That does not mean we authorize them. We restrict combat, but we allow the President to delegate authority for humanitarian, for monitoring and so forth. But the only place where we are putting the restriction is where we are talking about U.S. combat troops. That does not mean we OK the rest. That was similar to the discussion I had with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER]. We are not taking a position on that. We just have not restricted it. The only restriction we have is when we are talking about U.S. combat troops.

In regards to the 30 days the Senator mentioned, yes, we put that 30 days in thinking the President might find himself in a scenario where peacekeeping became peacemaking or it became involved in a conflict. So we did allow for an emergency or allow the President to make a waiver, to come to Congress and make that case.

Or the President has another option. The President would not have to do anything under this amendment if he just asserted U.S. control over those troops. That has always been the case. That was the case in the Persian Gulf. That has been the case in other operations—U.N. operations where they have become engaged in conflict. The President has asserted control over those troops.

The same thing in Somalia, I might tell my friend. The troops that engaged in combat are under U.S. control. So we are trying to keep the President's control, make sure it is not delegated to the United Nations.

Mr. SPECTER. I take that lengthy answer to be a "yes"?

Mr. NICKLES. Nothing in this language authorizes the President to do anything. Nothing impedes his power to do anything if he keeps control over the troops in that chain of command.

Mr. SPECTER. Let us review the bidding. The amendment prohibits the use of funds for U.S. Armed Forces under U.N. control, but there is an exception. That exception is, under (b), "The prohibition described in subsection (a)(1) shall not apply" under three conditions.

First, the President determines the "national security interests justify waiver of such prohibition; (2), the President declares that an emergency exists and immediately informs the Congress of his actions and reasons therefor; and (3), within 30 days of such declaration there is enacted a joint resolution authorizing such actions. * * *"

So, under Senator NICKLES' language, is it not true that until 30 days pass and there is no such congressional declaration, that the President does have authority to use funds under this act to put U.S. troops under U.N. control, once he determines there is a national security interest and there is an emergency, and he informs the Congress?

Mr. NICKLES. To respond to my colleague, during that 30-day period we do nothing to authorize it. We just do not prohibit that money for that 30 days. It gives the President that latitude——

Mr. SPECTER. I understand.

Mr. NICKLES. To make that decision, but it is not an assertive affirmation about what he has done. What it just says is, no, we do not prohibit the use of funds during that 30 days.

Mr. SPECTER. I understand. That is why I characterized it as a "yes" answer, because it eliminates the prohibition and leaves the President where he stands at the present time.

Mr. NICKLES. That is correct.

Mr. SPECTER. If the term were 60 days, so that the President would not have a prohibition from acting within 60 days, would the consequence of the Senator's amendment not be the same as the War Powers Act? I understand there is a difference between authorization and prohibition, but would not the impact of the Senator's amendment,

were the term 60 days, be the same as under the War Powers Act where Presidential authority terminates after 60 days, unless there is an affirmative action by the Congress authorizing the use of forces? Just as the President's emergency powers, under my colleague's amendment, terminate at 30 days unless there was an affirmative conclusion by the Congress that he could continue that course?

Mr. NICKLES. I would say no. The Senator again is trying to make the analogy between this resolution and war powers. The two do not fit. War powers says the President can take whatever action he wants but he has to get congressional approval within 60 days if our U.S. forces are engaged in hostilities.

Under this amendment, all the President has to do is assert control over those troops and this amendment does not apply, period. So there is no restriction whatsoever of the President in making commitments of U.S. forces under this amendment if he asserts control over those troops.

Again, with respect to war powers, most people have perceived war powers as a restriction of Presidential authority or involvement in other countries. This amendment does not touch that. The President can do whatever he wants, as long as he asserts and maintains control over those forces. This amendment tries to make sure that he does not delegate that authority to the United Nations.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Oklahoma for those answers and I compliment him for his diligence in pursuing this amendment and his work generally. We have worked together in the Senate since election day in 1980, and it has always been a pleasure.

But with all respect, I disagree with my distinguished colleague on his conclusions on this issue. I think it is a very important point because I think the continuing denial by the executive branch, by the President, to recognize the constitutionality of the War Powers Act has brought us to the situation where we are today, where there is an active effort made by the Congress, the Senate today, to limit executive authority through the power of the purse and the power to control spending. It is entirely fortuitous that this defense appropriations bill is on the floor at this particular time. The sequence of events in Bosnia and Somalia and now in Haiti, which the President has responded to with vacillation and indecision, gives rise to action by the Congress to try to fill the vacuum. It is, I submit, action which goes beyond the constitutional limits and beyond the appropriate limits of public policy.

If we did not have this bill on the floor we would have many speeches in morning business or in the middle of quorum calls, but we would not be using real bullets like we are today. When we introduce amendments which cut off spending, that is a very powerful weapon, the only real weapon which the Congress has in asserting authority in fields like Somalia or Haiti or Bosnia.

I think that the passions of the moment and public opposition to what has happened in Somalia, when Americans have died and Haiti where Americans headed in and then were recalled while executive branch officials said we may use force even though it does not appear in any way warranted, have given rise to these very appealing amendments to limit executive authority.

I suggest that they go too far in a constitutional sense, and I suggest that they undermine the institution of the Presidency. The discussion that I have just had with my colleague, Senator NICKLES, I think is illustrative of the point. He disagrees with my conclusion, but I believe that it is conclusive, as a matter of logic, that had the Nickles amendment given the President 60 days before cutting him off from exercising his discretion to place U.S. troops under a U.N. command in a situation of hostility, that it would have had the same effect as the War Powers Act. The War Powers Act provides that when U.S. forces are in hostility that they have to be withdrawn at the expiration of 60 days unless authorized by Congress, or the period is extended.

Had the Nickles amendment contained a 60-day provision, it would have authorized the President, upon his declaration of an emergency, to put U.S. forces under U.N. command for a period of 60 days unless authorized to continue them by a joint resolution of the Congress.

It is the absence of the War Powers Act and our ability to function under the War Powers Act which has brought these additional amendments to the floor. The War Powers Act would have provided additional restraints beyond that which is in the Byrd amendment, which goes until March 31.

We face a tough situation. We will have a variety of Presidents over the course of the next many years and the history of this country. May it be many, many centuries. The Constitution has been very carefully crafted on a balance of legislative and executive authority. I think the Senate has to be very careful not to overrespond when we have the problems of Somalia, the problems of Haiti, and we have the indecisiveness and vacillation of this President, not to weaken the institution of the Presidency.

Mr. NICKLES. Will the Senator yield? I will just make one clarification. The difference in war powers, as I stated, is this whole amendment is void, so the President would not have to withdraw troops or do anything, if he asserted control over those troops. I just make that point.

I have a question for my colleague from Pennsylvania. Does the Senator support the United States making a commitment of combat troops to an international United Nations combat force?

Mr. SPECTER. Under what situation?

Mr. NICKLES. That is a good question. That is one of the things this amendment would prohibit. The U.N. Secretary General—so my colleague will know this amendment was not drafted because of mistakes that were made in Somalia. This amendment was drafted long before the Somalia disaster happened, although it contributes to the interest in the amendment. But this administration was considering and contemplating making commitments to a standing U.N. international combat force without mission specific, without country or region specific. It would be there to put out fires as the U.N. Secretary General and maybe U.N. Security Council would deem fit.

I think that is a mistake. That is one of the things this amendment would prohibit. I did not know if the Senator was interested—some of my colleagues may be interested in supporting that. I think one or two are. But I think it is a serious mistake. I did not know if the Senator was interested in supporting and committing U.S. troops to a U.N. armed force.

Mr. SPECTER. My answers are these: When it comes to the issue of a standing U.N. armed force which is in part 2 of your amendment, I do not believe that the President of the United States has the authority to commit U.S. troops to such a standing U.N. international armed force without authorization of Congress. I do not believe that issue ought to be decided by the U.S. Senate when there are five Senators on the floor, and probably some of those who are on the floor are waiting for purposes other than engaging in this debate.

That is a momentous question. It ought to be taken up after we have hearings, after we have extensive consideration, after we hear from a variety of witnesses and we have an opportunity to think about it when we are on more than one foot.

I heard about this amendment, if I may say, last week, and I have been thinking about it. I came back especially to vote on it yesterday. I did not seek a postponement, but I was pleased to see it was postponed.

I thought about it and I consulted with my son Shanin who took a year of international law at Cambridge. I called him up to get the real inside story. I want to have consultations and discussions about issues such as these with the next generation in the Specter household.

I do not want to decide it today. I do not think the President has that authority, and I do not want to see him

exercise that authority without the Congress acting. It may be it requires treaty ratification; that it is a question which requires two-thirds approval of the Senate. Maybe we can leave the House out of it entirely and just have ratification by the Senate.

When it comes to the gravamen of your amendment on the emergency use of Presidential authority over U.S. troops under U.N. command, I do not want to limit future Presidents. I might want to limit this President, but I do not want to limit the institution of the Presidency in this way.

I also do not want to decide this question on a Senate debate with a handful of Senators here. We have the War Powers Act which has not been used and I think it is scandalous that it has not been. I entered into extensive debates—I remember Senator Percy on the floor of the Senate when war powers was debated during Beirut. We went through Korea, which he agreed was a war; Vietnam was a war, and we had a problem of how we exercised congressional authority to declare war.

I am just not prepared to see a ration of amendments—even as thoughtful as the Senator from Oklahoma has been—or have this amendment decided by the Senate when only a few of us have said a few things on the Senate floor.

Mr. NICKLES. If the Senator will yield, I appreciate my colleague's comments. I happen to agree with you wholeheartedly that the President should not and I believe could not make a commitment of U.S. combat forces to an international army without concurrence or authorization or possibly treaty commitment of the United States.

I was going to ask, and I know my friend from Wyoming has been waiting patiently, but does the Senator support making a United States commitment of combat troops to an international group that might entail 25,000 combat troops going into Bosnia? There are a lot of things that are out there that I hope my colleague—I do not think his position is that far away from mine, when I listened to his responses, we do not want to make a commitment of combat troops to an international organization. That is what this amendment would prohibit.

I have not given up on getting the Senator's vote. I appreciate very much his interest and his diligence in studying the issue.

Mr. SPECTER. In response to Bosnia—and I do not know if the Senator from Wyoming is waiting patiently. I think he is waiting impatiently. I will only be another 30 seconds.

I do not think the President should commit troops to Bosnia, I say to my colleague from Oklahoma, because there is no emergency there. The situation in Bosnia has remained pretty much the same. We have had a lot of Presidential declarations on the subject, before and after his inauguration. I think that is a matter that ought to come before the Congress, just as the use of force in the gulf war came before the Congress without the President exercising authority on his own.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WALLOP addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. WALLOP. Mr. President, as I listened to the arguments of my friend from Pennsylvania, for the life of me, I do not see why they are not arguments in support of the Nickles amendment. I share with him the concern of Congress transgressing its constitutional authority.

This Senate last week acted to limit the President's authority in Somalia after having witnessed a failed policy delivered by incompetent people. It was the uniform, it was not a partisan view that it had been a failed policy, and it was not a partisan policy that it was done incompetently.

When the President of the United States said, "I was unaware that the mission had changed," people began to wonder if he was in fact the Commander in Chief. I mean, after all, who does approve mission changes but the President of the United States?

So as I was listening to the arguments of the Senator from Pennsylvania, what I see happening is that with troops under the command of a U.N. commander, we have no place to go to limit that person. That is a foreign person whose authority is not under the reach of the Congress of the United States.

What I see the Senator from Oklahoma trying to do is maintain a set of circumstances under which the political accountability of events that take place overseas regarding the lives of young Americans in combat remains within the reach of the political apparatus of America.

We, I suppose, can get Madeleine Albright to go up and moan about the incompetence of U.N. commanders in New York City, but that does not leave them within the reach of the body politic responsible for those lives and those decisions.

Far from denying the President authority, what I see the Senator from Oklahoma doing is maintaining that authority and also maintaining accountability. Once you put it in the hands of a foreign commander under the auspices of the United Nations the political accountability goes with it. And the President can say, "Well, I did not know they were going to do that," and Secretary Aspin, if he can get a full sentence out of his mouth, can deny that he thought that was going to happen.

But there still is no accountability once it is under the command of the United Nations. I see what we are doing here, those of us who support this amendment, is trying to maintain accountability, not tie the President's hands but tie the President's hands for excuses. The President can do as he wishes in committing U.N. troops.

I quite agree with the Senator from Pennsylvania on what I believe to be the unconstitutional nature of the War Powers Act. But keep in mind, Members of the Senate and colleagues, that we acted last week after demonstrated failure. We are now talking about whether this is going to deny us burdensharing offers from our allies overseas.

We have noted that our allies overseas are not particularly enthusiastic about burdensharing, and one part that I always disagreed on, with Secretary of Defense Cheney and President Bush and others, is this whole notion of collective security. If you take a look at the history of the world, collective security depends on one thing and one thing alone. That is one part of the collection having the ability and the will to go all by itself if necessary. Then you can get all kinds of people to join you. If you do not have that will and that ability to begin with, there is not going to be a collection. You cannot gather up courage by having lots of people around with no competence. You have to have one with will and one with competence, and then the collection will become complete.

We are not going to see that. So this is not a debate about burdensharing. This is a debate about keeping will and command authority and political accountability in the hands of the Congress, in the hands of the body politic of America. And so it should be.

We have had and are going to have some very curious debates. Many Members of the Senate listened to an extraordinary briefing from the Secretary of Defense and Mr. Tarnoff and General Powell on what we are going to do or not going to do or might do, if we can decide what to do, in Bosnia. And the net result of it was the majority leader and others spared the Secretary of Defense from having to go any further and said we were only talking about plans that had not yet been made, which was an obvious event to those who attended the briefing. But still, they were within the reach of the political accountability of the Senate and the Congress of the United States, where they belonged.

We are going to have a debate about Haiti. I do not believe, frankly, as I see it coming down, that we ought to, in the name of protecting ourselves from incompetent decisions that we fear are about to be made, make the United States forever more an incompetent Nation because Presidents cannot act.

It seems to me that is a very different thing than what is taking place with this amendment, which is making

certain that when and if the President does act, he gets the credit or he is accountable for whatever takes place. This is a Nation founded on politics, political judgment, freedom and democracy, and accountability is part of it. Success is owed when success is won, but blame is deserved when blame is earned. What I see the Nickles amendment doing is nothing more simple than keeping that equation framed and within the reach of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, I salute the sponsor of this amendment, and I hope very much that the Senate sees fit to adopt his amendment.

Mr. LEVIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, first I would like to make a parliamentary inquiry relative to the Nickles amendment. The inquiry is this. On line 6, the words "by this act or any other act" appear. My inquiry is whether or not the presence of the words "or any other act" by themselves constitute this as legislation on an appropriations bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the opinion of the Chair, that would constitute legislation on an appropriations bill.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I wonder if my friend from Oklahoma would answer a few questions. He has been very responsive to questions this morning. I think it is important that we have this kind of discussion and debate on a matter as important as this. I commend him for his willingness to engage in that kind of debate.

As I understand the discussion with the Senator from Pennsylvania, the Senator from Oklahoma indicated that during the 30-day period in subsection (b) on page 2, where the President determines that a national security interest justifies a waiver and that an emergency exists, during the 30-day period following that declaration, the U.S. troops may be assigned to a U.N. commander.

Is that correct? Did I hear the Senator correctly?

Mr. NICKLES. If the Senator will yield, I am not sure I caught all the question. The President would have the option at any point to assert control.

Mr. LEVIN. I understand.

Mr. NICKLES. And therefore void any prohibition whatsoever that is triggered by this amendment. If he went the waiver route—basically, he can go two ways.

Mr. LEVIN. It is the waiver route I am inquiring about.

Mr. NICKLES. One, he could assert control. The amendment does not apply. It is what Senator WALLOP was talking about, about accountability and responsibility. If he wished to keep it under U.N. command, under foreign command, he could do so. He could request the waiver, go through the emergency process, and seek a joint resolution of authorization from Congress.

Mr. LEVIN. My question to the Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. President, is during the 30-day period referred to, the Congress has the opportunity to act to authorize. During that period, may the President assign those troops to that foreign commander under U.N. authority?

Mr. NICKLES. This amendment would allow the President to continue on during that 30-day period of time. It does not authorize it, but it does not restrict the funds to prohibit him from that engagement.

Mr. LEVIN. So there is no prohibition in this amendment during that 30-day period that Congress is deliberating on the authority question, there is no prohibition for the President assigning those troops to that foreign commander under U.N. auspices?

Mr. NICKLES. I would have to answer the Senator and say if the President declared an emergency.

Mr. LEVIN. Yes. I am saying under the qualifications in the waiver provision, if he has declared the emergency and he has determined that national security interests justify a waiver and then submits a joint declaration, a joint resolution to the Congress, there is nothing in this amendment which prohibits those troops from being assigned to the foreign commander under U.N. auspices during that 30-day period?

Mr. NICKLES. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the Senator yield for one further clarification on that provision?

Mr. LEVIN. I have some other questions on that provision, but I would be happy to yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. Rather than using the word "prohibition," it would be more appropriate, in this cosponsor's opinion, if you would say there is no limitation on the use of funds appropriated in this bill for that purpose.

Mr. LEVIN. Or any other bill, according to the language of the amendment.

Mr. COCHRAN. On any appropriations bill for this fiscal year. That is the intent of the amendment. That is what the answer was to a similar question posed by the Senator from Pennsylvania just a moment ago. That is the intent, and that is why the appropriate word would be limitation on the use of funds, rather than "prohibition."

Mr. LEVIN. I appreciate that clarification. I do not think that is the intent that is executed in this language for a number of reasons, not the least of which is that the language does not say "or any other appropriations act." It says "or any other act." So this has been, by the Chair's ruling, just by those words alone, deemed legislation on an appropriations bill. I thank my friends for the clarification at least of the intent of the language.

My second question is this: If the President submits a joint resolution to the Congress, or the Congress takes up a joint resolution in any event, is there an expedited process that you have provided for to assure that there will not be a filibuster during that 30-day period.

Mr. NICKLES. We have not put that language in this amendment.

Mr. LEVIN. My next question is: If the President determines that there is a national security interest which justifies a waiver of the prohibition and declares the emergency and informs the Congress, and on the 30th day there is no joint resolution enacted, for whatever reason—perhaps it is being filibustered or perhaps it has been defeated—is there any prohibition in this language on the President again determining that the national security interest justifies a waiver and again declaring on the 30th day that an emergency exists in order to start another 30-day clock running? Is there any prohibition on that in this language?

Mr. NICKLES. I do not know that there is specific language that would prohibit that. That is certainly not the intent. If the President wished to proceed, he has 30 days to get congressional authorization, which is the intent.

He either has to withdraw the troops or put the combat troops in the U.S. control.

Mr. LEVIN. I understand the intent. These are critical questions. These can be life and death questions for men and women in combat. So we are dealing with an extremely serious matter, and I think all of us, whatever side of the question we end up with, would agree with that, whatever we do in these areas, and there are going to be merging areas, many of them.

Is it fair to say that there is nothing in this language which addresses the issue—I am not talking the intent but in the language itself—and there is nothing which would preclude the President from issuing on the 30th day another determination and another declaration to start another 30-day clock running?

Mr. NICKLES. That is more than a violation of the intent. It is my thought and belief that at the end of 30 days, the funds will be cut off.

Mr. LEVIN. Is there any language in here which implements the belief of the Senator in that regard?

Mr. NICKLES. I think the language is fairly clear. I compliment my friend from Michigan, who goes to great lengths to try to analyze things, but I believe that the language is very clear. I do not see it as being ambiguous.

Mr. LEVIN. Could the Senator read the language which justifies a waiver in declaring an emergency? I do not see any language there which implements the Senator's intent. I understand the Senator's intent.

Mr. NICKLES. I appreciate my colleague's interest, but certainly I do not read this language—and I will read it again, but there is a prohibition. If you read this it says:

None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act or any other Act may be used to support United States Armed Forces personnel—

And it says—

when such forces are: under United Nations operational or tactical control if such forces would be under the command, operational control or tactical control of foreign officers, unless prior to that date (A) the President has submitted a report * * * or (B) that the congressional committees and subcommittees have had 30 days to review * * * (C) and a joint resolution authorizing the placing of such forces under foreign command has been enacted.

We do allow the Presidential exception or the waiver under (b). It says:

The prohibition described in subsection (a)(1) shall not apply if the President determines that national security interests justify a waiver of such prohibition.

What the Senator is saying is that maybe I should clarify it and say that the President could only request one waiver. I do not think it is even implied that the President would have the authority to come back and submit an additional waiver request on the same incident of committing U.S. troops. I repeat to my colleague that if the President is troubled by this provision——

Mr. LEVIN. I am troubled by this provision. I think we have to be very clear on this. I think it is fair to say that there is no express prohibition or grant of that authority to the President, but that the intent of the Senator from Oklahoma is that there only be one waiver period. That is the way I read it.

Mr. NICKLES. The way the language would read is that the President would only have the 30 days, not renewed authority to submit additional waiver requests.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank my friend for that. I do not see that in the language, but perhaps I will continue to look for that very important question to be answered. In the meantime, I do think that the real issue here, which I will address later on this afternoon, is whether or not this language will jeopardize American forces. I think that is really the key here as to whether or not we could, by this language, inadvertently find ourselves in circumstances where our own troops are placed in jeopardy by this restriction on Presidential power.

I am not talking about section 2, which has to do with the standing army. That seems to me to be a very different issue. But here we are talking about in operational circumstances, where we have American forces in combat, whether there will be circumstances where the assignment of them under clear rules to a U.N. commander, not of American nationality, could be essential for their well-being, or whether or not the removal of that authority under emergency circumstances on a battlefield, without time for a Presidential waiver, could plunge our men into great jeopardy. I know that is not the intent of my friend from Oklahoma. I know him well enough to know his intent is not that at all. But I believe this amendment inadvertently could place our troops in great danger in combat circumstances, and I will be addressing that issue later on this afternoon.

I thank my friend from Oklahoma for answering the question.

Mr. METZENBAUM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BREAUX). The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, I know this matter is of major importance to the U.S. Senate and the Congress, and I would not interrupt the debate; but it is my understanding that there is nobody waiting on the floor to be heard at the present time.

I have spoken with the managers of the amendment, as well as the manager of the bill.

Under the circumstances, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for a period not to exceed 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. METZENBAUM. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. METZENBAUM pertaining to the introduction of S. 1566 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements of Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The chairman of the committee, the Senator from Hawaii, is recognized.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECESS UNTIL 2:30 P.M.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, on behalf of the leadership, I ask unanimous consent that the previous order governing the recess period today for the party conference luncheons be changed to reflect the period to extend to 2:30 p.m., and that the Senate stand in recess.

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

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:15 p.m., recessed until 2:30 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. WOFFORD].

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

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT OF 1994

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the pending amendment by my colleague from Oklahoma that is now before the Senate, and more broadly, to talk about the situation in which we find ourselves with reports of other amendments that may well be offered in regard to potential operations in Bosnia and Haiti and elsewhere.

It is very easy for all of us to become emotional at a time like this. Who could watch those scenes on television of one of our own young soldiers being dragged through the streets in Somalia without feeling emotion? Who could not be touched by the tragic combat deaths of our soldiers in that country? Who could not be concerned about the situation in the Balkans and about what could happen if American troops are committed as a part of an international peacekeeping force in Bosnia? What American could not be disturbed when our ship was turned around and our forces were turned back when they landed in Haiti, again to carry out the terms of an agreement that had been freely entered into between the two parties in that country?

As we look at the mistakes that have been made, it is easy to whip ourselves up into a frenzy and to seek to lash out in every direction with purported solutions without thinking about the long-term consequences.

I think we are about to do that. I cannot think of a period of time since I have served in the Senate, including the 6 years that I chaired the Senate Committee on Intelligence, in which I have been more alarmed by the possibility that the tides of emotions of the moment might lead us to make very unwise decisions for the future of this country as I am now.

I appeal to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle: Stop. Pause. Reflect. Think. Think not only about today and tomorrow and next week, but think about next year, and think about the kinds of foreign policy we need in the next century as well, in this new world environment in which we are entering.

I do not believe this debate is really about what we should do in Haiti. I, for

one, am not anxious to send American forces into Haiti. I would be very reluctant to see that happen. You would have to convince me, after a long and hard argument, that it should be done. But I do not think that is what we are talking about here. The same is true of sending American forces into Bosnia. I would be extremely reluctant to do that now, not until conditions are much clearer than they currently are.

I do not think this is a debate about Somalia. As I said on the floor last week, I had the opportunity, with Senator PELL and Senator LEVIN, to be among the very first Members of Congress to be in Somalia after our troops landed—4 days, I believe, after the marines landed. They had just arrived. They were still sleeping on the ground. They had no facilities. But in the beginning that mission was succeeding. It was succeeding diplomatically, in getting the various sides to lay down some of their arms. We all remember that, when our forces went into that country, they were not resisted. They were not brought under attack. They had the support of virtually the total local population, and they were able to stop hundreds of thousands of innocent children from starving.

I do not support what has happened since then. The policy has veered off course. It was not watched closely enough. We became partisans and combatants, choosing one side in a civil war over another, and we unnecessarily and tragically risked the lives of young American troops. But I do not believe this debate is about whether we like what happened in Somalia, either.

In fact, the current amendment would not even affect what happened in Somalia. I believe it is drawn perhaps because of the outrage among many Americans—an outrage which I share—of a policy gone awry. But let us remember that those troops that were tragically killed in Somalia were under the command of American officers in an American operation at the time.

If these series of amendments that are on the floor, or are apt to be on the floor over the next few hours, are not really about whether we should go into Haiti, or whether we should continue down a certain path in Somalia, or what we should do in Bosnia, what are they really about? They are fundamentally about what kind of foreign policy we are going to have in this country for the next several years.

Mr. President, I appeal to my colleagues again to stop and think about the world situation in which we now find ourselves. Not too long ago, I was at a gathering where a well-known columnist in this city grabbed me by the lapels and said: "Isn't this an exciting and incredible time to be alive?" I must confess, I was taken aback by the intensity of that remark. I said, "What do you mean?" He said, "Well, I was up writing a column, thinking about it until early this morning, and I was thinking about how much change has occurred in this world in the last 3 years, more change in a shorter period of time than any other period in the history of our world for the past several centuries in terms of changed relationships between nations and economic systems and political systems, all without the cataclysm of world war. Think of the change."

Then he said, "There is something else. It is the first time in many, many years since we have been a world power that the world is not divided into two superpower camps looking at each other across the barrel of a gun."

A remarkable moment. No sooner was World War II over then our parents and grandparents had to face the responsibility of fighting the cold war with the hairline nuclear trigger. This continued for the next 45 years. We never had an opportunity to build a new world order or to secure the peace. We never had an opportunity to make sure that World War II was the war to end all wars because, for one reason, the United Nations could not effectively function because of the Soviet veto in the Security Council and because of the competing power blocs which aimed missiles at each other.

Now we have a unique moment, an opportunity that our parents did not have and our grandparents did not have to chart a new course, to come up with a new architecture. Since the great and most powerful nations of the world are not at each other's throats, since they do not have one finger on the red button, now is an opportunity to work together. Perhaps now, for example, we can figure out a way to stop the spread of dangerous weapons around the world. That is a terrible threat that we face.

Some of the nations obtaining these dangerous weapons—chemical weapons, biological weapons, and nuclear weapons—are among the least responsible nations in the world. That is a real threat, an even graver threat in the long run perhaps, than the superpower confrontation of the cold war.

How long will this opportunity last for us to devise a new foreign policy for this country? No one knows. Three weeks ago, we saw events in Moscow that, had they ended differently, could have slammed shut that window of opportunity and perhaps even restarted the cold war. But we are living in a unique opportunity to build a whole new architecture for the foreign policy of this country to take us into the next century. We have a moment that has been given to us when the world is not divided into two major hostile camps.

So, Mr. President, this is not the time for us to react emotionally to the events of yesterday or of a week ago. It is the time for us to sit down, using our best ability and our clear and deep thoughts, bringing together the top expertise available in this country, taking time out from our busy schedules as Members of Congress, to try to come up with an architecture for that policy.

If things change and the world is plunged back into a new cold war, what will we have? The missiles are all still there and they are all still targeted, the weapons continue to spread around the world, and brush-fire wars begin to break out all over the world again, with dangerous weapons being used—chemical weapons, nerve gas that could be put into the air-conditioning systems of major buildings or chemicals that could be put into the water supply of major cities and kill literally millions of people around the world. If we do not take the opportunity given to us to build a different kind of architecture for our children and our grandchildren, they are going to look at us and they are going to say: "Where were you? Why did you miss the opportunity?"

Trying to act with a floor amendment—a floor amendment—with only a few hours of debate, to set precedents that will have a major impact on the future of this country in the next century because we are emotionally overwrought by things that have happened that none of us on either side of the aisle like, is wrong, Mr. President; it is wrong. We need cold water splashed on our faces so that we will stop and think: What do these amendments purport to do, the ones talked about and the one now pending?

The one now pending, in essence, rules out or makes it almost impossible for us to use multilateral approaches to solve foreign policy crises by requiring approval in advance before the Presidents can enter into operations within the United Nations.

I think we need to think through how we should operate if our troops are under the command of the United Nations. We should think that through very carefully. There should be guidelines. So far we have not lacked adequate guidelines. For us to adopt a policy which says, in essence, we do not really want to participate and to make available multilateral approaches to solving crises in the world, and which rules out that alternative now is grossly premature and irresponsible.

The American people have said time and time again, "We do not want to be the world's policeman all by ourselves." Why should our taxpayers foot the full bill every time there is a crisis? Why should young Americans take all the risks? Why should it mainly be American lives that are put at risk and put in jeopardy?

That is why, in many cases, it has been right for this country to work with other nations. Where would we have been in Korea if we had to do it all alone? Where would we have been in the Persian Gulf if we had to do it all alone? Where would we have been in

terms of trying to contain communism for 45 years if we had to do it all alone without NATO and SEATO and others helping us in that effort?

And yet, Mr. President, that is exactly what we are being asked to do because we are overwrought with what happened in Somalia. We are being asked to adopt an amendment that is quite far-reaching. Wake up, my colleagues. Wake up. We are being asked to adopt an amendment that, in essence, repudiates the multilateral option for us as we enter a very new, uncertain, uncharted world environment.

I do not think the American people want us to give away that tool. We can always say no to a multilateral operation. Congress always has the power to cut off the money and to stop an operation anytime we want to do it. But why tie our hands in advance? Why give up an option before we can even possibly imagine all of the circumstances in which it might be needed in the future?

There is something else, Mr. President. All three of these amendments—and we should think about this—all three of these amendments require—whether we are talking about the potential amendment to be offered on involvement in Haiti or in Bosnia, or whether we are talking about this amendment dealing with possible operations within the United Nations—that the President receive prior approval from Congress before the President acts.

Mr. President, that is one of the most radical suggestions that has ever been made on the foreign policy front in the Congress of the United States. Not since the beginning of our country, not ever, as far as I can find—and I am still researching the point. I do not believe that ever before have we passed a statute saying the President of the United States has to have prior approval before, as Commander in Chief, he acts to preserve our national security interests.

We are not just talking about this President, if we pass amendments such as this that set this type of precedent. People may be dissatisfied with some of the things this President has done. I am not satisfied with every one of them. But if we set this precedent, we are setting a precedent not only for this President but for every President in the future.

The War Powers Act does not do that. I have heard the War Powers Act discussed by some on the other side of the aisle, and I have sometimes agreed with them that the War Powers Act goes too far in restricting the powers of the President as Commander in Chief.

What does the act say? It says, after the President commits forces, he has to file a report. Once that report is filed, the clock starts running. If there is no congressional approval after the fact, then the forces would have to be withdrawn. It does not say before.

Think about what we are doing, as we enter into a new era without a crystal ball to guide us. We are saying that we are going to make a fundamental change in the constitutional powers of the President of the United States with floor amendments in the Senate, with maybe 5 minutes of deliberation by the average Member, who cannot be here for all the debate, with all action concluded in 1 week.

Mr. President, we badly need that cold water in our faces. We need to step back. We need to wake up. We need to reflect. We need to get rid of this pent-up emotion that is driving us to make decisions we will regret year after year after year. We have the power to stop Presidents if they act irresponsibly. President Clinton has already indicated, for example, in the case of Bosnia that he does not intend to commit any American forces in Bosnia without full advanced consultation with the Congress.

I think that is a wise decision by the President. I think he should consult with us in advance. But I do not think we should ever pass a statute which says the President must have the prior approval of the Congress before he enters into actions, unless it is something that the President voluntarily decides to do. No President, no Member of this Senate, can possibly know every situation. We cannot have 535 commanders in chief in this country. We cannot run this country by committee in the midst of a national or international emergency or crisis.

Once I heard Mrs. Thatcher say something very wise. She was asked, "What one lesson have you learned above all others in your years of public service serving as Prime Minister and in Parliament?" Do you know what she said? "I have learned always to expect the unexpected."

A very wise lesson. Be prepared for the unexpected. If there is any lesson we can learn, it is that. Here we are trying to tie the hands of the President of the United States and future Presidents by establishing a precedent. And we are doing this, for the first time in our country's history, by use of floor amendments without hearings in the relevant committees, without sitting down thoughtfully, as I think we should, legislative branch and executive branch together, perhaps even with a special commission composed of Members of both Houses and both parties and the executive branch, in order to think about the long-term changes in our foreign policy that are needed.

In his book, entitled "Present at the Creation," Dean Acheson wrote about the beginnings of a new foreign policy, a new approach. It is the foreign policy we still have. It came together after World War II, at the beginning of the Truman administration. As our colleague from Florida, Senator GRAHAM, has reminded some of us, even that architecture which served us so well and included collective security, the containment of communism, the Truman doctrine, the beginnings of NATO, the Marshall Plan, even that architecture was not put together in a week or a month. It evolved over 2 to 3 years in the Truman administration.

Without careful thought and reflection, we are going to change the basic constitutional powers of the President with a floor amendment. In essence, we are going to push aside multilateral action as an option at a time in which none of us want to see our young people and our taxpayers have to bear all the risks and all the burdens. It is unwise, Mr. President.

This is not about Haiti. This is not about Somalia. This is not about Bosnia. This is not about whether or not we approve of everything that has happened. I do not think any of us do on either side of the aisle. This is about charting fundamental foreign policy for this country into the next century. It is about the powers of the President to deal with emergency situations. It is about our constitutional framework of Government.

Mr. President, let us have the courage to say that we should not make those kinds of long-range, fundamental decisions without adequate reflection. The American people look at us sometimes, and they say, "What are you people doing in Congress to make such major decisions with so little thought and reflection about the possible implications?"

They are right. If the American people witness us deciding such fundamental questions out of emotion, without adequate thought and reflection, but with floor amendments, they will be right.

I honestly hope that all these floor amendments will be withdrawn. Yes, then we should go—bipartisan, together, Republicans and Democrats, Americans—we should go to the President and we should say, "Mr. President, there is a fundamental decision that needs to be made about how we interact with the United Nations if our forces are committed and there are some fundamental decisions that need to be made about how Congress and the executive branch work together in times of international crisis."

We should sit down, and we should work, we should think, we should study, and we should give it our best effort. That is what we should do.

I am not denigrating the motives of any of those who have offered these amendments or talked about offering these amendments. They are people for whom I have the highest regard. My colleague from my home State and I have never had a cross word. We have great mutual respect for each other, and I have great respect for the other coauthors of this amendment. I have

great respect for the distinguished minority leader. I commended the position which he took recently on a very difficult foreign policy issue. He is one of the Senators in this Chamber for whom I have the greatest respect.

But I say and appeal to my colleagues, please stop and think. Let us not make these fundamental decisions now. I have been here when Republican Presidents warned us against micro management or tying the hands of the Commander in Chief or applying the War Powers Act when it perhaps should not have been applied. In nearly every one of those situations, I believe, except once, I supported the power and the discretion of the Commander in Chief to make those decisions when the President was of the other party. It is not a matter of politics. This is a matter of what is good for the country.

I understand the frustration that has led to the offering of this particular amendment. I have not heard all the comments made by my colleague from Oklahoma, but I think he has pointed out, accurately, that we have not yet determined well enough what the guidelines should be in terms of committing American forces and how they are to operate within the United Nations and how that is to interact with the Congress. There, in essence, is a vacuum existing right now because we have not clearly enough spelled out those foreign policy objectives. And I thank my colleague and others who raise this issue—and there are those on both sides of the aisle that have done us a service. They have put on the radar screen for all of us that we are operating without a clear course of action or charter in front of us. The President and the Congress need to understand each other and their appropriate roles. And our young people need to know the rules and obligation of the support that is either behind them or not before they are even put in that position.

Having done that and realizing that we do not have in place a foreign policy with sufficient guidelines. Let us go to work to accomplish these goals. But let us not do this with floor amendments in the U.S. Senate without adequate time to think about the issues. Please do not do that. Let us not do that to our country. Let us not do that to those that will be living in the next century. It is too important. It requires more thought. Let us take the time; let us do our job right.

I urge my colleagues seriously to consider—and I will be the first to join with them in the effort—to say to the President that it is time we sit down and work out these guidelines and understandings. Let us not listen to our hearts alone, but to our heads as well. Let us not just emotionally react to a situation that has deeply and gravely disturbed all of us in our country, of both parties, wherever we happen to live. The decisions are too important.

We are given an opportunity, as I said in the beginning, Mr. President, not given to any other generation, save perhaps those alive in that brief period right after World War I. There was an effort then that failed to put together a new world order—the debate over the League of Nations ended tragically, with the country in disarray and with nothing in its place. Thereafter we were plunged into World War II followed by the cold war. And now, 70 years later, we have that opportunity again. It is a gift to us. It is a chance for us to chart the right course for our children and our grandchildren, to make a lasting change in the relationship among the nations of the world.

Let us meet that responsibility. But let us do it carefully and wisely, and let us give it our best efforts. We must work together, with Members from both sides of the aisle, because I believe this Nation must speak with one bipartisan voice. Let us do the job. You have raised some serious concerns. You have made valid points. You have made criticisms that are correct. Now let us deal with them constructively, as we should, and let us do it in the right way and not try to develop on the floor of the U.S. Senate, in 1, 2, or 3 days of debate, a basic architecture of the foreign policy of this country that will carry us into the next century. Let us give it more thought now that we have had the problem brought to our attention forcefully, and let us wisely craft the best solution.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I will not take a great deal of time, but I want to commend our colleague, the senior Senator from Oklahoma, for his statement here this afternoon. He certainly has expressed my views and, I hope, the views of the majority, because it transcends the specific issues in front of us which are not insignificant, and that is the role of the United States in the post-cold-war period. Do we commit forces to be a part of international peacekeeping forces? If so, where, under what circumstances, and how? Do we support that before we take the action or after the action is taken?

We have a critical issue with Bosnia, and we have not decided it. And there is division in this country as to how we ought to proceed. We saw a great division in Somalia, a policy to go in and try to feed hundreds of thousands of starving people. The policy changed and moved, and we had a significant debate less than a week ago. Now we have the issue on Haiti—again, a critically important issue.

This is a different time, and our colleague from Oklahoma properly pointed that out, and he pointed it out in a historical context. There was only one other period in this century when we found our country in a similar position as today. That was at the end of World War I when we were virtually the unchallenged power in the world. We debated as to whether or not we ought to establish something called the League of Nations, and how we deal with world crises. Many competent historians would argue that the collapse of our ability to put together some alternative to superpower confrontation contributed to World War II and events thereafter.

We now find ourselves once again, for the second time in this century, as the Senator pointed out, in that unchallenged position. We need to sort out how we are going to handle this. Obviously, none of us here, I hope, wants to go it completely alone in every case. President Bush established a foreign policy approach with the Persian Gulf crisis that I think ought to be the model of how we at least try to resolve problems in the future.

There was a disagreement and debate over whether the time was right to use force in the Persian Gulf. But I do not recall an ounce of debate and discussion about whether or not the formulation of an international coalition at the very outset of that issue was the wrong approach to take. As I recall, everybody endorsed it, and properly so. It was a significant foreign policy achievement under the leadership of the then Secretary of State, Jim Baker, and others, putting together that coalition and deciding to go in and deal with Saddam Hussein on that basis.

I think you would have had a different political debate internationally and domestically had we decided to do it alone in Iraq. I am not sure what the outcome would have been.

President Bush is the architect, in many ways, of this approach—the use of international bodies to deal with these problems. One thing I hear from my constituents is that "this country cannot resolve every problem in the world." The Senator from Oklahoma has very accurately framed at least the format by which we ought to examine these issues. By lurching in Bosnia or Haiti, or lurching in this amendment dealing with the United Nations, we are not doing that in the way it ought to be done.

That is all I think the Senator from Oklahoma is pointing out here. We need now to spend some time and think this through, so that we approach it intelligently. I will comment on Haiti specifically later on. But the senior Senator from Oklahoma has properly and intelligently framed how this debate ought to occur and at what level it ought to occur. I hope that our colleagues who have offered these amendments, with the best of intentions, will take heed to what our senior colleague from Oklahoma has raised here this afternoon and possibly withdraw these amendments.

In fact, I point out that in Haiti the President has done the right thing. He

did not send in troops when the danger occurred there, the very thing we asked him to do to avoid that kind of confrontation. So I think we should go through the process and approach this new foreign policy architecture in a way that makes some sense, not just for these events, but for the future as well. As the Senator from Oklahoma pointed out in quoting Margaret Thatcher, I can guarantee as we stand here today, next week or next month there will be another crisis someplace else in the world, and we will be lurching for an answer on that one as well, unless we try to think this thing through and do it in an intelligent, responsible way.

I commend the Senator for his remarks.

Mr. BOREN. I thank my colleague very much.

I see my colleague from New Mexico on his feet. We have matters to debate in another meeting in the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress.

I am very serious about what I said a moment ago. I hope my colleague from Oklahoma will think about it, and I hope the distinguished minority leader and others, who perhaps are considering offering amendments on specific subjects on specific countries will think about it.

It would be much better if we could find a way, rather than dealing with these issues in sort of an ad hoc manner, country by country, with floor amendments, to come together and make a bipartisan proposal, a very serious one, in which we really bring together the best thinkers in both parties and both Houses of Congress and with the administration in a totally bipartisan fashion to look at this whole area and to do so in a very, very thoughtful and a very careful way.

I am not saying this in order to try to diffuse criticisms of the President. The President himself has admitted that mistakes were made in Somalia, for example.

If the resolution wants to have a whereas clause that says the administration and leaders of our Government have not yet developed fully enough guidelines under which we should be operating, this Senator would be happy to agree with that statement. We do need to develop them. I think we need to develop them together, not only with the President, but Congress and the President together with Members of both parties.

So I would hope that staff members and perhaps our colleagues, if they are listening in their offices, will take this suggestion seriously, because I mean it, seriously. I think that we are all willing to say that mistakes have been made. Let us go forward from there, and let us sit down and really try to do this in the right way rather than in an ad hoc way.

Again, I say that not to offer criticism of those who have offered these amendments, because the points they have made are valid, and needed to be made; this issue needed to be raised.

I just appeal to them—let us figure out a way; let us get together as we should, Democrats and Republicans, across the aisle together; and let us figure out a way and mechanism that can be established so we can deal in a broader way and sounder way and one which will allow us to take care of various situations rather than doing it ad hoc.

So I appeal to my colleagues to take my request seriously, not to treat it as a matter of political rhetoric but to take it seriously, because I think there is much work that needs to be done as my colleagues who have offered this amendment have pointed out.

Let us do this work together, and let us find a better way of making these decisions, because they are so far-reaching.

We had many debates out here about the constitutional powers of the Presidency, and I think that we need some new mechanisms. The world is changing. We need to think of new ways to operate in it and to think about how the President and the Congress interact. Let us do this in a different way. That is all I am suggesting.

I am not suggesting that concerns are invalid. I am just saying let us find a different approach for dealing with it.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BOREN. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I am going to use a moment and make an observation which I assume will bring a response but, if not, we will probably leave and do some other work. We are already late and not only late this afternoon but maybe the Senate thinks we are late in not having a deal out here on congressional reform.

Let me say I am privileged to listen to the Senator's remarks here. Frankly, I agree with a lot of what the Senator has said.

I hope the Senator does not think that the Senator from New Mexico approaches this in a cavalier manner. This is serious business.

However, I suggest to the Senator we have had a little bit of time to assess our relationship to the United Nations and what we ought to be doing in the areas that Senator NICKLES addresses. It is not a new issue. It is just that it has been called to our attention again. That is, the relationship of American men and women in the military in combat as part of a U.N. force under U.N. command, and it is also the issue of the United Nations' standing army versus American military men and who will lead them in combat if there is to be such activities.

I personally believe that there is a huge vacuum in those two areas. I think the American people expect us to do something about those two areas quickly. Frankly, I think we are going to have ample opportunity after we adopt this amendment, if we do, on just these two areas—that is what it is all about—for the President and the Congress to decide in due course. And sometimes due course around here takes 2 or 3 years.

We have been complaining about the United Nations not having any fiscal control over all the moneys that the world gives them, and nothing has been done year after year after year. Everybody says "Study it. It is very important."

Finally, we are going to say in an appropriations bill you are going to get less money until you do something, and we are not sure we know what is right. But we said 10 percent of the arrearage you do not get until you have some kind of auditing system.

I submit if we do not do something like Senator NICKLES is suggesting, which does not have to last any longer than it takes for this institution, the House and the President, to thoroughly examine the issue, if they want to, and do something much more diverse, widespread, create a different atmosphere about the relationship of America to the United Nations, what should we do? Why should we not adopt just these two, the standing army provisions and the prohibitions on our men and women being in that standing army of combat unless Americans control it? Why should we not go ahead and say continue your U.N. activity but not as far as combat is concerned unless you follow the principles in the amendment?

I believe there is just as good an argument to say do that and then give everybody plenty of time to proceed with the other areas as there is your argument on the broad spectrum of Presidential constitutional power as the Commander in Chief.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from New Mexico, before he leaves the floor, will answer a question for me with the indulgence of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. DOMENICI. I would be pleased to try.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, could the Senator from New Mexico tell me what situation would be different in the past several years, including Somalia today? What situation would be different if the Nickles amendment had been in effect?

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me to respond, I will be happy to respond to my colleague from Arkansas. There is nothing. This amendment, which some of my colleagues have spoken to with great energy and acted like this is a fundamental change in course in history, it is not correct, because this amendment

would allow the President to do exactly what he is doing right now in Somalia.

As the Senator from Arkansas is probably aware, the combat troops are under the U.S. command. The logistic troops, humanitarian troops are under U.N. command.

This amendment would not prohibit or tie the President's hand in any way, shape, or form.

I might go further. I do not want to overanswer my colleague's question. But as to the idea of people saying that this is historical change, I have looked at all past U.N. peacekeeping operations going all the way back to 1945. This amendment would not have affected any of those.

Mr. BUMPERS. If the Senator will allow me at that point, if it is not broke, why are we trying to fix it?

Mr. NICKLES. That is an excellent question. The reason is—and I will read some quotes—this administration is contemplating very expansive use of U.N. peacekeeping forces, which I might mention have grown dramatically just in the last few years. They have gone from 10,000 in 1990 to over 80,000 today. I will read you just a quote that was made by Madeleine Albright, U.N. Ambassador, who said: "The end of the cold war has opened up another avenue for multilateral cooperation long limited by U.S. solely." Really, that is U.N. peacekeeping. I will go further. This is President Clinton.

Her comments were made September 23, less than a month ago.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NICKLES. Let me make an additional point.

President Clinton, on September 28, less than a month ago, said "If the parties to the conflict now"—referring to Bosnia— "take hard steps needed to make real peace, the international community, including the United States, must be ready to help in its effective implementation."

I think my colleague is aware the U.N. Secretary General has been talking about 50,000 troops. The U.N. Secretary General says they should be under U.N. command.

I might note that the nominee for NATO commander, Gen. George Joulwan, yesterday said they should be under NATO command. If they are under NATO command, this amendment would not come into effect. It does not do anything as far as undermining our existing, very successful NATO relations. It does not do anything that would undermine our relations in Korea.

But it does say we do not want to put U.S. combat forces under U.N. command with the foreign commander. That leaves the President totally out of the equation as Commander in Chief, and I think that is a serious mistake and it has not been done in the past I inform my colleague from New Mexico. We are not talking about changes; we are talking about changes, about the proven, effective methods we have in the past. That is that we do not commit U.S. combat troops to the United Nations and turn that over to foreign control and really get the United States out of the chain of command. I think that would be a serious mistake. We have not done it in 48 years. It is now being contemplated by the administration.

I also tell my friend from Arkansas that enthusiasm for that has probably waned somewhat in the last couple weeks as a result of the disaster in Somalia.

I hate to think of that reason, but I would tell my colleague from Arkansas this amendment was contemplated well before the Somalia disaster ever happened. This is not a result of that disaster. This is the result of reading newspaper clips, including the Washington Post.

This is a result of reading newspaper clippings, including the Washington Post on June 18, that says "U.S. Plans a Wider Role in U.N. Peacekeeping." There is another article from the Washington Post, "Wider U.N. Police Role Supported; Foreigners Could Lead U.S. Troops."

That has not been the case in the past. Those are changes in policy, changes that I am trying to curb.

But I am going so say that in my minimal restrictions we do not restrict the use of peacekeeping troops, we do not restrict the use of humanitarian troops, medical troops and so on. We have limited it and narrowed it to combat troops, to limit it to invasive power and making sure the President maintains and keeps his role as Commander in Chief.

Mr. BUMPERS. If the Senator would yield further—who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma has the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI. I think the Senator asked me a question. All I want to tell you is he answered it much better than I could have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Oklahoma has the floor.

Mr. BOREN. Let me say just one word and then I will let my colleague from New Mexico make a brief comment, because we both have to go to this meeting which we are cochairing.

I am still concerned, I would say in response to his original question to me, that we make this decision in this way. Again, I want to compliment my colleagues for raising valid concerns.

I agree exactly with the term "vacuum" that was used by the Senator from New Mexico. I think there is a vacuum in some ways in terms of the guidelines that have been lacking in terms of the use of these forces.

But, for example, President Bush proposed—and I recall when he did it—that we allow one of our unused military bases to be used as a training base for U.N. forces where units from other countries could come together with American units and train together, and perhaps be reequipped so their radios would communicate with each other and the rest of it.

I am not sure from reading this amendment whether or not that would be allowed. Certainly the U.N. troops in Somalia or anywhere else would be operating much more efficiently and probably with less loss of lives and less risk to our troops if they had the opportunity to train together, to work together, and if the commanders knew each other, and they could have been better equipped.

As I read the second part of this amendment, which says no funds will be used except for certain categories, I think it might well rule out the use of training and equipping of these kinds of forces which would make them much more effective.

Whether we ought to allow that is subject to debate; whether President Bush's proposal is wise or not is a matter worthy of debate.

All I am saying is, I do not think it is a matter that should be decided by floor amendment without hearings in relevant committees and without long-term consideration of how all of that should fit together in terms of our foreign policy architecture.

I, again, want to thank my colleagues. I have spoken with some passion. I certainly have not spoken in anger or in criticism of my colleagues, because they are frustrated and worried and raising questions about a vacuum that does indeed, I believe, exist in terms of the inadequacy of guidelines to cover these situations.

I would simply appeal, while there are many good ideas here, that we pool all of our good ideas together and we do it over not a prolonged period of time but allow enough time to make sure that we have had sufficient hearings and have given it sufficient thought, because I do think these are fundamentally important decisions and we should make them very, very carefully.

Mr. BUMPERS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, before the Senator from Oklahoma leaves, I would like to compliment him on all the remarks he made, especially the part about this being a very far-reaching piece of legislation. And for us to come to the floor here with 100 Senators and 100 different views for each one to try to amend or craft or decide whether he is going to vote for or against something of this magnitude borders on lunacy.

Now, for whatever merit or demerit this amendment has, it should be introduced as legislation. It ought to be referred to the Foreign Relations Committee and the Armed Services Committee and reported back to us. There ought to be hearings. It ought to be debated at length.

I think that was the main thrust of what the Senator from Oklahoma said, and I subscribe to that. But I have a few other things I would like to say, also.

I would not impugn the motives of the Senator from Oklahoma, but I must say, I had not ever heard of this amendment. It may be that he and some of his colleagues were busily crafting this amendment before the big firefight in Somalia on October 3 and 4, but I had never heard of it.

I will agree, everybody knows I am not just a steadfast defender of President Clinton, because I think the resolution that was adopted by the United Nations setting out as a part of our mission there to arrest Aideed was a mistake. I am not sure that I ever said that on the floor of the Senate or even said it to my wife over the breakfast table at the time, but certainly, on hindsight, that turned out to be a bad vote. And in a way it is a tragedy that Madeleine Albright was not instructed to vote no on that resolution.

But let me go back and review the bidding. Bear in mind, we went to Somalia for humanitarian purposes. Humanitarian is covered in this amendment, and I will come back to it in just a moment.

But I can remember my predecessor here in the U.S. Senate, Bill Fulbright, and I were having lunch about a week after President Bush said we are going to send troops to Somalia to feed the people and alleviate the death, or at least prevent the death of as many as a million people. Virtually nobody in the United States opposed that.

I was having lunch with Senator Fulbright and I said, "What do you think about it?"

He said, "I have very grave reservations about it."

Now, let me tell you. His reservations were not necessarily based on the fact that he is an academician and understands history. I think his reservations were, more than anything else, based on his 30-year tenure in the U.S Senate and seeing the most laudable motives on the most laudable undertakings anybody could conjure up, turn sour.

I said, "Surely, you are not opposed to the United States preventing this many deaths?"

He said, "I'm telling you, a lot of these things start out for the most noble and laudable reasons, but the first thing you know, they begin to bog down."

And the minute we began to feed these people and they became healthier, our mission continued there. We should have pulled out before the U.N. resolution ever said anything about arresting Aideed.

But I remember Senator Fulbright said, "The first thing you know, you lose an American soldier. And the next thing you know, a soldier is taken hostage and everybody is demanding a little pound of revenge. And the next thing you know, we are bogged down."

How prescient that observation was because it happened precisely the way he said it would happen.

But even so, going on, Mr. President, I will agree that we made a mistake in voting for the resolution to arrest Aideed. I think we erred in expanding the mission of our forces there. Once we fed those people and they became rather self-sufficient—they are right now—it would have been infinitely better if we had left. But we did not. Chalk that up to a mistake.

But no resolution was offered here when it was said we were going to stay. There were a few Senators that said I think this is a mistake; that we ought to get out. I was one of them.

But all of the sudden, when you lose some people in a firefight, people want to change the law in a very dramatic way that everybody agrees impinges dramatically on the President's authority as Commander in Chief and on his authority to make and implement foreign policy.

Our military forces exist essentially for two purposes—to make certain that our Nation is secure and, No. 2, to implement foreign policy. The tragedy of this amendment is it has a lot of political appeal. I said not long ago that I wish I could vote no on the President's deficit reduction package. I did not mean I wish I could vote no because I thought it was a bad idea—incidentally, as many newspapers in my State construed. I said I wish I could vote no so I would not have to answer so much mail. I wished I could vote no because I know where the politics of that issue was. But I voted yes because I thought it was a good idea to try to do something about the deficit rather than just sit around and make chamber of commerce speeches about the deficit.

I would like to vote aye on this for the same reason. I can tell my colleagues that the Nickles and Dole amendments are popular across the country. Do you know why? Do you know why a lot of people in this body will vote "aye"? Because you cannot answer your critics with a bumper strip. It is a complex issue. If you could come up with a little short, snappy bumper strip to answer why you voted no on the Nickles amendment, I daresay he would not get 20 votes. But it is complex.

It has gotten to the time in this country the reason we have a $4 trillion debt is because people cannot answer it on a bumper strip. No, I will take that back. One of the reasons we have a $4 trillion debt is because all those people who favor a line-item veto and constitutional amendment to balance the budget vote for every dime of spending that comes up on the floor of the Senate and then go home and say, what we really need is, not a Senator with the stamina and determination and courage to reduce the deficit, it is because they will not vote for a constitutional amendment to balance the budget.

Everybody applauds and says, "Isn't he wonderful?" That is wonderful chamber of commerce talk. I said it on the floor—it sounds a little arrogant, and I am a little reluctant to say it—I know how to make people stand and cheer as well as anybody in this body. As the old saying goes, "You can bring people to their feet but you cannot bring them to their senses," with those bumper strip answers.

While I am willing to concede that there have been a couple of foreign policy mistakes made, I have this very strong suspicion that a lot of people are going to come out here and vote for the Dole amendment and are going to vote for the Nickles amendment and pack their bags this weekend and head for New Hampshire and tell them why they ought to be elected to replace Bill Clinton. Bear in mind one thing. Bill Clinton did not send troops to Somalia. I thought it was a mistake to send peacekeeping troops to Haiti. I did not agree with that. I still do not agree with it. And I do not think he will.

For whatever it is worth to my colleagues, they should bear this in mind. President Clinton has said he will not send peacekeeping troops to Bosnia without congressional approval. I think that is a very good concession on the part of the President. He is saying, "I want to cooperate with you."

Everybody here knows there are times when the President must have the authority to act. When I first came here I was a staunch proponent of the War Powers Act. But the longer I have been here—I am not going to yield until I finish and then we will have a colloquy—I have concluded over a period of years that the War Powers Act is almost impossible to implement. I think it would be more impossible to implement than a balanced budget amendment. But, be that as it may, I think the President wants to cooperate with the Congress. He has talked to virtually every leader in the Senate on every move he has made. I think right now there is a sense that his popularity is suffering as a result of an ill-defined foreign policy. I am not quarreling with that. It is not well defined.

But we have had an operation to bring about the dissolution of the Soviet Union for over 40 years, called NATO. It has been a textbook example of 17 nations cooperating under all kinds of different commands: Canadian, British, French, American. It is a

perfect example of how nations can cooperate to achieve a mission. So what does this amendment do? Well, it exempts NATO. We have 600 troops in Macedonia right now, under a foreign command. I expect this amendment, before it is voted on, to maybe exclude Macedonia. Nobody suggests bringing these troops home from Macedonia, though they may be in harm's way. The Senator from Georgia and I were in Macedonia 3 or 4 months ago, and we visited with the U.N. commanders there. It is a very poor nation, scared to death the war in Yugoslavia is going to extend. I heartily applauded President Clinton's sending 600 troops to Macedonia, and my guess is the Senator from Georgia, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, did also. That is one small thing we can do. But he could not have done that under the Nickles amendment, not without a lot of debate in the U.S. Senate. It has been said here many times, we had two battalions under a French command in Desert Storm.

This amendment, for example, starts off saying the President can send troops without congressional approval if the mission is humanitarian. Is that not what Somalia was; to feed people? So there is not anything in this amendment that would have stopped George Bush or Bill Clinton from sending troops to Somalia, because it was a humanitarian mission. But, as Senator Fulbright said, humanitarian missions have a tendency to go sour, and the first thing you know the troops with the most laudable, altruistic motives of feeding people are caught in combat. So what do you do then? Come back and say, withdraw, retreat, disengage? The President has to submit a request for permission from Congress. There will be no more shooting until 30 days have elapsed and Congress has acted on it.

Mr. NICKLES. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUMPERS. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. NICKLES. I would like to inform the Senator that is not correct. I will inform the Senator our amendment would allow the President to do just exactly what he did.

You have troops in Somalia who were under U.N. command, and those are primarily for humanitarian and logistic causes. We do have some rangers who were in combat, and they were under U.S. operational control. The President is sending a few thousand additional troops. They are also under U.S. control, not under U.N. control. So the President, basically, did exactly in that situation what is allowed.

So this amendment, if there was a future Somalia, would not have impacted his flexibility in responding in any way.

Mr. BUMPERS. Let me ask a question. I stand corrected on the point my colleague made. But let me ask this additional question.

Let us assume that in Somalia you have a battalion of Americans who are there under the most laudable purposes, namely, humanitarian purposes. Let us assume that they are under an American command. Let us assume further that all of a sudden they get encircled by Aideed's forces and the only troops close enough to rescue them is a battalion—say, a company or two companies of Americans, and a battalion of French. Would you allow those two companies of Americans to be put under the command of the French so they could rescue the Americans?

Mr. NICKLES. If the Senator will yield, one, you have rules of engagement. Our troops anywhere, anyplace, anytime, regardless of their position or status, have rules of engagement, and that is to be able to protect themselves and to call on other troops, U.S. troops or allies, if necessary, to extricate themselves from that situation. That does not change.

Mr. BUMPERS. Where does your amendment refer to rules of engagement?

Mr. NICKLES. That is just a fact of military rules of engagement which we do not encroach upon in any way, shape, or form. That is the case for all military personnel worldwide. It always has been, it still will be.

To respond to where I think my friend and colleague from Arkansas is coming from, what if you have a situation where you have United States troops engaged in a humanitarian effort that does go sour; that is, like our situation in Somalia, do they have the capability? It just so happens the Rangers who were encircled, who were pinned down for hours, were under U.S. control. The other troops, the logistic troops basically, are staying in a U.N. or U.S. compound separate from that facility, but they have the right, through rules of engagement, to try to rescue our troops.

Likewise, the President took exactly the right action. He made it very clear in his press conference that the additional thousands of troops would be under U.S. command.

I might also tell my friend and colleague, in cases of U.S. combat, all Presidents, going all the way back throughout the history of the United Nations, when we committed U.S. combat troops, they have been under U.S. command. So we do not lose that chain of command. We do not delegate that chain of command to the United Nations or to the Secretary General of the United Nations.

Mr. BUMPERS. I think the Senator ought to take his amendment and put a provision in there that where the rules of engagement ought to apply, then this amendment is null and void, so there can be no mistaking what the answer is to the question I just asked.

Let me ask a second question. If I understand the amendment correctly, if we have an American commander—and let us assume the American commander is in charge of all American troops—but let us assume that you have five American battalions that are under the tactical command, one of the French, one of the British, one of the Canadians, one of the Pakistanis, one of the Indians. As long as the overall command is American, the Senator has no problem with that, is that correct, even though tactically most of these people are under the command of a foreign commander?

Mr. NICKLES. The Senator is correct. We had that situation, I might mention, in the Persian Gulf, where actually we had the 82d Airborne under the operation——

Mr. BUMPERS. We had two battalions under the command of the French there.

Mr. NICKLES. That is correct, but that would not be prohibited because you had the operational control under the direction of the United States.

Mr. BUMPERS. I submit to the Senator that the tactical matter is a lot more important at that level than is the overall division level.

Mr. NUNN. Will the Senator from Arkansas yield on that particular point?

Mr. BUMPERS. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. NUNN. I heard the answer of the Senator from Oklahoma to that. As I understand the question, the Senator from Arkansas was saying, if there was an overall operational commander who was American, and then, under that commander, there was a foreign commander that had tactical command of U.S. forces, would that be exempt from the Nickles amendment, or would that require congressional approval?

I understand the Senator from Oklahoma to say that would be exempt from the Nickles amendment because the operational command was under an American.

Mr. President, I will say to my friend from Oklahoma and my friend from Arkansas, that is not the way I read the Nickles amendment. The paragraph that is operable here says very clearly, and I hope the Senator's interpretation is correct because I think that would——

Mr. BUMPERS. What page is the Senator on?

Mr. NUNN. The Nickles amendment I have in front of me is page 1, paragraph "(a) Prohibition," but (1) under paragraph (a). The first paragraph says:

> None of the funds appropriated—

So forth and so on—

> may be used * * * after March 1, 1994, when such forces are:

And this is the applicable paragraph.

> (1) under United Nations operational or tactical control if such forces would be under the command, operational control, or tactical control of foreign officers, unless prior to that date.

If the answer of the Senator from Oklahoma is correct, he needs to change that "or" to "and," because clearly this covers either operational control or tactical control, as I read it.

Mr. NICKLES. If the Senator will yield.

Mr. NUNN. I will be glad to. I do not have the floor.

Mr. BUMPERS. The Senator's point is well made. It is a follow-on to the one I was about to make, so please proceed.

Mr. NICKLES. If the Senator will allow me to respond, on page 3, we define U.N. operational or tactical control. It "means the exercise by the United Nations Security Council, the United Nations Secretary General, or any other non-United States entity designated by the United Nations Security Council or the United Nations Secretary General, with the exception of NATO, of the power of command usually given to the leader of a military force, such as the authority to coordinate and direct mission-related activities of the units comprising such force."

So I appreciate the remark made by my colleague, but I think that definition clearly states it would be the overall commander of such units.

Mr. NUNN. I have to beg to differ with my colleague from Oklahoma. I have seen the definition, but the definition says here:

For the purposes of this section, "United Nations operational or tactical control"—

That covers both, operational or tactical—

means the exercise by the United Nations Security Council, the United Nations Secretary General, or any other non-United States entity designated by the United Nations Security Council or the United Nations Secretary General, with the exception of NATO, of the power of command usually given to the leader of a military force, such as the authority to coordinate and direct mission-related activities of the units comprising such force.

That applies to operational command or tactical command. The Senator's amendment on page 1 clearly—clearly—covers operational or tactical command.

If the Senator means "and," then it ought to be said here. Because if he means "and"—for instance, Jonathan Howe is the head of the United Nations over in Somalia. He is an American. He is not a foreigner. But if under him there is some tactical commander or, if under an American general, General Montgomery, who wears two hats over there—it is rather complicated, as we all know; he wears two hats—under him—he is an American. No matter what hat he wears, anybody under him, it is OK, even though he has a U.N. hat, because he is an American. If he has a Nigerian tactical commander under him, the way the Senator's answer was to the Bumpers question, then that would be OK, that would be exempt. But clearly that is not the way the amendment reads, nor is it the way the definition reads either.

Mr. NICKLES. I appreciate my colleague's comments, and I will further check the reading. I think the reading is very clear. If you have an overall commander that is under the United Nations chain of command, what we are really trying to do is make sure the President does not delegate his chain of command to the United Nations and foreign commander, to be basically out of the loop when we are talking about committing U.S. combat troops.

In response to the Senator from Arkansas, the President did not do that in the case of the rangers who were under fire. Those are clearly under U.S. operations, U.S. command and control, as well as the 5,000 or 6,000 additional troops that the President sent in just recently, or are in the process of being sent in.

Mr. NUNN. Could I ask my friend from Oklahoma a further question?

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I yield the floor. They can proceed with this colloquy. Please go ahead.

Mr. NUNN. I would just like to ask my friend from Oklahoma, along the same line that the Senator from Arkansas was pursuing, if the Nickles amendment, as it is now drafted, had been in effect before October 3, if it had been in law then, is there anything in the Nickles amendment that would have, in any way, precluded the operation in Somalia that led to the catastrophe, the disaster we had there?

Mr. NICKLES. No, and I mentioned that before. This amendment would not have restricted the operations in Somalia. I believe it would go further. This amendment would not have restricted the ability of the President to send in police instructors, whatever you call the troops for that mission into Haiti, because that was not defined as a combat mission.

This amendment is not as broad as some people have indicated. It only would restrict when you are talking about sending combat troops under U.N. control under a foreign commander and we are out of the command loop. So it is much more narrow than some.

No, it would not restrict the operation, nor the President's response to the catastrophe in Somalia.

Mr. NUNN. I thank the Senator. I would agree with him on that reading of the amendment, as I read it. If I could ask the Senator a couple of other questions—and I applaud what the Senator, I think, is getting to, and that is we have to be very careful and selective about who we place American forces under, whether it is the United Nations, whether it is NATO, or whether it is a bilateral arrangement.

Let me ask the Senator about this situation: If the President decided that he was going to embark on a bilateral kind of multinational force with Malaysia, Thailand, and Nigeria, but it was not under the United Nations, is there anything in the Nickles amendment that would preclude that?

Mr. NICKLES. The Senator is correct. It would not. The President would still have the authority to do anything unilaterally that he so desires, as he would keep control over our forces. And nothing would prohibit the President under this amendment from entering into a bilateral or multi-national-type effort or cooperative effort.

Mr. NUNN. So under the Nickles amendment, if it is agreed to, the President could get together with Malaysia, Thailand, India, Pakistan, and Indonesia and say, "I have this problem, folks. I have this law here which says I have to get authority from Congress if I act under the United Nations. But you are the people who are going to send forces over there anyway, so let us just all get together and have this multinational arrangement. But the United Nations is not involved, so I do not have to come to the Congress of the United States for authority."

Mr. NICKLES. If the Senator will yield further, the President could do that. I would think that the President would not want to do that unless he kept operational control of the troops. But, clearly, he could do it. This amendment does not restrict a bilateral multinational effort. What it does do—and I say to my friend, he might say, "Why are you offering this amendment?"

Mr. NUNN. That was going to be my question eventually.

Mr. NICKLES. Let me just explain to my colleague and maybe I could help him be aware of the very, I am going to say, adventuresome efforts by this administration to expand U.N. roles beyond peacekeeping. I tell my friend, for whom I have great respect, from the State of Georgia—he has worked on the Armed Services Committee and the Armed Forces Observer Group and I have been involved with him over the years—there is a very strong effort by this administration to expand U.S. peacekeeping forces and to expand their role. I can show my friend and colleague quotes from the United Nations Ambassador, from the President of the United States, from leaked reports about Presidential directive 13 which was reported in the papers, talking about a very significant expansion of U.S. peacekeeping roles into peacemaking and peace enforcing which really you are talking about making commitments of U.S. forces into combat situations under, I am going to say, a bureaucracy almost under the United Nations in lots of hot spots around the world.

We now have a very actively engaged U.N. peacekeeping force that has grown dramatically. Three or four years ago it was 10,000 troops. Today, it is 80,000

troops and yet we still only have about 80 supervisors involved in the United Nations.

I will be happy to read a quote from the commander of the U.N. forces in Sarajevo, Canadian Maj. Gen. Lewis Mackenzie. He said, "Do not get into trouble in the field after 5 p.m. New York time or Saturday or Sunday. No one answers the phone."

My concern is this rapidly expanding multinational effort to not only commit the United States to combat-type situations through the United Nations but also the second part of that amendment is saying, wait a minute. We should not be involved in having U.S. combat forces committed to an international armed force, and that is also a proposal that the U.N. Secretary General has been very outspoken on, of which some people in this administration have been supportive.

Mr. NUNN. I say to my friend from Oklahoma, I believe I know what he is shooting at. What I am trying to ascertain in this series of questions is really what he is hitting. I think I agree with the target. I believe we have to slow down on this U.N. peacekeeping effort, not because we do not want the United Nations involved, not because the United States can do it alone.

I know the Senator from Oklahoma does not want his amendment to be read by all the other nations in the world as saying, well, the United States will not let us put any of their troops under any of our people, and therefore we are not going to let any of our people be put under the United States.

The result of that, inadvertently, if that is the psychology that spreads here, is that the United States would see a country go down the tubes without doing anything because multinational action of the United Nations would not be possible unless somebody lets somebody else have control of their troops.

By definition, you cannot have a multinational force unless some foreigner viewed from the perspective of some country has control of somebody else's troops.

So what we would not want the Nickles amendment to be known as, inadvertently, 3 years from now, 5 years from now—and it is permanent law—is an amendment that made the United States the policeman of the world.

I know that is the opposite of what the Senator intends, but there is a psychology here, there is a psychology when you say to Malaysia or to Thailand or to Indonesia or to Singapore or any of those countries that you do not have a commander worthy of us serving under.

Mr. NICKLES. If the Senator will yield——

Mr. NUNN. They would turn right around and say, well, if that is the case, then we do not want any of our forces serving under a U.S. commander.

I have to say to the Senator from Oklahoma, I share his apprehension about the United Nations ability now because I think they are spread thin. They do not have logistics support. They do not have command and control, the kind of command and control that is necessary in modern warfare. They do not have intelligence. They do not have a lot of things. They are spread thin all over the world. But we have to be careful about how we shape this.

I would like to see if we could work with the Senator from Oklahoma in shaping an amendment which would express these very legitimate concerns but do so in a fashion where we know what the target is and we tell the President what we think but we do not injure the ability of this country to participate in international organization activities so that we do not have to do it alone and so that we have help from other countries.

I also say to my friend from Oklahoma—and I know he has thought about this long and hard, and my friend from Mississippi—I think it is very important in reacting to the immediate we not forget the long term. This is permanent law. We have all been through the War Powers Act. I voted for it, and I wish I had not because it will not work. It has never worked. It is not going to ever work. It just will not work.

The reason it will not work—there are probably several reasons but the main one—is it has in it a feature whereby if the President sends up a notice under the War Powers Act that hostile activities are about to occur, then that sets up a trigger. The trigger is a number of days. If Congress fails to act within a certain number of days—I do not know whether it is 45 or 60; I forget at the moment—then that inactivity by the Congress—the Congress sits on its hands. All of a sudden the President has to pull the troops out. It is no coincidence that no President, Republican or Democrat, has ever given notice under that War Powers Act, and they never will. Two hundred years from now somebody will be debating, and I assure you no President will ever have given notice.

If this amendment is agreed to, what the President will do, if he really wants to participate in a U.N. operation, particularly if he thinks it is urgent and in our national security interest—just as the War Powers Act was drawn with a lot more care than this amendment, months and months and months of very bright people like the Senator from Mississippi, Senator Stennis; the Senator from New York, Senator Javits; and others, this amendment has some of the same features of the War Powers Act.

The failure under this amendment, as I read it, the failure of Congress to act within 30 days once the President sends up a notice under a waiver and an emergency saying he has to assign U.S. forces to the United Nations under a foreign commander, once that happens, if he sends that up, if Congress sits on its hands for 30 days, under the Nickles amendment, then the President by implication—it does not say it explicitly but I assume that is the meaning; otherwise, it would have no teeth at all—the President then has to do away with that command, no matter what the circumstances. The inactivity by the Congress of the United States, whether by filibuster, whether by recess, whether by other important items, is going to trigger the President of the United States having to change the command arrangements.

Mr. President, I hope that we would find a way not to have to choose between a bureaucratic organization called the United Nations which now is spread thin and a Congress of the United States that has a lot of priorities and simply is not able to make these command decisions.

There are a lot of things Congress should do and there are a lot of things Congress cannot do. We cannot have 435 people in the House and 100 people in the Senate trying to detail the command decisions of the U.S. forces in participation abroad. If we want to be consulted, I think that is absolutely appropriate. I think the President ought to be given not just a warning light but sort of a red light for the next few months, a red light that says do not put any more U.S. forces under the United Nations until the United Nations gets its own act sorted out.

But that is not what the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma does. This is permanent law. It will apply to Republican Presidents in the future as well as the Democrat President now. It will apply to every President. It is a change in the balance of power between the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States.

I am not saying I am against that in all cases. I am just saying we ought to have a caution light ourselves before we make that kind of choice, and we ought to make sure that while we are worrying about the United Nations and its abilities now, while we are concerned that the President and his people may have had some lofty, dreamy notion about the United Nations and all of the things it could accomplish, we ought to say to the President, "Mr. President, slow down. We do not think you have thought through this."

We should say to ourselves, the Senate, "Slow down. You are about to alter the balance of power between the President and the Congress"—assuming this is constitutional, and whether it is or not, the courts will have to decide. I do not know that a long constitutional debate is worthwhile.

Mr. President, let me just ask the Senator from Oklahoma and the Senator from Mississippi, while they are

here, a couple of other questions I think are very important.

Mr. NICKLES. If I could respond, if the Senator would be kind enough to let me.

Mr. NUNN. Yes, I yield.

Mr. NICKLES. I believe the Senator mentioned in his remarks that this would alter the balance of power. Frankly, this would strengthen the Commander in Chief's power. It is telling the Commander in Chief not to delegate command and control over U.S. combat forces to the United Nations. If the situation that was described was a scenario of problems, the President can assert control over U.S. combat forces. That is what President Clinton did in Somalia. I think that was the correct thing to do. I do not see that as congressional intrusiveness into Presidential power. I see it as more or less reaffirming that the President not delegate that power to the United Nations or to the Secretary General of the United Nations.

Mr. NUNN. I thank my friend. I would wager any kind of bet that if you take any President of the United States that is still living, Republican or Democrat—and that includes several—and pose the question, "Is this an addition to the powers of the Presidency or a diminution?" I would give whatever odds the Senator desires that every President would say this diminishes the President's power and shifts the balance to the Congress on these issues.

I do not mind shifting the balance to the Congress on some things. I do not mind that. But for the Congress of the United States which, from the time President Bush committed those troops in Somalia last year in December, never passed a congressional resolution by the Senate and the House—we passed one, and they passed one several months later. We never acted on that at all. We never had time for it. It was not important enough on our radar scope for us after 8 months, until the Senator from West Virginia took the floor and made a big point of this. Then we had the tragedy which gave it momentum, and all of a sudden, it is the most important thing on the agenda. But we ignored it for 8 months, and now we are saying we have been ignoring that situation for 8 months. And now we want the President to get approval from us before making a command arrangement wherever you are in the world operating with anything other than Americans. I think that is very questionable.

I also say that I have watched the Presidents be able to get around the War Powers Act. If the President wants to get around this, all he has to do is avoid the U.N. commander label. All he has to do is have the United Nations pass a resolution under the auspices of the United Nations and have it done by whatever countries were going to participate in any way—and it is bilateral. You could have a Malaysian in charge of overall command, or a Thai, or Indonesian. Every soldier in the forces could be under a foreign commander, and as long as it did not have U.N. stamped on it, the Nickles amendment would not apply. I think we need to think long and hard.

Let me say to my friend that, again, I want to agree with him on the underlying point he has made about the caution light to the executive branch and a caution light to the United Nations. President Clinton himself put up a caution light when he made his U.N. speech. I think we have to realize that the United Nations has no logistics, no military intelligence capability; it has no command and control, no way to coordinate land forces, air forces, and naval forces. So it is time for us to say that when the U.N. Security Council does something these days, we better start listening. Guess who is going to have to carry it out? The United States.

If the Nickles amendment passes, we will not have anybody helping us because, I am afraid, countries around the world are going to say: Those Americans. Sure they are big, strong, and powerful, and sure they have better training than we do, but when our folks die, it hurts just as much back here as it does in America. And Americans cannot tell us that none of our generals, not even the best general anywhere we have in our military forces, is capable of commanding United States forces.

That is going to be the reaction. I am afraid that we are getting a little xenophobic, if that is the right word, in looking at just the United States. The Pakistanis that got killed, I am sure their families had the same kind of deep feeling of tragedy that we did when our forces got killed. I think we all ought to remember that when our forces got in trouble and we did not have equipment over there, adequate equipment—and that was a mistake, no doubt about that—who did we have to call on? We had to call on the Malaysians. We had to call on the Pakistanis. Those were the people who came to our rescue at considerable risk.

I want to point out a couple of other questions I have, and I will welcome response from my friends from Oklahoma or Mississippi.

One of the exceptions provided for in the Nickles amendment is that exception that is for temporary observer or liaison activities. I have three questions on that.

The first question: Would that apply to the deployment of United States forces which occurred in June of this year in Macedonia? They are performing observer duties as part of the U.N. protection force, and they are under the control of the Danish commander. Is June to September temporary? When does it move from temporary to permanent?

Question two: The United Nations has a mission in Iraq, the Iraq-Kuwait Observer Mission, known as UNIKOM, in which United States military personnel have been participating under foreign command. That has been in place since 1991. Question: Is that temporary? Is that temporary, or does 2 years make it permanent? Would we have to pass a specific resolution to continue that operation?

The third question: Does the U.N. Truce Supervision Organization, called UNTSO for the Middle East, in which U.S. personnel have been participating under foreign command—and that has been in place since 1948. I guess everybody will stipulate since 1948 is not temporary. So are we going to pass a resolution on that?

Does the Congress of the United States really want to pass resolutions on every one of these? I will ask further questions. The United States military force is in Somalia now, and that has been the case that brought this to our attention. They are performing logistics, communications, and other support under a Turkish general, General Bir.

As I understand the Senator's amendment, that would be an exception. That would fall under the exception and would not require specific congressional approval. But we also have intelligence forces that are serving under that same Turkish general. Do those come under the Nickles amendment? Are those forces part of the exception, or would they have to be specifically authorized for intelligence to flow to the Turkish general, who, as I understand, from all our commanders happens to be a very superb general?

I also ask about the United States quick reaction forces. Perhaps this has already been covered. But if the United States quick reaction forces have to go to the rescue of any of our allies in Somalia, there could be a tactical situation where they are under the control of a foreign commander.

We covered that a minute ago. Admiral Howe is not a foreigner. He is a U.N. person, but he really is not in control of the forces. He is in control of the operation overall. Perhaps, if our quick reaction forces went to the rescue of some allies there, they could be assigned to that allied foreign command. I am not sure how that question would be answered.

I say, finally, to my friend from Oklahoma, there is a longstanding provision in the law that covers what I think may be at the heart of what many people are apprehensive about—and I must say I am one of them—and that is, if the United States decides to participate with the United Nations force, if we have any kind of American presence, whether this President or another one who assigns U.S. forces to

the United Nations on a standing basis—and I believe there have been some alarm bells go out on that and properly so—whether that would require the approval of the Congress of the United States. I think it should. I think it should. But that is already the law. That law has been on the books for years and years and years. It was part of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, and it basically says that any President can negotiate a special treatment with the U.N. Security Council as envisioned by article 43 of the U.N. Charter to make U.S. forces available on call to the United Nations.

I have seen some discussion on that, and I would throw up a red light on that one, also, saying to the President, "Let us think through this long and hard." The United Nations has more than it can do now. Why should we get into this at this point in time? Maybe 10 years from now, maybe 15 years from now, but not now.

I say to my friend, if that is what his amendment is aimed toward, the same provision of law that set that up in 1945, that calls for approval of Congress for that. It could not be done. That is already the law. That kind of assignment of U.S. forces on a permanent basis to the United Nations for contingencies who knows where has to be approved by the Congress of the United States. I think that is proper.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. NUNN. I know I posed a lot of questions here, but I wanted my friend from Oklahoma to know that I share his concerns, but I think his amendment, and many people think his amendment, is shooting at what happened in Somalia on October 3 and October 4. I know it does not, because he made that very clear, and I think he explained it clearly. That is what the public sentiment out there wants. They want something that will prevent that kind of episode from happening again. So do we.

But we have to tell our people truly these were U.S. forces; they were under the command of General Howe, whose headquarters are in Tampa, FL, under the tactical command of an American general. They were carrying out American orders, and America itself participated in the Security Council resolution that set up this overall mission. It was a mistake, but these forces were not under foreign commanders.

I hope that everyone listening to this debate will recognize that. The Senator from Oklahoma has made it abundantly clear that if his amendment had been in effect on October 2 or October 1, nothing would have changed. It would not have covered that situation.

So I posed a lot of questions, and I would certainly yield to my colleague, the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STEVENS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I am going to object. I am certainly going to object. I know the Senator from Georgia has the floor, and I know that these questions are going back and forth. My job is to manage this appropriations bill. Very soon now I am going to object unless we have some order in terms of presentation statements and an end to this. If nothing else, although I would hate to do it, I tell my friend from Oklahoma, I am going to move to table this amendment myself. Until we start getting around to the business of appropriations—this is not appropriations. I have great love for all three Members here right now, but they are not helping us get to this bill.

I do not object now. I just want all to know that it is not long until I am going to be forced to do so.

Mr. NUNN. I say to my friend from Alaska I have managed a bill before, and I understand his feeling fully. But, of course, I say this is the first time I have spoken on this amendment, and I am not going to take an undue amount of Senate time. This is an important amendment, and it goes to American foreign policy, and it goes to really the delicate balance that also has ambiguities and gray areas between the Congress and the President. It also, as I view it, is going to give the Congress of the United States a lot of decisionmaking that we really are not capable of making.

The truth of it is, what we really want the Joint Chiefs to do, if we are going to ever contemplate putting U.S. forces under any kind of foreign commander—and that would include NATO, although we have a lot of confidence in NATO—we want the Joint Chiefs to say to the President, "Mr. President, we think this is a good, solid commander. We think this a good, solid command arrangement. We believe this commander can communicate with our troops. We believe there can be clarity of command. We believe that the rules of engagement are sufficient." We want that to happen on every assignment of American troops to a foreign commander. In fact, we want it to happen to our own commanders, too.

But those are ad hoc judgments. We do not want incompetent, in effect, inefficient commanders commanding American troops, whether they are United States or whether they are Indonesian or British or French. Those are the questions that have to be asked.

I just have a hard time visualizing hearings in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee or Armed Services Committee where we go into that and we have a hearing in full public view of whether a certain commander we are thinking about assigning troops to is worthy of commanding our force. Those questions have to be asked. They should be asked. They must be asked.

But the question is, Do we in the Congress really believe we have time to ask them? I do not believe we do. I do not believe we have the inclination or the time to take micromanagement control of command decisions of that nature. If we do, we certainly should have had time to debate Somalia before September of this year, and we have not. I think we have got to take care of our big job and turn it over to the Executive under certain guidelines. We are the board of directors; we need to give him the guideline for making these decisions, but I do not think we really want all of these decisions to come back to the Congress for our approval.

I yield to my friend from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I thank my friend for yielding for the purpose of one response to the point the Senator makes.

As chairman of the Armed Services Committee, he mentioned the importance of having hearings to look into certain questions that would be raised if this amendment were adopted. It seems to me that hearings are going to be required anyway because there obviously is confusion about what the administration's intentions are with respect to allocating U.S. forces to a U.N. standing army or rapid reaction force, as has been discussed quite openly on a number of occasions by the President and others in the administration.

Mr. NUNN. I will agree completely with the Senator from Mississippi on that. If talking about the micro issue of whether to assign U.S. forces to the unit, I agree completely.

Mr. COCHRAN. That is this amendment. This amendment says, "No funds appropriated by this bill shall be used by the Department of Defense" for that purpose. It seems to me that is a limited approach by this amendment. It does not spell out a policy for all time. It is not permanent law. It says none of the funds in this bill should be used for that purpose, and it seems to me that that is consistent with what the distinguished Senator from Georgia is saying as well. Is that not a correct reading of his reaction to the language?

Mr. NUNN. If I could say to my friend from Mississippi, I think he makes a very good observation here. Absolutely, we ought to be looking into the question of any U.S. plans to assign U.S. forces to any kind of U.N. command on a permanent basis or even on an on-call basis. I think that would be something we would have to do. To the extent his amendment hits that, I agree with it.

I also say, though, that that is already the law since 1945. It has been the law, and it would be required now for congressional approval, unless I am misreading the law. Our experts here can look that up. Maybe we need to update that law. Maybe we need to enlarge it. But I think that is an entirely different matter than having to have congressional approval every time the

Commander in Chief, or the President, makes a decision that this tactical unit is going to be assigned 2 days or 30 days or 60 days to this foreign command. Those are two different decisions. I think we have to be able to distinguished between the two.

What I believe the Senator's amendment starts off doing is exactly what the Senator from Mississippi said. When you look at all the circumstances, when you look at all the things this could cover—for instance, we could have a hostage-taking, we could have a situation where the United Nations was called in because there was an American airliner or any other airliner that goes down in a Third World country, and they do not want the United States in there, but they are willing to have some U.N. commands in there to deal with the terrorists, to deal with the whole situation and try to get the passengers back safely. That could be under U.N. command. We might want to send in the Delta Force, but they would have to report to the U.N. commander there.

In that circumstance, we really do not want a debate up here. We do not want to have a detailed debate about sending the Delta Force in, and with what commander. We want the President to be able to make those judgments, whether it is President Bush or whether it is President Reagan or whether it is President Carter or whether it is President Clinton.

There are all sorts of things I do not think have been thought through here, because the United Nations, obviously, is involved in a lot of places in the world. If we had a situation where the United Nations is involved, like in Somalia, and we do not have any combat forces under the United Nations there, but let us assume some of our logistical forces get taken captive and we want to have some kind of rescue mission there that is under a Turkish general.

All of the sudden we are going to have to coordinate, maybe not shift the whole command, but we are going to have to coordinate very carefully with that Turkish general in order to have that kind of hostage rescue mission.

All I am saying is, let us take another look at this amendment. Let us sit down and say what were the authors looking at? Let us take a look at the scope of what is being hit here. Because I think, as I read the amendment, it is much broader than what the authors have expressed here on the floor.

Mr. STEVENS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, while the Senator from Georgia is here, I want to say, I meant no offense to the Senator from Georgia with my comments previously. He and I had a very interesting discussion at lunch yesterday. I know that we share some of the feelings of the Senator from Oklahoma about the evolving problem of U.S. intervention overseas now that the cold war is over.

But, having said that, I would also remark that one of our colleagues just walked up to me and told me I ought to stay out of this debate, because it is a little bit above the pay grade of an appropriator to get involved in a discussion of such weight and that it should be left to the authorizing committee.

Mr. NUNN. I say to my friend from Alaska, no such thought ever crossed the mind of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. STEVENS. I understand it might. I do confess, we deal with some 30,000 different items of money in this bill. But we have been on this amendment now since Friday morning, and we have not gotten back to the money amendments.

After we dispose of this, we have another Somalia amendment, a Bosnia amendment, a Haiti amendment and probably a couple of others. As a matter of fact, we have seven language amendments coming.

I really find that we are under criticism for add-ons and changes in the appropriations process from the authorizing committee or the President's budget or what the House has done. There are legitimate complaints about what we do.

We constantly complain about the time we have on the floor being taken by matters that are very weighty—and I agree with the Senator from Georgia, they are very weighty. And I do believe that we have an issue that must be determined by Congress and the extent to which Congress ought to be involved in determining whether a dispute overseas involves our national interests sufficient to commit combat forces. Now, how that is to be done and who will resolve it, who will bring it to the floor is, obviously, I think, within the control of either the Armed Services Committee or the Foreign Relations Committee or both. It certainly is not within the jurisdiction of our committee to initiate that, but here we are.

All I ask is that somehow or other we try to resolve these issues. My good friend from Hawaii is temporarily absent. I would urge that we find some way to get some time limit on this amendment, to find some way to have the Senate express its will.

I will tell the Senator from Georgia—although I wish the Senator from Oklahoma did not have the phrase in this amendment "or any other law," I wish it were just a limitation on funds for this year only—I think it would send a message downtown. I do not view this as being anti-President Clinton. I would hope that it is not viewed that way.

I remember, to my regret, as I said on the floor here, that I opposed the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia on Lebanon. I really wish now that I had not done that. I think a lot of us do. I know that at the time the Senator from Arizona presented his amendment in the House as a young Congressman and, as I pointed out the other night, he was opposing a Republican President at the time in connection with Lebanon.

I hope politics does not come into this. I think we have to find a way to bridge the gap that was discussed here on the floor for a long time.

I remember Senator Eagleton of Missouri from the other side of the aisle. I sat on the floor for days listening to him, in terms of his opposition to the War Powers Act. And I did vote against the War Powers Act because I thought he proved conclusively that it would not work, and it has not worked.

But the problem is, we need something. We need something to define the time at which Congress ought to become involved, to determine whether it has a constitutional role in planning for involvement in disputes overseas that might involve combat troops.

I agree with my friend who said that is not within my job description. I would like to get around to talking about appropriations. Could we do that? Could we find some way to decide when we are going to vote on this amendment? Is the Senator from Oklahoma about ready to have a vote on this amendment?

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, in response to my colleague from Alaska, I have been ready to vote on this amendment since Friday. I was happy to vote on it yesterday. As a matter of fact, I think I told both the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Hawaii I was expecting that we would vote on this yesterday, because we had extensive debate. I was here this morning at 10:30 to begin debate and I have been ready to vote any time.

Most of the debate, I think, has been helpful. My friend and colleague from Georgia said that he agreed with a lot of the stated goals. I am very receptive if he has some language suggestions or something in trying to sort some of those out.

I would also like to respond to a couple of the questions that he had.

Mr. STEVENS. I yield the floor for that purpose.

Let me say this before I yield the floor. If no one else does, by about 5:30, I am going to move to table this amendment, although I will vote against that motion, because I do believe we ought to determine if it is the will of the body to continue this debate. I would like to vote for the amendment. But I do think we ought to find out procedurally whether we should go ahead with this debate and, if the Senate is not going to approve this amendment, we ought to get on to Somalia, Bosnia and Haiti sometime before we finish tonight, because we have a whole series of about 52 amendments dealing with this bill to go.

Mr. NICKLES addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments made by my friend from Alaska, and I hope that we do vote. I would like to have an up and down vote on the amendment. But if that is not possible, if the only way we can get a vote on the amendment is a motion to table, I am willing to do that. I hope that we would do it soon.

I would like to respond to a couple comments and questions raised by my friend and colleague from Georgia.

He mentioned, I think, four specific areas where we have the United Nations forces involved in peacekeeping operations. I will just submit for the record all 27 cases. This goes all the way back to 1945. I have already stated on the floor that none of those would be adversely impacted by this amendment. So the amendment is not as far-reaching as some people have mentioned.

Mr. NUNN. Will the Senator yield on that?

Mr. NICKLES. Yes.

Mr. NUNN. How can something that has been going on since 1945 come under the exception?

Mr. NICKLES. I might tell my colleague that we had written those definitions to exclude the use of the word of force or of combat. And combat is not engaged in those. Those are peacekeeping. They include medical, logistics, communications, humanitarian, training, temporary observer or liaison activities.

I think there is enough flexibility. The one word we did not say there was "combat." Clearly, we are trying to restrict the opportunity of committing U.S. combat forces under United Nations or under foreign commands where we do not have any direct link in the chain of command.

And so that is the reason why we went the exclusion route, instead of putting in the combat route. Frankly, we did that as a result, I think, of consultation with members of the Armed Services Committee and others that thought if we used the word "combat," it would be more intrusive and I did not want to get into that. Some people have combat missions or roles defined by their activities, even though they are not in combat situations, and that is the reason why we defined it as such.

I have a couple of other responses to my friend and colleague, more or less on the line of why we are doing this.

No other President has even considered placing our combat troops under United Nations control and foreign command. And that is what is different here.

We now have, both by the President, by his statements—and I read these; I do not want to be too redundant, but the President's statements—President Clinton made comments both as a candidate and as recently as his speech before the United Nations on September 27 talking about a very expanded peacekeeping role, including in that statements by the Ambassador of United Nations and others, including articles talking about Presidential Decision Directive 13. And I would encourage my friend and colleague from the Armed Services Commitee to take a close look at that.

It is a document that maybe has changed. My guess is it has changed a lot in the last 2 weeks. That talked about a wider role in U.S. peacekeeping. I will give my colleague copies of the articles, if he is interested. But that is the reason, why this amendment.

Also, my colleague mentioned one other question. He said, would this not end up in a situation where we would have our allies deciding that they would not want to participate because the United States would say no, we are going to be the leader? I do not think that is the case. I think we have proven, under U.S. leadership, that we can coalesce multinational forces to achieve an objective, a mission, including a combat mission. Certainly, that was done quite well in the Persian Gulf. It was done successfully. That would not be prohibited under this amendment.

So the President, as the Senator pointed out in earlier questions, could enter into bilateral or multilateral, or he could do things under the United Nations. But he would do it under United Nations with U.S. control. So the President would be engaged, as Commander in Chief; he would be in the chain of command and not delegate that to the United Nations, which is clearly involved in lots of operations worldwide and spread very thin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. NUNN. I would say to my friend the one thing in here that seems to be contradictory is, as I understood the Senator from Oklahoma, he said this was just funds in this act. But clearly the amendment I have—maybe it has been changed—says, "None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act or any other Act, may be used * * *." This is permanent law, as I read it.

Mr. NICKLES. If the Senator will yield, I do not think that is correct. The Senator read it correctly. "None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act or any other act," you are talking about appropriations. The reason it says "any other Act" is, as the Senator knows, for a long time U.N. peacekeeping operations were originally funded out of the foreign operations bill.

Now they are funded out of the defense bill. That is the reason why it is inclusive. You would not want to have the situation where we agree to the amendment and find out they had some leftover funds in foreign ops and got around this restriction and fund it out of the other appropriations bill. But it is on this appropriations bill; it is limited to this fiscal year. It is not extensive.

Mr. NUNN. Where is the limit to this fiscal year?

Mr. NICKLES. Because this is fiscal year 1994 and it says "funds appropriated." It is not talking about amending statutory law. I heard my colleague say this has a long-term impact or something—that is not the case.

Mr. NUNN. I would say to my friend, when you say "any other act," that includes any past act. If it is permanent law it includes any future act.

Mr. NICKLES. I differ with my colleague, with all due respect. "None of the funds appropriated." We are talking about appropriated accounts. We are not talking about authorization. We are talking about appropriations.

Mr. NUNN. But authorizations do not get spent unless they are entitlements, unless they are appropriated, so appropriations are necessary for all military activities.

Mr. NICKLES. The only thing, we do have the power of the purse and we do have the right to place some restrictions. Again, that is exactly what this is. It says, "None."

"Funds appropriated in this Act or any other Act," we are talking about appropriations, and that is what we would limit it to.

Mr. LEVIN. Will my friend from Oklahoma yield on just that narrow point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia has the floor.

Mr. NUNN. I will yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. LEVIN. If the Senator from Georgia will yield on that point, this morning I made a parliamentary inquiry on exactly this issue: Whether or not that language, "or any other Act," meant that this was legislation on an appropriations bill. The ruling of the Chair was that it was, in fact, because of that language, legislation on an appropriations bill. It is not limited to appropriations. It is "or any other Act." It is not limited to this bill because it says "or any other Act." But without getting to that argument I would—and I thank my friend from Georgia for yielding the floor—remind the body that we have a ruling of the Chair on this point, that because of that language "or any other Act," we have legislation on an appropriations bill.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I know other Senators will want to be heard on this. I just say to my friend from Oklahoma and my friend from Mississippi, I appreciate the dialog and the openness of the debate. I think this has

helped me have a better grasp of their intentions here. I hope they would not foreclose the possibility of working something out that would express those intentions in a narrower way.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. NICKLES. As I mentioned to my friend and colleague, if I may just respond, as I mentioned earlier, I would be happy to receive any suggestions he has. I think we made some constructive dialog in the debate. I will just leave it at that. I will be happy to work with the Senator.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, first, I do not believe that a letter from the Acting Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has yet been entered into the RECORD. If it has not been entered into the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent it be printed at this point.

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

JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF,
Washington, DC, October 18, 1993.

Hon. GEORGE J. MITCHELL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MITCHELL: As the debate on the revised Cochran-Nickles Amendment to the FY 1994 Department of Defense Appropriations Bill (H.R. 3116) continues, some military operational consolidations should be emphasized.

My fundamental concern remains: the amendment precludes our effective involvement in multi-national coalition's (other than NATO) under U.N. command or pursuant to a Security Council mandate, except when the United States commands the effort.

By precluding even basic tactical control by a foreign commander in any situation, the proposed legislation would prevent effective assistance from the U.S. to any foreign element in a coalition operating under a U.N. mandate (DESERT STORM) or U.N. command. As an example, during the Persian Gulf ground war, two U.S. Marine Corps artillery battalions were placed under the operational control of a British and French commander to ensure those forces had sufficient firepower to breach Iraqi lines at the same pace as U.S. forces. The amendment's limitation would apply even if we had overall command of the operation. Logically, other nations also could be expected to adopt similar conditions on their U.N. military participation.

This amendment's failure to indicate parameters of its excepted categories will embroil our leaders in controversy. For example, the term "humanitarian" has a broad spectrum of meaning and whether a given situation is included in the definition will present many policy and operational uncertainties.

I trust these additional comments will prove useful to Congressional discussion on this important matter.

Sincerely,

DAVID E. JEREMIAH,
Acting Chairman, of the
Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, this letter from the Acting Chairman, Admiral Jeremiah, says the following. It is brief and I will read it because I think it its important as to how our top military people interpret the amendment pending before us.

As the debate on the revised Cochran-Nickles Amendment to the FY 1994 Department of Defense Appropriations Bill (H.R. 3116) continues, some military operational considerations should be emphasized.

My fundamental concern remains: the amendment precludes our effective involvement in multi-national coalitions (other than NATO) under U.N. command or pursuant to a Security Council mandate, except when the United States commands the effort.

By precluding even basic tactical control by a foreign commander in any situation, the proposed legislation would prevent effective assistance from the U.S. to any foreign element in a coalition operating under a U.N. mandate (DESERT STORM) or U.N. command. As an example, during the Persian Gulf ground war, two U.S. Marine Corps artillery battalions were placed under the operational control of a British and French commander to ensure those forces had sufficient firepower to breach Iraqi lines at the same pace as U.S. forces. The amendment's limitation would apply even if we had overall command of the operation. Logically, other nations also could be expected to adopt similar conditions on their U.N. military participation.

This amendment's failure to indicate parameters of its excepted categories will embroil our leaders in controversy. For example, the term "humanitarian" has a broad spectrum of meaning and whether a given situation is included in the definition will present many policy and operational uncertainties.

I trust these additional comments will prove useful to Congressional discussion on this important matter.

Sincerely,

DAVID E. JEREMIAH,
Acting Chairman, of the
Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. President, our top military official has read the amendment before us in the same way Senator NUNN and others have read it, which is that this would preclude a tactical commander being a U.N. commander who is a foreigner.

What he has described for us are all the operational difficulties—operational difficulties that this would create for the United States. This is our top military person, reading the pending amendment. I do not think there is any other way to read it but that, because the pending amendment specifically prohibits U.N. operational or tactical control. It says, "or tactical," not "and tactical." It says, "if such forces would be under the command, operational control or tactical control"—not "and tactical control"—"or tactical control of foreign officers."

There are numerous situations where the tactical control of American soldiers is given to a U.N. commander who is a foreigner for the sake of the protection of American forces. These are American soldiers who are at risk, and there are times when there is a foreign commander, a U.N. commander, who is given tactical control to save our forces.

Mr. LEAHY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEVIN. I will be happy to yield for a question.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, does this not, as I ask my friend from Michigan—does this not basically, this amendment, say—if you read the amendment and read Admiral Jeremiah's interpretation of it—does it not basically say to the rest of the world you are free to come here and help us? We will tell you what to do and how to do it. But anywhere else, whether our national interests are involved or not, we are simply going to go it alone. We will do it without help or cooperation. We either go it alone in regional conflicts or expect other countries, having seen us take this attitude that we will only go it alone, expect them to suddenly volunteer to come and join us, under our command?

My question is, Does that not defy our whole historical experience, especially since World War II?

Mr. LEVIN. I think it does. I think it creates major problems in that regard, and Jeremiah is right. In a more narrow sense, it creates dangers for our men in combat. The situations given by the Senator from Georgia—let me give you another one.

Let us assume that we had a quick reaction force which is made up of two companies, one is an American company, with an American colonel, and the other one is a British company with a British colonel. The American colonel is in command, and that is OK under the amendment. They are out there in combat and the American colonel has this British colonel as a deputy. I think that is all right under this amendment because the British colonel is the deputy to the American colonel. But the American colonel is killed.

Are they supposed to come back to the Congress to see if it is OK if the British colonel can take command? Is that what we are saying to ourselves? Men in combat, an American company and a British company under the command of an American colonel, tactical command of an American colonel, it is the mission that they are on, the American is killed, his deputy should take over. That is the structure. But, no, not under this amendment because tactical command cannot go to a foreigner unless Congress approves.

We have problems at the United Nations I think these problems have to be addressed. I agree with my friend from Oklahoma trying to point out some of these problems. I happen to feel strongly that both Foreign Relations and Armed Services should address a number of issues which my friend from Oklahoma has raised. But we cannot plunge into this kind of amendment which is binding on a Commander in Chief without great care because of the

danger that we will be placing our own combat forces in.

There are many scenarios like the ones that I have just given, and we cannot unwittingly—of course it is unwittingly, this is not the intent of the amendment—but the words of this amendment—tactical control not "and and and." It is "or or or," and to prohibit tactical control in these kind of circumstances will endanger the very people whose safety we are sworn to uphold, the men and women in the United States military.

So, Mr. President, I do hope if something cannot be worked out which will get our committees to really address these issues—and, by the way, a number of our committees already are, both the Armed Services and Foreign Relations and a number of our subcommittees are addressing these issues, but we should do it with greater urgency, I believe, because of the events in Somalia and other parts of the world. But if we cannot work out a resolution which will give some impetus to a common goal of all of us in this body to address these multinational issues, I then hope that this amendment would be tabled or would be defeated.

Mr. EXON. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LEVIN. I will be happy to yield to my friend from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. Before I pose a question to my friend and colleague from Michigan, I would simply like to say, 24 hours ago, about right now, I was on the floor debating this amendment with the Senator from Oklahoma. Some of the things that have been said today just drive home the point that I was making in debate yesterday on this. We seem to be spinning our wheels a great deal.

Clearly, what is being attempted by the amendment I think offered in good faith by my colleague from Oklahoma, but I told him yesterday I thought this was a very mischievous amendment, and I cited some examples not significantly different in their thrust that have just been enunciated by my colleague from Michigan. Clearly this is, among other things, legislation on an appropriations bill. I think we have had a ruling of the Chair on that. Now we have a letter from the acting Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff indicating some serious problems with this, in addition to the ones this Senator addressed yesterday. We discussed this in the Democratic caucus today at some length. I assume the Republican caucus did likewise.

I will simply say to the Senate that we seem to be spinning our wheels.

I ask this question of my colleague from Michigan: Since undoubtedly there are people on both sides of the aisle who feel very strongly about the situation that confronts America right now, but that does not mean I believe we should adopt a mischievous amendment regardless of how well-intentioned that amendment is.

I am wondering if to save some time and maybe accomplish what many people, including this Senator, would like to do, to bundle up in some fashion after some compromise and move ahead instead of continuing debate, get the parties together with the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma, with the amendment offered or intended to be offered by the minority leader on the situation in Haiti, and one or two other amendments, could we not accomplish what most of us would like to do; and that is, a statement of fact; could we not wrap all of these up, in the opinion of the Senator from Michigan, in some sort of a sense-of-the-Senate resolution that I think might satisfy the large number of Senators on both sides of the aisle, a sense-of-the-Senate resolution then would not be legislation on an appropriations bill? It would not be challenged with regard to its constitutionality, which some of these issues will.

I am wondering, in the interest of comity and moving this ahead, if the Senator from Michigan might think it a good idea for several of us to get together and see if we could not come up with a sense-of-the-Senate resolution that embodies the concerns expressed by the Senator from Oklahoma, and others, and maybe bring this matter to a head in that fashion.

Mr. LEVIN. In answer to my friend from Nebraska, I hope something like that would be possible. I share what he has just said about the concerns of our friend from Oklahoma as being legitimate concerns. I must tell you, I visited the United Nations command center. As chairman of my subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, I went there to see it, and I have studied this issue at some length. I have a great deal of difficulty with the lack of clarity, for instance, of U.N. command structure.

What the Senator from Oklahoma, I think, is driving at is something which probably troubles most of the Members of this body. It is important we address them and address them carefully, and I have a hunch he will agree with that thought as well.

I will yield the floor with just a plea to all of us that we try to find a way——

Mr. LEAHY. I wonder if the Senator will yield for a question first.

Mr. LEVIN. The way the Senator from Nebraska talks about seems to me is a useful possibility I hope will be explored to try to come up with a sense-of-the-Senate resolution addressing these issues.

My plea would be we do try to achieve a bipartisan approach to these issues. They are very important, whether the President is a Democrat or Republican. All of us, I think, are troubled by a number of aspects of the events that are going on in the world, and I would hope that some time would be taken, and I know my friend from Alaska wants to move the bill, but I do think it important to take the hours necessary to try to achieve a bipartisan approach to the kind of situations and circumstances which my friend from Oklahoma has identified.

Mr. LEAHY. If you will yield on that point, just for a question on that point, because I find much of what my friend from Nebraska said appealing. But part of my opposition to this amendment, which I find an ill-founded amendment—not the author of it—I think he seems to approach it with a great deal of care, but I ask the Senator from Michigan basically this question:

Are we prepared to put together a sense-of-the-Senate resolution on this issue today?

Let me give you some basis for that question.

First, the situation in Somalia we all watched on the evening news. Everybody was down here the next morning and, by golly, we are going to rearrange the way we are going. We saw the ships off to Haiti in what was a policy based more on hope than on any sense of history.

These two things were a wake-up call and the policy, to the President's and the administration's credit, has changed both in Somalia and Haiti from what it was a few weeks ago. It is reflecting the concerns expressed by the Congress and by the American people.

But can we make foreign policy in this post-cold-war period by having a resolution today and having an amendment today for Haiti or Somalia and tomorrow for Bosnia and the next day, if something happens in Pakistan or India or anywhere else in the world, in the Caribbean, in the Mediterranean, in the South Pacific? Where do we respond?

Suppose in some of the places where we support somebody, they have been elected and suddenly the ruling junta says, "No, we think we are going to think this through and do it again." Do we step in? Do we move into Cambodia? Where do we go?

But there is another aspect. I am as frustrated as anybody about the command and control problems in the United Nations, and I am also concerned about personalities that become far more involved than the overall sense of what is best.

But if we come in here with an amendment today that basically trashes the United Nations, basically tells the United Nations it is useless, it is beneath our consideration, what are we going to do? Are we going to put ourselves in the situation where we become the policeman of the world, and if somebody calls, we either go it alone or there is nobody left to do it?

We do not have a bipolar world anymore. We can no longer say to the Soviets you keep your hands on this one; we will keep our hands on that one. We cannot do that.

Do we really want to be in a position whereby if our interests, our security interests, our humanitarian interests, or whatever interests are affected somewhere, it is either we go it alone or it does not get done at all?

Basically, we are saying that. We are saying we are prepared to do this alone because we are not going to do it with you. And if we say we are not going to do it with you, can we be so arrogant as a country that we can assume every other country in the world is going to say, well, OK, we understand we are so inferior to you you cannot operate with us, but we will immediately come and do what you tell us to do? If we assume that, we have not been reading history. We do not understand what is going on.

Now, there is frustration, and a justifiable frustration, in some of the things that have been happening. But let us not kill any ability for the United Nations to carry out a peacekeeping role. Let us not kill any ability for the President of the United States, this President or the next President or the President after that, to carry out our foreign policy. Let us not abrogate the responsibility we have as the only superpower in the world today.

If we are responding to the poll of the moment, we are ignoring the history book of tomorrow. If Harry Truman had reacted with the Marshall plan when the polls showed only 7 or 8 percent of the people agreed with it, if he said "OK. Whoops. Yank that sucker off the table," where would we be today? Do you think the history books would record there was a poll that showed 90 percent were against the Marshall plan? Of course not. History books report on the Marshall plan and the fact it worked and the fact that it helped keep peace and stability in the Western World.

So my question basically to the Senator from Michigan—and he and I have been friends from the moment we met. He has indulged me in going along with probably an overlong premise, certainly more than we in New England use.

Mr. LEVIN. It gives me a lot of time to figure out the answer.

Mr. LEAHY. But is it not a case, I say to my good friend from Michigan, that this reflects the frustrations of the moment, legitimate concerns, as to the United Nations and what our policies are going to be in this post-cold-war period? But having said that, it is something that requires study and effort of Republicans and Democrats alike, on the appropriate committees, and a real debate on the issue itself, not as the amendment of the moment on an appropriations bill where we are going to have to vote to do something that may affect our Nation for good or ill for the rest of our lives.

Mr. LEVIN. Very briefly, I will try to answer. I think there are three advantages to a bipartisan sense-of-the-Senate resolution to address some of these concerns.

First of all, it will be a way for us to address some concerns which we legitimately have on both sides of the aisle about a number of these operations. It is a way of expressing some of our unease. That is No. 1.

Second, if it is a bipartisan approach, it will be in the great tradition of this body. Right now I see Senators on this floor on both sides of the aisle who have participated in great bipartisan efforts frequently in this body. I happen to have as the ranking member on my Armed Services subcommittee Senator WARNER from Virginia, who consistently addresses problems on a bipartisan basis. I have seen it year after year after year.

The second advantage of a sense-of-the-Senate resolution is that it would be bipartisan, which sends a very powerful signal.

The third advantage now gets to my friend from Vermont. If it is a sense-of-the-Senate resolution addressing these concerns, it is not written in statute. If we make a mistake in a sense-of-the-Senate resolution, it is not a mistake which cannot be easily remedied because it is not binding on the executive branch.

So it has all three advantages: having some flexibility, you can correct your mistakes; it is bipartisan; and it does express some legitimate concerns which many of us have.

So I hope that if this effort is undertaken—and I think many are already trying to move in this direction—my friend from Vermont might be willing to participate in that effort.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I strongly oppose the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma. It is untimely, ill-advised, poorly drawn, and highly partisan in its attack on the President.

This amendment would prohibit the commitment of U.S. combat forces to U.N. command where such command is exercised by foreign officers. As I read the amendment, U.S. military personnel in noncombat functions could be committed to U.N. command. There is an exception to permit the President to commit U.S. combat forces to such command arrangements in emergency situations as long as specific conditions are met, although Congress would have to vote to approve such action within 30 days. There is a total prohibition on any U.S. forces being committed to any prospective standing U.N. international armed force.

If the Senator from Oklahoma were seeking to prevent the President from doing, through the United Nations, what many of us believe he cannot do unilaterally—that is, commit American forces to hostilities without the authorization of Congress—that might be a different matter. But that is not in fact what this amendment does. It is only U.N. military formations or units, whether engaged in hostilities or not, under foreign command that are off limits to American combat forces; if such formations or units are put under U.S. command, then U.S. forces can be engaged without any prior authorization by Congress. It is not U.S. forces being engaged in hostilities through U.N. action without the approval of Congress that is the issue—it is whether such U.N. forces are, or are not, under American command.

Mr. President, I yield to no one in this body in my defense of the right and duty of Congress to vote whether to authorize the President to make war. I stood for that principle when President Reagan committed American marines to Lebanon without the authorization of Congress, and 240 of them died. During the period preceding the gulf war, I was one of those who demanded that the President seek the authorization of Congress before initiating offensive combat operations. Recently, I voted to cut off funding for operations in Somalia by March 31 of next year unless Congress, by a new vote, authorizes a continuation of United States forces in Somalia. I am prepared to use the power of the purse to assert Congress' constitutional responsibility to authorize the commitment of U.S. Armed Forces to hostilities. I am a strong supporter of the War Powers Act.

But this amendment goes far beyond the exercise of the constitutional powers and responsibilities of Congress, or the constraints of the War Powers Act. It blatantly infringes on the President's constitutional powers as Commander in Chief to direct U.S. forces, including making such command and control arrangements as best suit the goals and objectives of the United States and its allies. It would prevent the President from committing U.S. combat forces to U.N. peacekeeping or other operations without prior approval of Congress—or unless he exercised a national security waiver, subject to being overturned by Congress within 30 days. This potentially severely limits the ability of the President to take emergency actions to protect U.S. military forces or American citizens or property through U.N. military operations. It could expose U.S. forces to attacks while they are engaged in noncombat activities as part of U.N. peacekeeping or observer operations—activities clearly permitted by this amendment—by preventing any U.S. forces from coming under U.N. operational command where foreign military officers would be exercising such command.

Mr. President, there are half a dozen or more situations right now, today, where such an emergency could arise. United States military personnel are involved in U.N. peacekeeping or observer operations in: UNTSO—Middle East, UNIKOM—Iraq-Kuwait, MINURSO—Western Sahara, UNTAC—Cambodia, UNPROFOR—former Yugoslavia, UNMIH—Haiti, and UNOSOM II—Somalia. In any one of those places there could be attacks on U.S. military personnel engaged in U.N. activities, with relief and rescue operations being carried out by U.N. forces under U.N. command. As I understand this amendment, any U.S. military operations aimed at rescue or relief would have to be carried out independently of any U.N. military operations, even though U.S. and U.N. troops would be carrying out the same missions, operating side by side, and assisting each other, unless the President chose to exercise the waiver authority. And, the waiver authority is itself subject to being overturned by Congress. Before agreeing on any such limitation on the President's powers as Commander in Chief, we must remember that such U.N. operations would not be aimed solely at rescuing Americans; many nations commit military personnel to these missions, and they would have a right to expect, and to demand, that the United Nations take immediate and effective military action to protect and defend their nationals. If U.S. forces remain aloof from U.N. relief operations, how could we expect U.N. forces to give the same priority to rescuing Americans as they would to their own nationals?

This is surely not the intent of the Senator from Oklahoma. No one would deliberately endanger U.S. forces, whether combat or support troops. But I am afraid that is exactly the effect of this amendment. It could inadvertently expose several hundred young American men and women now engaged in U.N. peacekeeping or observer missions to a danger that the President could not act immediately to commit U.S. combat forces to a U.N. rescue or relief operation. I can imagine a situation in which U.S. forces immediately available in a given situation are insufficient, and where U.N. forces represent the strongest relief force at hand. Yet, under this amendment, American forces could not join the U.N. relief or rescue operation if it meant accepting even the tactical command of the foreign military officer.

The amendment raises major policy long-term problems aside from the emergency situations I just described. It would prevent the President from permitting U.S. combat forces from being committed to U.N. command when such command is exercised by foreign military officers. Put less politely, this means whenever U.N. military operations are under U.S. command, it is fine to commit U.S. forces, and for other nations to commit their forces to U.S. command. But when it comes to any U.N. operation being under the command of non-American military officers, U.S. military participation is off limits. This is a wonderful argument for employing the United Nations as an instrument for conflict resolution and peacekeeping around the world. Why not just say we will participate only when the United Nations takes orders from us, and otherwise, count us out?

During the debate on the Somalia amendment a week ago, I called attention to a dilemma we are heading into with all these criticisms of the United States as a peacekeeper, and these outcries to prohibit any U.S. forces from participating under foreign command in peacekeeping operations. The American people do not want, nor will they allow, their sons and daughters to be the police officers of the world. Unilateral American military interventions are going to be rare indeed in the post-cold-war world. But we already have ample evidence that this world is not going to be a peaceful, stable world. If we keep on trashing the United Nations, having debates on ill-considered amendments like the one today, refusing to play our leadership role, just who do we think we are going to turn to for order and stability in the world?

This amendment has gotten ahead of serious debate, discussion, and analysis of how the United States is to exercise leadership in the post-cold-war world. It is being offered in the heat and emotion of the recent events in Somalia and Haiti. And let us be candid. It is being offered to try to embarrass the President on foreign policy.

Mr. President, we need to think through this whole question of peacemaking and peacekeeping before we start limiting the role of American military forces or tying the President's hands. Unilateral military interventions by great powers, such as the United States intervention in Santo Domingo in 1965 or the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan in 1979, are largely things of the past. At least, I certainly hope so. Only in the direst situation involving immediate and vital American interests can I envision unilateral U.S. military intervention. Rather, it is now going to be through multilateral institutions such as the United Nations, the Organization of American States, NATO, and other international bodies, that we, as the world's one remaining superpower, lead the community of nations in working together to maintain peace and resolve conflicts.

This amendment says the United States will go it alone, without help and without cooperating with others. It says we will leave it to others to deal with regional conflicts and international instability, while we grandly give orders and ask others to sacrifice where we will not. It fails to understand what has happened in the last 5 to 10 years, the realities of the international arena, and the mood of the American people. As so often with spur-of-the-moment amendments driven by television reporting and opinion polls, it has no sense of history.

Mr. President, I urge all Senators to join in opposing the Nickles amendment. Let us send a signal to the world that the United States is still capable of exercising global leadership, that we are still a superpower, that we are prepared to do our part in building a better, more stable world for our children and our grandchildren. Let us give the President the tools he needs to protect American interests abroad.

Mr. MCCONNELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Kentucky.

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

I think it was that great American Yogi Berra who said, when noticing the similarity to an event that occurred in the great American pastime of baseball, "This is deja vu all over again."

I recall arguing as forcefully as I could during the Reagan and Bush administrations that Congress ought not to micromanage American foreign policy.

Mr. President, I am persuaded that just because there is a new President of a different party that argument is still valid. It is still valid.

I think there is a good deal to recommend certain portions of the Nickles amendment. I wish to congratulate Senator NICKLES and Senator COCHRAN for kicking off this very important debate.

The one new initiative of this administration in the foreign policy area was this growing reliance on multilateralism. That was going to be the great new initiative of the Clinton administration, which is to place more faith, particularly in the United Nations, to carry out missions that we were either incapable or unwilling to carry out on our own. That was going to be the new idea of the Clinton administration.

Mr. President, I think it is perfectly clear that creeping multilateralism is not going to work in the post-cold-war period, and I think that is a subject worth discussing. The Nickles amendment has certainly kicked off that debate once again as well as the debate we had last week on Somalia.

So in looking at the details of the Nickles amendment—and I followed the debate rather carefully both yesterday and today—there are some parts of it that are clearly, it seems to me, worthy of commendation.

If, Mr. President, we were to take this opportunity—and my own view is we should probably not do it at this point, but if we should take this opportunity to start crafting some measure

for congressional approval of the deployment of American troops to the United Nations, this 30-day period as it is currently crafted in this amendment would present the opportunity for one single Senator to filibuster a Presidential initiative.

So, if we were to go that far, at the very least it would seem to this Senator, there ought to be expedited procedures, and it ought to be a resolution of disapproval to give the President some chance of overcoming the temptation that many of us have around here under Presidents of both parties to try to micromanage every detail of one of these initiatives.

Mr. President, I am not yet ready to support that micromanagement proposal. Again, I say Senator NICKLES has provided an opportunity for a much needed debate. He has given a lot of thoughtful attention to this issue. I wish to commend him for raising it.

But, in addition, Mr. President, he raises another issue of the amendment that I would be prepared to vote on today, another idea that has been kicked around by Members of this body and others, and that is the question of whether the United Nations ought to have a standing army made up in part, presumably, of American troops.

The Nickles amendment on page 2 of the version I have appears to prohibit the U.S. participation in a U.N. standing army. I would say to the Senator from Oklahoma and the Senator from Mississippi that is something I would be prepared to vote on today because I think a U.N. standing army is a terrible idea.

It is an atrocious idea. And that is one subject upon which this Senator does not need any additional hearings. Senator NICKLES has raised that issue in the course of crafting this amendment. If we were to have a vote on some portion of the Nickles amendment either today or tomorrow or whenever it would be, my suggestion to the Senator from Oklahoma is that we try to carve out of the Nickles amendment that portion of it upon which there might be pretty widespread agreement.

My suspicion is—I could be wrong—that a majority of the Members of this body would think that a U.N. standing army, which might or might not be able to function at the behest of the Secretary General with or without approval of the Security Council, is a pretty bad idea.

I can think of one hypothetical, for example, where a U.N. standing army might decide it wants to isolate Israel, for example. If it had the authority to do that, based upon some action conferred on the part of the Israelis that it did not approve of and could do that without the support of the Security Council, they would be in there, I say to my friend from Oklahoma, they would be right in there.

(Mrs. MURRAY assumed the chair.)

Mr. MCCONNELL. So I think that is a very, very important issue that the Senator from Oklahoma does raise in his amendment, very appropriately so, one that I think a lot of us have given some thought to over a period of time. I would say as far as this Senator is concerned, no more hearings are needed on that part of the Nickles amendment.

With regard to the whole Nickles amendment, I must reluctantly say to my friend from Oklahoma I could not at this particular point support it. I think it does set up a procedure that is a little bit troubling to me, a procedure that I suspect I would have been arguing against had we had a Republican President in office right now.

I know consistency may be the hobgoblin of little minds, but this Senator is going to try to at least be somewhat consistent in these foreign policy determinations because I think it is extremely important that we try to diminish the level of partisanship when we get beyond the shores of our country. I cannot think of a single domestic initiative of the Clinton administration that I would vote for today or that I am likely to vote for in the future. I do not like what the President is trying to do to this country. But in the area of foreign policy, it seems to me we ought to be trying to work together to craft bipartisan support, where possible, to make it possible for the President to move forward.

I must say there is no way to get around making a case-by-case assessment of our foreign policy initiatives. Somalia is not Haiti, and Haiti is not Bosnia, and sooner or later we have to make some judgment on individual countries.

From my point of view, we have no national interest of any kind in Somalia—none. As I said last week, I think we should have left in May when the humanitarian mission officially came to an end. Some would argue hindsight is always 20/20, why did we not have the debate then, and we were derelict, we should have had the debate then.

I have a hard time finding American interest in Bosnia. I have a hard time finding ourselves having an interest, but I could see a European interest there.

When it comes to Haiti 800 miles off our shores with dissatisfied Haitians coming to the United States any way they can, with increased drug trafficking, I am told, through Haiti as a result of the conditions there locally, I think it is pretty hard to argue that the United States does not have a direct, vital interest, maybe even a national security interest in Haiti. I hope the President is going to take a great deal of interest in Haiti. I think this country has a great deal of interest in what happens there.

I do not want this current situation of a flap in Somalia, action in Haiti, proposed action in Bosnia to cause us to rush to pass a set of requirements for any President to meet prior to taking any unilateral action that we later would regret.

So I say to my friend from Oklahoma, I think he has done a terrific service here. I think this is an excellent amendment in some respects. I hope the Senator might at some point choose to carve out that portion of the amendment that deals directly with the question of the U.N. standing army. Let the Senate speak on that. As far as this Senator is concerned, it would not have to be a sense-of-the-Senate resolution. A lot of us have given a lot of thought to that issue, whether or not that would be a good idea. It is a terrible idea, a terrible idea, Madam President. One of the very useful things that would come out of this debate is we could scotch that once and for all, right now. The notion that the United States was going to support a regular U.N. army to run around the world, presumably with some American troops as part of that, intervening willy-nilly wherever it chose to do so is a terrible idea.

So I hope the Senator from Oklahoma might consider offering a modified version of his amendment and give us a chance to express ourselves on the question of a U.N. standing army.

Madam President, that basically concludes my observations. I really regret that I will not be able to support the Nickles amendment in its current form. I would like to see it resurrected with some modifications along the lines that I have suggested.

Again, I want to commend the Senator from Oklahoma for a good piece of work and really kicking off a much-needed debate about this whole business of multilateralism. I hope the President and the administration will get the idea that there are a lot of people here in the Senate who do not think these kinds of multilateral initiatives, particularly to the extent that they appear to be molded and led by the United Nations, are something that is going to get much support around here.

I am not a U.N. basher. I think the United Nations can do some things well. I am extremely skeptical as to whether or not the United Nations can engage successfully in nation building, and I am certainly not interested in seeing them do it with American troops without congressional approval.

I yield the floor.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. Madam President, I hoped I could get the attention of the Senator from Oklahoma if he is on or about the floor. I would very much like to pose a question to him.

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, may I say in answer to the question

that I just spoke to the Senator from Oklahoma. He was called from the floor and is not present at this time.

Mr. EXON. Could I possibly pose the question to the Senator from Alaska, then, and he might consult with the Senator from Oklahoma?

Given the many statements that have been made, last night at this time the Senator from Rhode Island, Senator CHAFEE, was on the floor. I just heard the Senator from Kentucky elaborate on his views on this. I think we all appreciate the fact that the Senator from Oklahoma has been trying to address something that I think, to one degree or another, concerns a great many of us.

However, in my question of Senator LEVIN during the time that he had the floor, I raised a question as to whether or not, given the circumstances that have been gone over and over again with the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma, my question is, does the Senator from Alaska believe the Senator from Oklahoma might be inclined, in cooperation with the minority leader and others that intend to offer amendments in this general area, if we might not be able to move this matter along under the guidance of the two managers of the bill, the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Hawaii, to have maybe an agreement on a sense-of-the-Senate resolution, which I think might be the most speedy fashion in which to solve the matter that currently confronts the Senate.

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, I might say to my good friend from Nebraska that it is my understanding this is a second-degree amendment.

It is not subject to amendment. It has been pending now since Friday morning. The Senator from Oklahoma indicated to me that he does desire a vote on his amendment. He prefers an up-or-down vote. But I have indicated that I might make a motion to table. In the event that could not be done soon—and I have had a request here that I not do that immediately, but I do intend to pursue that sometime this evening if there is not an alternative arrangement made.

I suggest to the Senator from Nebraska, and others who might wish to have him change his mind, they should consult with him. I have no information to the contrary, other than the Senator from Oklahoma has talked with me within the last 45 minutes and asked me to assist in getting a vote on his amendment.

Mr. EXON. I will yield the floor in a moment. I just appeal once again.

Let me ask this question of the Chair:

The amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma is a second-degree amendment, as I understand it; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. EXON. Have the yeas and nays been requested on the second-degree amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. EXON. Then we are in a parliamentary situation where we are either going to have an up-and-down vote, we are going to have to have a tabling motion, or the Senator could withdraw his amendment, pending some kind of an arrangement for a sense-of-the-Senate resolution, as I have suggested.

I see the Senator from Hawaii is on his feet. I was going to ask him a question as to whether or not he thought through his good offices and those of the Senator from Alaska, if it might not be possible in his judgment, if the Senator from Oklahoma would agree, to compromise on some kind of a sense-of-the-Senate resolution that I think most of us will support?

Mr. INOUYE. Madam President, if I may respond to my friend from Nebraska, in my conversations with the Senator from Oklahoma, I am convinced that he wishes to have a vote on his amendment. But I wish to advise my colleague from Nebraska that at this moment, the Senator from Georgia, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, is working on a draft of a sense-of-the-Senate resolution that I believe covers all those points that the Senator from Nebraska has indicated in his debate. That resolution should be ready for presentation, I have been advised, sometime within the hour. I would suppose that sometime before 7 o'clock, an up-or-down vote, with or without a motion to table, will be made on the Nickles amendment. Soon thereafter, possibly back to back, will be the Nunn sense-of-the-Senate resolution.

Mr. EXON. I thank my friend from Hawaii.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

Mr. DOLE. I just wanted to take a minute, Madam President, to give sort of an update. A couple other amendments are floating around—one on Haiti and one on Bosnia. I know they were discussed today at the Democratic policy luncheon and at our leadership meeting.

I have had a couple of meetings with Senator MITCHELL on these specific amendments. I thought I might let my colleagues know that we continue to work with the White House, and I assume they are working with State, Defense, and the National Security Council people in an effort to try to reach some balance between the Congress and the President in this very difficult area, on what power do we have as Members of the Congress under the Constitution, and what powers the President has to commit forces under the Constitution. I received a four-page letter from the American Civil Liberties Union supporting my amendment stating a number of arguments that we thought were pertinent.

In any event, we are trying to resolve the differences that we have with the White House because, as I said the other evening, in nearly every case I want to give the President the benefit of the doubt, particularly in foreign policy. So if we can come to closure on some agreement, that may save the managers some time. If not, we will just have the debate and have a vote up or down on the amendments as they are presently drafted.

Mr. KERRY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KERRY. Madam President, let me just say to the distinguished minority leader that, hopefully, the course he has laid out is one that can be adopted, and that will provide us with an opportunity to have some sort of meeting of the minds. I think that the Senator from Kansas, the Republican leader, well knows from defending the Presidency, through both Presidents Reagan and President Bush, and in his own quest for the Presidency, which may or may not continue, there is certainly a strong need to have bipartisanship. We are stronger as a country when we are bipartisan in our policies.

So, I certainly hope we can find an agreement, because I think this process is hurtful to all of us.

Madam President, in building on what the distinguished minority leader has said, if you review the history of our foreign policy and our diplomatic history, no one, in my view, will contest the notion that there are two ingredients that are critical to a successful policy. First is bipartisanship. Second is consensus—consensus in the country at large, and consensus in the U.S. Congress.

Efforts that detract from consensus undermine our ability to pursue our policy. In Vietnam we did not have consensus. After a while, bipartisanship broke down. You can look at lots of other examples—Grenada, Panama, Iraq—where we developed the consensus and people came to support the policy. The United States is strong when that happens.

This is a particularly dangerous time in the world, because no framework has yet been defined or built for our policy or that of other nations post-cold-war period. We all knew how to behave for years. Ever since the Truman doctrine was laid down, we understood with a certain clarity that certain parts of the world—indeed, most of the world—was consumed by the East-West dynamic. Sometimes we strayed from that, and when we did, we usually put it in the context of the East-West dynamic. Domino theories, whether applied to Southeast Asia or Central America or

Latin America, were all rooted in the context of that pervading hegemony, that unilateral marching entity called communism.

During all of the period that we were struggling with communism, we tried to build the institution of the United Nations. If you look back, historically, most people viewed the effort to make the United Nations work and be a success as an outgrowth of the failure to make the League of Nations work. At the end of World War I, the world had this extraordinary opportunity to try to create a new world order, and we blew it in a lot of different contexts.

Ultimately, we wound up expending enormous treasure of this country because of the events that led to World War II and ultimately World War II itself. Our leaders were wiser after that. Churchill and Roosevelt laid the groundwork for what we had to stand for and how the world should seek a peaceful resolution of disputes.

It seems that suddenly there is a panic; there is a disorder right here within this institution and within our country. We seem to be resorting to the kind of isolationist, America-first attitude that dominated the interwar period and challenged us until we finally entered World War II.

I am not suggesting that very legitimate questions about implementation of policy or the military command structure or choices that were made should not be raised in the debate that we are having here today. But it seems to me that there is an effort now to curb Presidential choices at a stage far earlier than any intrusions that I can remember by Congress into Foreign policy.

Some of these amendments that are floating around here, potentially place restraints on the choices of the President of the United States such as we have never discussed previously. Most of the people who are floating these suggested restraints, or supporting them are people who would never have contemplated placing these restraints, on the prior Presidents of recent time and would have used constitutional arguments to resist them. People contemplating these choices would have been the first on the floor defending the prerogative of President Reagan, President Bush, President Ford, or President Nixon to make the choices they made, and indeed the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is absolutely filled with those arguments.

So something is going on here. I hope that it is not partisanship. I hope these are just legitimate concerns that are being expressed. If these are just legitimate concerns that are being expressed, then we ought to examine the substance of what people are offering. However, the substance of what is being offered in this amendment is, frankly, way off the mark and even dangerous in the context of protecting American troops or protecting American interests.

I am not going to deal now with the other amendments that are floating around. Nor will I deal at this moment with the full measure of what is at stake right now vis-a-vis the United Nations or other peacekeeping efforts that we put such stake in. But I might just mention that you can find countless successful United Nations operations, such as those in Cyprus, Cambodia, Iraq and Kuwait, the Golan Heights and the Middle East.

Now, after the United States has spent a lot of its good will encouraging other nations to lose their young men defending the notion of democracy and multilateralism and after we have lost many of our own, suddenly we are questioning the viability of an institution—the United Nations, that we have taken years building, that represents an alternative to the expenditure of $300 billion a year for a unilateral defense structure.

Anyone who wants to suggest that instability in nations across the world is better than stability or that having civil war break out all across the world does not affect our interests is portraying a world that responsible leaders have never tried to offer the citizens of their countries.

Let us look at Cambodia. The United States bears enormous responsibility for the events that led up to the breakdown of Cambodia as a nation. It was, after all, our decision to invade Cambodia and our decision to bomb Cambodia for a long period of time. That created a nation of refugees and a lack of government. In fact, we bear some responsibility for the advent even of the Khmer Rouge. Recently the United Nations had an operation in Cambodia, a country that is filled with land mines and ambushes. Everybody said you can never get an election there; it will never work. What are you doing, nation building, all you crazy people?

What happened? They had an election, and now they have a government and perhaps they have an opportunity to make something out of the chaos that has been their lives for the last quarter-century or more. I would note that during that operation, some Japanese peacekeepers were killed. But Japan did not leave. They stayed in the operation. I am not suggesting that we ought to be involved everywhere. I am not suggesting that we can be the policeman of the world. But I am suggesting that what we have built over these years in the United Nations needs to be improved, nurtured, and advanced, not just stopped cold, destroyed, and undercut.

That is precisely what the Nickles amendment would do—undercut, stop cold, and send an incredibly damaging, dangerous, message to other nations that have been part of all of these U.N. efforts over the years.

What kind of message is it for the United States of America, the world's only superpower, in which we take such pride, to send to the world: that when the going gets tough in the first instance, we are not going to cope, to make changes to make the institution work; instead we are just going to go, that is it. You folks, stay there and defend all these lofty principles that we fought for all these years.

When you look hard at the Nickles amendment, it is clear that it does not deal with the problem before us, but it is probably unconstitutional on its face, since it purports to take away the power of the Commander in Chief as a commander in chief who has the right to order troops to fight in certain ways at certain times with certain people.

Since when does the Congress get involved in that kind of decision? Yes, we have the right to say we are not going to spend money, but I do not know where it says in the Constitution we have a right to be the Commander in Chief prospectively.

So, there is an enormous constitutional question involved here. But beyond that, I think, the amendment is flawed. The amendment is obviously a reaction to events in Somalia.

There is not one of us, and we have all said this on the floor, who was not horrified and angered by the sights that we saw. There is not one of us, I might add, who does not have serious concerns about the choices that the military made. But, Madam President, our military made those choices. Those troops were not under direct tactical command of a foreign commander.

There is not one thing in this amendment that would change what happened in that incident in Somalia. Our combat forces were operating in support of a U.N. operation but under U.S. command. The overall commander of the U.N. operation, Admiral Howe, is an American. The Deputy Commander of the military component of the U.N. operation is an American general. The fact of the matter is that the operation that went awry was conceived by American military commanders, under the operational control of a military commander of the United States, and whatever errors were made we cannot attribute to the problem of a foreign command.

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, will the Senator yield just for one moment?

Mr. KERRY. I will yield without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, I made a comment, and I said to the Senator from Massachusetts that I would make a motion to table the amendment at 5:30. I was requested by the leadership to defer that at least until 7 o'clock. I want the Members to know that.

I appreciate the Senator's yielding and I thank him.

Mr. KERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Alaska.

Madam President, as I said, had the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma been on the books earlier this month, it would have had no impact on the operation in Somalia. It would not have changed the outcome. Our combat forces were operating in support of the United Nations but under U.S. command. So let us understand that, as we approach this kind of flighty, quick, hasty, unexamined response to emotions that are in the streets of our country.

The real issue that we debated for the last 2 weeks is not the issue, I think, of foreign command. The real issue that people are grappling with and frustrated about, and rightfully so, is the deployment of American troops in harm's way and whether or not Congress is going to have an adequate say in that deployment.

I would respectfully suggest—and I suggested this on a couple of television shows over the course of the weekend—that we need a fundamental examination within the U.S. Congress and a definition of the new international context and our role in it. I think we ought to think very hard about—and I would advocate embrace—the notion of a volunteer force within our volunteer army. Some may say that is kind of an oxymoron. I do not think it is. The volunteer army that we have today is an army that is made up of folks who, notwithstanding the fact that it is a volunteer effort, are not signing on to every policy effort America is signing onto. There is a sort of limitation, if you will, to the kinds of risks they believe they are going to undertake by joining the service. Those risks, basically, are viewed by most people as the kind of risks we expected them to take in defense of this Nation through the cold war. If there is some major kind of conflict, maybe we will get sent off and have to defend our Nation, and possibly there will be the kind of thing that took place in Panama or Grenada, and that sort of is OK as long as it turns out OK.

I think that we need to draw from that volunteer force of our country a specialized group of people who know that they are putting themselves on the line for something that is not quite as well defined, who know that they may be called on to go and fight somewhere for this concept of peacekeeping or peacemaking in the world.

I would suspect that you will find many, many young Americans anxious to embrace these principals, but anxious also to gain the experience that they would be afforded by virtue of being on those front lines, and that you would have an extraordinary outpouring of volunteers who are willing to commit themselves to this larger effort.

If we did that, when the Congress of the United States, together with the President—and I emphasize, the Congress, together with the President—suggests that there is some well-defined interest that we ought to stand for in the context of peacekeeping and stability and a clear mission that we should undertake, then I think you would eliminate much of the concern of people being sent without justification, without legitimacy, against their will. You would eliminate parents and others in this country feeling that somehow their loved ones might be in some wasted effort rather than in an effort that they chose out of their feelings of gut and heart and head that led them to make that kind of commitment.

I would insist, however, that we must still have congressional input so that we do not have some sort of supermercenary force or some kind of effort outside of the traditional restraints that we have, so that this Nation is not sucked into something inadvertently. I would think our efforts would be greatly helped by that.

Mr. President, the pending Nickles amendment really does not address these larger concerns that are, frankly, at the center of people's reservations, confusion, or questions about current policy.

There is no way to eliminate risk when you send soldiers, whatever basis they go on, into harm's way. However, we can be more certain than we have been that the mission is well conceived and defined, that we understand the chances of success, that we know it is in our interests as a nation and that those interests and the mission have been clearly defined to the American people.

The Nickles amendment, if it were adopted in its current form, would frankly make it difficult, if not even impossible, for the United States to participate in the legitimate efforts that we are already a part of or that we might contemplate being a part of as a member of the United Nations. As one of the creators of the United Nations, it seems to me that we envisioned an institution through which nations broadly would be able to resolve disputes. Now that that institution is no longer restrained by cold war politics, it seems to me that we should not be adopting an amendment which is not fully thought through, that has the effect, as Senator LEAHY, Senator EXON, Senator LEVIN, and others have said of totally tying up, hamstringing, our forces.

Admiral Jeremiah's letter has been talked about already in the course of this debate. I do not think it needs a great deal more discussion, except to say that I do not think we should lightly dismiss his opinion and the substance of what he put in his letter, particularly his comments on restraints on tactical command.

You simply would have a more dangerous situation with the adoption of the Nickles amendment, by virtue of the fact that you would have time lags in your capacity to make choices about reaction, or who serves where, and also because you would restrict our ability to be able to engage in rescue missions, mercy missions, or in emergency choices that might arise in the field.

Madam President, the U.S. participation in peacekeeping operations is not something new, as I mentioned earlier. And it seems to me that this issue of command is also not new and should not, in the wake of all of the events that have taken place in the last few days, become a central issue.

Besides the operation in Somalia, American military personnel have participated in five other U.N. peacekeeping operations—most recently in the Middle East, the western Sahara, Cambodia, the former Yugoslavia, and on the Iraq-Kuwait border—and they have worked on peacekeeping at U.N. headquarters. We did not raise the issue of foreign command then. We did not raise the issue under Presidents Bush or Reagan.

With the exception of many of our forces in Somalia, these Americans, obviously, were serving in a noncombatant capacity. But whatever they were there for, the Nickles amendment is a statement that if you are in a noncombat status but still under a foreign command, your life is not worth as much or we are not going to care as much about the control over the kind of activities you might be subjected to or the kind of danger you might be put in.

Obviously, we all know that plenty of logistical people can be put in enormous danger. The Nickles amendment makes this distinction between combat and noncombat, which I believe is unfair and inappropriate and which the Senate should not ratify.

Not only does the amendment erode the capacity of the United States to participate in U.N. peace operations, but the amendment obviously weakens the President's ability to be able to respond in the event that an emergency should arise.

History does not support the position that is being taken by the Senator from Oklahoma on the foreign command issue. And I think that is an important point for all of us in the Senate to focus on.

There are numerous examples of American forces operating under foreign command. In World War I, we had about 2 million Americans who served with French and British armies under the overall coordination of a Frenchman. And in World War II, United States and British command and staffs were interlayered throughout the military on many different levels. United States units were under the command of British commanders a number of times, for example, in Italy, Normandy, Arnhem, and the China-Burma-

India theater. The United States-Republic of Korea Combined Forces Command, which consists of 1 American division and 22 Republic of Korea divisions, has been under the command of a South Korean general since 1992. This is a U.N. command.

It seems to me we should understand also that in the Desert Storm operation, despite the fact that the United States had overall command, U.S. brigade from the 82d Airborne Division was placed under operational control of the French 6th Light Armored Division.

So all of that would have been, and would be, prohibited and would send an incredible message about U.S. willingness to participate and share and lead.

Now I am not suggesting for an instant that there are not legitimate questions about command and control. There are. And we certainly never want to cede the command of certain kinds of delicate operations, or certain kinds of missions, where we have any doubts at all about the capacity of those missions to be carried out.

Madam President, I think on its face this amendment is so wanting on constitutional levels, so wanting in terms of the effort to build bipartisanship, so wanting in terms of what it does to the United Nations' capacity to effect its mission, so wanting in the capacity to properly protect military people in the field, so wanting in terms of the diplomatic message that it sends to our fellow participants in peacekeeping, that the Senate ought to defeat it resoundingly. We ought to move onto a far more sensible debate about where and how the United States is going to serve its interests and what is the proper post-cold-war framework, how we implement it, how we regain our strength for bipartisanship and for consensus building. If we will do that, then we will live up to our obligations and to our aspirations as a superpower.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I take it, from my colleague and friend's comments, he is leaning slightly against this amendment. I would just have to say I caught part of my colleague's comments. I did not catch all of his comments. But some of them I would just like to point out, I believe, are factually incorrect.

My colleague mentioned that we have had United States troops serve successfully in World War I, World War II, in the Persian Gulf effort, under foreign commands. That is correct. And they would not be prohibited under this amendment.

My colleague mentioned several successful U.N. peacekeeping efforts. They would not be prohibited under this amendment. My colleague, I think, mentioned that we would undermine U.S. or make it difficult to participate in U.S. peacekeeping operations. That is not the case. This amendment exempts noncombat operations. So, if we were involved in humanitarian, medical, and other types of operations, border control, we could do that.

What this amendment does address is putting U.S. combat forces under U.N. command, under a foreign commander, so you do not have Presidential involvement. That has never happened in the 48 years under United Nations. We have never had a President willing to assign U.S. combat troops to the United Nations. Maybe my colleague would like to do that. I do not.

Let me make a couple of other quick comments. It was implied that, under my amendment, you could not have a situation such as we had in the Persian Gulf where you had an overall U.S. command and that he could not delegate command in lower groups or units to a foreign commander. That is not the case. We did that in the Persian Gulf and that worked and worked effectively. But you had overall U.S. control of the operations.

My colleague mentioned that the United States bears some responsibility for the Khmer Rouge. I am not even going to comment on that.

My colleague mentions that U.N. peacekeeping forces might be a significant alternative to $300 billion defense budgets. Maybe some people do have the idea——

Mr. KERRY. Will my colleague yield for just a question on that?

Mr. NICKLES. Yes.

Mr. KERRY. I know he does not want to comment on the question of the Khmer Rouge, but the fact is—I was there at the time. I was even involved in some operations which took them weapons and traded weapons for information.

Why we were arming them is beyond me. The Senator may not want to comment on it, but it is a historical fact. I would be happy to respond to the other issues the Senator has raised if he wants to discuss them.

Mr. NICKLES. No, I just want to respond to some of the comments my colleague from Massachusetts made.

Mr. KERRY. Madam President, I wonder if he would enjoy a good dialog or just prefers to comment in a vacuum.

Mr. NICKLES. The Senator made significant statements against my amendment. I would like to respond to just the few of these I made notes on.

My colleague mentioned it undermined U.N. peacekeeping efforts. That is not the case. As a matter of fact, I think I have done this two or three times. I went through the 27 operations that we have had in the United Nations since its inception—going back to 1945. This amendment would not eliminate or make those missions impossible.

My colleague mentioned it would not impact Somalia. I stated that several times on the floor. The Somalia operation—I might mention a couple of things. My colleague mentioned that Somalia went awry and it went awry for a lot of different reasons. Part of those reasons was U.N. control. And some of the reasons were U.N. support of resolutions which have greatly expanded their role away from the humanitarian role into nation building. That resolution supported it. It passed. Unfortunately, it was supported by the United States.

In addition to that, in June the role was expanded again beyond nation building into the capture of General Aideed. So we moved from a peacekeeping effort, basically, into nation building, and into a military operation. At the same time, we significantly reduced our military forces from 20,000-some troops to about 4,000 troops. I think that was a mistake.

As my colleague pointed out, this amendment does not address Somalia. My colleague may or may not be aware of it, but this amendment was drafted well before the events or the tragedy that happened in Somalia, and it was a tragedy. This amendment was drafted because this Senator kept reading things about Presidential Decision Directive 13, which was going to greatly expand our role in the U.N. peacekeeping operations—greatly expand it—that was talking not about just peacekeeping but peacemaking, peace enforcement.

We have seen an increase in U.N. peacekeeping forces, increase in the last few years, from 10,000 to 80,000. That is not an insignificant amount. Then, I am going to say with 80 individuals working full time out of U.N. headquarters, they are certainly spread thin. They are now involved in 14 operations.

I might mention, since my colleague went back to some of the history and some of the successful U.N. operations, I would agree. But in the United Nations between the year 1945 and the year 1987, I believe, we had 13 U.N. peacekeeping operations. Since 1987 we have had 14. So we have had a greatly expanding role.

Now we have an administration that wants to expand it even more rapidly. We have a U.N. Ambassador who has made very strong statements about expanding it more rapidly. So that is my concern.

I would just say again, in response to the thrust of my colleague's statement that we would undermine the United Nations, no President in the past since the creation of the United Nations has committed U.S. combat troops to the United Nations without maintaining control, command of those troops. That is what I would like to protect. This is not a change in policy, not gutting the United Nations, but trying to preserve and protect the existing policy that we have had since its inception.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. I would just ask my friend from Oklahoma—and I do not do this contentiously at all—but reading this amendment, I, at least, come to a different conclusion, as other colleagues have.

My friend has just suggested all the things it would not do. But that is his word versus the language that is in the amendment itself. I am reading from a paragraph on the first page—unless it has changed. What I have says that you cannot have any funds appropriated to support Armed Forces personnel, other than those engaged in medical, logistics, communications, humanitarian, and training.

First of all, we have people out there who are Americans who are not in combat notes. And we distinguish their lives from those of the combatants. You can get into a lot of trouble having to protect your citizens, who are there for logistical reasons, just as you might in protecting those in combat. But that is a distinction we are not going to worry about here. I think that is problematical. The relevant phrase of his own amendment is as follows.

You cannot deploy U.S. forces as part of U.N. operations if such forces would be under the command of foreign officers.

That does not say at what level. It just says, "under the command." You could have these forces at a battalion level or at a company level operating in some joint operation. Even though your supreme commander might be American, they might be under a foreign command. This prohibits that.

I would like my colleague to show me how that is not prohibited by this language.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, it does not prohibit that. If my colleague will look at the definition, "under United Nations operational or tactical control."

Let me just back up for a second.

In the first place, the only restriction we place is on combat troops. So the President would be allowed to participate in the U.N. peacekeeping effort as Presidents have going all the way back to 1945 for humanitarian and other reasons. That is the reason for that distinction.

Mr. KERRY. That is what I am getting at, the combat troops.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I have the floor. I would like to finish responding. I have not quite finished responding. My colleague made a couple of comments.

"Why have the distinction?" The reason we made the distinction is because when we are talking about placing combat troops, then we ought to be involved in the decision. The President ought to be involved in the decision and we should not put U.S. combat troops under an international organization without any link to the U.S. chain of command. We need that chain of command to have responsibility, to have not only authority but also responsibility. I think that is very important.

We made an exception for NATO because that is another area which has worked quite well. So has Korea. We made an exception for that.

I want to address the second part of my colleague's question when he said, What about the power of command?

"The power of command under United Nations operational or tactical control," as defined on page 3, "* * * the power of command usually given to a leader of the military force, such as the authority to coordinate and direct the mission-related activities of the units comprising such force."

The commander can delegate to other commanders of lesser rank, I would suppose, to control those units. We did that in the Persian Gulf. We had a supreme commander. We have done it in NATO. The United States had a supreme commander in NATO. We did it in World War II where you had General Eisenhower as the Supreme Allied Commander, but he designated power or authority to other commanders. That is clearly allowed under this amendment. I wanted to make sure that my colleagues were aware that that is the correct interpretation.

Mr. KERRY. Madam President, I have just read this section, and it really does nothing, I must say to my friend, to change my observation. It says U.N. operational or tactical control. It says "with the exception of NATO, of the power of command usually given to the leader of a military force."

"A military force" does not say the principal military force or the U.N. force. It says "a military force." You have tactical command of a military force if you are a patrol or if you are a combat division or battalion, or whatever. I still read it to say that if they are in a tactical situation or operational, which is what it says, then you cannot have them under a foreign commander.

I do not think that changes anything. I think the observations of the Senator from Georgia, Senator NUNN, stand.

Mr. NICKLES addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I am surprised I was not successful in convincing my colleague from Massachusetts. I will finish reading the definition: "* * * the power of command usually given to the leader of a military force * * *." The second part of that says: "* * * such as the authority to coordinate and direct the mission-related activities of the units comprising such force."

Clearly, that is the overall supreme commander of whatever units it is to comprise that force.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KERRY. Madam President, again, I know he is not surprised that he did not persuade me. I am surprised I have not pointed out the discrepancy adequately. But the fact is, the leader of a military force is still a military force. It is the leader of a military force, not "the military force," not "the U.N. force," not "the principal U.N. force," not "the U.N. mission," not "the U.N.-sanctioned, Security Council-sanctioned force." It is "the leader of a military force," and a military force is any unit you send out on a mission.

I just think this is an example why we should not rush to this. It is precisely why we ought to spend some time drafting an amendment that is far more clear when it has the kind of significant impact that this amendment purports—not purports—would have. As a consequence, I think it is critical to be much clearer as to what we mean by "tactical," what we mean by "operational" and who and what has control.

Let me say to my friend, I am chauvinistic enough about our own forces in this country that in most instances, I personally would be a lot happier if I knew we had a command and control structure that was either American or sufficient for the situation. I think that is one of the issues that we are going to have to work out as we approach these missions.

Clearly, the U.N. Ambassador should not sign off at the United Nations and we should not vote for a particular operation in the future until these kinds of issues are much more clear. But for us to step up and usurp the power from the President, I think, is a very dangerous precedent prospectively.

I thank my friend.

Mr. NICKLES addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I understand my friend from Hawaii wants to make a suggestion on how we manage the rest of this amendment, and possibly the bill, this evening.

Let me just restate that it is this Senator's intention not to take away any power from the President. He is trying to make sure the President does not give away power to the United Nations or to a foreign officer and make a commitment of U.S. combat troops. I want to make sure the President will keep his power, his authority as Commander in Chief and, likewise, keep congressional involvement as well. That is the purpose of the amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. INOUYE. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to express a few thoughts about the nature of the debate that has been taking place for the past several days. I have received a number of press inquiries about motivations, such as what has prompted Senator NICKLES to offer his amendment to this bill?

And what about Senator DOLE, who just last week was such a staunch supporter of the powers of the President, arguing against measure that might undermine his position or the credibility of the United States. Yet, today or tomorrow he might very well be in a position of supporting and sponsoring an amendment that would place restrictions upon the ability of the President to commit troops into foreign lands, without prior congressional consent or approval. Is there some hidden motivation? Is this something that is inconsistent, to be supportive on the one hand, and on the other hand be less supportive and perhaps even antagonistic?

I think it is very clear—to me at least—without even having a discussion with Senator DOLE, that once our troops have been committed to a region and are under fire or are in danger, he has always made it a position to rally behind the President of the United States and express his support on behalf of the President.

What he is doing on this occasion, however, is to try to gain the attention of the White House and to say that prior to committing our forces to foreign lands, there must be congressional participation. Do not put us in the position of having to ratify what may be viewed as an unwise act on the basis that to do otherwise would mean that we are endangering the security of our forces and contributing to the loss of faith of our allies in our mission or ability to carry that mission out.

Mr. President, I think, despite the fact that the President acted from the best of motives to, as he said, focus like a laser on domestic issues, he found that someone—the gods or whomever—has held a mirror up to that laser beam that now reflects in his eyes, in fact blinding him with critics and cries of weakness and incompetence that is being displayed by the White House. Congress and the American people are now questioning whether the lives of our men and women in uniform can be entrusted to this administration.

That is what is at the heart right of this debate that has been taking place and will continue into tonight and tomorrow. I think the President and his advisers are responsible for the situation, which I think has been damaging his Presidency and the Nation, and only he and his administration can truly correct it. But so long as they express befuddlement, as they did in recent meetings with the Congress, or assert unilateral authority over warmaking powers, as the President did yesterday, I think Congress is going to feel compelled to craft its own solution, as inadequate as that might be.

I think the primary issue is the administration's confusion over when and how to use military force. A recent series of speeches by the President and his senior officials have failed to adequately clarify its policy or to repudiate earlier pronouncements that were as clear as they were wrong.

To give you an example, during the 1992 campaign, Governor Clinton embraced the concept of a new multilateralism, the cornerstone of which would be a standing United Nations army, ready to intervene around the globe to reverse aggression and to keep the peace. A few weeks before he was chosen to be Secretary of Defense, Congressman Les Aspin rejected the criteria articulated by Gen. Colin Powell for when and how to use force and proposed an alternative approach that would lead American troops into combat on a much more frequent basis.

I would like to take a few moments to review the Aspin doctrine, because I think it helps to explain congressional anxiety over yielding to this administration the ultimate decisionmaking authority on when to spill American blood and treasure.

In a highly touted speech last September, Congressman Aspin summarized the Powell criteria in the following terms:

First, force should only be used as a last resort. Diplomatic and economic measures should be tried first.

Second, force should be used the only when there is a clear military objective, not to achieve vague political goals.

Third, force should be used only when we can measure that the objective has been achieved, that is, we need to know when we can bring the troops home.

Fourth, force should only be used in a decisive fashion to get the job done as quickly as possible and with as little loss of life as possible.

While he acknowledged that "these criteria have served us extraordinarily well," Congressman Aspin summarily rejected them as being obsolete in "this brandnew world of ours * * * a world of agitation and turmoil."

He, I think, falsely criticized those who endorse these sensible criteria as the all-or-nothing school. And he declared that those in a competing limited objectives school were "unwilling to accept the notion that military force can't be used prudently short of all-out war."

Congressman Aspin lamented that "under the all-or-nothing school, the U.S. military is likely to be used very, very rarely," undercutting public support for even very modest defense budgets.

To me, it struck me as a variation of the theme that we must use it or lose it. I think that is a very dangerous philosophy as it applies to our military.

He proposed that "a signal should be sent to deter" ethnic and nationalist conflict in many parts of the world and identified the conflict in Bosnia as a good opportunity to send such a signal.

He went on to criticize the then-Secretary of State Lawrence Eagleburger's advice that we should think more than one step ahead before intervening in the former Yugoslavia, and Eagleburger's warning that Vietnam was the result of such incrementalism. Chairman Aspin declared,

> In Vietnam, American policymakers kept escalating our involvement because they were afraid of what our allies and adversaries would think—and do—if we withdrew. If we failed to keep our commitment, we would embolden our adversaries and cause our allies to question our commitment to them. During the cold war, you could not just walk away.

Those are Congressman Aspin's words.

Well, here we are in the post-cold-war world, and Secretary Aspin has concluded that we could not just walk away from Mogadishu because to do so could damage our credibility, embolden our adversaries, and cause our allies to question our commitment.

In fact, the debate has not been between the all-or-nothing and limited objectives schools but, I would submit to you, between a clear objectives-decisive force school and what I would call an opaque objectives-marginal force school.

General Powell and Secretary Weinberger before him never ruled out the use of force to pursue limited objectives, so long as the objectives are clear and defined such that we will know when they are achieved and decisive force is used to achieve them. Decisive force does not mean all-out war, but force that is more than adequate to achieve the task. As Weinberger made clear in his well-known 1984 speech, if the objectives are limited, the force used might well be small in an absolute sense, yet still be decisive.

Under the clear objectives-decisive force school, we would not have allowed our military mission in Mogadishu to grow after our forces were reduced and the chain of command rendered ambiguous. The U.S.S. *Harlan County* would not have set sail for Haiti with 200 lightly armed troops while the State and Defense Departments were still debating what their mission would be—only to sail away, in the face of a hostile reception the Pentagon had warned of but the State Department dismissed as the cries of Chicken Little.

These are the actions of the opaque objectives-marginal force school, which

is responsible for the resulting policy debacles that we are witnessing.

Foreseeing in his 1984 speech a more chaotic world in which "the line between peace and war is less clearly drawn than at any time in our history," Secretary Weinberger also presciently warned against the opaque objectives-marginal force school's response to this not-so-brand-new world:

> Some theorists argue that military force can be brought to bear at any crisis. Some of these proponents of force are eager to advocate its use in even limited amounts simply because they believe if there are American forces of any size present, they will somehow solve the problem.

I guess I have to ask how else can we explain the administration's insistence, over the objections of U.N. officials, on sending a meager United States force to Haiti as part of what one diplomat called a psychological gambit to take advantage of Haitians' supposed awe of foreigners?

The administration is learning that theory must yield to reality. Yet veiled threats of an American invasion of Haiti, apparently without any consultations with congressional leaders regarding such an option, suggest it really has not learned enough from the events of the past few weeks. Until it does, it should not expect a very long leash from Congress.

As Air Force magazine warned in January,

> These people are not dealing in abstract concepts. They are tinkering with deadly force. If their notions become policy, we may learn all over again that it is much easier to get into a fight than it is to get out of one.

I think it is worth remembering that we slid into the Vietnam quagmire not because of a lack of intelligence, but an excess of arrogance—regarding America's ability to impose its will, even where our interests were limited, and the Executive's primacy over the Congress. And many of the best and the brightest are now in power.

Mr. President, arrogance and power is a dangerous brew. We must resist the temptation to drink this hemlock that is offered to us as the nectar of the gods or, at least, of the all knowing.

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

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine withhold the request?

Mr. COHEN. I will withdraw the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EXON). The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I shall speak briefly.

I oppose the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma, and I favor the sense of Congress that will be offered by Senator NUNN.

We have to ask ourselves the very fundamental question: What if other countries do the same thing we do in passing the Nickles amendment and say we will not permit people from other countries to be in charge of our Armed Forces? You cannot pass this and assume no other country is going to do it. If we did that and if other countries did the same, we would have chaos wherever the United Nations takes responsibility.

What we are saying—because we do not want other countries to do the same thing—is that we want to follow one rule in these combat situations, we want all of you to follow another rule. That just is unworkable. So, I hope we will do the right thing, the rational thing, and reject the amendment of Senator NICKLES, well motivated as it is.

If you ask the same question of the proposal that will be made by Senator NUNN, what if other countries do this, have the same sense of their parliamentary body, and follow the procedures that are outlined here, would that cause chaos? And the answer is no. That is workable.

What the sense-of-Congress resolution says is let us be careful, let us be cautious as we move ahead.

So I rise in opposition to the Nickles amendment. I rise in support of the amendment, the sense of Congress, that will be offered by Senator NUNN.

Mr. President, if no one else seeks the floor, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma.

I must say that earlier I had intended to come and speak in support of the Senator's amendment. However, having listened to the distinguished senior Senator from Nebraska, the current occupant of the chair, and the chairman of the Armed Services Committee discuss the preferred course of hearings and a more reasoned approach, as well as a resolution indicating that we need to do things differently, I now think it would be unwise for us to amend the appropriation bill in this fashion.

Mr. President, I believe, as I know the distinguished occupant of the chair does because I have heard him speak of it, that this amendment does raise legitimate concerns about placing U.S. Armed Forces under foreign command in U.N. combat operations. The question, it seems to me—and it is a difficult one for us to answer—is how do we make these multinational forces work? How do we take a multilateral force that we have in the United Nations and make it work?

Obviously, or it seems to me that it is obvious, the United States cannot be the world's policeman. We cannot move in a unilateral fashion every single time we see even our own interests at risk. It seems to be clear to the majority here that we are going to increasingly be using the U.N. forces to carry out these kinds of operations. Thus, I believe that the questions raised by the Senator from Oklahoma are legitimate questions that need to be addressed.

Mr. President, there have been many other speakers who have come here and talked about United States forces having served in the past under foreign commanders in Europe in World War I. One of the largest armies we ever deployed was under the strategic direction of Marshal Foch of France. During World War II, U.S. units were occasionally detailed to serve under British commanders. And we are all familiar with the more recent example of NATO. Although that is a peacetime example, our ground forces in Europe served for many years, and still today serve under a German four-star general.

But the authors of this amendment properly point out that the U.N. operations are different. And I would add that U.S. forces are different, as well. That is why I support the conclusion of this amendment which is that U.S. forces should be deployed only under a U.S. chain of command.

Now, the distinguished Senator from Nebraska and the distinguished Senator from Georgia have pointed out repeatedly that that was the case and is the case in Somalia; that, in fact, there is a United States chain of command in that particular operation.

We have been distracted, unfortunately, by a debate that centers on what is going on in Somalia, and far too often the conclusions that have been reached have been based on inaccurate assumptions.

U.S. combat forces are different. And I think it is very important for us to begin with that analysis. I have heard many people come down and say, "Well, other forces are just like us." It is not true, Mr. President. They are not just like us. We are the only superpower left on Earth. Perhaps we wish that that burden fell upon someone else. Perhaps we wish it would fall to someone else. But it falls to us, Mr. President. We are the only superpower on Earth and, thus, the very presence of our forces raises the ante of any U.N. operation.

Our forces transform the operation into a duel with a superpower. As in Somalia, the local thugs seek to prove their machismo by attacking the superpower's soldiers, the soldiers and marines with the unexcelled global reputation. Tension rises wherever we deploy. Sometimes the U.N. may want to risk that rising tension and ask for U.S. troops anyway because they need our skills. And our President may decide that our interests in the success of

the mission requires the commitment of our forces.

But everyone should know and understand going in, that the price of U.S. combat unit participation is a U.S. chain of command. I do not think that very many foreign professional soldiers would object to this. They know how good our commanders are.

As to an international army, our soldiers, the soldiers of the superpower, do not belong in it. Again, because of our power and size and military capability, we are just not another member country of the United Nations when it comes to participation in these operations. It is simply not accurate to come to the floor and say, "Well, what about the feelings of soldiers in Malaysia or the Army of Pakistan?

Yes, we ought to be just as concerned for those soldiers. And it was a mistake on the 5th of June, when 24 Pakistanis were killed, for us to say, "Well, that is not that big of a problem." We should have regarded them as casualties of a multilateral operation that we were participating in. We should have regarded them as our own, Mr. President. As a consequence of not doing that, we took our eye, clearly took our eye, off the ball.

Sometimes the requirements of foreign command can be just plain silly. In Macedonia, for example, we have contributed a unit of the Army's Berlin Brigade, which is one of the top units of our Army, and we have contributed that unit to the peacekeeping force. But the commander of that unit is a foreign officer. He may be very knowledgeable and I assume he is very competent and skilled, but I doubt that he is equal to his American subordinates in either combat experience or knowledge. Nonetheless, this particular officer is an example of the sort of situation we can get in.

Reportedly, he directed that our troops stack their arms and receive extensive retraining before they could take up their post.

Mr. President, I find that objectionable, an example of why it is important for us to assess and make it clear that, if U.S. troops are going to be involved in combat operations, there indeed needs to be a U.S. chain of command.

But after we set conditions and say what we will not do, we should also say what we will do, because we have unique capabilities that can make U.N. operations more successful.

The United Nations does not blow it everywhere. I have heard lots of criticism of the peacekeeping efforts. I think it is terribly important at this particular time not to lose confidence in our capacity, with these efforts, to do good. We had tremendous success in El Salvador. A tremendous success as well in Cambodia. Indeed, the Cambodia operation serves as a good example of how to do it. There, in Cambodia, peacekeepers also came under attack and were killed under the forces of Pol Pot, the Khmer Rouge. But instead of going to the Security Council, insisting on a resolution giving the U.N. Forces the authority to go after Pol Pot, U.N. Forces kept their cool and we did not get any such direction, which obviously would have been foolish. Obviously, it would have resulted in the United States being drawn, and the U.N. Forces being drawn, into a worsening conflict. Thus we ended up with a successful election.

Furthermore, in Cambodia we can see the value of saying, "At this time certain we leave." It is one of the things we did not do when the Bush administration made the decision to go to Somalia. They were constantly asked, "When are our troops coming home?" The answer was always, "We think it is only going to be a month or 2 months or 3 months. We think they will be out of there relatively quickly."

It does not work for us to send a U.N. peacekeeping operation in without a solid political agreement going in and without some sense of when those soldiers are going to be able to come out.

I think we can help a great deal with U.N. peacekeeping operations. We have some unique strengths that can, in fact, strengthen this operation. We have unparalleled military airlift, for example, and our intelligence and data transmission are the world's best, as is our military medicine and our military engineering. No one can touch us as logisticians. With all these talents we should be helping the United Nations get its act together at its headquarters in New York and in specific peacekeeping operations.

We can also train foreign forces who have volunteered for U.N. operations. We can even help equip them out of our excess, or by loan. For example, in the Cambodia operation, Bangladesh contributed an engineering unit to help clear mines. But I understand they arrived in Cambodia ill-equipped and in need of some training. In another case we could have given that unit some refresher training at the Engineer Center at Fort Leonard Wood, MO, and then loaned them the equipment they trained with for use in Cambodia.

It is that kind of innovative approach we should be taking to increase the likelihood of success for United Nations operations, because we have a powerful interest in the world's finding a way to manage regional crises without calling for U.S. combat troops.

So I believe the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma and the distinguished Senator from Mississippi has allowed us, in fact, to focus on the very important question of how do we make these U.N. peacekeeping operations work? And not only to try to learn from our failures, but to be guided as well by our successes.

I do not think the people of the United States of America ought to look to Somalia and be say, "this is a failure." I believe the soldiers, sailors, and marines who participated in this operation can take pride in the fact that they have saved lives, that they have engineered the possibility of peace in Somalia.

But, we here in America clearly took our eye off the ball. We here in America were distracted at a time when our forces were at risk. As a consequence, we suffered this great tragedy two Sundays ago, that was the largest combat loss since Vietnam.

I would also say an awful lot of people have wept and come to speak very movingly about the loss of life—18 soldiers killed, 75 wounded out of a force of 100. But I think Americans also need to hear how brave this 100-man Ranger company was. I have heard it said by people who know, that you will never find a braver unit; you will never find a unit that did more in the face of great adversity; you will never find a unit that faced that kind of adversity and survived the way this Ranger company did.

So, in addition to grief, in addition to anger that we took our eye off the ball and put them at risk, the people of the United States of America should feel real pride. This was one of our best fighting forces that went to Mogadishu and, in spite of overwhelming odds, acquitted themselves above and beyond the call of duty. I think it is terribly important for us not to simply wallow around trying to figure out who is and who is not at fault. There are far too many important things at stake for us to do that.

I believe, as I said, that the questions raised and the concerns raised by the distinguished Senators from Oklahoma and Mississippi are legitimate. I intend to support the efforts of the distinguished Senator from Georgia, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, to come to the Senate with a resolution in the alternative because I think it is a much more appropriate action at this time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FEINSTEIN). The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. PRESSLER. Madam President, what we are debating here is not really the constitutionality. It is not really arguing the fine points of war powers. Rather, what is happening in this Chamber is a manifestation of the feeling that the Nation's foreign policy is a mess, it's formulation has fallen into a state of disarray.

There is a distinct feeling that there is no coherent or defined foreign policy, nor that what the administration does have is properly staffed. There is a feeling that our military is not being listened to. There is a feeling that a we/they mentality exists in the Pentagon, between the civilians and the military. There is a feeling that no one

knows who is reporting to whom at the top levels of our State Department.

This morning in the Foreign Relations Committee, I asked a series of questions about the formulation of our foreign policy under this administration and how the decisionmaking process works. I received very vague answers about a deputies meeting, that is a meeting at the Deputy Under Secretary level, of the CIA, State, Joint Chiefs, Defense, and National Security Council. These deputies report to a so-called principals committee. But no one knew if this principals committee had actually met on Somalia before it became controversial. The principals are supposedly at the Cabinet level, and no one knows for sure who reports the principals' decisions to the President.

Thus, we find ourselves in a position where we do not have a coherent, defined foreign policy, and the Congress has lost confidence in the decisionmaking process, knowing that decisions are not properly staffed through.

We have an elaborate group of agencies that work for the President of the United States and provide him with advice. I have mentioned a few of them. But there is a process, an organizational process, that has to be followed between the State Department, the CIA, the Defense Department, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the National Security Council, and others. That process seems to have broken down in the administration's assessment of Somalia and Haiti.

What is taking place in the Senate tonight is not so much a vote on this amendment or that amendment, but, rather, it is a manifestation, it is a cry for definition in our foreign policy process, the administration's decisionmaking process. We need coherent, well-defined foreign policy where decisions are properly staffed through a distinct chain of command.

As has already been pointed out, some mistakes have been made in Somalia. The top Pentagon civilians have said, "Well, we are learning from these mistakes." But the military already knew and already had lived through these same types of mistakes before, and had corrected them. Indeed, I served as a lieutenant a long time ago in the Army in Vietnam. Some of those lessons were learned by the military then, and at a cost. But the military was not listened to this time. Their advice should not necessarily always be taken, that is why we have civilian control of the military in America. But there is no evidence, in these so-called deputies meetings and principals' meetings that were held to formulate such policy, that the military was consulted or that their advice was even considered.

Let us take, for example, our support for former President Aristide. Our Government seems to have unquestionable support for President Aristide. On the surface of it, he was democratically elected. But we have read in the newspapers that he has great mental problems, that he is not a democrat—with a small d, and that he too encouraged murder, mayhem, and necklacing during his presidency. As soon as he came to power he went to the courthouse steps and incited mobs to riot in order to threaten a judge who, as a consequence of the violent mob outside, imposed a life sentence upon a man who was only supposed to get 15 years.

He led other mobs against his political opponents urging they practice necklacing, that is when a tire is put around the neck of the victim, filled with gasoline and lit. He had a terrible human rights record by our own State Department's human rights reports. This is not a democrat. This is not a democracy. Yet we are blindly supporting President Aristide.

Has that decision been properly staffed through the agencies? Has there been a coherent set of meetings leading to a recommendation to the President of the United States? No. There has not. They cannot point to any such meetings. The way the foreign policy and military policy of this country is supposed to be formulated is through a series of meetings at the Deputy Secretary of State level, Deputy Secretary of Defense, the Deputy Director of the CIA, and the Deputy National Security Advisor.

They then make their recommendation to the principal's meeting—the Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, and so forth. Were such meetings actually held? No, they were not. If they were, nobody has a record.

It appears to be a helter-skelter thing where somebody in Defense has an idea and calls the President and someone in CIA has an idea—and I might say, the CIA is better run administratively and organizationally under Director Woolsey than the other agencies. People knowledgeable about foreign policy in both parties are very concerned.

Tonight, we are not really debating the Nickles amendment, or the Nunn-Warner amendment. In the Senate, there is a strong manifestation that our foreign policy is a mess, that the formulation of it is a mess, that the various meetings supposed to be held between the various agencies are not taking place. There needs to be some serious attention given to public administration by the President and his top people in order to decide how these decisions are to be made.

Madam President, in conclusion, let me say that we in Congress may also be responsible. Some of us have been trying to get the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense to testify before the Foreign Relations Committee. They have said that they want to wait. We have not had that type of top level testimony from this administration, and the majority party in the Senate has not seen fit to join us in trying to force them to testify. That is bad for the country because we are supposed to be doing our part here in the Senate, we have a responsibility to the American people, but if we cannot receive testimony from the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and others, we cannot know how foreign policy is being formulated. We are flying blind.

In conclusion, the Congress and the President need to get their act together in terms of the staffing and the organization of this decisionmaking process so the American people can be confident that our decisionmaking in foreign policy is not helter-skelter.

The reason the Senate is here tonight, the reason we have the Nickles amendment, the Nunn-Warner amendment, and this debate on constitutionality, really is not to address the finer points of law, it is a manifestation of our discontent. This is the only way this body has to express its dissatisfaction and cry out for improvement in the way we formulate our foreign policy.

Many of the points I have made were recently touched upon in an article found in the Economist. I ask unanimous consent that these remarks be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Economist, Oct. 16, 1993]

FOGGY BOTTOM FUMBLING—WHY BILL CLINTON NEEDS TO OVERHAUL HIS FOREIGN-POLICY TEAM

"We want to keep it a little vague," said a senior administration official; "we want to keep him off balance." He meant policy towards General Muhammed Farrah Aideed in Somalia; but he might as well have been talking about American policy towards everyone, enemy and friend alike. Faced (see page 45) with treat or-heat confusion in Somalia, a dizzying set of u-turns on Bosnia, foot-shuffling over North Korea's nuclear plans and a mission to restore democracy in Haiti that is blocked before it reaches dock, America's allies are entitled to feel anxious. If America cannot get a grip on the world's impending disasters, nobody can.

Americans themselves are just as worried. Congressmen are furious; they cannot work out what the administration wants, or what it thinks it is up to. Even the man in the street, his head jerked up from Michael Jordan's basketball career to see. American bodies being dragged through Mogadishu, is beginning to ask whether Bill Clinton's team could do better.

It could. To make America's top foreign-policy people the scapegoats for a single horror would be unfair; but a pattern of incompetence suggests that the problem is more serious. Attempts to "evolve" a foreign policy have been frequent; but they stay on a plan so lofty and unspecific that the bad old world soon makes a nonsense of them. This need not happen. The mess the world is in, though considerable, is not so awful that it could not be improved by sharpness and consistency. The international scene has often

been a shambles but the great powers have managed to make sense of it through the analysis, and the voices, of strong men. If the world's greatest power is found habitually mumbling behind its sleeve, it is not good enough to blame the chaotic state of the maps. It is time to ask whether the men in charge are up to their jobs.

As it turns out, resolve and strong voices are not to be found in the offices in Washington where foreign policy is made, or should be made. Bill Clinton himself, who has begun to show encouraging signs of punctuality, commitment and "prioritising" in domestic policy, still seems to regard foreign affairs with as much pleasure as a skier regards an avalanche. Scrambling, panting and clarifying, he deals with the world when it hits him. And his advisers do not help. At the National Security Council, Anthony Lake is a quiet, unforceful soul to whom the brutal ways of the world seem to come as a surprise. At the Pentagon, Les Aspin, jovial and intelligent, looks more suited to the backslapping anterooms of Congress than to the serious and rather solitary role of secretary of defense.

It is Mr. Aspin who is taking the flak for Somalia, where he refused to send in armoured reinforcements to protect American troops. Yet he is not the weakest link in Mr. Clinton's trio of foreign-policy advisers. That title belongs to Warren Christopher, the secretary of state. Mr. Christopher has brought to foreign policy all the instincts, for good and bad, of the corporate lawyer he used to be. He is discreet to the point of invisibility; non-committal, cautious; wedded to dogged negotiation and to keeping open the option of changing his mind whenever it suits his client. His performance in the Middle East peace talks was typical; laudable in its perseverance, but overtaken in the end by the forcefulness of the clever Norwegian who brought the two parties to a handshake. Mr. Christopher likes to proceed by consensus, but as he showed on Bosnia, consensus of a crippling sort; America asks its allies their opinions first, and tries to make up its own mind later.

In this grey-tinted world, any sense of America's world role, or even of its policy case by case, seems hard to discern. Flashes of resolution are soon blacked out, or obscured with conditions and deadlines. This tactic of caution is less diplomatic than political. Mr. Christopher understands that part of his job is to protect his President back at home; he must not get him into traps abroad. That is fair enough; Jim Baker did the same for George Bush. But Mr. Baker and Mr. Bush also shared a genuine enthusiasm for foreign affairs which could, if necessary, override concern for polls at home. In Mr. Christopher's and Mr. Clinton's case, the dull discretion of the courtier feeds the disinterest of his prince. Domestic "political viability" is the chief indicator the two men seem to be watching.

WANTED: CONVICTION

America cannot change its president for another three years. But that president, if he cared to, could change his team. It is not too late to bring in a genuine enthusiast for foreign policy and one who understands, in the most hard-headed way, how the world works. The ideal candidate would be prepared to work out and articulate, not occasionally but regularly and forcefully, how America's principles apply to a given problem, where its interests in the matter lie, and how far it will go to defend them. He (or she) would also know who, or what, America's enemies are and how they should be countered. Some all-purpose set of principles would provide an important rudder; but even if the issues were taken case by case, a strong and unwavering voice on each would be an improvement.

That voice need not belong to a paid-up Democrat. Foreign policy no longer divides Americans in partisan ways; it tends to unite them either in sulky fretfulness, as on Bosnia, or, as on Somalia, in outrage. Mr. Clinton might do well to recruit an independent or even a Republican to help him. If he cannot bring himself to have a secretary of state who is a power in his own right—a Dean Acheson or a Henry Kissinger—he could still benefit from someone unreservedly outspoken and forceful, along the lines of a George Shultz, giving him his ten-minute briefing every day. Who knows: he might even find the outside world interesting and, in every sense, engaging. Applications, please.

Mr. PRESSLER. Madam President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MITCHELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Nickles amendment No. 1051 and the committee amendments be temporarily laid aside and that Senator NUNN be recognized to offer an amendment in his behalf and that of Senator WARNER relating to U.S. forces; that there be a total time limitation of 40 minutes for debate on the Nunn-Warner and the Nickles amendments, with the time running concurrently; that the time be equally divided and controlled between Senators NUNN and NICKLES, or their designee; that no intervening amendments or motions be in order prior to disposition of these amendments; that when the time is used or yielded back, without intervening action or debate, the Senate proceed to vote on the Nickles amendment, to be immediately followed, without intervening action or debate, by a vote on the Nunn-Warner amendment.

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

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, Senators, therefore, should be on notice that two votes will occur this evening, if all time is used and not yield back, at approximately 7:45. If any time is yielded back, the vote will occur, of course, prior to 7:45, to the extent that time is yielded back.

Madam President, I thank my colleagues for their cooperation. This agreement is the result of discussions of several Senators over some period of time. I now yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

AMENDMENT NO. 1069

Mr. NUNN. Madam President, I will just take a few moments to explain the sense-of-the-Congress resolution Senator WARNER and I will be propounding and, as the unanimous-consent agreement has set forth, we will be asking our colleagues to vote on this whether or not the Nickles amendment is defeated. I will certainly urge that that amendment be defeated.

We have had considerable debate on that amendment over the last couple of days. I made my views known this afternoon in a rather lengthy dialog and debate with the Senator from Oklahoma. I commend the Senator from Oklahoma and the Senator from Mississippi for bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate, but I do believe that there is a much better choice than having to choose between the United Nations, which is now not really effective in conducting what we call peacemaking operations, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, saying the Congress of the United States is going to be involved in micro- managing the assignment of military personnel under command operations, which has historically been an operational decision of the Commander in Chief and his advisers. So I think there is a third and better way, and I will take just a moment to explain what the Nunn-Warner resolution would do.

First, Madam President, I send the amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN], for himself and Mr. WARNER, proposes an amendment numbered 1069.

Mr. NUNN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING OPERATIONAL CONTROL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES

SEC. 9001. Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Armed Forces of the United States have conducted combat operations under the operational control of foreign commanders on numerous occasions, including during two World Wars.

(2) Regional security organizations, such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, are premised on military operations by the forces of a number of nations under an integrated chain of command consisting of officers from member nations.

(3) The end of the Cold War has seen a substantial increase in the conduct of international "peacekeeping" and "peace enforcement" operations pursuant to decisions of the United Nations Security Council under Chapters VI and VII of the United Nations Charter.

(4) The United Nations has conducted traditional "peacekeeping" operations successfully over the years, but the number and size of such operations has stretched the Organization's management and oversight capabilities thin.

(5) The United Nations has not yet acquired the expertise or infrastructure to enable it to effectively manage "peace enforcement" operations.

(6) Any special agreement negotiated by the President with the United Nations Security Council to make units of the United States Armed Forces available on call to the United Nations must be approved by the Congress pursuant to the United Nations Participation Act, enacted into law in 1945.

(7) Any decision by the President to place combat forces of the Armed Forces of the United States under the operational control of foreign commanders, other than pursuant to the North Atlantic Treaty and other arrangements in effect at the time of the enactment of this Act, has significant consequences for such forces, the Congress, and the American people.

SEC. 9002. It is the Sense of the Congress that—

(1) the Armed Forces of the United States must be under the operational control of qualified commanders; and must have clear and effective command and control arrangements; appropriate rules of engagement; and clear and unambiguous mission statements;

(2) the President should consult with Congress before placing combat forces of the Armed Forces of the United States under the operational control of foreign commanders, other than pursuant to the North Atlantic Treaty and other arrangements in effect at the time of the enactment of this Act; and

(3) the President should submit a report to Congress within 48 hours after placing combat forces of the Armed Forces of the United States under the operational control of foreign commanders, other than pursuant to the North Atlantic Treaty and other arrangements in effect at the time of the enactment of this Act, setting forth—

(A) the mission of such forces and a clear explanation of the difference, if any, between the mission of such forces and the mission of the forces of other nations participating in the same military operations;

(B) in a case in which the operation is conducted under the auspices of the United Nations, an assessment of the United Nations capability to effectively manage the operation;

(C) an explanation of the United States interest that would be served by and the justification for placing such forces under the operational control of a foreign commander in this instance;

(D) the command and control arrangements for the operation of which the forces of the Armed Forces of the United States are a part;

(E) the number, type and general description of equipment of such forces;

(F) the estimated cost to the United States of the participation of such forces;

(G) the anticipated duration of the participation of such forces;

(H) a general description of the rules of engagement for such forces; and

(I) the foreign commander or commanders involved.

Mr. NUNN. Madam President, the Congress will make the following findings under the Nunn-Warner resolution: First, the Armed Forces of the United States have conducted combat operations under the operational control of foreign commanders on numerous occasions, including two World Wars.

Second, we cite the experience we have had in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Third, we cite the end of the cold war which has seen an increase in both peacekeeping and peace enforcement operations pursuant to chapters VI and VII of the United Nations Charter.

Fourth, we state clearly that the United Nations has, over the years, conducted peacekeeping operations very successfully, but the number and size of such operations has stretched the organization's management and oversight capabilities very thin.

Then we cite, which I think is unfortunate, the fact that the United Nations has not yet acquired the expertise or infrastructure to enable it to effectively manage peace enforcement operations.

Then we go forth, Madam President, in this resolution to express the sense of the Congress that any decision by the United States to place combat forces of the Armed Forces of the United States under the operational control of foreign commanders, other than pursuant to the North Atlantic Treaty and other arrangements that are already in effect at the enactment of this act, has significant consequence for such forces, for the Congress, and for the American people.

We set forth the sense of the Congress that the Armed Forces of the United States must be under the operational control of qualified commanders, must have clear and effective command and control arrangements, appropriate rules of engagement, and clear and unambiguous mission statements.

Then we say clearly the President should consult with the Congress before placing combat forces of the Armed Forces of the United States under the operational control of foreign commanders, again other than the existing arrangements that are already in effect with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and other similar arrangements.

We go on to say the President should submit a report to the Congress within 48 hours after placing combat forces of the Armed Forces of the United States under the operational control of foreign commanders, again other than existing arrangements and existing alliances.

Madam President, we make it plain by the report that the President would have to file that these are the things we expect the Commander in Chief to focus on:

We expect him to focus on the mission of such forces with a clear explanation of the difference, if any, between the mission of the U.S. forces and the mission of the other nations' forces.

We expect him to focus on, in the case of United Nations involvement, an assessment of the United Nations capability to effectively manage the operation.

We expect the Commander in Chief to focus on and to report to the Congress an explanation of the United States interests that would be served by, and the jurisdiction for placing such forces under the operational control of a foreign commander.

And we expect him to, most importantly, tell us and to focus on himself, before making this commitment, the command and control arrangements for the operation of which the Armed Forces of the United States are a part.

Madam President, on that part, even though we do not spell it out, implicit in that is we want an examination of the qualifications of the military commanders. That is something that the Joint Chiefs must advise the President on. It is a detailed but crucial Executive deliberation that we expect to occur.

We also would want to know other details, but that is something the Commander in Chief and his advisers need to focus on. It is not something the Congress of the United States can effectively manage. That is the difference between this and the Nickles amendment.

Then we also ask for the number, type, and general description of this equipment of such forces in such operations; the cost to the United States; the anticipated duration of the participation of such forces; as well as a description of the rules of engagement, and certainly the commanders that are involved.

Madam President, this is a description of the Nunn-Warner resolution. I will address further the reason this is preferable to the Nickles amendment at a later point, but I would first yield to the Senator from Maryland 3 minutes, and then I wish to yield certainly all the time the Senator from Virginia, who is a cosponsor of this resolution, would need.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland is recognized for 3 minutes.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I thank the Senator from Georgia for yielding me 3 minutes.

Madam President, I rise in support of the Nunn-Warner resolution. In doing so, I first wish to pay my respects and express my appreciation to all of the troops serving under the United Nations flag in Somalia, a particular thanks to the Pakistani and Malaysian troops who gallantly and forcefully led an effort to come to the aid of the American Rangers who were under siege for 9 hours, and my real sympathy to the Pakistani people for the number of men who serve under the United Nations flag from their nation who have suffered great loss.

Madam President, know that I also support the principle of burdensharing, not only of money but also burdensharing of risk and danger. We need an approach for peacekeeping that does share the risk financially and risk of danger in this new world order, yet know I was drawn to the Nickles amendment.

The reason the Nickles amendment had such magnetism for me is because I do not feel we have had a clearly enunciated policy on the issue of peacekeeping. We have lacked clarity. We have lacked consistency. We have lacked firm criteria for our involvement in peacekeeping, the deployment of combat military, and under whose command American forces would serve. We need that; the American people need that and the American military needs that.

The American troops, the wonderful men and women of the United States military, signed up to fight and die for the United States of America. They did not sign up to fight and die for the United Nations. But they will fight, they will serve if they have a commander that they trust and believe in, a Commander in Chief who has given a clear policy as to why they need to be where they are called to duty, and a Congress that supports the Commander in Chief and supports those troops in the field.

I believe the Nickles amendment went too far. Its reach, by cutting off all funds should American troops serve under a foreign commander, went too far. And I believe also his rush to offer an amendment confused operational control with tactical control.

This amendment had serious questions from the joint chiefs and other military experts. The Nunn sense-of-the-Senate amendment, I believe, strikes the right balance. It expresses a sense of the Senate regarding operational control, and the criteria in the resolution has my support.

I believe the wake-up call Congress is sounding around peacekeeping will be best served by voting for the Nunn sense-of-the-Senate resolution.

I yield the floor.

Mr. NUNN. I thank the Senator from Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. NUNN. Madam President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 11 minutes 39 seconds.

Mr. NUNN. Madam President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Virginia, the cosponsor, and thank him for his stalwart support of this resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and I also express my special appreciation to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES] and Senator COCHRAN, because they have patiently espoused their views for 2 days, and their views are not far removed from the thrust of this amendment.

Their views are held by, in my judgment, many Members of this body. We commend them for bringing this to a vote at this time.

Where I depart—and for 2 days I have entered into colloquies with my good friend from Oklahoma—where I depart is the micromanaging of the chain of command and the raising of an inference that foreign commanders are not professionally qualified to exercise operational control or tactical control of our Armed Forces. Therefore, I encourage Senators to look very carefully at the Nunn-Warner amendment, which is in the nature of a substitute for the Nickles-Cochran amendment.

We are going to have a series of amendments proposed dealing with similar issues. I have worked with the distinguished Republican leader on an amendment on Haiti and an amendment on Bosnia. I view the constitutional responsibility of the President very clearly, to order the Armed Forces into those areas of the world where, in his judgment, this Nation has a security interest and where, in his judgment, our Armed Forces could make a difference, a difference which would be in our national security interests.

Also, it is very clear that the Congress, the Senate has the constitutional power to stop, at any time, that Presidential decision through our power over the purse.

But, Madam President, there has to be a middle ground where there are shared powers, shared powers not specifically given to only one branch of our government but shared by the executive and legislative branches for the common good for this Nation. We must find a way to speak with one voice, the President and the Congress, in these situations.

That is what I view these amendments as trying to do, establish that ground where there is shared power and how this Nation can speak with one voice, especially when that voice means the difference between life and death for the men and women of our Armed Forces.

This amendment, which of course is a sense-of-the-Congress, provides that the President should consult with Congress before placing combat forces of the Armed Forces under the operational control of foreign commanders. I repeat, that is operational control. At no time under this amendment, or any amendment, or any piece of legislation should we indicate to the President that he has the right to give up the command—command as distinguished from operational tactical control—of the U.S. Armed Forces. Command of the U.S. Armed Forces can never be given to an officer who is not subject to the command of our President, that is, a foreign officer, because to do so would in effect remove those forces from the command of the President of the United States, the constitutional officer who has, and who must maintain, the authority as Commander in Chief, command over our troops at all times. But this amendment simply says that he should consult with the Congress if he proposes to assign our forces to the operational control of a foreign officer.

But the operative words in my judgment are "before placing combat forces of the Armed Forces of the United States under the operational control of a foreign commander." And likewise he should submit a report to the Congress within 48 hours after placing combat forces under foreign command, a very timely period given those circumstances.

Do I understand from the Presiding Officer that the time has expired?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 25 seconds remaining.

Mr. WARNER. I just simply conclude that this amendment, in my judgment, reaches in and tries to establish an approach in an area of shared powers of the Congress and executive branch, so we can speak with one voice when the men and women of the Armed Forces, their lives and their safety are at risk.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. NUNN. Madam President, I do not want to take all the time on this side. If the Senator from Oklahoma desires to be heard, I do want to yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island. If it is all right with the Senator from Oklahoma, I will be glad to do that.

I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. PELL. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. President, I rise to speak to the Nunn-Warner amendment restricting the use of U.S. Armed Forces in United Nations peacekeeping operations. I agree with the sponsoring Senators of the Nickles-Cochran amendment that the U.S. Congress has a responsibility to ask questions and be satisfied with the replies it receives from our President.

However, I believe now—when passions are enflamed by tradegy in Somalia or the hatred in Haiti—is not the time to attempt to limit the President's constitutional rights as Commander in Chief.

May I add that the United States has a long history of attaching U.S. military forces to units under foreign command. We did it in 1900 in connection with the Boxer Rebellion, in World War I, in World War II, in NATO since 1950, and during Desert Storm in 1991. And not once did the Congress demand to second guess the decisions of the Presidents that made those decisions.

Mr. President, during World War II, I served in the U.S. Coast Guard on convoy duty in the North Atlantic. Such convoys were often under British or

Canadian commodores. At that early stage in my career, the nationality of our commodore was a matter of interest only to those well above my pay grade.

Later, on duty with the allied military government in Italy, we often served interchangeably with and under British officers. It worked just fine, as it should in a truly effective military alliance.

The question should not be framed in terms of the nationality of a commander or of the organizational framework in which U.S. forces are operating but rather the competence of the commander and the soundness of the overall mission to which a U.S. President contemplates assigning U.S. forces. In this connection, it is bizarre that the Nickles-Cochran amendment would permit United States forces to serve under a British general in a NATO context, but would prohibit such service under that same general in a U.N. operation. That does not make sense.

Moreover, implicit in this amendment is an assumption that it will never be possible for the United Nations to get its act together on peacekeeping. I do not accept that. There are deficiencies in the United Nation's current organization for peacekeeping, and the Clinton administration is playing a leading role in correcting those deficiencies, which, I might add, have only become apparent as demands for peacekeeping operations have overwhelmed the United Nations. I would agree, that under current circumstances, we should be very wary about placing U.S. forces under foreign command in a U.N. operation, but that should not mean that it could never even be contemplated as would be the case under the Nickles-Cochran amendment.

It appears that this amendment arose as a result of the disastrous operation mounted by U.S. forces on October 3 in Mogadishu to capture leaders of Aideed's militia. Yet, because that operation was a totally U.S. decision and was carried out by U.S. commanders, the Nickles-Cochran amendment would not have applied if it had been in effect prior to October 3. Contrary to some public perceptions, United States combat forces in Somalia are not under U.N. command, they are under United States command.

Second, the sponsors of this amendment have expressed concern about the possibility of the creation of a standing U.N. military force, including U.S. units, that could be dispatched at a moment's notice by the U.N. Secretary General to put out fires anyplace in the world without U.S. approval. That is an unfounded concern.

It is true that under article 43 of the U.N. Charter, it is contemplated that U.N. members should make available armed forces to the U.N. Security Council. But these forces would be made available only in accordance with a special agreement that would be subject to ratification by the States providing forces. Thus, there will be a role for the Senate in shaping the terms and conditions for the command and control of U.S. forces. In addition, as a permanent member of the U.N. Security Council, the United States can veto any peacekeeping operation involving U.S. forces which the President considers inappropriate. So I believe that there would be sufficient safeguards associated with U.S. participation in a standing U.N. force. But it is clear that a lot of work must be done on U.N. peacekeeping arrangements before we are ready to contemplate the creation of a standing force under article 43.

It is ironic that this amendment comes from the other side of the aisle. During the 12 years of Republican control of the White House, Members on the other side of the aisle stoutly opposed congressional micromanagement and defended the President's prerogatives as Commander in Chief. Yet, here we have a Republican amendment that would tell the President in an unprecedented manner that he could not deploy U.S. forces under certain conditions, even if the President, acting on professional military advice, believes that those conditions are optional for the furtherance of U.S. national interests. That simply does not make any sense and reflects an unhealthy distrust of this President's, or any future President's, capacity to make sound military decisions.

Before taking an action which would unduly constrain the President, I believe it is our responsibility to consider fully the implications of that action. Hearings should be held, legislation thoughtfully considered and fully debated before we attempt any step that might be construed as unwisely limiting the President's exercise of his constitutional authority. In addition, when the President is in the midst of evaluating our policy toward U.N. peacekeeping operations and is supporting reforms of the United Nations, it is again not the time to attempt to tie his hands through legislative action as this amendment would do.

Today, the Foreign Relations Committee held a hearing at which senior State and Defense Department officials testified concerning our policy toward Somalia. Tomorrow, our Ambassador to the United Nations, Madeleine Albright, will testify concerning Somalia and United Nations peacekeeping. Other hearings will follow.

The issue of the role of the President and the Congress in making war is too central to our system to be tampered with after a few brief hours of debate. I urge my colleagues to defeat the Nickles-Cochran amendment.

Mr. NUNN. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Rhode Island.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, before the Senator from Georgia sits down, I know that one of the sections of the amendment that I offered on behalf of myself and Senator COCHRAN and others prohibited participation of the United States in the United Nations standing Armed Forces. Does his sense of the Senate also state opposition to the United States participating in the standing United Nations force?

Mr. NUNN. I would say to my friend from Oklahoma, I think he makes a very good point on that. We incorporated in this Nunn-Warner resolution a finding, a congressional finding. I will not take the Senator's time to read it, but it is No. 6 which basically recites the existing law that was passed in 1945 saying that if there is any assignment of U.S. forces by the President to a United Nations standing force, U.S. forces committed to the U.N. on a standing basis, it can only be done pursuant to the statutory requirement, legal requirement; that Congress itself approve that. So it is a provision of the law.

The Senator is entirely correct in pointing out that this has to be done with approval of Congress.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I appreciate my colleague's response. I also have read the section 6 where it talks about U.N. forces available on any special agreement negotiated by the President and the U.N. Security Council, that making units of the U.S. Armed Forces available on call to the United Nations must be approved by Congress pursuant to the United Nations participation which was enacted into law in 1945. That is not nearly as strong as the language that I have that says no funds to be used to fund the United States participation in the United Nations standing army, looking for some mission to solve or some fire to put out.

I appreciate the Senator's statement that he believes that it means that they would have to come back to Congress. I am looking at the U.N. Charter, article 43, and it does state that the agreement shall be negotiated as soon as possible and with the initiative of the Security Council, they shall be concluded between the members of the Security Council and groups of members and shall be subject to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with the respective constitutional press.

That is a little less than clear. I might mention that our language is very clear. It says the United States shall not participate in a standing United Nations armed force. I like the clarity of our language, and I am pleased that my colleague from Georgia believes—I am not sure that others would take that same result.

Mr. NUNN. Madam President, will the Senator yield for 10 seconds for further clarification?

Mr. NICKLES. Yes.

Mr. NUNN. I wonder if the Senator also would take a look at section 287(d) of title 22 of the United States Code which says the President is authorized to negotiate a special agreement or agreements with the Security Council which shall be subject to the approval of the Congress by appropriate act or joint resolution.

That is what I was referring to. So that is I think, in addition to the paragraph that the Senator read. It makes it very clear.

Mr. NICKLES. I appreciate my colleague's comments.

Madam President, I am looking at the sense-of-the-Congress resolution proposed by my good friend from Georgia and my good friend from Virginia. I read through it. I see that it does not do much. I do not know any reason to vote against it. But I am not excited about voting for it.

It says the President should consult with Congress before placing combat forces, Armed Forces of the United States, under operational control of foreign commanders other than NATO. That is logical.

It also says the President should submit a report to Congress within 48 hours, I might mention, which is after placing U.S. combat forces of the Armed Forces of the United States under operational control of foreign commanders; even tighter than the language that I have, but it is a should report; it is a sense of the Congress.

Most of us are aware of the fact that the sense of Congress has no legal or binding impact.

I know for some of our colleagues this is good cover. I know that they will say that they voted for this sense of the Congress and because they wanted to restrict the United States or have some limitation on the United States from participation in United Nations operations under foreign control, this amendment does not do it. This joint sense of Congress does not do it. It says the Congress needs to report, or the President needs to report to Congress, but it does not prohibit. No President of the United States going all the way back to 1945, has placed U.S. troops under the command of the United Nations, under foreign command. That has not happened. We did not do it in Korea; we did not do it in the Persian Gulf.

We had successful participation in U.N. peacekeeping operations, and those are allowed under our amendment. For some people to say that our amendment is a draconian exercise and radically undermines the United Nations, they have not read our amendment. Our amendment allows logistics, our amendment allows humanitarian, our amendment allows medical, and, it allows United States participation in peacekeeping forces.

Where our amendment draws the line is it says the United States should not participate in combat role under the auspices or control of the United Nations and in foreign command because that leaves the President of the United States out. Some people stated, well, the amendment offered by myself, Senator COCHRAN, and others undermines the President. It reasserts the President's constitutional responsibility as Commander in Chief just as it reconfirms the Congress responsibility.

If you read the Constitution and the authority granted to Congress to make and declare war, and to support the armies and the navy, that is congressional authority. That should not be delegated to the United Nations, and we should not delegate to the United Nations Secretary General command of our troops combat situations.

The United Nations Secretary General stated concerning Bosnia that he would set the targets. If there is going to be bombing, he would set the targets. The United Nations would set the targets, not the NATO commanders.

I might just mention that the nominee for NATO commander, General Joulwan, mentioned for military matters I think the United Nations can make the political decisions and has the political authority. But for the operational part of it, the military part of it, that needs to be under a very clear chain of command, and that should be NATO.

I agree with the general's statement.

Under my amendment, we allow for NATO operations. We allow for joint operation operations. We allow for bilateral operations. What we would place some restriction on would be the fact of, basically, advocating responsibility and authority to the United Nations under foreign command, leaving U.S. forces and commanders out of the chain of command. I think that would be a serious mistake.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Mississippi be delegated control of time on this side.

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

Mr. COCHRAN. May I inquire how much time remains for the proponents?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 12 minutes 12 seconds remaining.

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me just elaborate on the point, so eloquently made by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, that we are not just talking about the Presidential powers here and how to define those in a way that protects his responsibilities and reinforces them as the Commander in Chief of the U.S. Armed Forces. We are also acknowledging and reaffirming that Congress has a very important constitutional role. The Senator mentioned the powers enumerated in article I of the Constitution. Let me just recite a few of those to illustrate how important a role the Congress has in the view of the Framers of the Constitution:

> To declare war; to raise and support Armies; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces; to provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrection and repel invasions; to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States.

The point is that the Congress has a very important constitutional role and responsibility when it relates to the commitment of U.S. Armed Forces to combat and to the supervision of rules and regulations regarding our Armed Forces. And to simply say that it is going to be too much trouble, or it might be cumbersome for us to undertake to review executive decisions in this area, is wrong. It is our constitutional responsibility, and the Senate, this year, has led the way for the Congress in respect of certain rules and regulations governing the armed services, under the leadership of the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, to help ensure that the role of Congress is acknowledged and is taken into account and the views of Members of Congress are made a part of the decisionmaking process. That is all this amendment suggests. As to the Commander in Chief, before the President makes a unilateral decision to send troops of the United States to a standing army of the United Nations, he must seek and obtain congressional approval. That is what the law said back in 1945, and all this amendment says is that no funds appropriated in this bill should be used for that purpose. It is a limitation on the use of appropriated dollars in this bill for this fiscal year. It is a statement that the Congress has to be consulted, and that the Congress has a role to play in this decisionmaking process; it is a reaffirmation of legislative powers and responsibility.

It seems to me that the Senate ought to go on record as saying we agree with this amendment, we agree with the limitation on the use of these funds. I am very happy that the members of the Armed Services Committee, who are cosponsoring the alternative that will be offered, I am advised, have come to the floor and debated this issue, because it illustrates how important it is to all of us here in the Senate, not just to Appropriations Committee members, who worry about the possibility of a change in policy without proper consultation and involvement of the Congress in making these decisions. That is what we should insist upon. That is what this amendment says will be the case, and I hope the Senate will approve it.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. NUNN. Madam President, I believe we just have 4 minutes left. I

would be glad to yield. Does the Senator from Mississippi want to conclude this earlier?

Mr. COCHRAN. I am happy to proceed to a vote. I do not know what the arrangements are with the leadership. The managers of the bill may wish to be heard on the subject. I know of no other Senators who have not spoken who wish to speak. We have debated this for about 3 days now, so we have said about all that could be said.

Mr. NUNN. I have been told that they prefer that we use all of the time. So somebody may have to repeat something said previously.

I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Let me pose a question to my good friend from Mississippi. We have had a colloquy on this now for some 2 days.

Let us say it is December, the Congress is home, and suddenly a call comes from the United Nations that we need some United States troops to go into a combat situation; the Congress is at home and the President says, all right, I can send them. But then the United Nations says, France, send yours and Great Britain, send yours, Pakistan, send yours, and others; and suddenly a force comes in, and there is in this amendment the power for the Congress to jerk out those forces in 30 days, assuming we would come back sometime—usually we are not here until late January. So my point is, how can a successful coalition of the United Nations be put together, possibly under the leadership of a U.S. President, with this sort of Damocles hanging over the head of the whole operation with a period of such short duration that the Congress couldn't return and assemble and vote an authorization of U.S. participation? I ask that of my good friend from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Madam President, we have discussed all of the possible ramifications of this amendment over a 2-day period. This amendment is not a prohibition against the use of any constitutional powers that the President may have. It is a limitation on the use of funds appropriated in this bill, so that he cannot delegate to the United Nations authority over U.S. troops or assign U.S. troops to a permanent standing army of the United Nations without the authorization of the Congress. That is all the amendment does.

To ask questions about all these speculative and possible situations on the 30 days and all of the rest absolutely misses the point of the amendment and distorts the true intent of the authors of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia was given 2 minutes and that has expired.

Mr. NUNN. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. BIDEN. Will the Senator from Mississippi, notwithstanding the fact that I oppose his amendment, be the southern gentleman he always is and yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. COCHRAN. I will yield to the Senator.

Mr. BIDEN. Madam President, I congratulate the Senator from Oklahoma and the Senator from Mississippi for raising a serious issue of principle regarding the deployment of U.S. combat forces.

For 12 years, I and others have been trying to get my Republican colleagues to recognize that the Constitution grants Congress exclusive power to authorize the use of force.

It is unfortunate that it has taken this long—but I am not one to look a gift horse in the mouth.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma—in principle—is on the mark. Congress should be in on any decision to deploy U.S. forces in an area where they may face hostilities.

But the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma is flawed in at least two respects.

First, as judges might say, the amendment is underinclusive, because it addresses only the discrete question of placing U.S. forces under U.N. command.

If the Senator from Oklahoma is indeed concerned about a congressional voice in decisions about the use of force—and I share his concern—then we ought to address such a fundamental question in a more comprehensive manner.

And that would not be with a hastily drafted, ad hoc amendment to an appropriations bill, but with a thorough review and revision of the war powers resolution.

Such a review was undertaken in 1988 in the Foreign Relations Committee, when I chaired a special subcommittee on war powers.

At that time, I drafted a bill—entitled the "Use of Force Act"—to provide a new framework for executive-legislative decisions on the use of force.

I am now reviewing that draft, and will soon introduce it in the Senate.

Second, the amendment by the Senator from Oklahoma fails—again using the lexicon of judges—insofar as it is overinclusive. That is, it sweeps far too broadly—limiting the President's power even to deploy combat forces, even in situations where hostilities may not be imminent.

Even those of us who are strong defenders of the congressional war power are not willing to circumscribe the President's powers in such a drastic manner.

So, I welcome the initiative by the Senator from Oklahoma. But I would respectfully suggest that he is going about it in the wrong way.

A thorough and comprehensive national debate is required about the most solemn decision a Nation can make—the decision to place forces in harm's way.

Congress should move promptly to consider a revision of the war powers resolution.

I thank the Senator from Mississippi for yielding me the time. I hope I was not too strenuous in my opposition, but I sincerely hope that this body gets about the business about which we have been trying to attract attention for the past 5 years. The Senators got the administration's attention now, and Republicans are focused on it as well as Democrats. We should craft a new structural framework for the use of force in this post-cold-war era. It is doable. Everybody seems ready, and I think we can get under way in doing that in committees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Madam President, let me inquire about the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Mississippi is 4 minutes 44 seconds.

Mr. COCHRAN. Madam President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Delaware, who made a strong and persuasive argument.

In response further to the Senator from Virginia, who inquired about what if the time of 30 days expires and Congress has not acted on a resolution as contemplated in the Nickles-Cochran amendment, would the commanding officers of the U.S. troops be required to withdraw forces?

The answer is, no, they would not be required to withdraw forces.

The hypothetical question is another example of the confusion that has resulted in comparing this amendment with the war powers resolution. Under the war powers resolution, there is a specific responsibility of the President to withdraw forces if permission has not been granted to deploy those forces under the circumstances contemplated in the resolution within a 60-day period. Thirty additional days can be granted under some circumstances, but unless the Congress acts, the Executive has to withdraw forces.

That is not the case in this amendment. None of the constitutional powers of the President are restricted or impinged by the language of this amendment. The intent of the authors is to limit the use of the funds appropriated in this bill to deploy troops as a part of a standing army of the United Nations or to deploy troops to a United Nations command without the prior authorization of the Congress if it is a combat force and it is contemplated that military action and combat activity will be involved.

The people of the United States elect a President of the United States, and they understand that under the Constitution the President is the Commander in Chief of the armed services. They do not contemplate that U.S. armed services can be deployed to a

United Nations command where the Secretary General of the United Nations exercises the same power and is responsible for the lives and well-being of U.S. armed forces just as is the Commander in Chief of the United States.

It would be a clear disappointment and fly in the face of constitutional principles if we did not assert this fact now, since this alternative is being discussed by the administration and it is not consistent with the established policy of the United States. The policy contemplated by the administration would be inconsistent with the clear language of this amendment on the use of funds appropriated in this bill.

Madam President, I yield the time that is remaining to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, Senator NICKLES.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. NICKLES. How much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 1 minute 17 seconds.

Mr. NICKLES. How much time is remaining on the other side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One minute eighteen seconds.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, one, I wish to thank the colleague from Mississippi for his leadership in this amendment as well as the other dozen or more Senators who cosponsored it.

I remember not too long ago Senator BYRD raised an amendment dealing with Somalia. He raised several concerns about the Somali operation, and his amendment was legislative language on the authorization bill.

I also remember the leadership working hard to dissuade him from offering that amendment, and ultimately he ended up with a sense-of-the-Senate resolution.

Madam President, I have regretted that we did not vote on Senator BYRD's original language. It might have saved some lives.

The language that we are offering today by myself and others is language that says we will not commit U.S. combat troops under foreign command. We should retain that command. No U.S. President has ever committed U.S. troops to the United Nations operation under foreign command. That has never happened, and for good reason—so we would maintain a chain of command, so we would maintain control, so we would maintain accountability and responsibility.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. NUNN. Madam President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 1 minute 14 seconds.

Mr. NUNN. Madam President, this has been a good debate. I commend the Senator from Oklahoma and the Senator from Mississippi. I believe out of this is going to come a clear understanding by the executive branch of the expectations of the Congress of the United States and, I think, the expectations of the American people.

I urge defeat of the Nickles amendment because it contains a confusion between tactical and operational control and because it gets Congress into the business of micromanaging command structure.

I would have to add, I think, the administration has been given a flashing warning light as to the commitment of U.S. forces, particularly commitment of U.S. forces under foreign command.

Madam President, I hope the President and all in the executive branch will take due note of this debate.

I would like to close by relating a little history. I will not go back as far as the Senator from West Virginia to Roman times, that he knows so well.

In the battle of Yorktown, that had a lot to do with the beginning of this country, Gen. George Washington was in operational control of American troops. He was battling General Cornwallis, the British commander. The British commander was under a great siege. Washington felt Cornwallis was about to break out of that siege with cavalry. He called on a general by the name of General Rochambeau, the French commander, to help him keep Cornwallis from breaking out. George Washington assigned U.S. troops to General Rochambeau's tactical control. He assigned U.S. troops to General Rochambeau. General Cornwallis was defeated, and this country was started.

Madam President, 200 years later in the Persian Gulf war the United States assigned certain forces from the 82d Airborne under the tactical control of the French 11th Light Infantry, and their objective in that war was called Objective Rochambeau. As a matter of fact, the 14th Street Bridge here is named the Rochambeau Bridge.

So I think that little bit of history tells us about the importance of working with allies as well as the caution that has already been expressed.

Mr. President, the United Nations has undertaken many successful peacekeeping operations. The United Nations is not, however, politically, organizationally, and technically suited to conduct combat operations. Neither is the U.S. Congress. The Nickles amendment would have us choose between an understaffed, overloaded international bureaucracy and congressional micromanagement of command and control decisions. Mr. President, there has to be a better choice.

We should recognize that the United States has a long history of placing its troops under foreign command—and for good political and operational reasons. And parenthetically I might add that there have been many occasions when foreign forces have been placed under U.S. command.

Mr. President, during the past century there have been many cases of U.S. forces serving under foreign command. During the Boxer Rebellion of 1900, 2,000 American soldiers and marines served under a British, and later, a German commander. During World War I's critical last 6 months all 2,000 United States troops in France were placed under the command of French Field Marshal Ferdinand Foch. During World War II, United States forces in Italy, the Mediterranean, and the China-Burma-India theater served under British field marshals, one of whom also commanded United States ground forces during the Normandy invasion. In NATO, United States forces have for decades served routinely under German, British, and other European command. And since last year a Korean general has commanded United States forces in South Korea.

Mr. President, I recognize there is a difference between alliance commands where training and planning have been coordinated, and instances where this type of advanced work has not been done. These differences have to be taken into account before U.S. forces can be placed under any foreign commander.

During General Shalikashvilli's confirmation hearing to be the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff before the Armed Services Committee last month, he addressed the issue of foreign command of U.S. troops. After declaring that the United States must work with allies and that means sometimes placing U.S. forces under foreign command, General Shalikashvili went on to say that:

> I think the issue for the United States is not so much * * * whether we should or should not have Americans serving under foreign commanders. It is rather that we should reserve the right, it seems to me, on a case-by-case basis to decide whether we should get involved in any particular operations. And one of those considerations should be just how robust the command and control arrangement is, and even who the commander is, whether we in fact consider that commander to be competent to lead our soldiers in that particular operation.

Mr. President, I believe that General Shalikashvili has got it just right. He is focused on the real issues, namely, the effectiveness of command relationships—be they United Nations, NATO, or otherwise, and the competency of a particular foreign commander to lead our soldiers in a specific operation—be that commander United Nations, NATO, or otherwise. This is a judgment for the President and his military advisors to make—not the Congress.

Members of Congress are justly concerned about this issue because of recent events in Somalia. The issue of

foreign command, however, had nothing to do with the decimation of a United States Army Ranger company in Somalia last October 3; indeed, but for the assistance of foreign forces, our losses would have been greater. Most people don't realize that on October 3, all United States forces involved in the events of that day where under the combatant command of General Hoar, the Commander in Chief, United States Central Command, in Tampa, Florida, and under the operational and tactical control of United States commanders on the ground in Somalia. Mr. President, had the Nickles amendment been in force, it would not have made one iota's difference with respect to the events of October 3.

Moreover, I don't think we should derogate non-American officers serving under U.N. auspices by passing an amendment that implicitly presumes that they might not be militarily competent. As a nation we have had our own fair share of military commanders who have performed poorly. On that fateful day at the Little Bighorn, I'm sure the men of the 7th Cavalry had wished they had been led by a foreigner—or even a friendly native American. I'm also sure that Lincoln would have welcomed a Prussian almost any Prussian general to command the Army of the Potomac for the first 3 years of the Civil War.

Mr. President, I am not a constitutional expert, and I am sure that there would be differences among the experts as to the constitutionality of the Nickles amendment. I do believe, however, that the President, when acting as Commander in Chief, should be able to make the decision as to the best command arrangements for U.S. forces. And I believe that the Congress should have the affirmative responsibility to overturn the President's decision if they believe that he is acting irresponsibly. I do not believe that the Congress should be able to overturn the President's decision in this case by inaction. That is the situation that we have under the war powers resolution and that is why all U.S. Presidents of both parties have found a way to avoid actuating the war powers resolution.

Additionally, and to compound the problem, the Nickles amendment not only would lead to a reversal of the President's decision on this matter by congressional inaction, but it also has no expedited procedures for consideration of an authorizing resolution. That means that a small minority of Senators could block consideration of an authorizing resolution by a filibuster. The Nickles amendment also would result in overturning a Presidential decision if the Congress was not in session and thus unable to address this issue within 30 days.

Finally, I want to make a point similar to that I made during the floor debate last week on the Somalia amendments. The United States must work closely with its allies, both those with whom we have multilateral or bilateral security agreements and those with whom we routinely cooperate. The United States can not and should not always have the preponderance of forces in a military operation. In those instances when we do, I believe we should insist on a U.S. commander. But when we do not have the preponderance of forces, I believe that we should carefully consider on a case-by-case basis, taking into account all of the factors, including, as General Shalikashvili has noted, how robust the command and control arrangements are and the competence of a foreign commander to lead U.S. forces in a particular operation.

Mr. President, we may be the only world's superpower. But surely we don't want to be the world's only policeman. We still need allies and we can not afford to tell our allies that the Congress of the United States starts with the assumption that their commanders can not lead our forces. Moreover, if we start down the road of refusing to place our forces under foreign command—and I believe that the Nickles amendment is but the first step in a broader agenda, then we can expect allies in the future to refuse to place their forces under American command. This, in turn, could torpedo effective multinational military operations involving the United States. Our calls for military partners will be ignored, and we will have to go it alone—assuming more and more the burden of policeman.

NO U.S. TROOPS UNDER U.N. COMMAND

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I rise to speak in favor of the Amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES].

Traditionally, this Nation has sent troops into harm's way overseas only when two situations pertained: first, when direct U.S. interests were under threat and, second, when those troops could be placed under fully qualified commanders. I believe that this Nation would be well advised to abide by those two conditions and this belief has impelled me to cosponsor the Nickles amendment.

If U.S. troops are to be sent abroad at the behest of the U.N., how are we to guarantee that those troops are being called upon to defend U.S. interests? The United Nations is, by its own description, a universalist institution—the entire world lies within its sphere of interest. Conflict, political dislocation, starvation anywhere in the world comes under the aegis of the United Nations. Now the United States has interests around the world, interests relating to our security and our economic well-being but those interests are by no means universal. Some areas of the globe are vital for our national security; other regions are of virtually no relevance to us at all. In short, the interests of the United Nations cannot and should not be directly equated with the interests of the United States.

The question which faces us today is—are we going to allow U.S. troops to be sent abroad to defend U.N. interests or are we going to maintain our traditional policy and use our forces only for the defense of U.S. interests? Or, to put it more directly and brutally, how many of us are willing to pick up the telephone and commiserate the parents of a dead U.S. serviceman knowing that we cannot tell them that their son died in defense of vital interests of the United States?

This is not to say that the United Nations has no role to play in establishing security in the post-cold-wa world. To the contrary, the United Nations must continue to function as the crucial international forum in which coalitions can be formed to confront regional aggression, just as the Bush administration used the United Nations to bring together the coalition of nations which liberated Kuwait. That coalition went into battle under the aegis of the United Nations and I hope that future coalitions will similarly repel future aggression under U.N. auspices.

However, the United Nations now desires to move beyond the Desert Storm model. It no longer wishes to serve as the forum in which multilateral security policy is formulated. Now the organization aspires to have actual operational control over military operations which take place under its auspices and it is against this background that the Clinton administration has agreed to make United States troops available to the U.N. passage of the Nickles amendment will not preclude the establishment of future coalitions like the one which liberated Kuwait. It will, however, assert that U.S. troops which take part in those operations will be under the operational and tactical control of qualified military officers, not of civilian U.N. officers.

Mr. President, if this Government decides to expose the lives of its servicemen overseas it owes them the best commanders who have trained and exercised with them over extended periods of time, commanders who are thoroughly familiar with their operational procedures. This Government also owes our servicemen a convincing explanation as to why the national interest requires that they take the supreme risk. If this body fails to adopt the Nickles amendment today, there is every possibility that soon we will see U.S. troops being called upon to fight in conflicts which are of little or no importance to the national security of this Nation. We have, in my opinion, no choice but to vote for this amendment and to insist upon its retention in conference.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President I come to the floor today to speak in opposition to the Nickles amendment. While I feel

the intentions of the gentlemen from Oklahoma are good, I am concerned that we are considering a policy that is so broad, it will undermine the powers of the President as our Commander in Chief.

I too share Senator NICKLES concern that we not put our men and women of the armed services at unnecessary risk. But we as a nation, and we as members of the United Nations, must be prepared to stand shoulder to shoulder with other members in the community of nations. I believe this sends the wrong message to other members of the United Nations when the U.S. President is forced to say, "Well I'd like to help out, but I have to run it by Congress first."

The Constitution says the President is Commander in Chief, and so I believe that gives the President the latitude and discretion to act. But that is not to say that Congress has no role. Quite the contrary. As we did in the Somalia issue last week, Congress has the power to cut off funds and bring our troops home if the original mission is accomplished, or the mission has run too far afield from what was originally intended.

In my opinion, the Nickles amendment is too broad, because each potential international crisis has its own unique set of problems, and the President must have the discretion to decide based on those unique circumstances. What our intentions might be in Somalia, may be far different than our intentions in Bosnia. The actions we might need to take in Haiti may be far different than actions warranted elsewhere. Ultimately, what we need is Presidential discretion and leeway to act on a case-by-case basis, not a blanket and rigid foreign policy dictated by Congress. Again, Congress still has its power to check the President when our mission is over, or runs off course.

This debate is not just about the constitutional or foreign policy questions either. As we all witnessed during live television coverage of Operation Desert Storm, things in a volatile military situation can change dramatically. A President needs the ability to act quickly and decisively, often with little notice. As prescribed in the Constitution, the President has the power to act as Commander in Chief, but he must also have the power to react.

I know the Nickles amendment includes provisions where the President can act without congressional authorization, such as in the case of humanitarian concerns, or if national interest is at stake. I agree with those provisions, but I do not agree that we put any conditions on how the President might act under other circumstances. The President needs flexibility, the President needs discretion, and the President needs the power to act. To do otherwise not only undermines his constitutional authority, but it undermines his ability to provide leadership in the world community.

Let us keep in mind, we are not giving the President unchecked authority, nor is Congress surrendering its role in foreign policy. I urge my colleagues to vote against the Nickles amendment, and preserve the flexibility our President needs as Commander in Chief.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1051

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 1051 offered by the Senator from Oklahoma. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. DECONCINI] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SIMPSON. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DASCHLE). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 65, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 317 Leg.]

YEAS—33

Bennett	Domenici	Lugar
Bond	Faircloth	Mack
Brown	Gorton	Murkowski
Burns	Grassley	Nickles
Coats	Gregg	Pressler
Cochran	Hatfield	Roth
Cohen	Helms	Simpson
Coverdell	Hollings	Smith
Craig	Hutchison	Stevens
D'Amato	Kempthorne	Thurmond
Dole	Lott	Wallop

NAYS—65

Akaka	Ford	Metzenbaum
Baucus	Glenn	Mikulski
Biden	Graham	Mitchell
Bingaman	Gramm	Moseley-Braun
Boren	Harkin	Moynihan
Boxer	Hatch	Murray
Bradley	Heflin	Nunn
Breaux	Inouye	Packwood
Bryan	Jeffords	Pell
Bumpers	Johnston	Pryor
Byrd	Kassebaum	Reid
Campbell	Kennedy	Riegle
Chafee	Kerrey	Robb
Conrad	Kerry	Rockefeller
Danforth	Kohl	Sarbanes
Daschle	Lautenberg	Sasser
Dodd	Leahy	Shelby
Dorgan	Levin	Simon
Durenberger	Lieberman	Warner
Exon	Mathews	Wellstone
Feingold	McCain	Wofford
Feinstein	McConnell	

NOT VOTING—2

DeConcini	Specter

So the amendment (No. 1051) was rejected.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. EXON. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the Nunn-Warner amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1069

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. DECONCINI] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SIMPSON. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced, yeas 96, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 318 Leg.]

YEAS—96

Akaka	Faircloth	Mathews
Baucus	Feingold	McCain
Bennett	Feinstein	McConnell
Biden	Ford	Metzenbaum
Bingaman	Glenn	Mikulski
Bond	Gorton	Mitchell
Boren	Graham	Moseley-Braun
Boxer	Gramm	Moynihan
Bradley	Gregg	Murkowski
Breaux	Harkin	Murray
Brown	Hatch	Nickles
Bryan	Hatfield	Nunn
Bumpers	Heflin	Packwood
Burns	Helms	Pell
Byrd	Hollings	Pressler
Campbell	Hutchison	Pryor
Chafee	Inouye	Reid
Coats	Jeffords	Riegle
Cochran	Johnston	Robb
Cohen	Kassebaum	Rockefeller
Conrad	Kempthorne	Roth
Coverdell	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Craig	Kerrey	Sasser
D'Amato	Kerry	Shelby
Danforth	Kohl	Simon
Daschle	Lautenberg	Simpson
Dodd	Leahy	Smith
Dole	Levin	Stevens
Domenici	Lieberman	Thurmond
Dorgan	Lott	Warner
Durenberger	Lugar	Wellstone
Exon	Mack	Wofford

NAYS—2

Grassley	Wallop

NOT VOTING—2

DeConcini	Specter

So, the amendment (No. 1069) was agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. INOUYE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. GREGG. If I might inquire of the distinguished ranking minority member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, it is my understanding that the bill under consideration, H.R. 3116, terminates the Nonacoustic Antisubmarine Warfare Program known as ATD-111, and as a result, this has become an issue for the committee of conference. Am I correct?

Mr. STEVENS. The distinguished Senator from New Hampshire is correct.

Mr. GREGG. It is also my understanding that, in light of the Senate's

position, the Navy has appealed the termination of the program, citing the absence of other technologies which are more promising or advanced than ATD–111 and arguing that the continuation of this program is necessary for adequate fleet testing of these critical technologies. Is this also the understanding of the senior Senator from Alaska?

Mr. STEVENS. It is, and if I might state for the record, I am aware of the importance of this project to the Navy, whose support has become evident since the subcommittee completed its work on this bill. In light of this support, and in the interest of seeing the best, most affordable technology supplied for our naval forces, I can assure the Senator that this matter will be addressed in conference, at which time it will be my intent to seek ways to ensure the continuation of ATD–111.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I join the Senator from Alaska in assuring my colleague from New Hampshire that this matter will receive careful attention during the conference, and we will try to address the concerns raised by the Navy regarding this program.

Mr. GREGG. I am well aware of the daunting task of the subcommittee to fund our defense forces in these times of shrinking budget resources, and for this reason I appreciate the consideration of the distinguished ranking member. I yield the floor.

AN/BQG–5 WIDE APERATURE ARRAY

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, one of the many ways that the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee sought to preserve the negotiating leverage of our authorizing colleagues in their own conference was by respecting the decision of the Senate Armed Services Committee not to fund the AN/BQG–5 wide aperture array [WAA].

The BQG–5, a conformal hull sonar array developed for the *Seawolf*, is being considered for backfit on *Los Angeles*-class attack submarines and is a likely candidate for *Centurion*. The WAA provides rapid range and bearing on a target, an essential advantage in shallow coastal waters where sonar clutter, shipping, and ocean conditions limit surveillance ranges and increase the likelihood of chance encounters.

The House Armed Services Committee provided $50 million in their mark for the BQG–5, and I am confident that the House position will carry in the Defense authorization conference. Should the WAA be authorized, I will seek to include in our own conference report the funds necessary to procure two BQG–5 shipsets with full search capability. As always, I will be guided by the advice of the chairman and vice chairman on the best means of achieving my goal, one I believe is shared by members of the House Appropriations Committee.

Mr. INOUYE. I am aware of the strong interest of the Senator from New York in the BQG–5. As he knows, there are currently no funds in the appropriations bill for the Wide Aperture Array Program. However, I would encourage the Senator to raise the WAA during our conference deliberations assuming that funds are authorized for this program.

Mr. STEVENS. I, too, am aware of the enthusiasm of the Senator from New York for the BQG–5. I am equally prepared to listen should the WAA be raised during the Defense appropriations conference.

T–45 FUNDING

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, in lieu of offering an amendment, I would like to engage the chairman for a moment in a brief discussion of the T–45 engine competition program.

Mr. INOUYE. I would be glad to yield for a discussion with the distinguished Senator from Arizona.

Mr. DECONCINI. I thank my good friend and distinguished chairman.

Since the subcommittee marked up the bill before us today, I have had the opportunity to speak with John Dalton, the new Secretary of the Navy. One of the issues we discussed was the T–45 engine competition program which the committee has supported, correctly in this Senator's opinion, for the past 2 years.

As the chairman will recall, $15 million in fiscal year 1992 T–45 procurement funds were made available to support an engine competition as long as that competition was determined by the Navy to be cost effective. Last year, additional funds were provided in the Navy R&D account to further support such a competition.

I understand that the initial contract award for this program is imminent. Since full committee action on the bill, I have learned that the fiscal year 1992 procurement funds need to be transferred to the R&D account to properly execute the program. The Secretary of the Navy also raised this issue in general terms with me. The transferred funds would be used to execute the competition exactly as proposed originally.

It is my understanding that such a transfer could be accommodated in a manner which would have no net impact on outlays and could, possibly, be addressed during conference.

Rather than offering an amendment to this bill, may I ask the distinguished chairman to watch for an opportunity to realign the fiscal year 1992 T–45 procurement funds to the T–45 R&D account during conference with the House?

Mr. INOUYE. I thank the senior Senator from Arizona for raising the issue in the manner he has. I believe that what the Senator has requested may indeed be possible. I will be glad to accommodate his request when and if possible.

Mr. DECONCINI. I thank my good friend for his willingness to assist this competition which should save money for the taxpayers.

DISPOSAL OF ZINC FROM THE NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I would like to raise an issue with the distinguished manager of the bill, the chairman of the Defense Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, Senator INOUYE.

In the committee report, the committee raises certain concerns about the proposed disposal of zinc from the national defense stockpile. These concerns include the possible impact of continued disposals of zinc from the national defense stockpile on domestic producers and on the world market price, and whether the zinc in the national defense stockpile could be used by the U.S. Treasury in the minting of U.S. coinage.

Mr. President, these are valid concerns and important issues. I have no problem with the committee asking the Secretary of Defense to report to Congress on these issues.

Last year when the Armed Services Committee authorized the disposal of zinc from the stockpile, and again this year when we reviewed the annual materials plan for the stockpile, the Armed Services Committee looked at the issues involved in the disposal of zinc.

Currently, the Stock Piling Act requires the stockpile manager to dispose of materials from the stockpile in a way that avoids undue disruption of the usual markets of producers, processors, and consumers of such materials, and protects the United States against avoidable loss. Last year we established in law a Market Impact Committee in the executive branch to advise the stockpile manager on the potential market impacts of stockpile acquisitions and disposals. We received a report from this Market Impact Committee earlier this year that they had reviewed and approved the stockpile manager's plan for the disposals of materials from the stockpile in fiscal year 1994, including the disposal of zinc.

As far as using the excess zinc in the stockpile for U.S. coinage programs, I am all for that. However, according to the manager of the national defense stockpile, only about 7 percent of the zinc holdings in the stockpile are the special high-grade zinc which is suitable for Treasury coinage operations.

Mr. President, I have no problem with the Appropriations Committee's direction that the Secretary of Defense should report to the Congress on issues relating to the disposal of zinc from the stockpile. My only concern is with the committee's direction that zinc disposals from the stockpile should be suspended until 60 days after the report is received by the Congress.

According to the last two annual reports to Congress on national defense stockpile requirements, we no longer

need to keep zinc in the national defense stockpile. In light of this, Mr. President, we should allow the stockpile manager to proceed with the orderly disposal of all of the excess materials in the stockpile in accordance with the procedures set forth in the Stock Piling Act.

I wonder if the chairman of the subcommittee would be willing in conference to reconsider the committee's position that disposals of zinc from the stockpile should be suspended until 60 days after Congress receives the report from the Secretary of Defense? Perhaps the conferees could direct that the report be submitted within 60 days after enactment of the bill, and still allow disposals of zinc from the stockpile as appropriate under the annual materials plan at the discretion of the stockpile manager during the preparation of this report.

Mr. INOUYE. The Senator from New Mexico makes some valid points. I am informed that, according to the current American Society for Testing Materials' standards, the zinc in the national defense stockpile is acceptable for Treasury coinage operations. If in fact this is the case, then I believe the Treasury should consider purchasing zinc from the national defense stockpile.

I appreciate the Senator's concerns and I assure him that we will certainly give his suggestion careful consideration in conference.

MINUTEMAN MISSILE UPGRADES

Mr. BURNS. I would like to express my deep concern over the cuts made to the Air Force's Minuteman Squadrons Program for the Propulsion Replacement Program for Minuteman III missiles.

I believe that keeping the Minuteman III reliable and capable of service is an important goal. Given that the Air Force would like to extend the weapon system deployment through the year 2020, and given that the motors in some of these missiles are over 25 years old, the Defense Department requested $49.94 million for the Propulsion Replacement Program for fiscal year 1994. Both the House and the Senate authorized that amount. Unfortunately, no funding was appropriated in the House version of the Defense Appropriations Act. The Senate bill contains $4.7 million only for studies and analyses of the Propulsion Replacement Program.

I feel that a 1-year gap in the modernization program could have negative effects on our missile forces. In addition, there are costs to delaying this program—not all of them monetary. This delay will mean that one-third of our intercontinental ballistic missile [ICBM] fleet will be too old to be reliable by the time the first replacement motor is installed in the year 2005.

Would my colleague from Hawaii be willing to consider new information concerning the need for the Minuteman III Propulsion Replacement Program, and to help address these concerns during the conference on this bill?

Mr. INOUYE. I can say to my colleague from Montana that the subcommittee always is willing to consider new information concerning any of its recommendations. I look forward to the Air Force providing sufficient, additional information to address the subcommittee's questions about this project.

I would say to my colleague, and to other members of the Senate who have asked about the Minuteman III Propulsion Replacement Program, that House and Senate appropriators face a much more limited fiscal environment than do the authorization committees which initially approved this program. The Congress has limited the defense appropriations subcommittees to a military spending total for fiscal year 1994 which is billions below that recommended by the authorization committees. Defense appropriators must make much more difficult choices about military priorities.

Within this context, I can assure my colleague that we will do our best in conference with respect to this program.

Mr. EXON. I want to thank my good friend from Hawaii for bringing his usual insight to this important matter of the Minuteman III Propulsion Replacement Program. My understanding is that the committee's action was based on the concern that, given the tight budgetary environment, the Air Force has not provided adequate justification for proceeding with the program at this time.

Mr. INOUYE. My colleague from Nebraska, who is a leader in the Senate on strategic nuclear issue, is correct.

Mr. EXON. Therefore, am I correct in stating that the Appropriations Committee does not disagree with the Defense Department as to whether the Minuteman III Propulsion Replacement Program should be performed, but, instead, disagrees as to when the program should begin in earnest?

Mr. INOUYE. Let me try to respond to my colleague from Nebraska by saying that, so far, the Air Force has been unable to provide sufficient information to demonstrate the urgency of beginning this program in fiscal year 1994.

Mr. EXON. As the distinguished chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee is aware, the Air Force is concerned that the reduction recommended for the Minuteman III Propulsion Replacement Program will result in serious programmatic delays and cost growth. I share these concerns and respectfully ask that the chairman consider the correspondence from the Air Force about the need to fully fund this program and to revisit the issue when he and his colleagues are in conference.

Mr. DORGAN. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of Senator EXON, chairman of the Armed Services Subcommittee on Nuclear Deterrence, in support of the Minuteman III Propulsion Replacement Program. I would underscore that the Air Force has advocated funding of $49.94 million and a fiscal year 1994 start as the preferred way to reduce program costs and to ensure the reliability of the land-based leg of our nuclear deterrent Triad. I, too, would urge Chairman INOUYE to give serious consideration to the Air Force position during the conference on the fiscal year 1994 defense spending bill.

Mr. INOUYE. I am happy to consider the Air Force's correspondence and to do my best on this issue in conference.

MORNING BUSINESS

TRIBUTE TO THE HONOREES OF THE WASHINGTON CHAPEL CHRISTIAN METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH'S 1993 POSITIVE IMAGE AWARDS BANQUET

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, today I rise to pay tribute to the Washington Chapel Christian Methodist Episcopal Church and the honorees of the church's 1993 Positive Image Awards Banquet to be held on Saturday, October 23, 1993. This year, the church has chosen 14 outstanding men and women who have served their communities and have made a difference in improving the quality of life for the citizens of Memphis, TN. This honor is a reflection of the civic, academic, and professional achievements the following Memphians have attained.

Judge Bernice Donald, Federal Bankruptcy Court judge.

A.C. Wharton, Memphis/Shelby County public defender.

Dr. Gerry House, superintendent, Memphis City Schools.

James B. Payton, director, Martin Luther King Center.

Dr. N. Charles Thomas, general secretary of personnel services, the CME Church.

Dr. Scott Morris, director, the Church Health Center.

Michael Hawkins, principal, Hamilton Elementary School.

Sandra Burke, executive director, Inroads Memphis.

Melvin Burgess, director, Memphis Police Department.

Lucy Shaw, CEO, the Regional Medical Center.

TaJuan Stout-Mitchell, commissioner, Memphis City School Board.

Adele Hines, student, Whitehaven High School, NAACP Act-So Award winner.

Bessie Smith, member, Washington Chapel CME Church.

Ruth Odell, member, Washington Chapel CME Church.

I also want to take this opportunity to applaud the staff and members of the Washington Chapel CME Church. Through innovative community service programs, Washington Chapel has set a worthy example for other churches and community organizations to follow.

I salute the Washington Chapel Christian Methodist Episcopal Church and each honoree and wish them much success in their future endeavors.

IRRESPONSIBLE CONGRESS? HERE IS TODAY'S BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, as of the close of business yesterday, October 18, the Federal debt stood at $4,401,988,615,772.60, meaning that on a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child in America owes $17,137.76 as his or her share of that debt.

IN HONOR OF DR. PHILLIP ALLEN SHARP

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I doubt there are many previous winners of the Nobel Prize for Medicine who can say they got their start from a cow. But when Dr. Phillip Allen Sharp received his first calf at the age of 5, it helped start a college fund and put Sharp on the road to winning this year's prize.

Kentucky has always been proud of its rich agricultural heritage, both because of the traditions it upholds and for the futures it makes possible. While we know we can't take credit for Sharp winning the Nobel Prize, there are a whole lot of farm families in Kentucky who are proud of their native son and his farm roots.

Sharp was named a co-recipient of this year's prize for his discovery of split genes and for advancing research on cancer and hereditary diseases. He is credited with changing the scientific community's understanding about DNA makeup and helped launch the field of biotechnology.

Sharp is from Falmouth, KY, and attended Union College in Barbourville, KY, where he majored in chemistry and mathematics. Although he received a Ph.D in chemistry from the University of Illinois, he eventually shifted his focus to biology in postdoctoral studies at the California Institute of Technology and at Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory in New York.

Already considered one of this Nation's premier cancer research specialists, Sharp's honor apparently didn't come as a complete surprise to those closest to him. According to news accounts, his secretary has kept a bottle of champagne in the refrigerator for the past 15 years for the day her boss won the prize. And Sharp's family, who still reside in Kentucky, say they knew from the time he was "little", he was going to college and do something.

He certainly has done "something".

We in Kentucky add our congratulations and our thanks for contributions that have changed the face of medical research and the future of cancer treatment.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, as previously indicated, there will be no further rollcall votes this evening. I believe the managers are preparing a proposal to deal with the consideration of this measure tomorrow, and as we await that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate resumes consideration of H.R. 3116, the Department of Defense appropriations bill at 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, October 20, the committee amendments be laid aside and Senator BRADLEY be recognized to offer one of his listed amendments relating to the Army National Guard, with a time limitation of 1 hour for debate on the amendment, with no intervening amendment in order prior to the disposition of the Bradley amendment, with the time equally divided and controlled in the usual form; that when the time is used or yielded back, the Senate, without intervening action or debate, vote on or in relation to the Bradley amendment; that upon disposition of the Bradley amendment, Senator MCCAIN be recognized to offer an amendment on behalf of himself and Senator BINGAMAN relating to defense earmarks, with a time limitation of 1 hour for debate, with the time equally divided and controlled in the usual form, with no intervening amendment in order prior to the disposition of the McCain-Bingaman amendment; that when all time is used or yielded back, the Senate, without intervening action or debate, vote on or in relation to the McCain-Bingaman amendment.

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

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, for the information of Senators then, with respect to their schedules, the Senate will proceed to consider a Bradley amendment at 9:30, with 1 hour for debate. If all time is used, the vote on or in relation to that amendment will occur at 10:30 tomorrow morning. It is possible that all time will not be used and some will be yielded back. Therefore, Senators are on notice that a vote could occur at any time between 9:30 and 10:30 tomorrow, depending on how much time is used or yielded back.

That vote will be followed by a maximum 1 hour of debate on the McCain-Bingaman amendment, so there will undoubtedly be at least two votes tomorrow morning. Senators should be on notice in that regard.

REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the Second Protocol Amending the Tax Convention with Israel, Treaty Document No. 103-16, transmitted to the Senate by the President today; and ask that the treaty be considered as having been read the first time; that it be referred with accompanying papers to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed; and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. STEVENS. There is no objection, Mr. President.

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

The President's message is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification the Second Protocol Amending the Convention Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the State of Israel with Respect to Taxes on Income, signed at Washington on November 20, 1975, as amended by the Protocol signed May 30, 1980. The Second Protocol was signed at Jerusalem on January 26, 1993. Also transmitted for the information of the Senate is an exchange of notes and the report of the Department of State with respect to the Protocol.

The Second Protocol further amends the 1975 Convention, as amended by the 1980 Protocol, in large measure to accommodate certain post-1980 provisions of U.S. tax law and treaty policy. The new Protocol also reflects changes in Israeli law and makes certain technical corrections to the Convention that are necessary because of the passage of time. It will modernize tax relations between the two countries and will facilitate greater private sector United States investment in Israel.

I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the Protocol and give its advice and consent to ratification.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 19, 1993.*

200TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LAYING OF THE CORNERSTONE OF THE CAPITOL

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 146, a concurrent resolution permitting the use of the Capitol building and grounds for events to commemorate

the 200th anniversary of the laying of the cornerstone of the Capitol, just received from the House; that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

Mr. STEVENS. There is no objection.

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

So the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 146, was agreed to.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Edwin R. Thomas, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting a treaty and sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

REPORT ON HIGHWAY SAFETY FOR CALENDAR YEAR 1992—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 56

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the 1992 calendar year reports as prepared by the Department of Transportation on activities under the Highway Safety Act and the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966, as amended (23 U.S.C. 401 note and 15 U.S.C. 1408).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 19, 1993.*

REPORT OF THE FEDERAL PREVAILING RATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR CALENDAR YEAR 1992—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 57

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Governmental Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 5347(e) of title 5 of the United States Code, I transmit herewith the 1992 annual report of the Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 19, 1993.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:55 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following joint resolution, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 78. Joint resolution designating the beach at 53 degrees 53'51"N, 166 degrees 34'15"W to 53 degrees 53'48"N, 166 degrees 34'21"W on Hog Island, which lies in the Northeast Bay of Unalaska, Alaska as "Arkansas Beach" in commemoration of the 206th regiment of the National Guard, who served during the Japanese attack on Dutch Harbor, Unalaska, on June 3 and 4, 1942.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 47. Concurrent resolution to recognize the International Rescue Committee for its great humanitarian endeavors.

The message further announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 146. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol building and grounds for events to commemorate the 200th anniversary of the laying of the cornerstone of the Capitol.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of section 491 of the Higher Education Act, as amended by section 407 of Public Law 99-498, the Speaker appoints Mr. Thomas A. Butts of Ann Arbor, MI, from private life, to the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance to fill the existing vacancy thereon, on the part of the House.

The message further announced that pursuant to the provisions of section 4(a) of Public Law 98-399, as amended by Public Law 101-30, the Speaker reappoints as members of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Federal Holiday Commission the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. WHEAT, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. REGULA, and Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of section 9355(a) of title 10, United States Code, the Speaker appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Air Force Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. DICKS, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. HEFLEY, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

The message further announced that pursuant to the provisions of section 2702 of title 44, United States Code, as amended by Public Law 101-509, the Speaker appoints Mr. Richard F. Fenno, Jr., of Rochester, NY, from private life, to the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress on the part of the House.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

At 6:25 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions:

S. 1487. An act entitled the "Middle East Peace Facilitation Act of 1993."

S. 1548. An act to amend the National Wool Act of 1954 to reduce the subsidies that wool and mohair producers receive for the 1994 and 1995 marketing years and to eliminate the wool and mohair programs for the 1996 and subsequent marketing years, and for other purposes.

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

H.R. 2518. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

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

S.J. Res. 21. Joint resolution designating the week beginning September 19, 1994, as "National Historically Black Colleges and Universities Week."

S.J. Res. 78. Joint resolution designating the beach at 53 degrees 53'51"N, 166 degrees 34'15"W to 53 degrees 53'48"N, 166 degrees 34'21"W on Hog Island, which lies in the Northeast Bay of Unalaska, Alaska as "Arkansas Beach" in commemoration of the 206th regiment of the National Guard, who served during the Japanese attack on Dutch Harbor, Unalaska, on June 3 and 4, 1942.

H.J. Res. 111. Joint resolution designating October 21, 1993, as "National Biomedical Research Day."

The enrolled bills and joint resolutions were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore [Mr. BYRD].

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC-1656. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on direct spending or receipts legislation within five days of enactment; to the Committee on the Budget.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following report of committee was submitted:

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Appropriations:

Special Report entitled "Further Revised Allocation to Subcommittees of Budget Totals From the Concurrent Resolution for Fiscal Year 1994" (Rept. No. 103-160).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. RIEGLE, from the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs:

John Despres, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

Jeffrey E. Garten, of New York, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for International Trade.

Lauri Fitz-Pegado, of Maryland, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Director General of the United States and Foreign Commercial Service.

William J. Gilmartin, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

(The above nominations were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed, subject to the nominees' commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

By Mr. BUMPERS, from the Committee on Small Business:

Cassandra M. Pulley, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

(The above nominations were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed, subject to the nominees' commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. WOFFORD:

S. 1565. A bill to delay the effective date of regulations issued by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development governing the admission of single persons into public and assisted housing for the elderly; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. METZENBAUM (for himself and Mr. DURENBERGER):

S. 1566. A bill to establish requirements applicable to rent-to-own transactions; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SIMON:

S. 1567. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act and the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, to permit additional remedies in certain unfair labor practice cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. SIMON (for himself and Mr. WELLSTONE):

S. 1568. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to require the arbitration of initial contract negotiation disputes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. HATCH):

S. 1569. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish, reauthorize and revise provisions to improve the health of individuals from disadvantaged backgrounds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. HATCH:

S.J. Res. 145. A joint resolution to designate the period commencing on November 21, 1993, and ending on November 27, 1993, and the period commencing on November 20, 1994, and ending on November 26, 1994, each as "National Adoption Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. WOFFORD:

S. 1565. A bill to delay the effective date of regulations issued by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development governing the admission of single persons into public and assisted housing for the elderly; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

OLDER AMERICANS' HOUSING PRESERVATION ACT

• Mr. WOFFORD. Mr. President, I have heard from many older people in the Pittsburgh area who want, and need, to preserve their homes. They have emphasized to me that their housing is more than just an apartment building. It also serves as a safe, comfortable social center. Our communities have long recognized the special housing needs of older Americans. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development should move forward to implement a law passed by Congress last year which is intended to meet that need.

The concern arises from HUD's recent implementation of section 573(a) of the National Affordable Housing Act of 1990—known as NAHA. Before NAHA, the number of single people eligible for assisted housing, who were not 62 years old or older, disabled, handicapped, displaced, or the remaining member of a tenant family, was limited to 15 percent of an area's units. NAHA eliminated the 15 percent limitation. HUD's rule implementing this change became effective on August 25, 1993.

But in 1992, Congress acted to prevent the situation which is now permitted by HUD's rule. Section 622 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992, permits public housing projects for the elderly. The purpose of this change was to maintain occupancy in assisted projects designed for the elderly and clearly restricts the scope of the changes adopted in NAHA. However, HUD has yet to even propose regulations implementing the 1992 law.

The legislation I am introducing today would suspend HUD's rule, which permits admissions of all single people into public and assisted housing that has traditionally been for older Americans. The suspension would last until HUD implements the 1992 law.

Mr. President, we need to ensure that every American—especially the homeless and the handicapped—has access to safe and affordable housing. But we must continue to honor the unique housing needs of older Americans, by allowing them to live with each other, where they can receive the special services they have earned.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of this legislation be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1565

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

SECTION 1. TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Older Americans' Housing Preservation Act."

SEC. 2. LIMITED MORATORIUM.

(a) DELAYED EFFECTIVE DATE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, effective on the date of enactment of this Act, parts 812, 905, 912, and 960 of title 24, Code of Federal Regulations, as amended to implement section 573(a) of the National Affordable Housing Act of 1990, shall not apply to public and assisted housing developed as an elderly housing project with the approval of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (hereafter in this section referred to as the "Department") before the date on which the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (hereafter in this section referred to as the "Secretary") issues final regulations implementing section 621 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992.

(b) APPLICABLE REGULATIONS.—During the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and ending on the date on which the Secretary issues final regulations implementing section 621 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992, parts 812, 905, 912, and 960 of title 24, Code of Federal Regulations, as such parts existed prior to the effective date of the regulations issued to implement section 573(a) of the National Affordable Housing Act of 1990, shall apply to public and assisted housing developed as an elderly project with the approval of the Department.•

By Mr. METZENBAUM (for himself and Mr. DURENBERGER):

S. 1566. A bill to establish requirements applicable to rent-to-own transactions; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

RENT-TO-OWN CONSUMER CREDIT PROTECTION ACT OF 1993

Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, today, on behalf of myself and Senator DURENBERGER, I introduce the Rent-to-Own Consumer Protection Act of 1993, a bill that would regulate the rent-to-own industry and protect consumers from being gouged and ripped off by unscrupulous rent-to-own dealers. Rent-to-own is a relatively new sales phenomenon. In a rent-to-own transaction a low-income consumer acquires a television, stereo, VCR, refrigerator, or other household items for a small weekly, biweekly, or monthly payment. At the end of a specific number

of payments, the consumer may become the owner of the item, but usually at a considerable, and most of the time at an exorbitant cost. The consumer can pay as much as three to four times the actual retail value of the items purchased.

For example:

At Rent-A-Center in Gainesville, FL, a 19-inch Zenith color television rents for $11.99 a week, excluding insurance and taxes. The set can be bought in 78 weeks for $935.22. At Sears, Roebuck, and Co., in that area, a 19-inch Zenith television sells for $279, less than a third of the figure that the consumer is being required to pay on this rent-to-lease.

Similarly, a 20-cubic-foot Whirlpool refrigerator rents for $98.95 a month for 18 months at Buddy Bi-Rite Rental Purchase Centers in Ocala, FL. The cost to purchase, $1,781.10. That same 20-cubic-foot Whirlpool refrigerator at Sears cost less than about half of that, $899.99. Rent-to-own companies aim their often deceptive advertisements and unscrupulous sales practices at low-income women, racial and ethnic minorities, the elderly, public assistance recipients, and uneducated consumers who do not have a lot of credit options. These are people who would like to have one of these facilities in their home, their credit is not good enough to go in and buy it, so they go in and rent. It is this whole idea of rent-to-own. The fact is that those who own these companies focus particularly in minority areas inhabited by single mothers where ready credit is hard to obtain.

According to the October 1993 issue of the Washington Monthly, research done by Rent-A-Center, one or our Nation's largest rent-to-own dealers, reveals that nearly 60 percent of Rent-A-Center's customers earn less than $20,000 a year, while just 4 percent earn $45,000 or more. Only about 7 percent are college graduates. The average customer of Rent-A-Center represents a family of four with a combined income of $30,000. These unsuspecting victims are lured into onerous sales agreements by the promise of no credit requirements, low payments, quick delivery and no cancellation penalties. In the words of Irene Muldrow of Minneapolis who still does not own the furniture, which retailed for 1,000, she paid more than $2,500 on the rent-to-own basis. To quote her:

> I didn't understand I was paying so much money. * * * They take advantage of people who don't read that good.

According to Attorney General Ernie Preate, Jr., of Pennsylvania:

> Rent-to-own transactions are one of the biggest consumer ripoffs in my State and across the Nation * * * Low-income people * * * turn to the rent-to-own industry because they mistakenly believe it's an inexpensive way to obtain major appliances, furniture, and other products without credit. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Although installment payments are low—usually less than $20 a week—the interest rates these stores charge on rent-to-own transactions are far higher than those of banks, credit cards, or local retail merchants. According to a survey conducted by the U.S. Public Interest Research Group, rent-to-own companies have collected as much as 323 percent interest from consumers doling out $12 a week for up to 91 weeks to buy TV's and refrigerators. Some of those TV's and refrigerators are worth as little as $125 new.

Take, for example, the experience of Charlene Mathis, who lives in a public housing project in Jersey City. Ms. Mathis agreed to pay one rent-to-own store $21 a week for 87 weeks to buy a television and a VCR. The total cost of these items, which at retail would have cost about $250 each, came to more than $1,800.

In addition to high interest rates, rent-to-own consumers build no equity in their rent-to-own goods. If payments are missed, merchandise can be repossessed, even though the consumer is close to fully paying for the item. Ms. Green of Pennsylvania made payments totaling $964.35, excluding fees, which can be substantial, for living room furniture costing $1,157.22 under a rent-to-own contract. This same furniture had a listed cash price of $499. When Ms. Green was hospitalized and became unable to make the few remaining payments, her living room furniture was repossessed and she lost all the money she heretofore paid.

The Wall Street Journal, on September 22, 1993, reported the case of Nancy Thornley of Ogden, UT. Nancy Thornley:

> * * * was diligently handing over about $261 a month in rental payments to Rent-A-Center [a rent-to-own dealer] in 1991 when she lost a leg to diabetes. Faced with a $1,000 bill for a prosthetic limb, she arranged to defer part of her rental tab, she says. But shortly after she returned home from the hospital she was shocked when two store employees showed up without notice on a Saturday afternoon, accused her of being 3 months behind in payments and carted away all the goods, primarily basics such as a refrigerator and a couch.

That is from the Wall Street Journal story. In order to reclaim their goods, rent-to-own dealers engage in a variety of abusive repossession tactics. Some rent-to-own firms not only threaten, but also seek criminal prosecutions against consumers under State larceny statutes in order to collect rent-to-own arrearages or repossess rent-to-own goods. In fact, many rent-to-own contracts expressly provide—and most others imply—that the rent-to-own merchant may enter the customer's home to repossess the merchandise. Other rent-to-own companies even use the deceptive repossession tactic called a switch-out in order to repossess their goods. In a switch-out a company representative tells the customer that the appliance is being picked up for necessary repairs or maintenance when in fact it is being repossessed. Still other rent-to-own companies pay policemen $50–$100 to repossess rent-to-own merchandise.

And, the list of abusive repossession tactics go on and on. The Wall Street Journal reports that:

> Employees handling repossessions have been known to bring along members of a feared motorcycle gang as well as to vandalize customer's homes, extract sexual favors from strapped customers and even, in one instance, force a late payer to do involuntary labor.

The article cites the following example:

> Some store employees have boasted that they have gone out to the customers' homes, had sex with them, and then repo-ed the merchandise. * * *

Rent-to-own companies earn considerably more by renting, repossessing and the re-renting the same goods than it does if the first customer makes all payments. It was reported that in one instance, a Philco VCR which retailed for about $119 brought in more than $5,000 in a 5 year period.

While rent-to-own dealers are capitalizing on their ability to rent and then re-rent their goods, many consumers are left holding defective goods. Consumers have complained that they were not only delivered used goods but also received defective goods and rent-to-own dealers have failed to promptly repair defects.

The rent-to-own industry says it provides a valuable service by making a wide range of goods available for short-term rentals to low-income consumers who do not have credit and would not have access to such items any other way. Dealers say providing repairs for the life of a contract is expensive, as are collection and repossession efforts on items rented weekly or monthly.

Rent-to-own sales, if properly regulated, could provide a service to low-income consumers. However, as an unregulated industry, rent-to-own dealers prey on the unsophisticated poor through exorbitant pricing. With over 7,500 rental stores nationally, the $3.6 billion rent-to-own industry is an industry that tends to exploit low-income consumers rather than help them.

I would guess most of my colleagues in the Senate, including myself, know very little about the rent-to-own business. We probably do not. When we buy a VCR or want a TV set or washing machine or refrigerator we go out and buy it. But there are millions in America who are not in a position to do that, and unfortunately those are the ones who are being preyed upon by the rent-to-own industry. Rent-to-own dealers evade usury and consumer protection laws by structuring their contracts as short-term leases, which fall outside of most regulation. Thus, State regulation of the industry has been ineffective and court decisions inconclusive.

Indeed, legislation endorsed by the rent-to-own industry is currently on the books of 32 States, and the industry is scurrying to pass similar laws in the remaining States. The principal effect of these State laws, however, is to insulate rent-to-own dealers from potential lawsuits from dissatisfied customers. None of these State laws provide any real or significant consumer protection. For the most part, they require only minimal disclosures and insignificant consumer rights. Meanwhile, the abuses continue. Federal legislation is the only effective way with which to deal with this problem.

The Rent-to-Own Consumer Credit Protection Act of 1993, which I will introduce very shortly on behalf of myself and Senator DURENBERGER, makes it clear that rent-to-own transactions are subject to State and Federal consumer protection laws. By defining a rent-to-own transaction as a credit sale, these transactions will now have to comply with Federal statutes that protect consumers from unfair lending practices, abusive debt collection techniques, and onerous credit terms. Under the bill, the Truth in Lending Act, the Federal Debt Collection Practices Act, the Equal Credit Opportunity Act, and the Fair Credit Reporting Act would specifically apply to rent-to-own transactions.

In addition, significant disclosure requirements will now be mandated. Each item available for purchase under a rent-to-own transaction must disclose, among other things, whether the item is new or used, the cash price of the item, the annual interest rate to be charged to finance the purchase of the item, and the total payments required to be paid to acquire ownership of the item. A seller under a rent-to-own contract is specifically prohibited from threatening, coercing, engaging in conduct to oppress, harass or abuse, making fraudulent deceptive or misleading representation, or using any unconscionable means to collect amounts owed by a rent-to-own customer. Violations of these provisions and others provisions contained in the bill are subject to Federal fines ranging from $500 to $5,000.

This legislation will go a long way in stopping consumer gouging and curbing the abuses that have been identified with rent-to-own transactions. I hope all of my colleagues will join us in supporting this important consumer protection bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the September 22, 1993, article appearing in the Wall Street Journal, entitled "A Marketing Giant Uses Its Sales Prowess To Profit on Poverty" and the October 1993 article appearing in the Washington Monthly entitled "Renter Beware," and a section-by-section analysis of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 22, 1993]

PEDDLING DREAMS: A MARKETING GIANT USES ITS SALES PROWESS TO PROFIT ON POVERTY

(By Alix M. Freedman)

Recording stars Tina Turner, Frank Sinatra and the Beatles have made Thorn EMI PLC famous in entertainment circles. But a very different group of people is now making Thorn rich.

Though it doesn't advertise the fact. Thorn's most profitable subsidiary has nothing to do with the superstars who record under its various music labels. Instead, the largest single contributor to Thorn's operating profit is its most obscure and by far its least genteel, unit: Rent-A-Center a chain that thrives by renting refrigerators, furniture, diamond pinkie rings and assorted other merchandise to America's urban and rural poor.

Since buying Rent-A-Center in 1987. London-based Thorn has expanded it briskly using both acquisitions and aggressive marketing tactics introduced by the unit's top executive a former Pizza Hut marketing whiz. Thorn now thoroughly dominates the industry which is known as rent-to-own because renters who make every weekly payment usually for 78 weeks. become owners. Rent-A-Center USA controls 25% of the $2.8 billion U.S. market, the chain has more outlets than its four biggest competitors combined.

HIGH-PRESSURE SALES

Along the way though its high-pressure methods have sometimes turned coercive and abusive according to accounts by about 50 former store employees and company executives who have left within the past 18 months. Scrambling to meet ambitious sales targets set under Thorn. Rent-A-Center employees routinely encourage unsophisticated customers to rent more goods than they can afford, these people say. Then, when customers fall behind in payments, Rent-A-Center repossesses the goods and re-rents them.

Customers who manage to make every installment may end up paying several times the item's retail value—at an effective annual interest rate, if the transaction is viewed as a credit sale, that can top 200%.

While the rent-to-own business has always been gritty. Thorn has made it even tougher, many of those interviewed believe. Employees handling repossessions have been known to bring along members of a feared motorcycle gang as well as to vandalize customers' homes, extract sexual favors from strapped customers, and even in one instance force a late payer to do involuntary labor.

Says Brian Baker, a former store manager in Cambridge, Md. This is one of those jobs where if you have any kind of conscience you won't sleep well at night.

Now, a federal crackdown may be in the offing. House Banking committee Chairman Henry Gonzalez, a Democrat from Texas is expected next week to introduce a bill that would classify rent-to-own transactions as credit sales. Since some 30 States cap credit-sale interest rates at 21% or less, the bill would slash what Rent-A-Center and its rivals can charge. In addition, two class-action suits filed in Minnesota federal courts allege that Rent-A-Center charges usurious interest rates; one suit is pending and Rent-A-Center won the first round of the second suit, which has been appealed.

Rent-A-Center denies that its transactions are credit sales, because most customers don't end up buying the product and they can cancel at any time. Thus, it argues, it doesn't charge interest at all.

Rent-A-Center officials do concede that abuses occur and that the rent-to-own business has in the past, been sleazier than most. But they say the company sees itself as part of the solution rather than as part of the problem. Rent-A-Center Chief Executive Walter E. "Bud" Gates points to his efforts to improve employee training, to spiff up stores and to enforce a "Respect All Customers" program that is trumpeted on wall posters in outlets. He says he is cracking down on dicey collection and repossession practices.

"The carnival industry was a down and dirty, nasty industry and along came Disney who rewrote the standard, and over time the whole industry came up," he says "We're trying to do the same thing."

But former store manager Randy Richards, like many others interviewed, contends that the cleanup is in name only. "On paper, this company purified itself by introducing the new respect concept," he says. But in reality, "nothing changed." He says that in 1991—a full four years after Thorn took over—he himself picked an apartment lock with a credit card in order to retrieve a late payer's living room furniture.

A number of the former employees interviewed were fired, some for allegedly serious wrongdoing. But their accounts of working conditions, and customer treatment at Rent-A-Center were remarkably uniform. Their accounts were also consistent with those of employees who quit and those of customers, even though the people interviewed came from many different parts of the country.

THE $5,000 VCR

For low-income customers, Rent-A-Center has tremendous appeal. The chain gives them immediate use of brand-name merchandise, and the weekly payments are usually less than $20. But while in theory customers can eventually own the goods outright, the company says three out of every four are unable to meet all their payments.

Their failure is partially responsible for Thorn's success. The company earns considerably more by renting, repossessing and then re-renting the same goods than it does if the first customer makes all the payments. Derrick Myers, who was fired as manager of the Rent-A-Center store in Victorville, Calif., recalls one particular Philco VCR, for example, that he says retailed for about $419, but that brought in more than $5,000 in a five year period.

That means the most profitable customers are people like Minneapolis welfare mother Angel Adams, who says Rent-A-Center salespeople fooled her into renting more than a dozen items at a monthly cost that reached about $325. Though the salespeople knew how little she earned, "they pushed it on me, she says. When she fell behind in her payments in late 1991. Rent-A-Center sued her and repossessed the goods, ranging from a bedroom set to two VCRs. Ms. Adams is now the plaintiff in one of the two class-action suits plus one pending in federal court in Minneapolis. Rent-A-Center declines comment.

Even if a customer can't afford it and we know it and they know it, we'll rent to them anyway, says Rod Comeaux, a former store manager from Onley, Va., who was fired a year ago for unrelated reasons. "We can always get it back," and rent it to others, he says.

Rent-A-Center's Mr. Gates denies that salespeople put excessive pressure on customers or intentionally overload them with

goods. On average, customers rent 2.85 items a month, at a total monthly cost of $99.07, and they are able to cancel rentals at any time without a penalty, he pointed out. Store managers—who are required to obtain income and other financial information from customers, ideally should act as "financial planners for customers, he says, adding that the worst thing employees can do is to rent to customers whose eyes are bigger than their stomachs.

Rent-A-Center says its customer base is 25% to 30% black and 10% to 15% Hispanic, and just 15% are on welfare or government subsidies. But former store managers consistently maintain that the total on government assistance is more than 25%, with some claiming up to 70%. Indeed, they unanimously report that sales always spiked on "Mother's Day," as they call the day when welfare mothers get their checks.

How did Thorn come to enter such a harsh business? A predecessor company Thorn Electronics, planted the seeds when it opened a rental store outside London in 1931 and then expanded the chain throughout Europe. Half a century later, after the 1979 merger that created Thorn EMI, the conglomerate was struggling with poor results from its hodgepodge of disparate businesses, and decided to try its luck in the rental market in the U.S.

To get a foot in the door, Sir Cohn Southgate, Thorn's chief executive, contacted Goldman, Sachs & Co. in 1987. As it happened, Tom Devlin, the biggest player in the fragmented U.S. rent-to-own market, was looking for a buyer for Rent-A-Center, the 495-store chain he founded in 1973, and he too had approached Goldman Sachs. A deal was struck almost overnight, with Sir Cohn paying a lavish $594 million, or 42 times earnings.

Mr. Devlin stepped aside and Mr. Gates—already at Rent-A-Center—became its new chief executive. He quickly began buying up small competitors. Rentals now account for almost a third of Thorn EMI's total revenue, while music—including Thorn's EMI, Chrysalis and Capitol labels—accounts for just a hair more.

A former senior vice president of marketing at Pizza Hut, Mr. Gates had migrated to Rent-A-Center in 1986, after failing to land the top job at the pizza chain. Despite his rookie status in rent-to-own, Mr. Gates had a marketing man's feel for demographics, psychographics and New Age notions of customer empowerment. Inspired by some company research indicating that his renters craved good treatment even more than low prices, he began to merchandise respect.

Defying industry wisdom that poor customers would be intimidated by snazzy stores, for example, Mr. Gates has spent $40 million to make each Rent-A-Center outlet seem an idealized version of home and hearth. "Happy family" lifestyle posters (in a store's choice of black, Hispanic or Caucasian) adorn the outlets' walls. Prop kits dispatched from the home office in Wichita, Kan., provide cozy touches like plants and print bedspreads.

Employees under Mr. Gates are required to greet customers, preferably by name, within 10 seconds of their entrance and to conduct payment disputes out of earshot of other renters. Stores are also encouraged to keep fresh coffee brewing. "The customer should feel like this is home, a place where I feel comfortable and that cares about me," he explains.

THE HARD SELL

Those soft touches are coupled with hard-core salesmanship. According to a thick training manual, salespeople are supposed to quote the weekly and monthly rental rates. The manual doesn't instruct employees to quote the total cost, and former store managers say they made sure they never did. In fact, in 40 states, the total isn't even on the price tag. (Ten states require that it be listed on price tags, a rule Rent-A-Center says it will honor in all 50 states by next month.) Instead, the manual instructs employees to focus on "features and benefits," such as Rent-A-Center's free delivery and repair, and most of all, the low weekly price.

But the advertised weekly price is designed to yield each store about 3½ times its cost of purchasing the merchandise from Rent-A-Center headquarters. The total is jacked up further by a one-time processing fee (typically $7.50) and late fees (typically $5). The total price is usually revealed only in the rental agreement that customers sign at the end of the sales process, former store managers say.

To boost Rent-A-Center's profits, employees also push a "customer protection" plan that offers minimal benefits but that 95% of customers end up subscribing to. "It's better than insurance," saleswoman Laura Daupino of the Bloomfield, N.J. store was overheard telling an unemployed welfare mother recently. Yet unlike insurance, it doesn't replace stolen or destroyed items or reimburse customers for their loss. It offers customers basically one benefit. It prevent Rent-A-Center from suing customers if goods are stolen or destroyed.

For Rent-A-Center, however, the benefit is considerably larger. The protection plan is a $29 million annual revenue booster, much of which drops to the bottom line, as does most of the $27 million racked up from the other fees, according to internal company financial documents.

Rent-A-Center has long justified its high prices by citing customers defaults and the costs associated with its free repairs. But part of Rent-A-Center's secret of success is that those costs are minimal. Internal documents show its service expenses ran 3.3% of rental revenue in fiscal 1993, though Rent-A-Center says the actual figure is closer to 10%. And its total inventory losses—from junked merchandise and "skips and stolens" (as in customers who skip town)—run a bit over 2% of revenue.

Indeed, says Granville Quinton, Rent-A-Center's former director of budgets, forecasts and financial systems, "they have no higher skip or stolen rate than a conventional retailer." Rent-A-Center concedes that this is "technically true," but says the low rate is "misleading" because each lost item means the far greater loss of future rental income.

In part to beef up sales further, Rent-A-Center urges customers to pay their rental fees in person each week. That gives employees a chance, according to the training manual, to pitch added products. Employees are also supposed to try to "upsell," or trade up, renters to more expensive versions of the same product.

In some markets, employees are expected to hang fliers on hundreds of housing-project doors each week, in a drill known as blanket brochuring. You would brochure the projects one week before the [welfare] checks came out so you already had that seed planted in their mind," recalls Gerald Defiore, who was fired as the store manager in Spartanburg, S.C. "Then the day the checks came out, you'd go back and knock on doors and fill out the work forms there. Corporate was in on it, the stores were in on it. These people didn't stand a chance." (Rent-A-Center says that blanket brochuring is optional and that targeting a project would be "logical" if it was in a store's territory.)

Complementing those tactics are an array of less savory techniques not sanctioned from above. Mr. Defiore says he scanned the obituary page, for instance, and sent cheap flower arrangements signed from your friends at Rent-A-Center" to the bereaved. "At a funeral, everybody looks at who the flowers are from," he explains, "and when they drop by the store to thank you, you can hook them."

Rent-A-Center's Wichita headquarters staff jacks up those efforts with an $18.5 million direct-mail program so sophisticated that it can tailor brochures to a single block. Much of the blitz focuses on new prospects, primarily the six references that customers must list on an application form. (Former employees say they typically called only two references, using the rest simply for marketing purposes.) A sample letter opens like this: Wouldn't you rather watch a big screen TV than the one you have now?"

Other targets include former customers who had failed to make all their payments, even those who have had goods forcibly repossessed receive coupons blaring in bold type, "We Want You Back." Additional letters and coupons are aimed at customers who are on the verge of paying off a product they have been renting. Some get plastic paid cards, which look like credit cards and encourage additional rentals with perks like $1 to $2 in weekly rental charges.

If Rent-A-Center salespeople are unusually aggressive, they have good reason. Their jobs depend on it. Mr. Gates has honed a tough sales quota system known internally simply as "the plan," which calls for every store to meet weekly and monthly targets that rivals say are far more ambitious than their own. The stores' results are monitored daily by zone managers, in charge of roughly 10 stores each.

As with many other companies that use sales targets, if Rent-A-Center managers and employees exceed their quotas, they are eligible for cars, promotions and bonuses. But at Rent-A-Center, if they fail to "make plan," they are fired with extraordinary speed. In Utah's six-outlet market of 28 employees, for example, more than a dozen people were fired, including seven store managers, during the 18 months ended in July, according to two of the former managers. They say falling short of the plan was the major reason, though Rent-A-Center says there were numerous factors and that some departures were voluntary.

"Rent-A-Center's employee philosophy is burn and turn," contends former Las Vegas store manager Mr. Richards, who says he quit in May 1992 because his zone manager insisted he work 80 to 100 hours a week, something the zone manager denies. "It's bring them in and work them until they can't take it any more and send them on their way," Mr. Richards says.

Mr. Gates acknowledges that the company's "total turnover should be less than half" its current annual level of 56% companywide (excluding headquarters) and 25% at the store-manager level. The company is now working to retain its people by beefing up its training programs and by evaluating employees based on customer service and other factors rather than simply on numbers, he says.

In any case, Rent-A-Center's sales and marketing strategies have produced a huge payoff. For the fiscal year ended March 31, 1993, the 1,200 store unit racked up operating

profit of about $90 million on revenue of $560.3 million—a 16% margin that is eye-popping by retail standards. For the first time, Rent-A-Center was also Thorn's single most profitable subsidiary, contributing 14% of Thorn EMI's operating profit. Where store-level profit margins average 15% to 20% when smaller operators run such stores. Thorn's outlets show profit margins of 20% to 30%. Conventional retailers' store profit margins run at about 2.5% according to Management Horizons, Inc.

No wonder Sir Colin recently told a Las Vegas meeting of store managers that their unit was "the closest company to my heart in Thorn EMI" and that "most businessmen would give an arm, a leg, and probably half their body for its performance."

Thorn executives say there is nothing insidious about Rent-A-Center's strategy of courting customers who are of limited means, and of treating them well. Customers receive "fantastic" service, says Sir Colin, who professes to be "always puzzled" why the rent-to-own industry is "badly regarded." Rent-A-Center, he adds, "treats them like kings and queens.

Customers like Carol Baker, a waitress at a resort hotel in Bolton Landing, NY, are appreciative. "The prices could be cheaper," says Ms. Baker, whose home is almost completely furnished by Rent-A-Center, "but they treat me like I'm a somebody."

Former employees and other customers see things differently. "The Rent-A-Center philosophy," says Mr. Comeaux, the former store manager in Virginia, "is that if you treat the customer like they're royalty, you can bleed them through the nose."

REPO MAN

In the end, it isn't unusual for flattered customers to sign up for three or more rental agreements at a time. And some rent far more. For instance, Robert Ball, an unemployed Hunt-Wesson factory worker in Toledo, Ohio, says he is currently handing over all of his unemployment checks to pay for 13 different agreements totaling almost $900 a month.

Inevitably, some customers take on more than they can handle. So it is that behind every Rent-A-Center salesman lurks his doppelganger. Repo man.

Repossessions are never pretty, and the pre Thorn era was no exception. But because of the ambitious targets, people who have worked under both regimes say, employees now push harder than ever. Customers typically make their payments every Saturday and, throughout the morning, store employees work the phones exacting promises from the tardy. In these conversations, former customers say, they have been harassed, intimidated and even threatened with violence. Robert Keehn a former manager in Gasden, Ala., who was fired in March in part for carrying a gun, says that a favorite ploy is falsely informing customers or the relatives that a warrant for arrest has been issued for the theft of rental property.

The telephone onslaught resumes on Monday mornings, when 30 percent of customers are generally past due. If employees haven't reached a customer by Tuesday, they hit the road. Although it is against company rules, they often make a "mad run"—picking up payments from customers personally. Or they leave a message on the door instructing the customer to contact them. this process is repeated all week long. If they still don't get results, it's repo time.

In the company's vans, employees comb neighborhoods looking for slightly past-due customers and the more elusive "skips." In theory, Rent-A-Center employees new to the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, a federal law that doesn't apply to Rent-A-Center (it covers only third-party debt collectors), but that Rent-A-Center says it voluntarily complies with. Under these rules, debt collectors can't harass customers, for example, or engage in violent or criminal acts.

Mr. Gates cites such measures as proof that he is doing his utmost to make Rent-A-Center collection operation squeaky-clean. The CEO says his quest to transform Rent-A-Center's "profit-driven entrepreneurial culture into a service-driven, entrepreneurial culture" is "the hardest thing I have ever done * * * I haven't gotten everyone drinking the Kool Aid yet."

But former employees contend that Mr. Gates' strict enforcement of payment collections has in some cases actually stymied reform. Before Thorn, Rent-A-Center focused solely on the number of accounts past due, not the amount of "delinquent dollars"—or uncollected revenue. Early on Mr. Gates decreed that only 5.7 percent (and currently 5.5 percent) of a store's total monthly rental payments can go uncollected—and zone managers have tended to set even more ambitious goals. In contrast, smaller rent-to-own businesses generally leave 8 percent to 10 percent of bills uncollected each month.

Failure to control delinquent debts "will be your downfall, so you do as much as your conscience permits," says Gary Schiefer, a former store manager in Columbus, Ohio, who was abruptly fired in May 1992 when his delinquent dollars topped 9 percent. (His former zone manager says he was fired for other reasons.) Mr. Baker, the former store manager in Maryland, characterizes repossessions as "the dirtiest part of the whole business."

It is unquestionably the most creative * * * dressed as Cookie Monster, a gorilla and an alien life form and then knocked on a customer's door. Once inside, they successfully repossessed a home entertainment system on which payments hadn't been made in almost three months. Gary Gerhardt, the store manager who blessed this plan, calls the ruse "a last-ditch effort," adding, "it was the only way we could think to get someone in the door."

At the crack of dawn one Sunday, Mr. Myers, the store manager in Victorville, Calif., until March 1992, pulled off a particularly tough repossession by enlisting three burly Hell's Angels. He adds that in other instances he vented his spleen on delinquent customers who wouldn't come to the door by slathering superglue all over their deadbolts and doorknobs (Messrs. Gerhardt and Myers both were fired, but over unrelated matters).

The grueling routine grates on some Rent-A-Center employees. Mr. Baker, the former Maryland store manager quit in disgust in 1991 after one of his employees repossessed a refrigerator from a welfare mother with an infant, plunking her meat and milk on the kitchen table.

Yet abuses continue. Anthony Chapman, a Tyson Foods worker in Gasden, Ala. says that when he fell behind paying for a gold herringbone necklace, Rent-A-Center employee John Horton repeatedly showed up on his doorstep, brandishing two guns. The harassment climaxed. Mr. Chapman maintains, after he confessed that he had pawned the necklace. Mr. Horton promptly took Mr. Chapman's company issue thermal uniform and a gold ring, forced him into the back of his van, and left him there during Mr. Horton's leisurely lunch break, Mr. Chapman says. He says he was then presented, in tears, to Mr. Keeling, the Rent-A-Center store manager at the time.

On several occasions after that, Mr. Chapman says, Mr. Horton ordered him to ride in the back of his van to deliver heavy items to customers. Feeling he had "done wrong and didn't want to make a fuss, Mr. Chapman complied. The intimidation stopped after Mr. Chapman managed to pay up, he says adding. "This was the worst thing that ever happened to me in my life, period."One postscript. His god ring, he says, was never returned.

Mr. Horton, who was fired from Rent-A-Center in July for unrelated reasons, declines comment. Mr. Keeling, the former store manager, confirms the account and says such harrowing scenarios are commonplace. Around Christmas in 1990, he says he carted away the refrigerator of a diabetic customer after dumping her insulin on the floor.

"COUCH PAYMENTS"

Yet another tactic in Rent-A-Center's repo repertoire is the "couch payment"—sexual favors exacted by employees in lieu of cash. Of 28 former store managers interviewed, six said the practice has occurred in their areas.

Some store employees have boasted that they "have gone out to the customers' homes, had sex with them, and then repo-ed the merchandise any way," says Ken Dube, who spent time at a number of outlets as a field auditor. He later became an accountant at headquarters until he was fired in December for reasons Rent-A-Center declines to divulge.

Mr. Gates acknowledges that abuses such as couch payments occurred in the past and "are probably going on today." There are simply "more control problems" in a business where much of the activity takes place out of the store, he says. But the company stresses that such abuses are "few and far between" and not "in any way condoned by Rent-A-Center."

Rent-A-Center says it is doing its best to clean up remaining problems. It set up a customer hot line that in July received some 2,300 calls, of which only 300 were complaints, the company says. In a given month, 99% of those complaints are resolved in the customer's favor, according to company officials. Some late payers say they have been allowed to skip payments. Rent-A-Center also sometimes rewrites rental agreements, stretching out the payment term to stave off a repossession.

But Rent-A-Center employees are sometimes willing to take the risk of getting caught, since the stakes are so high. In May at the annual meeting held at Bally's in Las Vegas, scores of managers clambered on stage to collect bonus checks at a festive final gala. As the champagne flowed, the store manager of the year was awarded a year's use of a new red Corvette, a trip to the Ritz Carlton in Maui and a bonus of $24,200. Rent-A-Center estimates that the average store manager currently earns a salary of $30,000, and more than 80% received bonuses last year.

As for Rent-A-Center's future, chances are it won't be quite so freewheeling. Aside from the lawsuits and the House bill, the Senate is drafting legislation. The Internal Revenue Service is also examining the rent-to-own industry. And Pennsylvania's attorney general has concluded that Rent-A-Center is violating a state law capping annual interest rates at 18%, it is asking the firm to give refunds. The state also is examining reports that Rent-A-Center engages in illegal collection practices, including threatening to break into late payers' homes.

Despite the proliferating challenges, Mr. Gates remains optimistic. He is hard at work on his latest per project. "Rent-A-Center 2000." This store of the future, being tested in Kansas City, Kan., features a play area for children, a "wall of fame" with photos of star customers and a "troubled times" program that enables renters to skip or defer payments temporarily.

Rent-A-Center is also branching out into new rental areas. One of its most successful has been jewelry. Rent-A-Center is now among the largest customers of Harry Winston Inc., the famed jeweler to such clients as Imelda Marcos and the late Duchess of Windsor, which supplies lower-end baubles to the chain.

In its new ventures, Rent-A-Center will surely be able to count on its current customers, a loyal lot: Most feel they can't get quality goods any other way.

Nancy Thornley, an Ogden, Utah housewife, for example, was diligently handing over about $261 a month in rental payments to Rent-A-Center in 1991 when she lost a leg to diabetes. Faced with a $4,000 bill for a prosthetic limb, she arranged to defer part of her rental tab, she says. But shortly after she returned home from the hospital, she was shocked when two store employees showed up without notice on a Saturday afternoon, accused her of being three months behind in payments and carted away all the goods, primarily basics such as a refrigerator and a couch.

"It was a total humiliation," she says. "All my neighbors were watching."

A year later, though, Ms. Thornley was back, having been inundated by Rent-A-Center letters and "We Want You Back" coupons. She was reluctant to return, she says. But "I needed the item," a microwave oven, and couldn't afford to buy it. Says Ms. Thornley, "I felt like there was nowhere else to go."

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 22, 1993]

PITCHING BY THE SCRIPT

(Excerpts from Rent-A-Center's Sales and Service Manual dated February 1993)

CLOSING

Closing is helping the customer to make up his/her mind. Many customers will be prepared to rent immediately after looking at merchandise. Attempt to close early in the sales track if you sense the customer wants to rent. Make at least 5 attempts to close with every customer. Closing methods include:

Payment Close. "Will you be paying monthly, or is weekly more convenient?"

Assumptive Close. "Let's get the order started."

Delivery Close. "You can have that delivered by 4:00 p.m. today, or will 5:00 be more convenient?"

Choice Close. "This comes in beige or brown. Which would you prefer?"

Last Chance Close. "The sale ends tomorrow and I can't guarantee there will be any left if you wait. Shall we start the order?"

Summary Close. "Well you agree it's an excellent price, you like the fabric, and we can deliver by 3:00 p.m. today. Do you want to fill out an order?"

UPSELLING

While using the sales track, be aware of and take opportunities to upsell the customer. Upselling means becoming aware of a customer need and satisfying it. Many times, a customer might not even be aware of his/her own needs. Opportunities to upsell include

7 piece suites instead of 5 piece furniture suites

An electronic tune TV instead of a standard tune

A remote control TV instead of one with standard or electronic tuning only

A higher wattage stereo

A large capacity refrigerator freezer or washer/dryer

Whenever attempting to upsell explain to the customer why the upscale merchandise is a better value and how it will satisfy their needs.

[From the Washington Monthly, October 1993]

RENTER BEWARE

(By Mike Hudson)

Just $14.99 a week for a color television sounds pretty good to a $6-an-hour factory worker or a mother on welfare. For people without the cash or the squeaky-clean credit history to buy it at Sears, "renting to own" offers an alluring alternative: easy payments, no credit check, and no hassles. But your mother should have told you this: When you hear phrases like "no credit check and no hassles," keep your hand on your wallet. Someone's trying to pick your pocket.

The rent-to-own equation is simple. When a rent-to-own store brings in a new piece of merchandise, it multiplies the wholesale price by a set percentage—usually 350 percent to 450 percent—to come up with the total sales price. Then the store divides that total by a number of weeks or months—typically 78 weeks or 18 months—to determine what the installment payments will be. Throw in fees for insurance, later charges, and other submerged costs, and eventually customers pay three, four, or five times what they'd spend on the same item at a retail store. That's why a 20-inch TV that costs $329.99 at Sears will cost as much as $1,200, at Rent-A-Center, the nation's largest chain on rent-to-own outlets.

With these exorbitant prices come a set of rules that grossly favor the retailer over the customer. Iris Green, a public housing resident in Paterson, N.J., paid nearly $4,000 to Continental Rentals toward a stereo, washer, freezer, and other items that had a cash value of less than $2,800. Then she got sick and the paychecks from her job as a nursing home aide stopped coming. Continental came and took everything. Sandra James signed a $2,485, rent-to-own contract for bedroom furniture from a Rent-A-Center in Chicago. She fell behind in her payments and the store swore out a theft charge against her. She says the manager told her the warrant would be dropped if she paid $177.50. She paid but then was hauled off her job by police officers accompanied by the manager. She spent the night in jail.

Rent-to-own got its start back in the sixties, when state and federal governments were passing laws to control ghetto merchants who used retail installment contracts to fleece the poor. The industry's trade group, the Association of Progressive Rental Organizations (APRO), says the rent-to-own industry was born during this time "as a result of the tightening of consumer credit and burgeoning federal consumer protection legislation."

Rent-to-own stores have managed to avoid tough consumer laws by tinkering with the traditional credit contract. Mainly, it's a matter of changing the terminology. An interest charge becomes a "rental fee." A late charge becomes a "reinstatement fee." Merchandise that is repossessed is "returned by the customer." Buying an item is "exercising a purchase option."

For customers, the only advantage to this system is that if they can't afford to keep paying, the item can be brought back to the store with no further obligation for the rest of the payments. That's a nice option for anyone whose income is unreliable. But it's not much of a consolation for somebody like Iris Green, who's already invested thousands of dollars in the merchandise. It's been enough in most states, however, to get rent-to-own exempted from retail-credit laws which generally limit store owners to interest rates of 20 to 30 percent a year. By avoiding such regulation, rent-to-own dealers can charge the equivalent of interest rates of 100, 200, even 300 percent a year.

In the past three decades, rent-to-own has grown from a handful of inner-city operators one step ahead of the law to a powerful nationwide industry with 7,500 stores and revenues over $3.5 billion annually. It's dominated by a few conglomerate-owned, upscale-looking chains that have changed the look, if not the reality, of selling to the poor.

In spite of the industry's new image, it continues to spend a lot of money defending itself against lawsuits from attorneys for the poor. (At a legal issues seminar for rent-to-own dealers last year, the first question from the audience was: "What can we do to abolish Legal Aid?") The litigation has occasionally taught the industry something about the consequences of heavy-handed collection tactics. But the lawsuits have had less success in changing the pricing equation that makes every customer a victim. The industry has beaten back almost all challenges with a two-pronged strategy. First, overwhelm understaffed Legal Aid offices with private bar talent (or buy off destitute customers with modest confidential settlements). Then, work to change the laws.

In most states, industry lobbyists have prevailed by combining free-market rhetoric and hard-ball politicking. Back in 1983, Jeanne Fenner, a North Carolina state legislator, introduced a bill that would have limited finance charges on rent-to-own contracts. Pro-business lawmakers gutted the bill and then the industry took revenge on Fenner. During the next two campaigns, rent-to-own dealers from as far away as Texas poured more than $20,000 into their opponents' campaigns. Fenner, who spent a fraction of that, lost both times. Since then, rent-to-own opponents in North Carolina have gotten nowhere.

In many other states, the industry has headed off such nasty fights by using an effective strategy of preemptive regulation. It works like this: Dealers approach a legislator with a reputation as a consumer advocate and say, "We want to be regulated so we can protect our customers from a handful of bad apples out there. We've written a law that will do the trick."

The industry's model statute sounds good. And no doubt it does help run off some of the most outrageous scam artists because it includes some protections for consumers, like requiring that stores be honest about their prices and state whether an item is new or used. But the law also exempts rent-to-own deals from state retail credit laws and the interest limits that go along with them. "Disclose and Anything Goes," Legal Aid attorneys call this strategy. Since 1984, at least 35 states have passed such rent-to-own friendly statutes.

The industry—which by the late 1980s was spending half a million dollars a year on legislative efforts—has even persuaded the Council of State Governments to endorse its model bill. And it seemed ready to palm off

the same statute on Congress until Texas Rep. Henry Gonzalez was joined on his House Banking, Finance, and Urban Affairs committee by a number of newly-elected urban liberals.

What explains this history of legislative successes? Good public relations is much of it. The industry has convinced more than a few powerful people of what might generously be called half-truths:

"We're just a bunch of family-owned stores. Too much regulation would put us out of business.

In written testimony submitted to Gonzalez's committee this spring, the executive director of the industry's trade association declared that "Eighty percent of the industry is made up of 'mom and pop' operators with fewer than five stores each." Later, during his oral testimony, he changed that figure to "over two-thirds."

Even that's wrong. Rent-A-Center, the Wichita-based chain owned by Thorn EMI, a global conglomerate whose other assets include country-music star Garth Brooks, controls 1,200 of the industry's 7,500 or so stores. That's nearly 20 percent of the market all by itself. In fact, in written answers to questions from the House committee, the trade association's own figures indicate that 40 percent of rent-to-own stores are owned or franchised by chains with 25 or more outlets. David Ramp, a Minneapolis Legal Aid attorney who has been fighting the industry for years, says his research shows that 60 percent of the market is controlled by fewer than 20 large corporations. And the industry trend is toward more and more consolidation.

"We don't prey on the poor. Our customers come from all walks of life."

Anecdotal evidence aside, it's clear that the vast bulk of rent-to-own's customer base comes from the poor or near-poor. For example, Rent-A-Center's own market research has shown that nearly 60 percent of its customers earn less than $20,000 a year, while just 4 percent earn $45,000 or more. Only about 7 percent are college graduates.

"We're in the rental business, not retail. Just 25 percent of our customers end up owning. Most bring back their merchandise after a few weeks."

This is the industry's big lie. "We're in the retail merchandising business when you get right down to it," Larry Sutton, an owner in a Florida rent-to-own chain, told fellow dealers at a 1991 seminar. "We don't want to say that in court. [But] let's face it: We're in the retail business. We sell." Indeed, in a national survey, 70 percent of Rent-A-Center customers said they intended to own the merchandise. Just 11 percent said they only wanted a short-term lease. In fact, 48 percent believed they already owned the goods even before the "lease" was completed.

To test what they do tell consumers, I visited 15 rent-to-own stores in Georgia, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Virginia. I asked questions just like any customer off the street. Among them: What percentage of customers end up owning? Not one of them gave the 25 percent figure that's cited in official settings. Seven estimated 80 percent or more. Six others gave estimates ranging from 45 percent to 70 percent. At another store, a salesman said simply: "Almost all of them."

"We charge more because of the high costs of theft and because we offer free repairs."

In congressional testimony this spring, the industry's trade group said that 12 percent of rent-to-own merchandise is stolen. However, the industry association's chief attorney wrote in an 1989 trade journal article that rent-to-own stores' losses from stolen merchandise consistently averages about 2 percent of revenues—considerably less than what credit-card companies are forced to write off in unpaid debts.

As for free repairs and replacement, a lot of the stuff—such as furniture—requires little maintenance, and much of it is covered by manufacturer's warranties. A Rent-A-Center study found that less than five percent of their merchandise needed repairs.

But the spectre of damaged goods is actually a cash cow for the industry. Most stores require customers to pay "damage and theft waiver fees"—essentially credit insurance that covers the store if something happens to the merchandise. In return for the fee, you won't owe anything to the store if the merchandise is damaged or stolen during the contract period. The downside, of course, is that you're also out all the payments you've already made and can't keep what you've been paying for.

Typically, a rent-to-own store will charge you $1 a week in "waiver" fees for insurance—so that a $330 TV from Rent-A-Center (for which you're paying $1,200) costs another $74 to insure. For roughly that sum you could buy enough renter's insurance to cover $10,000 or even $20,000 worth of personal belongings. Rent-A-Center, meanwhile, makes a bundle on the extra fee: Ramp's research has shown that Rent-A-Center has to write off only about a nickel in claims for each dollar it takes in "waiver fees." (Another big money maker is fees to forgive late payments. Rent-A-Center customers in Minnesota paid $1.3 million in "reinstatement" charges over one four-year period).

Even where lawmakers haven't been snookered into buying this industry propaganda, rent-to-own dealers have found ways to get around the law. When Pennsylvania passed a statute in 1989 that defined rent-to-own as a retail sale and sets an annual interest limit of 18 percent, the state's rent-to-own dealers claimed the law would put them out of business. It didn't. Instead, most ignored it or found ways to skirt it. Some, for example, now offer straight rentals ("rent-to-rent") with the promise of a "rebate" that the customer can use to purchase the item at the end of the contract. An undercover investigation by the Pennsylvania attorney general's office found rent-to-own stores were still charging annual interest rates from 82 to 265 percent.

This end run shows the problem with trying to regulate away price-gouging: As long as there's a consumer demand and a market that is locked out of mainstream credit, some businesses will find a way to take advantage. "If you want nice things—where are you gonna go if you can't get credit?" asks Tonya Cross, a rent-to-own customer in Roanoke, Va. "If you want it, you're gonna have to get it from somewhere."

Which is where consumer advocates come in. Many customers are illiterate or financially unsophisticated and have little idea that they are paying double or triple retail, or more. Few know that—as the industry has sworn in court and in Congress—you have only a one-in-four chance of ultimately keeping the stuff when you rent-to-own. A consumer protection campaign pushing these themes would be a good start.

Other customers, like Cross, know that they're paying more, but go the rent-to-own route because they believe they have no other choices. That's why government and consumer activists should provide them with some alternatives by putting more resources into credit unions and other non-profit institutions that offer savings accounts and small loans to poor and working people.

In the meantime, there are some cheaper (though not inexpensive) alternatives: Buying things on time from retail stores or with credit cards is almost always cheaper than renting to own. Paying 20 percent interest a year or more to a retail store isn't cheap, but it's less than rent-to-own and the chances you'll actually keep the goods are better. Taking the plunge with Sears simply has to be better than paying $1,200 for a $300 TV.

RENT-TO-OWN CONSUMER CREDIT PROTECTION ACT OF 1993— SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1. Short Title. This Act may be cited as the "Rent-To-Own Consumer Credit Protection Act of 1993.

Section 2. Rent-to-Own Protection Act. The Consumer Protection Act is amended to include a new title, "Title X—Rent-To-Own Transactions."

Findings and purposes: The Congress finds: that the rent-to-own industry targets its products primarily to low-income and minority neighborhoods; the majority of rent-to-own customers enter into rent-to-own contracts with the intention of owning the goods for which they are contracting; rent-to-own dealers often fail to disclose key terms of rent-to-own contracts, and engage in unfair debt collection practices; and rent-to-own dealers do not provide customers with the protections afforded purchasers in retail installment sales under state and Federal laws, and often charge excessive fees and interest rates.

The purposes of this title are: to provide consumers in rent-to-own transactions the range of protections provided under state and Federal laws to individuals who acquire goods in other consumer credit sales; to require rent-to-own contracts, and tags affixed to items available for acquisition in rent-to-own transactions, to disclose the material terms of those transactions; and to prohibit rent-to-own dealers and collection agents hired by such dealers from engaging in abusive collection practices.

Definitions: The Act defines such terms as "cash price", "consumer", "credit", and "seller". A "rent-to-own contract means a contract in the form of a terminable lease or bailment of an item of consumer goods, under which the consumer has the right of possession and use of the item, has the option to renew the contract periodically by making payments specified in the contract, and the seller agrees in writing or orally to transfer ownership of the item to the consumer upon the fulfillment of all obligations of the consumer under the contract for that transfer. The term "rent-to-own transaction" means the lease or bailment of an item of consumer goods under the a rent-to-own contract.

State Law: Fees, Charges, Guarantees, and Warranties: All interest, finance charges or other fees charged by a seller in a rent-to-own transaction shall be of a type and in an amount allowed under state law. A termination fee, where permitted, shall not exceed 5% of the cash price disclosed under the contract, shall be disclosed in the contract, may be paid at the time the contract is entered into or over the life of the contract, and shall be calculated as part of the finance charge. The termination of a rent-to-own contract by a consumer under this title shall satisfy the consumer's obligation for all payments due under the contract except those payments due prior to the termination of the

rent-to-own transaction. All guarantees and warranties required under state law for goods sold pursuant to a consumer credit sale or retail installment sale shall apply to goods that are the subject of a rent-to-own transaction.

Application of Federal Law: The following Federal laws shall apply to rent-to-own transactions: "The Truth in Lending Act", the "Equal Credit Opportunity Act", the "Fair Debt Collection Practices Act", and the "Fair Credit Reporting Act".

Disclosures on Goods: Each item available for purchase pursuant to a rent-to-own transaction shall disclose: (1) the cash price of the item; (2) an itemization of services offered under a rent-to-own contract for the item, and the cash price of each service; (3) the annual percentage rate of the item as determined under the "Truth in Lending Act"; (4) the incremental payment schedule applicable under the rent-to-own contract and the number of payments required; (5) the total of payments required to be paid to acquire ownership of the item as determined under regulations under the "Truth in Lending Act"; and (6) specification of whether the item is new or used.

Prohibitions; Enforcement: A seller under a rent-to-own contract shall not threaten, coerce, engage in conduct to oppress, harass or abuse, make fraudulent, deceptive or misleading representation, or use any unconscionable means to collect amounts owed by the consumer. The Federal Trade Commission shall enforce these prohibitions.

Civil Liability: Any seller who fails to comply with the disclosure requirements of this title shall be liable to the consumer for actual damages sustained as a result of the failure, $500 for each failure, and all costs of the action and reasonable attorney fees. Any seller who fails to comply with any other requirements of this title shall be liable to the consumer for actual damages sustained by the consumer as a result of the violation, $5,000 for each violation and all costs of the action and reasonable attorney fees. Any action brought under this title must be commence in any United States district court or any other court of competent jurisdiction not later than 2 years after the date of the violation or failure. Nothing in this title shall be construed to limit any remedy otherwise available under state or Federal law.

Regulations: The Federal Trade Commission shall, within 6 months after enactment of this title, issue regulations as may be necessary to implement this title.

Relationship to other laws: This title does not annul, alter, affect or, exempt any person subject to the provisions of this title from complying with the laws of any State with respect to rent-to-own transactions, except to the extent that such laws are inconsistent with any provision of this title, and then only to the extent of the inconsistency. In addition, Chapter 5 of the "Truth in Lending Act", concerning consumer leases, shall not apply to a rent-to-own transaction to the extent application of that Act to the transaction is inconsistent with this title.

Section 3: Not later than two years after the enactment of this Act, the Federal Trade Commission shall report to Congress regarding issues relating to the Federal regulation of the rent-to-own industry, and where appropriate, make recommendations for further legislation.

Section 4: The provisions of this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

By Mr. SIMON:

S. 1567. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act and the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, to permit additional remedies in certain unfair labor practice cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. SIMON (for himself and Mr. WELLSTONE):

S. 1568. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to require the arbitration of initial contract negotiation disputes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

LABOR LEGISLATION

• Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, today I am introducing two bills to add to the series of labor law reform bills I introduced October 7, 1993.

The first bill, the Labor Relations Remedies Act of 1993, awards employees who have been unfairly discharged for union activities back pay equal to three times the employee's wage at the time of discharge. Further, employee's will have the right to sue for compensatory and punitive damages in district or State court.

In addition, on behalf of myself and Senator WELLSTONE, I am introducing the Labor Relations First Contract Negotiations Act of 1993. This will facilitate the consummation of the first contract between an employer and the certified bargaining representative. Briefly, this bill requires selection of a mediator when a new labor representative and an employer are unable to settle first contract disputes within 60 days after the representative has been certified. If the employer and representative have still not reached an agreement 30 days after a mediator has been chosen, either side may transfer matters for binding arbitration.

There has been a drastic decline in labor union membership during the past 20 years. I believe that the main reason for this decline is public policy which has frustrated efforts by employees to organize. The two bills I am introducing today along with the five bills I introduced last week are an attempt to remedy the inequities which plague current labor laws. We need to level the playing field. Employers and employees must have equal footing when negotiating and these bills go a long way toward ensuring fairness in the workplace.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the bills be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bills were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1567

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 "Labor Relations Remedies Act of 1993".

SEC. 2. BOARD REMEDIES.

Section 10(c) of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 160(c)) is amended by inserting after the fourth sentence the following new sentence: "If the Board finds that an employee was discharged in violation of this Act, the Board in such order shall (1) award back pay in an amount equal to three times the employee's wage rate at the time of the unfair labor practice and (2) notify such employee of the employee's right to sue for punitive damages and damages with respect to a wrongful discharge under section 303 of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U.S.C. 187), as amended by the Labor Relations Remedies Act of 1993.".

SEC. 3. COURT REMEDIES.

Section 303 of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U.S.C. 187), is amended by adding at the end the following new subsections:

"(c) It shall be unlawful, for purposes of this section, for an employer to discharge an employee for exercising rights protected under the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 158)."

"(d) An employee whose discharge is determined by the National Labor Relations Board under section 10(c) to be a violation of this Act may sue therefore in any district court of the United States without respect to the amount in controversy, or in any other court having jurisdiction over the parties to recover compensatory and punitive damages in addition to the back pay ordered by the Board."

"(e) Nothing contained in Section 8 or Section 10 of the National Labor Relations Act (19 U.S.C. 158), or in this section shall limit the rights and remedies under any State or Federal law or before any court or other tribunal of an employee discharged by an employer."

S. 1568

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 "Labor Relations First Contract Negotiations Act of 1993".

SEC. 2. INITIAL CONTRACT DISPUTES.

Section of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 158) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

(h)(1) If not later than 60 days after the certification of a new representative for the purpose of collective bargaining, the employer and the representative have not reached a collective bargaining agreement with respect to the terms and conditions of employment, the employer and representative shall jointly select a mediator to mediate those issues on which they cannot agree.

(2) If the parties are unable to agree upon a mediator, either party may request the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service to name one and the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service shall thereupon appoint a person to serve as mediator.

(3) If not later than 30 days after the date of the selection of a mediator under paragraphs (1) or (2), the employer and the representative have still not reached agreement, the employer or the representative may transfer the matters remaining in controversy to the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service for binding arbitration".•

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. HATCH):

S. 1569. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish, reauthorize, and revise provisions to improve the health of individuals from disadvantaged backgrounds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

THE DISADVANTAGED MINORITY HEALTHACT OF 1993

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Disadvantaged Minority Health Improvement Act of 1993. This legislation reauthorizes several vital health programs and establishes new initiatives for improving the health status of racial and ethnic minorities.

Despite impressive gains in scientific knowledge and increased ability to diagnose, prevent, and cure disease, many minority citizens in America do not benefit from these advances. Over $800 billion a year is spent on health care in this country, yet the health status of racial and ethnic minorities lags far behind the rest of the Nation. Today, African-Americans, Hispanics, native Americans, and Asian-Pacific Islanders as a whole are often in poorer health than typical citizens of Third World countries.

Because minorities are less likely to receive health care services, their children are at risk for being born prematurely or with physical disabilities or not being vaccinated against preventable diseases. Minority adults have a higher likelihood of dying from diseases that most physicians consider preventable.

"Health, United States, 1992" the latest annual report card on the Nation's health shows that a number of serious health problems disproportionately affecting people of color have not improved or have become worse.

The statistics on infant mortality are shocking. An African-American child is twice as likely to die in the first year of life as a white child, and the gap is increasing. African-American mothers are twice as likely to receive little or no prenatal health care. In addition, African-Americans die as a result of heart disease twice as often as whites, and life expectancy of black males is 8 years less. Survival rates for cancer are shorter and the incidence of AIDS is 4 times higher in black men than white men—and 15 times higher in black women than white women.

According to the U.S. Census Current Population Survey, 21 percent of blacks and 32 percent of Hispanics were uninsured in 1991, compared with 11 percent of non-Hispanic whites.

The way to eliminate these disparities is to eliminate the barriers that create them. One of the major obstacles is inadequate access to quality health care, which often results from the lack of health insurance, the scarcity of minority health providers, the lack of community-based services, inadequate support for institutions that serve minorities and the lack of relevant health information.

In 1990, Congress enacted the Disadvantaged Minority Health Improvement Act to reduce these barriers and the unnecessary diseases and deaths that disproportionately affect minorities. The act established an office of minority health in the Department of Health and Human Services to coordinate activities relating to health promotion, disease prevention, service delivery, and research involving racial and ethnic minorities. The act also established a loan and scholarship program to provide financial assistance to minority students pursuing careers as health professionals. In addition, the act strengthened and revised health service delivery programs for disadvantaged racial and ethnic minorities.

The Committee on Labor and Human Resources recently conducted hearings on the act. These hearings demonstrated the need for more research on minority health issues, better racial and ethnic minority health data collection, programs to improve access to health care, and the need for more minority health professionals.

The legislation I am introducing today reauthorizes and revises activities of the Office of Minority Health. It supports the National Minority Health Resource Center that disseminates information on health promotion, disease prevention, and preventive health services to racial and ethnic minorities.

This legislation also establishes a national center to address the problems facing individuals with limited English skills when seeking health care services. The legislation also revises and extends the Health Careers Opportunity Program, the Faculty Development Loan Repayment Program, the Centers of Excellence Program and scholarship and loan programs for disadvantaged students. These programs will help increase the number of minority students pursuing careers in medicine, dentistry, and clinical psychology by providing financial aid to students and grants to schools committed to training minority students.

In addition, the legislation creates new offices of minority health in four agencies—the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Health Resources and Services Administration, the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, and the Agency for Health Care Policy and Research. These offices will help ensure that disadvantaged minority groups have access to health promotion and disease prevention services provided by the Public Health Service.

In addition, the bill authorizes $3 million in grants to States to establish their own offices of minority health. These offices will act as clearinghouses to collect and disseminate information, develop innovative methods of delivering health care and social services to minority communities, and coordinate State activities relating to health promotion and disease prevention.

Finally, the bill establishes an advisory committee on research on minority health at the National Institutes of Health, to be composed of scientists, physicians, and health care provides with expertise in minority health research and in eliminating barriers to health care. The committee will analyze current research and design new research projects on all aspects of the relationships between disease and race and ethnicity, such as the onset of disease, and responses to pharmaceutical drugs and other treatments.

We have begun to make progress in this area in recent years, but much more remains to be done. I look forward to working with Congress and the administration to enact this legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1569

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Preventive Health Services and Health Professions Amendments Act of 1993".

(b) REFERENCE.—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or a repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or a repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 201 et seq.).

(c) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; reference; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Findings.

TITLE I—HEALTH POLICY

Sec. 101. Office of Minority Health.
Sec. 102. Agency Offices of Minority Health.
Sec. 103. State Offices of Minority Health.
Sec. 104. Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services for Civil Rights.

TITLE II—HEALTH SERVICES

Sec. 201. Community scholarship programs.
Sec. 202. Health services for residents of public housing.
Sec. 203. Issuance of regulations regarding language as impediment to receipt of services.
Sec. 204. Health services for Pacific Islanders.

TITLE III—HEALTH PROFESSIONS

Sec. 301. Loans for disadvantaged students.
Sec. 302. Cesar Chavez scholarship program.
Sec. 303. Thurgood Marshall scholarship program.
Sec. 304. Loan repayments and fellowships regarding faculty positions at health professions schools.
Sec. 305. Centers of excellence.
Sec. 306. Educational assistance regarding undergraduates.
Sec. 307. Area health education centers.

TITLE IV—RESEARCH AND DATA COLLECTION
Sec. 401. Office of Research on Minority Health.
Sec. 402. National Center for Health Statistics.
Sec. 403. Activities of Agency for Health Care Policy and Research.
TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS
Sec. 501. Revision and extension of program for State Offices of Rural Health.
Sec. 502. Technical corrections relating to health professions.
Sec. 503. Clinical traineeships.
Sec. 504. Demonstration project grants to States for alzheimer's disease.
Sec. 505. Medically underserved area study.
Sec. 506. Programs regarding birth defects.
TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS
Sec. 601. Effective date.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Section 1(b) of the Disadvantaged Minority Health Improvement Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 300u-6 note) is amended to read as follows—

"(b) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

"(1) the health status of individuals from racial and ethnic minorities in the United States is significantly lower than the health status of the general population and has not improved significantly since the issuance of the 1985 report entitled "Report of the Secretary's Task Force on Black and Minority Health";

"(2) racial and ethnic minorities are disproportionately represented among the poor;

"(3) racial and ethnic minorities suffer disproportionately high rates of cancer, heart disease, diabetes, substance abuse, acquired immune deficiency syndrome, and other diseases and disorders;

"(4) the incidence of infant mortality among African Americans is almost double that for the general population;

"(5) Mexican-American and Puerto Rican adults have diabetes rates twice that of non-Hispanic whites;

"(6) a third of American Indian deaths occur before the age of 45;

"(7) according to the 1990 Census, African Americans, Hispanics, American Indians, and Asian/Pacific Islanders constitute approximately 12.1 percent, 9 percent, 0.08 percent, and 2.9 percent, respectively, of the population of the United States;

"(8) minority health professionals have historically tended to practice in low-income areas, medically underserved areas, and to serve racial and ethnic minorities;

"(9) minority health professionals have historically tended to engage in the general practice of medicine and specialties providing primary care;

"(10) reports published in leading medical journals indicate that access to health care among minorities can be substantially improved by increasing the number of minority professionals;

"(11) diversity in the faculty and student body of health professions schools enhances the quality of education for all students attending the schools; and

"(12) health professionals need greater access to continuing medical education programs to enable such professionals to upgrade their skills (including linguistic and cultural competence skills) and improve the quality of medical care rendered in minority communities.".

TITLE I—HEALTH POLICY

SEC. 101. OFFICE OF MINORITY HEALTH.

Section 1707 (42 U.S.C. 300u-6) is amended by striking subsection (b) and all that follows and inserting the following:

"(b) DUTIES.—With respect to improving the health of racial and ethnic minorities, the Secretary, acting through the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Minority Health, shall carry out the following:

"(1) Establish short-range and long-range goals and objectives and coordinate all other activities within the Department of Health and Human Services that relate to disease prevention, health promotion, service delivery, and research concerning such individuals. The heads of the operating divisions of the Department of Health and Human Services and the heads of Public Health Service agencies shall consult with the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Minority Health to assist in the coordination of all activities within the Department as they relate to disease prevention, health promotion, service delivery, and research concerning such individuals.

"(2) Carry out the following types of activities by entering into interagency agreements with other agencies of the public health service:

"(A) Support research, demonstrations and evaluations to test new and innovative models.

"(B) Increase knowledge and understanding of health risk factors.

"(C) Develop mechanisms that support better information dissemination, education, prevention, and service delivery to individuals from disadvantaged backgrounds, including racial and ethnic minorities.

"(3) Establish a national minority health resource center to carry out the following:

"(A) Facilitate the exchange of information regarding matters relating to health information and health promotion, preventive health services, and education in the appropriate use of health care.

"(B) Facilitate access to such information.

"(C) Assist in the analysis of issues and problems relating to such matters.

"(D) Provide technical assistance with respect to the exchange of such information (including facilitating the development of materials for such technical assistance).

"(4) Establish a national center that shall carry out programs to improve access to health care services for individuals with limited English proficiency by facilitating the removal of impediments to the receipt of health care that result from such limitation.

"(5) With respect to awards of grants and contracts that are available under certain minority health programs, establish a program—

"(A) to inform entities, as appropriate, that the entities may be eligible for the awards;

"(B) to provide technical assistance to such entities in the process of preparing and submitting applications for the awards in accordance with the policies of the Secretary regarding such application; and

"(C) to inform populations, as appropriate, that members of the populations may be eligible to receive services or otherwise participate in the activities carried out with such awards.

"(c) ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish an advisory committee to be known as the Advisory Committee on Minority Health (in this subsection referred to as the 'Committee').

"(2) DUTIES.—The Committee shall provide advice to the Secretary on carrying out this section, including advice on the development of goals and specific program activities under subsection (b)(1) for each racial and ethnic group.

"(3) CHAIRPERSON.—The Deputy Assistant Secretary for Minority Health shall serve as the Chairperson of the Committee.

"(4) COMPOSITION.—The Committee shall be composed of no fewer than 12, and not more than 18 individuals, who are not officers or employees of the Federal Government. The Secretary shall appoint the members of the Committee from among individuals with expertise regarding issues of minority health. The membership of the Committee shall be equitably representative of the various racial and ethnic groups. The Secretary may appoint representatives from selected Federal agencies to serve as ex officio, non-voting members of the Committee.

"(5) TERMS.—Each member of the Committee shall serve for a term of 4 years, except that the Secretary shall initially appoint a portion of the members to terms of 1 year, 2 years, and 3 years.

"(6) VACANCIES.—If a vacancy occurs on the Committee, a new member shall be appointed by the Secretary within 90 days from the date that the vacancy occurs, and serve for the remainder of the term for which the predecessor of such member was appointed. The vacancy shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the duties of the Committee.

"(7) COMPENSATION.—Members of the Committee who are officers or employees of the United States shall serve without compensation. Members of the Committee who are not officers or employees of the United States shall receive, for each day (including travel time) they are engaged in the performance of the functions of the Committee, compensation at rates that do not exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate in effect for grade GS-18 of the General Schedule under title 5, United States Code.

"(d) CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS REGARDING DUTIES.—

"(1) RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING LANGUAGE AS IMPEDIMENT TO HEALTH CARE.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Office of Refugee Health, the Director of the Office of Civil Rights, and the Director of the Office of Minority Health of the Health Resources and Services Administration, shall make recommendations regarding activities under subsection (b)(4).

"(2) EQUITABLE ALLOCATION REGARDING ACTIVITIES.—In awarding grants or contracts under section 340A, 724, 737, 738, or 1707, the Secretary shall ensure that such awards are equitably allocated with respect to the various racial and ethnic populations.

"(3) CULTURAL COMPETENCY OF SERVICES.—The Secretary shall ensure that information and services provided pursuant to subsection (b) are provided in the language and cultural context that is most appropriate for the individuals for whom the information and services are intended.

"(4) PEER REVIEW.—The Secretary shall ensure that each application for a grant, contract or cooperative agreement under section 340A, 724, 737, or 1707 undergoes appropriate peer review.

"(e) REPORTS.—Not later than January 31 of fiscal year 1995 and of each second year thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Congress a report describing the activities carried out under this section during the preceding 2 fiscal years and evaluating the extent to which such activities have been effective in improving the health of racial and ethnic minorities.

"(f) GRANTS AND CONTRACTS REGARDING DUTIES.—

"(1) AUTHORITY.—In carrying out subsection (b), the Secretary may enter into

contracts with public and nonprofit private entities for activities described in paragraphs (3) and (4) of subsection (b).

"(2) EVALUATION AND DISSEMINATION.—The Secretary shall, directly or through contracts with public and private entities, provide for evaluations of projects carried out with financial assistance provided under paragraph (1) during the preceding 2 fiscal years. The report shall be included in the report required under subsection (e) for the fiscal year involved.

"(g) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, the term 'racial and ethnic minority group' means Hispanics, Blacks, Asian Americans, Pacific Islanders, Native Americans, and Alaskan Natives. The term 'Hispanic' means individuals whose origin is Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, or any other Spanish-speaking country, including Spain or the Caribbean Islands, and individuals identifying themselves as Hispanic, Latino, Spanish, or Spanish-American.

"(h) FUNDING.—

"(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of carrying out this section, there is authorized to be appropriated $20,500,000 for fiscal year 1994, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1995 through 1998.

"(2) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS BY SECRETARY.—Of the amounts appropriated under paragraph (1) for a fiscal year in excess of $15,000,000, the Secretary shall make available not less than $3,000,000 for activities to improve access to health care services for individuals with limited English proficiency, including activities identified in subsection (b)(4).".

SEC. 102. AGENCY OFFICES OF MINORITY HEALTH.

Title XVII (42 U.S.C. 300u et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 1709. AGENCY OFFICES OF MINORITY HEALTH.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Minority Health, shall ensure that an Office of Minority Health is established and operating at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Health Resources and Services Administration, the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Administration, and the Agency for Health Care Policy and Research. Such Offices shall be established to ensure that services and programs carried out within each such respective agency or office—

"(1) are equitably delivered with respect to racial and ethnic groups;

"(2) provide culturally competent services; and

"(3) utilize racial and ethnic minority community-based organizations to deliver services.

"(b) REPORTS.—Each Office of Minority Health within the Department of Health and Human Services shall submit a report, not later than May 1 of each year, to the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Minority Health (as provided for in section 1707(a)) describing the accomplishments or programs of the plan, the budget allocation and expenditures for, and the development and implementation of, such health programs targeting racial and ethnic minority populations. The Secretary shall ensure the participation and cooperation of each Agency in the development of the annual report.".

SEC. 103. STATE OFFICES OF MINORITY HEALTH.

Title XVII (42 U.S.C. 300u et seq.), as amended by section 102, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 1710. GRANTS TO STATES FOR OPERATION OF OFFICES OF MINORITY HEALTH.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Minority Health (as provided for in section 1707), may make grants to States for the purpose of improving the health status in minority communities, through the operation of State offices of minority health established to monitor and facilitate the achievement of the Health Objectives for the Year 2000 as they affect minority populations.

"(b) ADMINISTRATION OF PROGRAM.—The Secretary may not make a grant to a State under subsection (a) unless such State agrees that the program carried out by the State with amounts received under the grant will be administered directly by a single State agency.

"(c) CERTAIN REQUIRED ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary may not make a grant to a State under subsection (a) unless such State agrees that activities carried out by an office operated under the grant received pursuant to such subsection will—

"(1) establish and maintain within the State a clearinghouse for collecting and disseminating information on—

"(A) minority health care issues;

"(B) research findings relating to minority health care; and

"(C) innovative approaches to the delivery of health care and social services in minority communities;

"(2) coordinate the activities carried out in the State that relate to minority health care, including providing coordination for the purpose of avoiding redundancy in such activities;

"(3) identify Federal and State programs regarding minority health, and providing technical assistance to public and nonprofit entities regarding participation in such program; and

"(4) develop additional Health People 2000 objectives for the State that are necessary to address the most prevalent morbidity and mortality concerns for racial and ethnic minority groups in the State.

"(d) REQUIREMENT REGARDING ANNUAL BUDGET OFFICE.—The Secretary may not make a grant to a State under subsection (a) unless such State agrees that, for any fiscal year for which the State receives such a grant, the office operated under such grant will be provided with an annual budget of not less than $75,000.

"(e) CERTAIN USES OF FUNDS.—

"(1) RESTRICTIONS.—The Secretary may not make a grant to a State under subsection (a) unless such State agrees that—

"(A) if research with respect to minority health is conducted pursuant to the grant, not more than 10 percent of the amount received under the grant will be expended for such research; and

"(B) amounts provided under the grant will not be expended—

"(i) to provide health care (including providing cash payments regarding such care);

"(ii) to conduct activities for which Federal funds are expended—

"(I) within the State to provide technical and other nonfinancial assistance under subsection (m) of section 340A;

"(II) under a memorandum of agreement entered into with the State under subsection (h) of such section; or

"(III) under a grant under section 388I;

"(iii) to purchase medical equipment, to purchase ambulances, aircraft, or other vehicles, or to purchase major communications equipment;

"(iv) to purchase or improve real property; or

"(v) to carry out any activity regarding a certificate of need.

"(2) AUTHORITIES.—Activities for which a State may expend amounts received under a grant under subsection (a) include—

"(A) paying the costs of establishing an office of minority health for purposes of subsection (a);

"(B) subject to paragraph (1)(B)(ii)(III), paying the costs of any activity carried out with respect to recruiting and retaining health professionals to serve in minority communities or underserved areas in the State; and

"(C) providing grants and contracts to public and nonprofit entities to carry out activities authorized in this section.

"(f) REPORTS.—The Secretary may not make a grant to a State under subsection (a) unless such State agrees—

"(1) to submit to the Secretary reports containing such information as the Secretary may require regarding activities carried out under this section by the State; and

"(2) to submit a report not later than January 10 of each fiscal year immediately following any fiscal year for which the State has received such a grant.

"(g) REIMBURSEMENT OF APPLICATION.—The Secretary may not make a grant to a State under subsection (a) unless an application for the grant is submitted to the Secretary and the application in such form, is made in such manner, and contains such agreements, assurances, and information as the Secretary determines to be necessary to carry out such subsection.

"(h) NONCOMPLIANCE.—The Secretary may not make payments under subsection (a) to a State for any fiscal year subsequent to the first fiscal year of such payments unless the Secretary determines that, for the immediately preceding fiscal year, the State has complied with each of the agreements made by the State under this section.

"(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of making grants under subsection (a) there are authorized to be appropriated $3,000,000 for fiscal year 1995, $4,000,000 for fiscal year 1996, and $3,000,000 for fiscal year 1997.

"(2) AVAILABILITY.—Amounts appropriated under paragraph (1) shall remain available until expended.

"(j) TERMINATION OF PROGRAM.—No grant may be made under this section after the aggregate amounts appropriated under subsection (i)(1) are equal to $10,000,000.".

SEC. 104. ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES FOR CIVIL RIGHTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part A of title II (42 U.S.C. 202 et seq.), as amended by section 2010 of Public Law 103-43, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 229. ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR CIVIL RIGHTS.

"(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF POSITION.—There shall be in the Department of Health and Human Services an Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

"(b) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Assistant Secretary shall perform such functions relating to civil rights as the Secretary may assign.".

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, is amended, in the item relating to Assistant Secretaries of Health and Human Services, by striking "(5)" and inserting "(6)".

TITLE II—HEALTH SERVICES

SEC. 201. COMMUNITY SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAMS.

Section 338L (42 U.S.C. 254t) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking "health manpower shortage areas" and inserting "a Federally-designated health professional shortage areas";

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking "health manpower shortage areas" and inserting "a Federally-designated health professional shortage areas" in the matter preceding paragraph (1); and

(B) by striking "in the health manpower shortage areas in which the community organizations are located," and inserting "in a Federally-designated health professional shortage area that is served by the community organization awarding the scholarship," in paragraph (2);

(3) in subsection (e)(1)—

(A) by striking "health manpower shortage area" and inserting "a Federally-designated health professional shortage area"; and

(B) by striking "in which the community" and all that follows through "located";

(4) in subsection (k)(2), by striking "internal medicine" and all that follows through the end thereof and inserting "general internal medicine, general pediatrics, obstetrics and gynecology, dentistry, or mental health, that are provided by physicians or other health professionals."; and

(5) in subsection (l)(1), by striking "$5,000,000" and all that follows through "1993" and inserting "$1,000,000 for fiscal year 1994, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1995 and 1996".

SEC. 202. HEALTH SERVICES FOR RESIDENTS OF PUBLIC HOUSING.

Section 340A(p)(1) (42 U.S.C. 256a(p)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking "$35,000,000 for fiscal year 1991" and inserting "$12,000,000 for fiscal year 1994"; and

(2) by striking "1992 and 1993" and inserting "1995 and 1996".

SEC. 203. ISSUANCE OF REGULATIONS REGARDING LANGUAGE AS IMPEDIMENT TO RECEIPT OF SERVICES.

(a) PROPOSED RULE.—Not later than the expiration of the 90-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services (in this section referred to as the "Secretary") shall issue a proposed rule regarding policies to reduce the extent to which having limited English proficiency constitutes a significant impediment to individuals in establishing the eligibility of the individuals for participation in health programs under the Public Health Service Act or in receiving services under such programs.

(b) FINAL RULE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the expiration of the 1-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue a final rule regarding the policies described in subsection (a).

(2) FAILURE TO ISSUE BY DATE CERTAIN.—If the Secretary fails to issue a final rule under paragraph (1) before the expiration of the period specified in such paragraph, the proposed rule issued under subsection (a) is upon such expiration deemed to be the final rule under paragraph (1) (and shall remain in effect until the Secretary issues a final rule under such paragraph).

SEC. 204. HEALTH SERVICES FOR PACIFIC ISLANDERS.

Section 10 of the Disadvantaged Minority Health Improvement Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 254c-1) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by inserting ", substance abuse" after "availability of health"; and

(ii) by striking ", including improved health data systems";

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking "manpower" and inserting "care providers"; and

(ii) by striking "by—" and all that follows through the end thereof and inserting a semicolon;

(C) by striking paragraphs (5) and (6);

(D) by redesignating paragraphs (7), and (8) as paragraphs (5) and (6), respectively;

(E) in paragraph (5) (as so redesignated), by striking "and" at the end thereof;

(F) in paragraph (6) (as so redesignated), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(G) by inserting after paragraph (6) (as so redesignated), the following new paragraphs:

"(7) to provide primary health care, preventive health care, and related training to American Samoan health care professionals; and

"(8) to improve access to health promotion and disease prevention services for rural American Samoa;

(2) in subsection (f)—

(A) by striking "there is" and inserting "there are"; and

(B) by striking "$10,000,000" and all that follows through "1993" and inserting "$3,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1994 through 1996"; and

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

"(g) STUDY AND REPORT.—

"(1) STUDY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary, acting through the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration, shall enter into a contract with a public or nonprofit private entity for the conduct of a study to determine the effectiveness of projects funded under this section.

"(2) REPORT.—Not later than July 1, 1995, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report describing the findings made with respect to the study conducted under paragraph (1).".

TITLE III—HEALTH PROFESSIONS

SEC. 301. LOANS FOR DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS.

Section 724(f)(1) (42 U.S.C. 292t(f)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking "there is" and inserting "there are"; and

(2) by striking "$15,000,000 for fiscal year 1993" and inserting "$8,000,000 for fiscal year 1994, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1995 and 1996".

SEC. 302. CESAR CHAVEZ SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM.

Section 736 (42 U.S.C. 293) is amended—

(1) by striking the section heading and inserting the following:

"SEC. 736. CESAR CHAVEZ SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM.

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking "there is" and inserting "there are"; and

(B) by striking "$11,000,000 for fiscal year 1993" and inserting "$10,500,000 for fiscal year 1994, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1995 and 1996".

SEC. 303. THURGOOD MARSHALL SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM.

Section 737 (42 U.S.C. 293a) is amended—

(1) by striking the section heading and inserting the following:

"SEC. 737. THURGOOD MARSHALL SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM.";

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting "(to be known as Thurgood Marshall Scholars)" after "providing scholarships to individuals"; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by inserting after "public health," "schools offering programs for the training of physician assistants,".

(3) in subsection (h), by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following new paragraph:

"(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of carrying out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated $17,100,000 for fiscal year 1994, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1995 and 1996.".

SEC. 304. LOAN REPAYMENTS AND FELLOWSHIPS REGARDING FACULTY POSITIONS AT HEALTH PROFESSIONS SCHOOLS.

Section 738 (42 U.S.C. 293b) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking "disadvantaged backgrounds who—" and inserting "racial or ethnic groups that are underrepresented in the health professions who—"

(B) in paragraph (5)—

(i) by striking "; and" in subparagraph (A) and inserting a period;

(ii) by striking "unless—" and all that follows through "the individual involved" in subparagraph (A) and inserting "unless the individual involved"; and

(iii) striking subparagraph (B);

(C) by striking paragraph (6); and

(D) by redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (6); and

(2) in subsection (b)(2)(B), by striking "$30,000" and inserting "$50,000";

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking "there is" and inserting "there are"; and

(B) by striking "$4,000,000 for fiscal year 1993" and inserting "$1,100,000 for fiscal year 1994, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1995 and 1996".

SEC. 305. CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE.

Section 739 (42 U.S.C. 293c) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by inserting before the semicolon the following: "through collaboration with public and nonprofit private entities to carry out community-based programs to prepare students in secondary schools and institutions of higher education for attendance at the health professions school";

(B) in paragraph (4), by striking "and" at the end thereof;

(C) in paragraph (5), by striking the period and inserting "; and"; and

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

"(6) to carry out a program to provide training to the students of the school to enable such students to provide health services to minority individuals at community-based health facilities that provide such services to a significant number of minority individuals and that are located at a site remote from the main site of the teaching facilities of the school.";

(2) in subsection (e)—

(A) by striking the subsection heading and inserting "AUTHORITY REGARDING CONSORTIA.—";

(B) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following new paragraph:

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may make a grant under subsection (a) to any school of medicine, osteopathic medicine, dentistry, clinical psychology, or pharmacy that has in accordance with paragraph (2) formed a consortium of schools.";

(C) in paragraph (2), by striking subparagraphs (A) through (D) and inserting the following new subparagraphs:

"(A) the consortium consists of—

"(i) the health professions school seeking the grant under subsection (a); and

"(ii) one or more schools of medicine, osteopathic medicine, dentistry, pharmacy, nursing, allied health, public health, clinical psychology, or graduate programs in mental health practice;

"(B) the schools of the consortium have entered into an agreement for the allocation of such grant among the schools; and

"(C) each of the schools agrees to expend the grant in accordance with this section."; and

(D) by adding at the end the following paragraph:

"(3) AUTHORITY FOR COLLECTIVELY MEETING RELEVANT REQUIREMENTS IN CERTAIN CASES.—With respect to meeting the conditions specified in subsection (c)(4) for Native American Centers of Excellence, the Secretary may make a grant to any school that has in accordance with paragraphs (1) and (2) formed a consortium of schools that meets such conditions (without regard to whether the schools of the consortium individually meet such conditions)."; and

(3) in subsection (i)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking "such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1993" and inserting "$25,000,000 for fiscal year 1994, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1995 and 1996"; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(C) by adding at the end the following: "Health professions schools described in subsection (c)(2)(A) shall be eligible for grants under this subparagraph in a fiscal year if the amount appropriated for the fiscal year under paragraph (1) is greater than $23,500,000. Such schools shall be eligible to apply only for grants made from the portion of such amount that exceeds $23,500,000.".

SEC. 306. EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE REGARDING UNDERGRADUATES.

Section 740 (42 U.S.C. 293d) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by adding at the end the following new sentence: "To be eligible for such a grant, a school shall have in place a program to assist individuals from disadvantaged backgrounds in gaining entry into a health professions school or completing the course of study at such a school.";

(2) in subsection (d)(1)—

(A) by striking "there is" and inserting "there are"; and

(B) by striking "1993" and inserting "1994, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1995 and 1996".

(3) in subsection (d)(2)(B), by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Scholarship recipients under this section shall be known as 'Cesar Chavez Primary Care Scholars.'".

SEC. 307. AREA HEALTH EDUCATION CENTERS.

Section 746(d)(2)(D) (42 U.S.C. 293j(d)(2)(D)) is amended by inserting "and minority health" after "disease prevention".

TITLE IV—RESEARCH AND DATA COLLECTION

SEC. 401. OFFICE OF RESEARCH ON MINORITY HEALTH.

Section 404 (42 U.S.C. 283b), as added by section 151 of Public Law 103-43, is amended by adding at the end the following subsections:

"(c) PLAN.—The Director of the Office, shall collaborate with the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Minority Health (as provided for in section 1707), to develop and implement a plan for carrying out the duties required by subsection (b). The Director, in consultation with the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Minority Health, shall review the plan not less often than annually, and revise the plan as appropriate.

"(d) EQUITY REGARDING VARIOUS GROUPS.—The Director of the Office shall ensure that activities under subsection (b) address equitably all minority groups.

"(e) ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—

"(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—In carrying out subsection (b), the Secretary shall establish an advisory committee to be known as the Advisory Committee on Research on Minority Health (in this subsection referred to as the 'Advisory Committee').

"(2) COMPOSITION.—

"(A) VOTING AND NONVOTING MEMBERS.—The Advisory Committee shall be composed of voting members appointed in accordance with subparagraph (B) and the ex officio nonvoting members described in subparagraph (C).

"(B) VOTING MEMBERS.—The Advisory Committee shall include not fewer than 12, and not more than 18, voting members who are not officers or employees of the Federal Government. The Director of the Office shall appoint such members to the Advisory Committee from among physicians, practitioners, scientists, consumers and other health professionals, whose clinical practices, research specialization, or professional expertise includes a significant focus on research on minority health or on the barriers that minorities must overcome to participate in clinical trials. The membership of the Advisory Committee shall be equitably representative of the minority groups served by the Office.

"(C) EX OFFICIO NONVOTING MEMBERS.—The Deputy Assistant Secretary for Minority Health and the Directors of each of the national research entities shall serve as ex officio nonvoting members of the Advisory Committee (except that any of such Directors may designate an official of the institute involved to serve as such member of the Committee in lieu of the Director).

"(3) CHAIRPERSON.—The Director of the Office shall serve as the chairperson of the Advisory Committee.

"(4) DUTIES.—The Advisory Committee shall—

"(A) advise the Director of the Office on appropriate research activities to be undertaken by the national research institutes with respect to—

"(i) research on minority health;

"(ii) research on racial and ethnic differences in clinical drug trials, including responses to pharmacological drugs;

"(iii) research on racial and ethnic differences in disease etiology, course, and treatment; and

"(iv) research on minority health conditions which require a multidisciplinary approach;

"(B) report to the Director of the Office on such research;

"(C) provide recommendations to such Director regarding activities of the Office (including recommendations on priorities in carrying out research described in subparagraph (A)); and

"(D) assist in monitoring compliance with section 492B regarding the inclusion of minorities in clinical research.

"(5) BIENNIAL REPORT.—

"(A) PREPARATION.—The Advisory Committee shall prepare a biennial report describing the activities of the Committee, including findings made by the Committee regarding—

"(i) compliance with section 492B;

"(ii) the extent of expenditures made for research on minority health by the agencies of the National Institutes of Health; and

"(iii) the level of funding needed for such research.

"(B) SUBMISSION.—The report required in subparagraph (A) shall be submitted to the Director of the National Institutes of Health for inclusion in the report required in section 403.

"(f) REPRESENTATIVES OF MINORITIES AMONG RESEARCHERS.—The Secretary, acting through the Assistant Secretary for Personnel Administration and in collaboration with the Director of the Office, shall determine the extent to which minorities are represented among senior physicians and scientists of the national research institutes and among physicians and scientists conducting research with funds provided by such institutes, and as appropriate, carry out activities to increase the extent of such representation.

"(g) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this part:

"(1) MINORITY HEALTH CONDITIONS.—The term 'minority health conditions', with respect to individuals who are members of minority groups, means all diseases, disorders, and conditions (including with respect to mental health)—

"(A) unique to, more serious, or more prevalent in such individuals;

"(B) for which the factors of medical risk or types of medical intervention are different for such individuals, or for which it is unknown whether such factors or types are different for such individuals; or

"(C) with respect to which there has been insufficient research involving such individuals as subjects or insufficient data on such individuals.

"(2) RESEARCH ON MINORITY HEALTH.—The term 'research on minority health' means research on minority health conditions, including research on preventing such conditions.

"(3) MINORITY GROUPS.—The term 'minority groups' means Blacks, American Indians, Alaskan Natives, Asian/Pacific Islanders, and Hispanics, including subpopulations of such groups.".

SEC. 402. NATIONAL CENTER FOR HEALTH STATISTICS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 306 (42 U.S.C. 242k) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by striking "Committee on Human Resources" and inserting "Committee on Labor and Human Resources";

(2) in subsection (g), by striking "data which shall be published" and all that follows and inserting "data.";

(3) in subsection (k)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking the subparagraph designation; and

(ii) by striking "Except as provided in subparagraph (B), members" and inserting "Members"; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (B);

(4) in subsection (l)—

(A) by striking paragraph (3);

(B) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (3); and

(C) in paragraph (3) (as so redesignated), by striking "paragraphs (1), (2), and (3)," and inserting "paragraphs (1) and (2),"; and

(5) in subsection (o)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking "1991 through 1993" and inserting "1994 through 1997"; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking "$5,000,000" and all that follows through

"1993" and inserting "$1,100,000 for fiscal year 1994, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1995 through 1997".

(b) GENERAL AUTHORITY RESPECTING RESEARCH, EVALUATIONS, AND DEMONSTRATIONS.—Section 304 (42 U.S.C. 242b) is amended by striking subsection (d).

(c) GENERAL PROVISIONS RESPECTING EFFECTIVENESS, EFFICIENCY, AND QUALITY OF HEALTH SERVICES.—Section 308 (42 U.S.C. 242m) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking subparagraph (A); and

(ii) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) through (E) as subparagraphs (A) through (D), respectively; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking "reports required by subparagraphs" and all that follows through "Center" and inserting the following: "reports required in paragraph (1) shall be prepared through the National Center";

(2)(A) by striking subsection (c);

(B) by transferring paragraph (2) of subsection (g) from the current location of the paragraph;

(C) by redesignating such paragraph as subsection (c);

(D) by inserting subsection (c) (as so redesignated) after subsection (b); and

(E) by striking the remainder of subsection (g);

(3) in subsection (c) (as so redesignated)—

(A) by striking "shall (A) take" and inserting "shall take"; and

(B) by striking "and (B) publish" and inserting "and shall publish";

(4) in subsection (f), by striking "sections 3648" and all that follows and inserting "section 3324 of title 31, United States Code, and section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5)."; and

(5) by striking subsection (h).

SEC. 403. ACTIVITIES OF AGENCY FOR HEALTH CARE POLICY AND RESEARCH.

Section 902(b) (42 U.S.C. 299a(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) REQUIREMENTS WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN POPULATIONS.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Administrator shall undertake and support research, demonstration projects, and evaluations with respect to the health status of, and the delivery of health care to—

"(1) the populations of medically underserved urban or rural areas (including frontier areas); and

"(2) low-income groups, minority groups, and the elderly.".

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 501. REVISION AND EXTENSION OF PROGRAM FOR STATE OFFICES OF RURAL HEALTH.

(a) MATCHING FUNDS.—Section 338J(b) (42 U.S.C. 254r(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) REQUIREMENT OF MATCHING FUNDS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—With respect to the costs to be incurred by a State in carrying out the purpose described in subsection (a), the Secretary may not make a grant under such subsection unless the State agrees to provide non-Federal contributions toward such costs, in cash, in an amount that is not less than $1 for each $1 of Federal funds provided in the grant.

"(2) DETERMINATION OF AMOUNT CONTRIBUTED.—In determining the amount of non-Federal contributions in cash that a State has provided pursuant to paragraph (1), the Secretary may not include any amounts provided to the State by the Federal Government.".

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 338J(j)(1) (42 U.S.C. 254r(j)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking "and" after "1992,"; and

(2) by inserting before the period the following: ", and $5,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1994 through 1996".

(c) TERMINATION OF PROGRAM.—Section 338J(k) (42 U.S.C. 254r(k)) is amended by striking $10,000,000" and inserting "$20,000,000".

SEC. 502. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS RELATING TO HEALTH PROFESSIONS.

(a) HEALTH EDUCATION ASSISTANCE LOAN DEFERMENT FOR BORROWERS PROVIDING HEALTH SERVICES TO INDIANS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 705(a)(2)(C) is amended by striking "and (x)" and inserting "(x) not in excess of three years, during which the borrower is providing health care services to Indians through an Indian health program (as defined in section 108(a)(2)(A) of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act (25 U.S.C. 1616a(a)(2)(A)); and (xi)".

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 705(a)(2)(C) is further amended—

(A) in clause (xi) (as so redesignated) by striking "(ix)" and inserting "(x)"; and

(B) in the matter following such clause (xi), by striking "(x)" and inserting "(xi)".

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply with respect to services provided on or after the first day of the third month that begins after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) MAXIMUM STUDENT LOAN PROVISION.—Section 722(a)(1) (42 U.S.C. 292r(a)(1)), as amended by section 2014(b)(1) of Public Law 103-43, is amended by striking "the sum of" and all that follows through the end thereof and inserting "the cost of attendance (including tuition, other reasonable educational expenses, and reasonable living costs) for that year at the educational institution attended by the student (as determined by such educational institution).".

(c) REQUIREMENT FOR SCHOOLS.—Section 723(b)(1) (42 U.S.C. 292s(b)(1)), as amended by section 2014(c)(2)(A)(ii) of Public Law 103-43 (107 Stat. 216), is amended by striking "3 years before" and inserting "4 years before".

(d) SERVICE REQUIREMENT FOR PRIMARY CARE LOAN BORROWERS.—Section 723(a) (42 U.S.C. 292s(a)) is amended in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1), by striking "through the date on which the loan is repaid in full" and inserting "for 5 years after completing the residency program".

(e) PREFERENCE AND REQUIRED INFORMATION IN CERTAIN PROGRAMS.—Section 791 (42 U.S.C. 295j) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(d) EXCEPTIONS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—To permit new programs to compete equitably for funding under this section, those new programs that meet the criteria described in paragraph (3) shall qualify for a funding preference under this section.

"(2) DEFINITION.—As used in this subsection, the term 'new program' means any program that has graduated less than three classes. Upon graduating at least three classes, a program shall have the capability to provide the information necessary to qualify the program for the general funding preferences described in subsection (a).

"(3) CRITERIA.—The criteria referred to in paragraph (1) are the following:

"(A) The mission statement of the program identifies a specific purpose of the program as being the preparation of health professionals to serve underserved populations.

"(B) The curriculum of the program includes content which will help to prepare practitioners to serve underserved populations.

"(C) Substantial clinical training experience is required under the program in medically underserved communities.

"(D) A minimum of 20 percent of the faculty of the program spend at least 50 percent of their time providing or supervising care in medically underserved communities.

"(E) The entire program or a substantial portion of the program is physically located in a medically underserved community.

"(F) Student assistance, which is linked to service in medically underserved communities following graduation, is available to the students in the program.

"(G) The program provides a placement mechanism for deploying graduates to medically underserved communities.".

(f) PREFERENCES IN MAKING AWARDS.—

(1) TITLE VII.—Section 791(a)(1)(A) (42 U.S.C. 295j(a)(1)(A)) is amended by striking "communities; or" and inserting "communities including—

"(i) ambulatory practice sites designated by State Governors as shortage areas or medically underserved communities for purposes of State scholarships or loan repayment or related programs; and

"(ii) practices or facilities in which not less than 50 percent of the patients are recipients of aid under title XIX of the Social Security Act or eligible and uninsured; or".

(2) TITLE VIII.—Section 860(e)(1)(A)(i) (42 U.S.C. 298b-7(e)(1)(A)(i)) is amended by striking "communities; or" and inserting "communities including—

"(i) ambulatory practice sites designated by State Governors as shortage areas or medically underserved communities for purposes of State scholarships or loan repayment or related programs; and

"(ii) practices or facilities in which not less than 50 percent of the patients are recipients of aid under title XIX of the Social Security Act or eligible and uninsured; or".

(g) GENERALLY APPLICABLE MODIFICATIONS REGARDING OBLIGATED SERVICE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 795 (42 U.S.C. 295n), is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking "speciality in" and inserting "field of"; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking "speciality" and inserting "field"; and

(B) in subsection (b)(1), in each of subparagraphs (A) and (B), by striking "interest on such amount at the maximum legal prevailing rate" and inserting "interest on such amount at the rate of 12 percent per year (compounded annually)".

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Each amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect as if such subsection had been enacted immediately after the enactment of the Health Professions Education Extension Amendments of 1992.

(h) RECOVERY.—Part G of title VII (42 U.S.C. 295j et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 795, the following new section:

"SEC. 796. RECOVERY.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—If at any time within 20 years (or within such shorter period as the Secretary may prescribe by regulation for an interim facility) after the completion of construction of a facility with respect to which funds have been paid under section 720(a) (as such section existed one day prior to the date of enactment of the Health Professions Education Extension Amendments of 1992 (Public Law 102-408)—

"(1)(A) in case of a facility which was an affiliated hospital or outpatient facility with respect to which funds have been paid under

such section 720(a)(1), the owner of the facility ceases to be a public or other nonprofit agency that would have been qualified to file an application under section 605;

"(B) in case of a facility which was not an affiliated hospital or outpatient facility but was a facility with respect to which funds have been paid under paragraph (1) or (3) of such section 720(a), the owner of the facility ceases to be a public or nonprofit school, or

"(C) in case of a facility which was a facility with respect to which funds have been paid under such section 720(a)(2), the owner of the facility ceases to be a public or nonprofit entity,

"(2) the facility ceases to be used for the teaching or training purposes (or other purposes permitted under section 722 (as such section existed one day prior to the date of enactment of the Health Professions Education Extension Amendments of 1992 (Public Law 102-408)) for which it was constructed, or

"(3) the facility is used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship,

the United States shall be entitled to recover from the owner of the facility the base amount prescribed by subsection (c)(1) plus the interest (if any) prescribed by subsection (c)(2).

"(b) NOTICE.—The owner of a facility which ceases to be a public or nonprofit agency, school, or entity as described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of subsection (a)(1), as the case may be, or the owner of a facility the use of which changes as described in paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (a), shall provide the Secretary written notice of such cessation or change of use within 10 days after the date on which such cessation or change of use occurs or within 30 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, whichever is later.

"(c) AMOUNT.—

"(1) BASE AMOUNT.—The base amount that the United States is entitled to recover under subsection (a) is the amount bearing the same ratio to the then value (as determined by the agreement of the parties or in an action brought in the district court of the United States for the district in which the facility is situated) of the facility as the amount of the Federal participation bore to the cost of construction.

"(2) INTEREST.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The interest that the United States is entitled to recover under subsection (a) is the interest for the period (if any) described in subparagraph (B) at a rate (determined by the Secretary) based on the average of the bond equivalent rates of ninety-one-day Treasury bills auctioned during that period.

"(B) PERIOD.—The period referred to in subparagraph (A) is the period beginning—

"(i) if notice is provided as prescribed by subsection (b), 191 days after the date on which the owner of the facility ceases to be a public or nonprofit agency, school, or entity as described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of subsection (a)(1), as the case may be, or 191 days after the date on which the use of the facility changes as described in paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (a), or

"(ii) if notice is not provided as prescribed by subsection (b), 11 days after the date on which such cessation or change of use occurs,

and ending on the date the amount the United States is entitled to recover is collected.

"(d) WAIVER.—The Secretary may waive the recovery rights of the United States under subsection (a)(2) with respect to a facility (under such conditions as the Secretary may establish by regulation) if the Secretary determines that there is good cause for waiving such rights.

"(e) LIEN.—The right of recovery of the United States under subsection (a) shall not, prior to judgment, constitute a lien on any facility.".

SEC. 503. CLINICAL TRAINEESHIPS.

Section 303(d)(1) (42 U.S.C. 242a(d)(1)) is amended by inserting "counseling" after "family therapy,".

SEC. 504. DEMONSTRATION PROJECT GRANTS TO STATES FOR ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 398(a) (42 U.S.C. 280c-3(a)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking "not less than 5, and not more than 15,";

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by inserting after "disorders" the following: "who are living in single family homes or in congregate settings"; and

(B) by striking "and" at the end;

(3) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

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

"(3) to improve access for individuals with Alzheimer's disease or related disorders, particularly such individuals from ethnic, cultural, or language minorities and such individuals who are living in isolated rural areas, to services that—

"(A) are home-based or community-based long-term care services; and

"(B) exist on the date of enactment of this paragraph; and".

(b) DURATION.—Section 398A (42 U.S.C. 280c-4) is amended—

(1) in the title, by striking "LIMITATION ON";

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the heading, by striking "LIMITATION ON"; and

(B) by striking "may not exceed" and inserting "may exceed"; and

(3) in subsection (b), in paragraphs (1)(C) and (2)(C), by inserting ", and any subsequent year," after "third year".

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 398B(e) (42 U.S.C. 280c-5(e)) is amended by striking "and 1993" and inserting "through 1998".

SEC. 505. MEDICALLY UNDERSERVED AREA STUDY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall conduct a study concerning the feasibility and desirability of, and the criteria to be used for, combining the designations of "health professional shortage area" and "medically underserved area" into a single health professional shortage area designation.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—As part of the study conducted under subsection (a), the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in considering the statutory and regulatory requirements necessary for the creation of a single health professional shortage area designation, shall—

(1) review and report on the application of current statutory and regulatory criteria used—

(A) in designating an area as a health professional shortage area;

(B) in designating an area as a medically underserved area; and

(C) by a State in the determination of the health professional shortage area designations of such State; and

(2) review the suggestions of public health and primary care experts.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall prepare and submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report concerning the findings of the study conducted under subsection (a) together with the recommendations of the Secretary.

(d) RECOMMENDATIONS.—In making recommendations under subsection (c), the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall give special consideration to (and describe in the report) the unique impact of designation criteria on different rural and urban populations, and ethnic and racial minorities, including—

(1) rational service areas, and their application to frontier areas and inner-city communities;

(2) indicators of high medical need, including fertility rates, infant mortality rates, pediatric population, elderly population, poverty rates, and physician to population ratios; and

(3) indicators of insufficient service capacity, including language proficiency criteria for ethnic populations, annual patient visits per physician, waiting times for appointments, waiting times in a primary care physician office, excessive use of emergency facilities, low annual office visit rate, and demand on physicians in contiguous rural or urban areas.

SEC. 506. PROGRAMS REGARDING BIRTH DEFECTS.

Section 317C of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247b-4), as added by section 306 of Public Law 102-531 (106 Stat. 3494), is amended to read as follows:

"PROGRAMS REGARDING BIRTH DEFECTS

"SEC. 317C. (a) The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, shall carry out programs—

"(1) to collect, analyze, and make available data on birth defects, including data on the causes of such defects and on the incidence and prevalence of such defects;

"(2) to provide information and education to the public on the prevention of such defects;

"(3) to operate regional centers for the conduct of epidemiologic research and study of such defects, and to improve the education, training, and clinical skills of health professionals with respect to the prevention of such defects; and

"(4) to carry out demonstration projects for the prevention of such defects.

"(b) NATIONAL CLEARINGHOUSE.—In carrying out subsection (a)(1), the Secretary shall establish and maintain a National Information Clearinghouse on Birth Defects to collect and disseminate to health professionals and the general public information on birth defects, including the prevention of such defects.

"(c) GRANTS AND CONTRACTS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary may make grants to and enter into contracts with public and nonprofit private entities. Recipients of assistance under this subsection shall collect and analyze demographic data utilizing appropriate sources as determined by the Secretary.

"(2) SUPPLIES AND SERVICES IN LIEU OF AWARD FUNDS.—

"(A) Upon the request of a recipient of an award of a grant or contract under paragraph (1), the Secretary may, subject to subparagraph (B), provide supplies, equipment, and services for the purpose of aiding the recipient in carrying out the purposes for which the award is made and, for such purposes, may detail to the recipient any officer or

employee of the Department of Health and Human Services.

"(B) With respect to a request described in subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall reduce the amount of payments under the award involved by an amount equal to the costs of detailing personnel and the fair market value of any supplies, equipment, or services provided by the Secretary. The Secretary shall, for the payment of expenses incurred in complying with such request, expend the amounts withheld.

"(3) APPLICATION FOR AWARD.—The Secretary may make an award of a grant or contract under paragraph (1) only if an application for the award is submitted to the Secretary and the application is in such form, is made in such manner, and contains such agreements, assurances, and information as the Secretary determines to be necessary to carry out the purposes for which the award is to be made.

"(d) BIENNIAL REPORT.—Not later than February 1 of fiscal year 1995 and of every second such year thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Labor and Human Resources of the Senate, a report that, with respect to the preceding 2 fiscal years—

"(1) contains information regarding the incidence and prevalence of birth defects and the extent to which birth defects have contributed to the incidence and prevalence of infant mortality;

"(2) contains information under paragraph (1) that is specific to various racial and ethnic groups; and

"(3) contains an assessment of the extent to which each approach to preventing birth defects has been effective, including a description of effectiveness in relation to cost;

"(4) describes the activities carried out under this section; and

"(5) contains any recommendations of the Secretary regarding this section.

"(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of carrying out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1994 through 1997.".

TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect October 1, 1993, or upon the date of the enactment of this Act, whichever occurs later.

By Mr. HATCH:

S.J. Res. 145. A joint resolution to designate the period commencing on November 21, 1993, and ending on November 27, 1993, and the period commencing on November 20, 1994, and ending on November 26, 1994, each as "National Adoption Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NATIONAL ADOPTION WEEK

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, it is my privilege to sponsor the joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim the week of Thanksgiving as National Adoption Week in 1993 and 1994. This week has been so designated for the past 15 years, so this joint resolution would continue the traditional observance.

For many families, the Thanksgiving holidays are a time for family unity and celebration—a time to join together and reaffirm the bonds that unite our families. However, for many children, these holidays are especially difficult times because they serve as a stark reminder of the love and support missing from their lives.

Adoption is an option that can relieve some of the suffering and loneliness that too many young children face. Adoption is vitally important to millions of couples and children wanting to belong to a family of their own. In America today, an estimated 36,000 adoptable children remain in foster care of institutions, bereft of the nurturing and guidance that all children need, because of public and private barriers to adoption. A majority of these children have special physical, emotional, or mental needs; or they may have reached school age, have brothers and sisters, or be of various ethnic backgrounds. A stable home and strong role models are especially important for these at-risk youngsters.

At a time when our Nation is experiencing a tragic increase in crime, teenage pregnancies, disease, and violence, we cannot afford to let one child fall through the cracks. We must work together to bring children into a permanent, secure, and loving family. We must work together to eliminate the barriers that discourage adoption.

In recent months, our country was shocked and disturbed by the case of baby Jessica DeBoer. I know I share some of my colleagues concern that this case may dissuade some couples from adopting out of fear that the child they have come to love might be taken from them. We need to assure people that adoption is a vital option for couples with love to give.

Please join me in celebrating those families who are brought together through adoption, in commending the institutions and individuals working to find permanent homes for all adoptable children, and in heightening awareness of adoption to those who want to have a family.

I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

S.J. RES. 145

Whereas Thanksgiving week has been commemorated as "National Adoption Week" for the past 15 years;

Whereas the Congress recognizes that belonging to a secure, loving, and permanent family is every child's right;

Whereas the President of the United States has actively promoted the benefits of adoption by implementing a Federal program to encourage Federal employees to consider adoption;

Whereas approximately 36,000 children who may be characterized as having special needs, such as being of school age, being members of a sibling group, being members of a minority group, or having physical, mental, or emotional disabilities are now in foster care or in institutions financed at public expense and are legally free for adoption;

Whereas public and private barriers inhibiting the placement of special needs children must be reviewed and removed where possible to assure their adoption;

Whereas the adoption of institutionalized or foster care children by capable parents into permanent homes would ensure an opportunity for their continued happiness and long-range well-being;

Whereas the public and prospective parents must be informed that there are children available for adoption;

Whereas the media, agencies, adoptive parent and advocacy groups, civic and church groups, businesses, and industries will provide publicity and information to heighten community awareness of crucial needs of children available for adoption; and

Whereas the recognition of Thanksgiving week as "National Adoption Week" is in the best interest of adoptable children and in the best interest of the public generally: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the period commencing on November 21, 1993, and ending on November 27, 1993, and the period commencing on November 20, 1994, and ending on November 26, 1994, are each designated as "National Adoption Week", and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe each week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 236

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 236, a bill to increase Federal payments to units of general local government for entitlement lands, and for other purposes.

S. 340

At the request of Mr. HEFLIN, the names of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRADLEY] were added as cosponsors of S. 340, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to clarify the application of the act with respect to alternate uses of new animal drugs and new drugs intended for human use, and for other purposes.

S. 578

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 578, a bill to protect the free exercise of religion.

S. 985

At the request of Mr. INOUYE, the name of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] was added as a cosponsor of S. 985, a bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act with respect to minor uses of pesticides, and for other purposes.

S. 1087

At the request of Mr. KOHL, the name of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MATHEWS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1087, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the possession

of a handgun or ammunition by, or the private transfer of a handgun or ammunition to, a juvenile.

S. 1361

At the request of Mr. SIMON, the name of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BINGAMAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1361, a bill to establish a national framework for the development of School-to-Work Opportunities systems in all States, and for other purposes.

S. 1425

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, the name of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1425, a bill to establish a National Appeals Division of the Department of Agriculture to hear appeals of adverse decisions made by certain agencies of the Department, and for other purposes.

S. 1437

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1437, a bill to amend section 1562 of title 38, United States Code, to increase the rate of pension for persons on the Medal of Honor roll.

S. 1443

At the request of Mr. EXON, the name of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. JOHNSTON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1443, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on luxury passenger vehicles.

S. 1511

At the request of Mr. DORGAN, the name of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBB] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1511, a bill to eliminate the crediting of "good time" for violent and repeat offenders in Federal and State prisons, authorize funding for boot camps and the conversion of military facilities to regional prisons, and for other purposes.

S. 1512

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1512, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the establishment in the Department of Veterans Affairs of mental illness research, education, and clinical centers, and for other purposes.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 41

At the request of Mr. SIMON, the name of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 41, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to require a balanced budget.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 83

At the request of Mr. DECONCINI, the names of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. METZENBAUM], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MATHEWS] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 83, a joint resolution designating the week beginning February 6, 1994, as "Lincoln Legacy Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 98

At the request of Mr. MITCHELL, the names of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRADLEY], the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DURENBERGER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MATHEWS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SASSER], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. WOFFORD] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 98, a joint resolution to designate the week beginning October 25, 1993, as "National Child Safety Awareness Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 134

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the name of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 134, a joint resolution to designate October 19, 1993, as "National Mammography Day."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 140

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 140, a joint resolution to designate December 7, 1993, as "National Pearl Harbor Remembrance Day."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 141

At the request of Mr. SARBANES, the names of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 141, a joint resolution designating October 29, 1993, as "National Firefighters Day."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 142

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the names of the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DANFORTH], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 142, a joint resolution designating the week beginning November 7, 1993, as "National Women Veterans Recognition Week."

AMENDMENT NO. 1051

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON her name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1051 proposed to H.R. 3116, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. HATCH his name was withdrawn as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1051 proposed to H.R. 3116, supra.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT OF 1994

MCCAIN AMENDMENT NO. 1061

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H.R. 3116) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 157, between lines 9 and 10, insert the following:

SEC. 8142. No provision of any Act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1994 may be construed as requiring a contract to be awarded, or as requiring a grant to be made, to a specific non-Federal Government entity.

GRASSLEY AMENDMENT NO. 1062

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3116, supra; as follows:

On page 68, line 20, after "law," insert the following: "the Secretary of the Navy may not obligate funds after December 31, 1993, for entering into any sealift contract or charter under which the Secretary, as determined by the Secretary, is to pay, either directly or indirectly through a contractor or subcontractor, compensation (including regular rate pay, overtime rate pay, and other pay-related benefits) with respect to a seaman billet at a total cost that exceeds the total cost to the Federal Government of the compensation that is provided by the Federal Government with respect to a comparable military billet reserved for, or filled by, a member of the Armed Forces of the United States,".

DOMENICI (AND NUNN) AMENDMENT NOS. 1063–1065

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. DOMENICI (for himself and Mr. NUNN) submitted three amendments intended to be proposed by them to the bill H.R. 3116, supra; as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1063

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . EXTENSION OF SPENDING LIMITS.

(a) CATEGORY.—Subparagraph (B) of section 250(c)(4) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended to read as follows:

"(B) For fiscal years 1994 through 1998, any of the following subsets of discretionary appropriations: defense or nondefense. New accounts or activities shall be categorized in consultation with the Committees on Appropriations and the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate.".

(b) DISCRETIONARY SPENDING.—Section 601(a)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by striking subparagraphs (D), (E), and (F) and insert the following:

"(D) with respect to fiscal year 1994—

"(i) for the defense category: "$264,051,000,000 in new budget authority and $277,294,000,000 in outlays;

"(ii) for the nondefense category: $236,913,000,000 in new budget authority and $261,463,000,000 in outlays;

"(E) with respect to fiscal year 1995—

"(i) for the defense category: $262,624,000,000 in new budget authority and $272,744,000,000 in outlays;

"(ii) for the nondefense category: $243,663,000,000 in new budget authority and $268,528,000,000 in outlays;

"(F) with respect to fiscal year 1996—

"(i) for the defense category: $254,139,000,000 in new budget authority and $265,742,000,000 in outlays;

"(ii) for the nondefense category: $265,003,000,000 in new budget authority and $281,521,000,000 in outlays;

"(G) with respect to fiscal year 1997—

"(i) for the defense category: $248,490,000,000 in new budget authority and $249,705,000,000 in outlays;

"(ii) for the nondefense category: $279,589,000,000 in new budget authority and $297,641,000,000 in outlays;

"(H) with respect to fiscal year 1998—

"(i) for the defense category: $254,260,000,000 in new budget authority and $253,173,000,000 in outlays; and

"(ii) for the nondefense category: $276,379,000,000 in new budget authority and $294,697,000,000 in outlays."

AMENDMENT NO. 1064

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . DEFENSE FUNDING LEVELS.

(a) The Senate finds:

(1) the Congress has already reduced fiscal year 1994 funding for the Department of Defense by nearly $130 billion in real terms as compared to fiscal year 1985;

(2) President Clinton has proposed to reduce national defense programs by a total of $244 billion in real terms over the next five years;

(3) recent world events, particularly developments in Russia, confirm the United States needs a strong national defense;

(4) the United States should engage in an orderly reduction in funding levels for national defense programs; and,

(5) reductions in defense spending should be devoted to deficit reduction.

(b) It is the is the sense of the Senate that legislation should be enacted to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to establish:

(1) individual spending limits for defense and nondefense discretionary funding levels for fiscal years 1994 through 1998;

(2) spending limits for the defense discretionary category for fiscal year 1994 through 1998 at the levels proposed by President Clinton in the fiscal year 1994 budget and adopted by Congress as part of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1994; and,

(3) spending limits for the nondefense discretionary category for fiscal year 1994 through 1998 at levels so that aggregate discretionary spending does not exceed the levels established by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993.

AMENDMENT NO. 1065

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . DEFENSE FUNDING LEVELS.

It is the sense of the Senate that legislation should be enacted to require the Office of Management and Budget to make across-the-board uniform reductions in defense programs or nondefense programs if aggregate appropriations for one of these categories exceed the levels proposed by the President.

NICKLES AMENDMENT NO. 1066

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. NICKLES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3116, supra; as follows:

At the end of the pending Committee amendment insert the following:

PROHIBITION OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES AS PART OF UNITED NATIONS STANDING ARMED FORCE

PROHIBITION.—None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act or any other appropriation Act may be used to support United States Armed Forces personnel when such forces are a part of any prospective standing United Nations international armed force.

BROWN AMENDMENT NO. 1067

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3116, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, add the following new section:

"SEC. . UNITED STATES COMBAT TROOPS IN BOSNIA.

"None of the funds appropriated under this Act shall be available for the deployment of United States combat forces in Bosnia-Hercegovina, without prior congressional approval."

DOMENICI (AND NUNN) AMENDMENT NO. 1068

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. DOMENICI (for himself and Mr. NUNN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3116, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

"SEC. . EXTENSION OF SPENDING LIMITS.

(a) CATEGORY.—Subparagraph (A) of section 250(c)(4) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended to read as follows:

"(A) For fiscal years 1994 and 1995, any of the following subsets of discretionary appropriations: defense or nondefense. New accounts or activities shall be categorized in consultation with the Committees on Appropriations and the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate.".

(b) DISCRETIONARY SPENDING.—Section 601(a)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by striking subparagraphs (D) and (E) and inserting the "(D) with respect to fiscal year 1994—

"(i) for the defense category: $264,051,000,000 in new budget authority and $277,294,000,000 in outlays;

"(ii) for the nondefense category: $236,913,000,000 in new budget authority and $261,463,000,000 in outlays;

"(E) with respect to fiscal year 1995—

"(i) for the defense category: $262,624,000,000 in new budget authority and $272,744,000,000 in outlays;

"(ii) for the nondefense category: $243,663,000,000 in new budget authority and $268,528,000,000 in outlays;"

NUNN (AND WARNER) AMENDMENT NO. 1069

Mr. NUNN (for himself and Mr. WARNER) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 3116, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING OPERATIONAL CONTROL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES

SEC. 9001. Congress makes the following findings:

(1 The Armed Forces of the United States have conducted combat operations under the operational control of foreign commanders on numerous occasions, including during two World Wars.

(2 Regional security organizations, such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, are premised on military operations by the forces of a number of nations under an integrated chain of command consisting of officers from member nations.

(3 The end of the Cold War has seen a substantial increase in the conduct of international "peacekeeping" and "peace enforcement" operations pursuant to decisions of the United Nations Security Council under Chapters VI and VII of the United Nations Charter.

(4) The United Nations has conducted traditional "peacekeeping" operations successfully over the years, but the number and size of such operations has stretched the Organization's management and oversight capabilities thin.

(5) The United Nations has not yet acquired the expertise or infrastructure to enable it to effectively manage "peace enforcement" operations.

(6) Any special agreement negotiated by the President with the United Nations Security Council to make units of the United States Armed Forces available on call to the United Nations must be approved by the Congress pursuant to the United Nations Participation Act, enacted into law in 1945.

(7) Any decision by the President to place combat forces of the Armed Forces of the Unites States under the operational control of foreign commanders, other than pursuant to the North Atlantic Treaty and other arrangements in effect at the time of the enactment of this Act, has significant consequences for such forces, the Congress, and the American people.

SEC. 9002. It is the Sense of the Congress that—

(1) the Armed Forces of the United States must be under the operational control of qualified commanders; and must have clear, effective, and robust command and control arrangements; appropriate rules of engagement; and clear and unambiguous mission statements;

(2) the President should consult with Congress before placing combat forces of the Armed Forces of the United States under the operational control of foreign commanders, other than pursuant to the North Atlantic Treaty and other arrangements in effect at the time of the enactment of this Act; and

(3) the President should submit a report to Congress within 48 hours after placing combat forces of the Armed Forces of the United States under the operational control of foreign commanders, other than pursuant to the North Atlantic Treaty and other arrangements in effect at the time of the enactment of this Act, setting forth—

(A) the mission of such forces and a clear explanation of the difference, if any, between the mission of such forces and the mission of

the forces of other nations participating in the same military operations;

(B) in a case in which the operation is conducted under the auspices of the United Nations, an assessment of the United Nations capability to effectively manage the operation;

(C) an explanation of the United States interest that would be served by and the justification for placing such forces under the operational control of a foreign commander in this instance;

(D) the command and control arrangements for the operation of which the forces of the Armed Forces of the United States are a part;

(E) the number, type and general description of equipment of such forces;

(F) the estimated cost to the United States of the participation of such forces;

(G) the anticipated duration of the participation of such forces;

(H) a general unclassified description of the rules of engagement for such forces; and

(I) the foreign commander or commanders involved.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Indian Affairs will be holding an oversight hearing on Wednesday, October 20, 1993, beginning at 9:30 a.m. in 485 Russell Senate Office Building on self-governance.

Those wishing additional information should contact the Committee on Indian Affairs at 224-2251.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate Tuesday, October 19, 1993, at 10 a.m. to mark up S. 1299, the Housing and Community Development Act of 1993; S. 423, the Investment Adviser Oversight Act; and the nominations of Jeffrey Garten, John Despres, William Gilmartin, and Lauri Fitz-Pegado.

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

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, October 19 beginning at 2 p.m. to conduct a hearing on NAFTA and its environmental side agreements.

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

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent on behalf of the Governmental Affairs Committee for authority to meet for a hearing on Tuesday, October 19, at 9:30 a.m. on the subject: "S. 1535, the Federal Workforce Restructuring Act of 1993."

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

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Small Business Committee be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, October 19, 1993 at 10:30 a.m. The committee will hold a full committee hearing to consider the President's nomination of Cassandra Pulley to be the Deputy Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

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

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet on October 19, 1993, at 9:30 a.m. on the nomination of Daniel Collins to be a member of the National Railroad Passenger Corporation and immediately following a Surface Transportation Subcommittee hearing on intelligent vehicle highway systems for commercial vehicles.

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

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate at 9:30 a.m., October 19, 1993, to receive testimony from Corlis Moody, nominee to be Director of the Department of Energy's Office of Economic Impact and Diversity, and Richard Stallings, nominee to be the Nuclear Waste Negotiators, Office of Nuclear Waste Negotiator.

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

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Human Resources be authorized to meet for a hearing on the Economic Impact of the Health Security Act, during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, October 19, 1993, at 10 a.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be permitted to meet today at 10 a.m. to hear testimony on the subject: "Social Problems and Health Care Costs."

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, October 19, 1993, at 10 a.m. to hold a hearing on United States participation in Somalia peacekeeping.

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, October 19, 1993, at 4:30 p.m. to receive a briefing from the administration on the situation in Somalia.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Human Resources' Subcommittee on Labor be authorized to meet for a hearing on "Single Payer Health Care Systems: Issues and Options," during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, October 19, 1993, at 2:30 p.m.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PATENTS, COPYRIGHTS, AND TRADEMARKS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Patents, Copyrights, and Trademarks of the Committee on the Judiciary, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, October 19, 1993, at 10 a.m., to hold a hearing on S. 373, the Copyrights Reform Act.

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

DRUG MANUFACTURERS VOLUNTARILY IGNORING CALL FOR MEANINGFUL PRICING RESTRAINTS

• Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, on September 15, 1993, I issued a challenge to this Nation's drug manufacturing industry to make a meaningful commitment to the American public and the Congress to restrain the increases in their pharmaceutical prices. I did this because I was concerned that the voluntary proposals that manufacturers were making to restrain prices, while a step in the right direction, were not truly meaningful to the average consumer buying prescription drugs at the local retail pharmacy.

To make up for this serious shortcoming in the manufacturers' approaches, I proposed that manufacturers sign a commitment to the Secretary of Health and Human Services that would require them to limit both the annual increase in their weighted average price to the rate of inflation and the increase in price of individual retail pharmaceutical products to the rate of inflation.

This specific price increase cap on retail pharmaceutical products is needed to protect consumers that purchase their medications out of pocket against continuing excessive price increases. That is because only a few manufacturers have put inflation caps on the actual prices that they charge for their retail-based products. This is where the prescription drug pricing problem has been most acute for older Americans, and where a solution is most urgent. My two-pronged approach to constraining drug price increases would therefore, in my opinion, be more meaningful for the average American buying medications out of pocket.

In my floor statement on that day, I told my colleagues that I would periodically update them on the number of manufacturers that say that agree to this meaningful commitment. Exactly 1 month after making that challenge, I am sorry to say that only one drug manufacturer has even so much as responded to my letter to them of September 16. One manufacturer, Genentech, has indicated in a letter to me that they are willing to "pledge for the next 3 years to maintain the list prices of each of our marketed products, so that future price increases, if any, are at or below the consumer price index."

I welcome Genentech's positive response to my challenge and congratulate them. The other drug manufacturers appear to be voluntarily ignoring my call for meaningful pharmaceutical price restraint.

Now, I know that 1 month may not be enough time for drug manufacturers to receive and review the commitment that I proposed. So, obviously, I want to give them a little bit more time. However, I wanted to let my colleagues know that the drug industry is generally very quick to respond when their best interest is at stake. When it comes to the good of the American public, and to the good of millions of older Americans, they seem to be a little bit slower in responding.

I once again encourage all manufacturers to expeditiously review the agreement that I developed. I call on them to tell us whether they are willing to provide true relief to the American public from ever-increasing medication prices. We are all eagerly waiting for an answer. In another month, I hope to have more encouraging news on this front.•

FOOD SAFETY REFORM

• Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, late Thursday of last week, a Federal judge ruled the U.S. Department of Agriculture to be in violation of the Administrative Procedures Act in its effort to mandate "safe food handling labels" on meat and poultry products. At issue in the suit brought by trade associations representing retailers, food service distributors, and wholesalers, was whether or not USDA violated the Administrative Procedures Act by issuing an interim final rule on the labels and forgoing the entire rulemaking process. In his decision, U.S. District Judge James Nowlin ruled that USDA "has not demonstrated any reason that would justify a departure from the normal rulemaking procedures."

The USDA issued an interim final rule on these labels in August as a result of an E. coli epidemic which sickened 500 people and killed 3 in my State earlier this year. An epidemic, in the mind of this Senator and the families of the victims of E. coli, represents a justifiable "departure from the normal rulemaking procedures." In fact, it is difficult to think of a better reason.

It is true, as the judge stated in his decision, that the majority of those infected with the E. coli bacteria earlier this year came into contact with the bacteria at a fast food restaurant. But what the judge failed to note was that each year hundreds of individuals contract the E. coli bacteria—not necessarily from a fast food or other restaurant.

When the Secretary issued his proposal for safe food handling labels in August, I believed that this represented an important step forward for food safety reform. I encouraged the Secretary to stick to his proposal to mandate these labels for all meat and poultry products which, if implemented, would have gone into effect on October 15. As it turns out, the final rule would have only mandated the label for ground meat and poultry on October 15 and would have required the remaining products to carry the label by April 15, 1994. Although the final rule would have contained this compromise, I continue to be supportive of the Secretary's proposal because the education of consumers is an integral part of reforming our food safety system. And in light of congressional and industry reluctance to move forward on food safety reform, consumer education is, perhaps, one of the most effective measures which the Secretary can enact.

Mr. President, I have been increasingly frustrated with the lack of action to reform our Nation's food safety system. This inaction ranges from committee chairmen who do not want to forgo their jurisdiction over USDA or the myriad of Federal departments and agencies which share conflicting jurisdiction over food safety and inspection, industry complaints that the status quo best serves their needs, and a general reluctance to consolidate and streamline our Nation's food safety system.

We saw an example of this reluctance in response to Vice President GORE's reinventing Government proposal to consolidate USDA's Food Safety and Inspection Service [FSIS] with the functions of the Food and Drug Administration. Immediately, industry and Members of Congress began to second-guess the merits of the proposed consolidation and cast doubt upon the cost savings of this proposal. Clearly we need to see the fine print of this proposal, but the Vice President's recommendation deserves to be considered closely and not merely shelved away because of turf battles and proponents of the status quo.

Earlier this year Senator DURENBERGER and I introduced legislation, S. 1349, which would consolidate the food safety and inspection functions of all departments and agencies into one, single Food Safety and Inspection Agency. This legislation shares a similar goal to that of the Vice President's proposal—consolidating and eliminating the Federal bureaucracy—and merits careful consideration as well.

Mr. President, in the opinion of this Senator, the decision made by the U.S. district judge last week was outrageous. The Secretary of Agriculture had made a well-thought-out policy decision in mandating the safe food handling labels. But, as has become custom, instead of working with USDA to address their concerns in the final rule, the groups who disagreed with the policy filed suit to stop it. And in doing so, these groups—groups which have a vested interest in food safety reform and the confidence of American consumers—took a giant step backward on food safety reform.

Over the past 10 months I have met often with the families of E. coli victims in the State of Washington and listened carefully to their concerns. And although the court decision is a setback for food safety reform, I will continue to work in cooperation with USDA to see that safe food handling labels are put into place sooner, rather than later.•

PREJUDICE IS WRONG

• Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, I respectfully request that the following article be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. "Prejudice is Wrong" was written by one of my younger constituents, Bill Sambrone, age 12, and I want to share his insightful views about this issue with my colleagues.

I ask that "Prejudice is Wrong" be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The article follows:

"PREJUDICE IS WRONG"

(Bill Sambrone, Age 12)

I think that prejudice is wrong. Why would anybody hate another person just because they have a different skin color, or anything different. Prejudice is also a sign that a person has poor character.

Are black, hispanic, or any other people not human? Can't they do what we all do? If not, or even if so, there is no reason for prejudice. Put yourself in their shoes. Would you like people to discriminate against you just because you are different? Plain and simple,

prejudice is foolish. All people are created equally (not everyone's talents are equal), which means that there should not be any prejudice.

The government should contribute to the cause of stopping prejudice. There should even be a law to outlaw it (maybe that might be a bit radical). If there was no prejudice, the world would be a happier place, not to mention the elimination of white supremist gangs or groups.

You can stop prejudice. Spread the word that prejudice is wrong. Take a stand. Every person against prejudice helps. After all, if prejudice grows too big, our nation will fall apart with frequent gang activity. Do you want this to happen? Stop prejudice!•

WITHDRAWAL OF AMERICAN TROOPS FROM SOMALIA

• Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, last week I offered an amendment to the defense Appropriation bill to bring about the prompt withdrawal of American troops from Somalia. I had become concerned that our original mission in Somalia had changed from one of humanitarian relief to one of nation-building. The humanitarian mission was supported by the Senate and the American people. The mission of nation-building was not. Following the complete collapse of the administration's ill-defined and poorly implemented policy in Somalia, and the debacle of October 3 and 4, I believed it was time to bring our troops home.

I want to make clear that my opposition to the President's policy in Somalia was brought about by the failure of the President to thoroughly consult Congress on the direction of that policy and the eventual failure of his efforts to implement it.

I made my opposition to any change from the humanitarian mission clear from the outset of President Bush's efforts to feed the hungry in that unfortunate nation. I expressed my concern for the changing mission twice this past August, I did not, however, attempt in a preemptive fashion to prevent him from exercising his Presidential prerogatives or his powers as Commander in Chief.

Mr. President, I am concerned that the amendments offered by my friends Senators DOLE and NICKLES to require the President to seek prior authorization from Congress before committing United States forces to Haiti, Bosnia, or, in the case with Senator NICKLES, to an operation under United Nations command inappropriately preclude Presidential leadership on these foreign policy questions. I have always doubted the constitutionality of the War Powers Act, and I fear these amendments come close to invoking the spirit of that Act, although even the War Powers Act would allow the President to commit the use of American forces before Congress could reverse the decision. Accordingly, I cannot support them.

My concern is based on constitutional grounds. The President is the Commander in Chief. As such, he has the power to commit U.S. troops to meet any contingency. The Constitution grants the Congress the power of the purse. With the powers given it, the Congress may end those military operations by cutting off funding. The Constitution does not give the Congress the power to prevent the President from committing forces.

Let me stress, Mr. President, that I sympathize with Senators DOLE and NICKLES as they seek to impose some guidance for American foreign policy in an environment where little guidance, as well as little consultation with Congress on these matters, is forthcoming from the administration. There is a vacuum in foreign policy leadership in Washington at the moment, and that is a dangerous situation for this Nation to risk at such a challenging moment in history. Neither would I like to see a repeat of the administration's inattentiveness, miscalculations and vague inclinations toward assertive multilateralism that result in our recent misadventure in Somalia. Understandably, Senators DOLE and NICKLES have sought some action which would reduce the likelihood of future repetition of this kind of folly.

One would hope that with adequate consultation with Congress, the administration would avoid future blunders that needlessly put at risk the lives of our troops. If they do not avoid such mistakes, Congress has the right to refuse to fund them. However, I do not believe Congress should preclude or circumscribe the President's foreign policy leadership in advance of the policy's formulation. Congress should work closely with the administration to help keep the President from making future mistakes like the debacle in Somalia. But should he persist in making them, our legislative resources should be to terminate them as quickly as we can by denying them funds for further implementation once they have been made.

The danger in proscribing certain foreign policies until they are authorized by Congress is that we cannot foresee today all the contingencies that may arise which would necessitate such action. Senator DOLE has attempted to provide for such contingencies in the numerous exclusions he has included in his amendment on Haiti. But again, Mr. President, no one can be certain today that we have conceived all potential emergencies which may someday require the use of force to resolve or special circumstances which may on rare occasion require the temporary stationing of U.S. forces under U.N. command. I sincerely hope that such an occasion never arises, but I cannot be certain that it will not.

I share the concerns of Senators DOLE and NICKLES with regard to the administration's policies in Haiti, Bosnia and at the United Nations, although I feel their proposed corrections exceed our authority. I close by urging the President in the strongest possible terms to consult closely with Congress, to weigh heavily in his calculations the concerns he will find here. Only when a policy is understood and supported by the American people and their elected representatives in Congress will it have a chance at success. Together, we may arrive at a more effective way to safeguard American interests overseas than has heretofore been the case.•

APPLICATION OF POSTAL REGULATIONS TO WEEKLY NEWSPAPERS

• Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I have introduced a bill which would ensure that postal regulations adopted March 19, 1989, do not have an adverse impact on certain weekly newspapers which have customarily been produced in a two-staple format.

The regulations were intended to control the inclusion of loose supplements in magazines, but they have impacted on a few bona fide newspapers which qualify for second-class postal rate.

Actually, only a few of the thousands of newspapers were affected by the regulation—as few as 50 newspapers in the Nation and 39 are papers published in the suburbs of Chicago.

All this bill does is say that if the newspapers were using two staples before March 19, 1989, they should be allowed to continue to use the two staples without changing the mail classification solely because of the two staples.

This bill will right the wrong which adversely affected the papers which were publishing in this manner prior to the regulation enacted back in March 1989.•

THE DRUG WAR, ONCE AGAIN

• Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, once again, I rise to speak on the subject of the war on drugs. It is increasingly clear that we are in the process of declaring victory and going home. In reality, we are snatching defeat from the jaws of, if not victory, then at least a hard-fought draw. This is a very serious defeat for America, a defeat that will threaten the safety and livelihood of every American.

I have spoken several time this year, in some detail, on various aspects of the drug war. I addressed the issue on February 16, March 25, April 20, April 22, and briefly on May 18. Since then, events and decisions that were pending have actually taken place or been made.

Tomorrow, the administration's new antidrug strategy will reportedly be released to the public when the Director of the National Drug Control Policy, Mr. Lee Brown, testifies before the Judiciary Committee. This public release

is previewed in the Tuesday, October 19, 1993 edition of the Washington Post, on page A8, in an article entitled "White House Shifts Anti-Drug Focus, but Not Funds," by Michael Isikoff.

Those events and decisions were also discussed in the Washington Post's September 19, 1993, editorial entitled "War Over the Drug War," and in a letter to the editor of the Post from Mr. Alec A. Des Roches that was published in the Friday, October 1, 1993, edition on page A24.

Mr. President, I ask that the article, the editorial, and the letter to the editor be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. D'AMATO. I fear that the critics are correct—that the administration and its allies in Congress are embarked on a process of ending the war on drugs. This unilateral surrender cannot be allowed to occur without protest and strong opposition.

As the vice chairman of the international narcotics control caucus, and as a Member with a long and hard-earned record of legislative achievements in fighting the war on drugs, I must speak out. I believe the consequences of the administration's mistakes in this area are already so serious that they are visible to anyone who takes the time to look.

Yesterday's Washington Post contained a front-page article by Dan Beyers and Avis Thomas-Lester entitled "Marijuana Makes a Comeback: Arrests Here Are Up by 19 Percent for Drug That Was on the Wane." While the headline says it all, I commend the entire article to those who are concerned about the fight against illegal drugs. It is clearly bad news.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article on marijuana be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

In my remarks on the 20th of this April, I placed in the RECORD an article by Herbert D. Kleber entitled "'Benign Neglect' Means Danger." In his article, he discussed the process of making drugs "* * * 'psychologically unavailable' through denormalization and the stigmatizing of their use." That was one of the major objectives of the demand side of the war on drugs as it has been fought until now. In fact, there is good evidence that it was making significant progress and that this progress was a real factor in reducing illegal drug use.

Now, let me quote a passage from yesterday's article on marijuana:

"Cocaine and PCP scared a lot of people," said George Koch, a Maryland State Policy analyst who studies marijuana trends. "Marijuana is seen as less of a threat, more acceptable by society."

That image is being reinforced by pop culture, where favorable references to marijuana are appearing increasingly in music of all tastes—from heavy metal to rap—and at colleges, where legalization of marijuana is being debated.

Some street vendors and trendy boutiques said they did a brisk business during the summer selling T-shirts and caps adorned with a marijuana leaf or marijuana-related slogans. Some even sold hemp clothes made from marijuana plants.

Clothing with printed marijuana emblems is now turning up in high schools.

What we have here is current evidence that the implicit message the administration's new approach to the drug war is sending has already been received and is being acted upon. The cutting edge of American society—the entertainment industry, small entrepreneurs selling T-shirts, bumper stickers, and similar merchandise, and the college-age population—have decided that illegal drug use is no longer bad. And they are influencing high school and junior high school children to think the same way.

Mr. President, they've made drug use fashionable and trendy again.

This is a disaster. We are seeing created before our very eyes the next generation of illegal drug users and abusers.

Let me quote again from yesterday's marijuana article:

"For me, marijuana is just like alcohol. No worse," said another Gaithersburg youth, a 15-year-old boy who said he tried his first joint earlier this summer. "You hear about it through the music. It's part of what is happening."

Mr. President, what is happening is that, while the Clinton administration is declaring victory and going home, we are losing the war on drugs. We see here the beginning of the reversal of the gains we have fought so hard for so many years to achieve.

The Clinton administration has sent out the implicit message that "it's all right to do drugs." Instead of denormalizing drug use and stigmatizing drug users, traffickers, and advocates of illegal drug use, they've created a warming climate, a climate that sends the subtle message that hardline policies are wrong, and while they can't be rolled back directly, they can be indirectly crippled and undermined.

Who are the victims of this counterrevolution in the cultural marketplace? You and I are the victims. Our children are the victims. Our communities are the victims.

It's not just a matter of T-shirts with marijuana leaves on them. It's a matter of bringing susceptible and impressionable young people into direct contact with experienced drug-dealing criminals.

It's a matter of recruiting new drug abusers who will become addicts.

It's a matter of glamorizing the drug trade, so that ambitious young people want to join and get rich quick.

It's a matter of increasing cash flow through the local drug gangs and international cartels.

It's a matter of shaping attitudes and perceptions, and as any practicing politician can tell you, attitudes and perceptions really do count.

One of the things that will happen as this implicit message strikes home is that violent drug-related crime will begin another spiraling climb. Yet, instead of pressing the drug war against the main enemy—drug abusers and drug traffickers—the administration proposes another misleading political offensive on gun control, distracting us from this devastating retreat from the true cause of much of the crime and violence in our cities and society.

This gun control effort, however genuine its motivations may be, goes after one of the symptoms of the crisis, rather than the true cause—illegal drug trafficking and the resulting addiction. The drug trade and drug addiction are major reasons why people become violent criminals in the first place and choose to use guns in their crimes in the second place.

What in the world does the administration's new idea—making gun possession by minors illegal—have to do with solving drug abuse and stopping the drug trade? Does the President think that the Brady bill's waiting period will have any effect at all on the teenage punks dealing drugs to a new generation of addicts? How many of their guns does he think were bought through legitimate channels?

And the greatest bugaboo of all—assault weapons. We are going to reduce drug-related street crime by outlawing assault weapons? Who are we kidding?

It may have escaped his notice, but a shipload—Mr. President—a shipload—of illegal immigrants ran aground on the beaches of Long Island earlier this year. And it wasn't the only such ship to reach our shores this year. If we can't stop organized criminal gangs from bringing in shiploads of people, how do we propose to stop them from bringing in shiploads of AK-47's?

In many cases, illegal alien smuggling gangs are involved in the drug trade, too. If we haven't stopped aliens or drugs, how would we stop guns? All we do by pressing gun control is offer another false hope of urban peace to our constituents, while, in reality, the administration's implicit message of tolerance for drug use—and concurrent programmatic cuts and redirections—promise more violence in the future, not less.

But the constitutional and practical aspects of gun control are not the objects of my discussion today. What gun control is, is the politician's equivalent of the magician's gestures—we are intended to be distracted by the gestures, so that we don't notice what is really going on.

I will not be distracted. Mr. President, we cannot afford to surrender. Losing the war on drugs cannot be blamed on anything but this administration's attitude, its helter-skelter approach to drug policy, and an apparent underlying distaste for strong eradication, interdiction, and domestic enforcement measures.

69-059 O—97 Vol. 139 (Pt. 17) 45

It's their watch now, they are responsible, and they are laying the foundations for a serious national disaster.

Mr. President, after the new drug strategy is in fact released to the public, I will have more to say. I want to have the opportunity to review the policy itself, not just published reports about it.

I appreciate the kind attention of my colleagues to my remarks on this very important topic. I hope that those with whom I have labored on this issue will respond with as much outrage and concern as I have over this administration's implicit message and apparent abandonment of the battle against illegal drug use.

It would be very useful if, during the course of our debate over the crime bill, we could take a detailed look at this subject and try very hard to change the administration's course. Remember, the last place we were encouraged to declare victory and go home from was South Vietnam, and no place called South Vietnam can be found on the map today.

Unlike South Vietnam, we live here. There is no place else for us to go. Either we win here, or our Nation dies.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 19, 1993]

WAR OVER THE DRUG WAR

Among the many endeavors the United States government has undertaken, few have been more frustrating than the war against drugs. True, there have been some successes in transforming social attitudes toward drugs, which have in turn led to a decline in drug use among some groups. But the sickeningly regular reports about drug crimes here and in big cities throughout the country speak far more to failure. The evidence suggests that neither the street price nor the purity of drugs has been much affected by all the commotion. This is not a war the United States is winning.

The hard truth is that all the interdiction and police efforts in the world will not make a dent in this problem as long as so many Americans, many of them poor, fall into the grip of addiction. This is, and always has been, primarily a domestic problem, rooted in other social problems.

But as long as drugs remain illegal, the federal government will feel obligated to stop the criminals who sell them. That is the inspiration behind the large military expenditures for operations against drug producers in countries such as Peru, Bolivia and Guatemala. It is the reason so many Coast Guard resources are directed toward keeping drugs from reaching American shores.

Frustration over past failures is pushing both the Clinton administration and Democrats in Congress toward a reappraisal of where anti-drug money should be spent. To the frustration of the Customs Service and the Coast Guard, the administration is considering a major shift in resources away from interdiction efforts nearer our borders and toward more military aid to destroy cocaine labs and disrupt trafficking organizations in South America. Democrats in Congress have gone farther, voting sharp cuts in State Department funds that support Central and South American anti-drug activities. "We've spent over $1 billion down there and we've accomplished virtually nothing," Sen. Patrick Leahy (D-Vt.) told The Post's Michael Isikoff. "We ought to realize it's not going to work and call it quits."

The biggest difficulty in "calling it quits" involves American commitments to South American governments that have shown real courage in taking on drug traffickers. If aid is cut from the military programs, should it be transferred to economic development programs aimed at shifting farmers in drug-producing countries to other lines of work? Would this money do any more than the money that's already been spent on the military programs? There is also the fear among drug enforcement agencies that cutting back on efforts to interdict and disrupt drugs would simply make the criminal syndicates even bolder.

Yet it's impossible not to share Mr. Leahy's frustration and wonder whether all the high-tech military operations aren't finally a distraction from the real issues: weaning addicts on our streets away from drugs and keeping young people from becoming addicts in the first place. That's why it's hard to understand why Congress and the administration have agreed to cuts in education and treatment programs that President Clinton has praised so often. Unless these issues are addressed better than they have been, the war on drugs will remain a quagmire.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 1, 1993]

WAR OVER THE DRUG WAR

The Sept. 19 editorial "War Over the Drug War" only scratched the surface of the major offensive against the war on drugs that began in January.

The first indication that there would be a war against the war on drugs was the new Clinton White House's suspension, or at least delay, of preemployment drug testing of White House employees. While it might be easy to dismiss these actions as mismanagement, preemployment drug screening had been standard procedure for years. In retrospect, the White House attitude toward preemployment drug testing was a clear indicator of the White House position on drug-control policy.

Then came the Democratic House leadership eliminating the House Select Committee on Narcotics. While eliminating the subcommittee may seem insignificant, it cleared the way for additional assaults on the drug war. The next came when the White House cut the staff of the Office of Drug Policy Control—the Drug Czar's office—from 146 people to 25 to just 15. With the House Select Committee on Narcotics gone and with the cuts coming before the new Drug Czar took office, there was no official legislative or executive branch organization to protest the cuts.

Then came the budget battle and the White House directing congressional Democrats to cut $131 million from drug-education programs and $100 million from drug-treatment programs. Making the cuts was easy because the Select Committee on Narcotics had been eliminated, the staff of the Drug Czar's office had been gutted and the position of the 'Drug Czar', which candidate Bill Clinton said he would raise to a Cabinet-level position, was still vacant.

The assault on the war on drugs is not only continuing, it is picking up speed. The White House, even before the release of Vice President Al Gore's reinventing government proposal, has been promoting the suggestion that the Drug Enforcement Administration's independent agency status be eliminated and that the DEA be absorbed by the FBI. Meanwhile, the attorney general's office is reviewing the criminal penalties for drug offenses.

Eradication efforts—the programs to eliminate coca fields and cocaine labs in South America—are also under assault. The editorial notes that "Democrats in Congress have gone farther, voting sharp cuts in State Department funds that support Central and South American anti-drug activities." Not only are the eradication programs being cut, but now, with the apparent support of Sen. Patrick Leahy and other Democratic leaders in Congress, the Clinton administration also is considering a major shift in resources away from interdiction.

There is a major war against the war on drugs, and unfortunately, those who are against the war on drugs, which includes the White House and many Democratic leaders, are winning. Those of us who want more drug-treatment programs, more and better drug-education programs in our schools and more effective international interdiction and eradication programs are losing.—Alex A. Des Roches, Burke.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 19, 1993]

WHITE HOUSE SHIFTS ANTI-DRUG FOCUS, BUT NOT FUNDS

(By Michael Isikoff)

Warning that the country is "still in the midst of a drug epidemic," the White House is planning to release a new anti-drug policy that calls for expanded emphasis on treatment and prevention, while pledging no new resources to carry out the tasks.

The new anti-drug strategy, drafted by White House Drug Control Policy Director Lee P. Brown's office, has been billed by administration officials as a change in direction from the law enforcement-oriented approaches of the past two Republican administrations. It targets hard-core abusers as the "principal" focus of federal efforts and proposed moving treatment programs for addicts "to the forefront of our drug abuse policy," according to a draft copy of the statement obtained by The Washington Post.

But the new strategy does not propose shifting any funds in the federal government's $13 billion anti-drug budget or recommend the elimination of any particular law enforcement or interdiction programs. Instead, it emphasizes already announced initiative contained in a crime bill now before Congress. Those initiatives include a waiting period for handgun purchases, a ban on semiautomatic assault weapons and funding for new "community policing" programs that will put more officers on the streets.

Clinton administration officials acknowledged the strategy was largely rhetorical, noting that precise levels of funding for anti-drug programs will not be known until the president releases next year's budget.

But critics quickly pounced on the policy as a largely meaningless document already undermined by congressional budget cuts, accepted by administration officials, in prevention and treatment programs.

"It's shockingly vacuous," said John P. Walters, who served as deputy White House anti-drug director during the Bush administration. "There's no shift [in resources] here. It doesn't have any objectives, it doesn't have any goals. It's a waste of everybody's time."

Administration officials said yesterday that at the last minute the drug office included general language requested by the National Security Council proposing a shift away from drug interdiction in the transit zones of Central America and the Caribbean. As part of that shift, the strategy will emphasize U.S. support for counter-narcotics programs in the "source" countries of Latin

America, focusing those efforts on what it calls "democratic institution-building of law enforcement and judicial institutions."

The policy is being released at a time when the Clinton administration is coming under increasing attack for failing to pay enough attention to the nation's drug problem. Although casual drug use among the middle class has declined markedly, these critics note, recent government figures show that hospital emergency room visits for cocaine and heroin overdoses have reached all-time highs—one sign that hard-core addiction has failed to diminish.

The strategy, to be formally released when Brown testifies before the Senate Judiciary Committee on Wednesday, concludes that the Nation's drug problem is as "daunting" as ever, noting that 1.1 million abusers are unable to receive treatment because there is no room in existing programs.

The strategy proposes to "aggressively" reduce this figure and touts the president's health care package as one means of expanding treatment services. But Ellen Weber, co-director of the Legal Action Center, a public interest lobbying group that focuses on drug issues, said the administration's proposal is "very troubling" and provides no coverage for long-term residential programs that hard-core addicts need most.

Brown yesterday declined to be interviewed, saying through a spokesman he wanted to wait until the strategy is formally released.

Rep John Conyers Jr. (D-Mich.), chairman of the House Government Operations Committee, called it "a step in the right direction," but added: "The real question * * * is what the lofty goals mean in terms of anti-drug program dollars" in light of recent cuts in Brown's staff and some treatment programs.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 18, 1993]

MARIJUANA MAKES A COMEBACK—ARRESTS HERE ARE UP BY 19 PERCENT FOR DRUG THAT WAS ON THE WANE

(By Dan Beyers and Avis Thomas-Lester)

Marijuana use in the Washington area appears to be surging after years of decline, fueled in large part by the drug's renaissance among young people, new evidence suggests.

An array of recent statistics on arrests, drug seizures, emergency room admissions and court-administered drug tests indicates that marijuana use is approaching levels not seen since the mid-1980s, when smoking marijuana laced with the hallucinogen PCP was common in several parts of the Washington area.

Last year, marijuana-related arrests in the District and Fairfax, Montgomery and Prince George's counties were up 19 percent from 1991, reaching 3,198, or an average of almost nine a day, according to police in those four jurisdictions.

The numbers are still climbing. In Prince George's County, police said they have arrested 221 people for marijuana possession and distribution in the first six months of this year, a 65 percent jump from the same period in 1992 and twice the number arrested in all of 1989. They said they also have seized $2.8 million worth of the drug during the same period, a fourfold increase over the first half of last year.

In Montgomery County, marijuana-related arrests are up 6 percent for the first eight months of this year, and about $1 million worth of the drug has been seized so far, double the value of all Montgomery seizures in 1992.

Police in Fairfax County said their 1993 arrest rate for marijuana is running at the 1992 level; last year, Fairfax reported 627 marijuana arrests, nearly twice the number made in 1988.

The District said its 1993 arrest figures were unavailable, but Phil O'Donnell, the deputy police chief who commands the narcotics and special investigations unit in the District, said city police seized twice as much marijuana through May of this year—$974,000 worth—as they did in all of 1991.

"For a while, because of all the law enforcement, cocaine got scarce. Because it was scarce, some people went back to marijuana,' O'Donnell said in an interview earlier this year.

"It is everywhere we turn right now," said Lt. Don Lenhart, who supervises vice and narcotics operations in Fairfax. "We're even finding it when we raid [suspected] crack houses."

Howard County police announced Friday that authorities had broken up a major marijuana ring operating in central Maryland that was believed to be distributing 250 pounds of the illicit drug a month. Three Anne Arundel County men have been arrested so far, and one has been charged under the state's "drug kingpin" statute.

As part of that operation, police seized 41 pounds of marijuana and $230,000 in cash and securities as they executed 28 search warrants in Baltimore and five counties.

Hospitals in the Washington area have reported a 32 percent increase in the number of marijuana users seeking emergency treatment in 1992, an average of 10 people a month. Many patients said they also were using more dangerous drugs, which specialists say probably worsened their health problems.

Drug specialists said a compelling piece of evidence that marijuana use is on the rise is coming out of the District, where drug tests given to recent arrestees are showing higher rates of marijuana use.

Juvenile use is rising the fastest, reaching its highest levels since the tests were first administered in 1986, according to the D.C. Pretrial Services Agency.

Forty-five percent of the 255 youths who voluntarily submitted to drug tests in August tested positive for marijuana; 49 percent tested positive for drug use overall. Two years ago, only 10 percent of all arrested juveniles tested positive for marijuana in the month of August.

The last statistic "is probably the most telling," said Clare Mundell, who has long tracked Washington drug trends for the University of Maryland's Center of Substance Abuse Research. "It is irrefutable evidence that marijuana use is on the rise among the juvenile criminal population."

Last week, an official of the center told a special legislative committee that a study of teenagers in two state detention centers showed young people turning away from cocaine and toward marijuana and PCP.

"There is evidence of a new epidemic in marijuana and PCP," said Eric Wish, of the center. "It's almost like people are saying, 'Thank God it's not crack anymore.'"

Marijuana long has been the most popular illegal drug with young people, and authorities have been predicting for some time that a new surge is around the corner. Marijuana also may be finding favor now because today's generation of young people came of age in a decade dominated first by the ravages of PCP and then crack cocaine, according to police, social workers and other drug specialists.

"Cocaine and PCP scared a lot of people," said George Koch, a Maryland State Police analyst who studies marijuana trends. "Marijuana is seen as less of a threat, more acceptable by society."

That image is being reinforced by pop culture, where favorable references to marijuana are appearing increasingly in music of all tastes—from heavy metal to rap—and at colleges, where the legalization of marijuana is being debated.

Some street vendors and trendy boutiques said they did a brisk business during the summer selling T-shirts and caps adorned with a marijuana leaf or marijuana-related slogans. Some even sold hemp clothes made from marijuana plants.

Clothing printed with marijuana emblems is now turning up in high schools.

"Most of the kids say they are wearing the shirts because it is part of the style these days," said Frank Stetson, principal of DuVal High School in Prince George's County. "For whatever reason, it is still a concern."

Like other principals in the area, Stetson said he usually tells the students to turn their offending T-shirts inside out or to cover the slogans with a jacket or another shirt.

"Ninety percent of the time, when you ask them what they think their parents would say, the students will immediately turn their shirts inside out," said Stephen Tarason, principal of John F. Kennedy High School in Montgomery. "But there's always the 10 percent who say their parents already know what they are wearing."

In addition to making a fashion statement, young people are using a new way to smoke marijuana—splitting open an inexpensive cigar called a Phillies Blunt and filling it with marijuana. In a May survey of 22 recent arrestees conducted by the D.C. Pretrial Services Agency, all but one of the District youths said they smoked marijuana in cigars. Sales of the Blunt brand cigars have tripled in the last year, according to one area wholesaler.

Some young users say they consider their use of marijuana to be harmless, and even preferable to the other trouble they could get into.

"I won't try crack or rock, because crack kills. You learn that from commercials and TV," said a 16-year-old girl from Gaithersburg, who said she started smoking marijuana a year ago, often in Blunts. "Marijuana gives you an inner peace. It makes you want to sit back and listen to music, or pig out with friends, instead of getting into trouble."

"For me, marijuana is just like alcohol. No worse," said another Gaithersburg youth, a 15-year-old boy who said he tried his first joint earlier this summer. "You hear about it through the music. It's part of what is happening."

The two Gaithersburg teenagers, whose names are being withheld at their parents' request, said they are currently receiving counseling for their drug use and other behavior problems. Their counselor, Vita Noble, said she is skeptical of claims that marijuana keeps young people out of more serious trouble. She said several of her young clients have become involved in scrapes and other violent encounters while high on marijuana.

"Marijuana drops all the guards," Noble said. "These kids tend to lack fear when they are high, and they are less afraid of confrontation. They seem to attract violence like a magnet."

Noble said she also is worried that the marijuana use could lead to more destructive behavior if it goes unchecked, and it

may even stir the youths to try more dangerous drugs in the future.

"I am concerned that we may see the cycle repeating itself with this generation," Noble said. "Marijuana use raises a lot of red flags."•

CANAAN BAPTIST CHURCH

• Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Canaan Baptist Church, in my hometown of Flint, MI, on the occasion of the 69th anniversary of the church's founding. From humble beginnings in November 1924, the church has seen tremendous growth as the result of the dedication and hard work of the pastors and congregation.

Many distinguished leaders in the Flint community are now or have been members of this great congregation and there have been many significant events in Canaan Baptist Church's history.

The church was greatly blessed by the arrival of the Rev. Willie M. Duncan in 1979. Under Reverend Duncan's guidance and vision, the size of the congregation increased, the facilities were improved, and community outreach programs were expanded.

Earlier this year, on May 28, 1993, Canaan suffered a great loss with Reverend Duncan's untimely death. While he will be greatly missed, the congregation will continue to be inspired by the memory of his leadership, commitment, and dedication.

Because of their devotion, faithfulness, and commitment, the members of Canaan Baptist Church have touched countless lives and helped numerous people; and I am honored to pay tribute to them for their commitment and effort.•

DURUM SEMOLINA WHEAT

• Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, an issue recently raised in the press and media affects companies and workers as well as consumers in my home State of New York. It involves the importation of Durum Semolina wheat from Canada by pasta manufacturers in New York, particularly in Buffalo. The issue was a subject of a Wall Street Journal guest article by James Bovard; a copy of which is included following my remarks. It was also the subject of a question on ABC TV's "This Week With David Brinkley" to U.S. Trade Representative Mickey Kantor by Sam Donaldson.

The effort to grant emergency quotas on wheat imports from Canada essentially is an effort to truncate the normal review process of such matters. A full review would take into consideration adverse consequences as well as potential benefits such a decision would cause. The recommendation to expedite this decision is reported to be ready by the Secretary of Agriculture as a representative of the administration.

I am concerned that the curtailing of affordable Durum Semolina wheat will have a negative effect on pasta production in the United States and put domestic producers at a price competitive disadvantage to imports from abroad. Ironically, low cost imports from abroad are made from U.S.-subsidized wheat shipped overseas and returned as low-cost pasta products to the United States. If the result of the emergency decision to limit these imports causes domestic pasta companies to pay higher prices for domestic wheat, not only will prices rise, but layoffs will occur in the face of predatory competition from abroad.

A precipitous decision seems not to serve the purposes of American consumers or American industry. Should not such a policy be reviewed by the numbers and in regular order, not be pushed through as an emergency measure.

In referring to the Wall Street Journal article, I do not ascribe to Mr. Bovard's implications or his attribution of motivation for calls for restrictions. But it is obvious that the success of bilateral agreements depends on both the enforcement and follow-through of the presumed goodwill of such agreements. This is particularly important as we approach final consideration of NAFTA and further negotiations of GATT.

A full review of the issues surrounding the Canadian wheat imports would go a great distance in clarifying the overall national interest as well as the interests of the United States producers and consumers.

There is no real reason for a quick fix; such attempts will be subject to misinterpretation. A full review would provide the opportunity for all parties to be heard and an equitable result for all parties.

I ask that a copy of the Wall Street Journal article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The article follows:

[From The Wall Street Journal, Oct. 15, 1993]

OUR WHEAT WAR WITH CANADA

(By James Bovard)

The Clinton administration is on the brink of imposing emergency quotas on wheat imports from Canada. If Mr. Clinton succumbs to this protectionist temptation, once again pandering to congressional pressure, it could result in a Canadian rejection of Nafta and a collapse of U.S. credibility in the GATT negotiations. Restricting wheat imports could also destroy American food manufacturing jobs.

Durum wheat, the bone of this trade conflict, is used for pasta, certain cereals and some Italian breads. Imports of Canadian durum have increased in recent years and now account for roughly 20% of U.S. consumption. To add insult to supposed injury, Canadian durum wheat is often of higher quality thanks to superior Canadian grain-handling practices. Naturally, the perfidious imports have sparked outrage on Capitol Hill—and the White House appears to have jumped on the bandwagon.

Sen. Max Baucus (D., Mont.) proclaimed "Canadian [unfair trade] practices put Japan to shame." Nine farm-state senators sent a letter to Agriculture Secretary Mike Espy on Sept. 9 demanding an "immediate initiation . . . of trade action to restrict U.S. imports of Canadian wheat." Undersecretary of Agriculture, Gene Moos, told the Senate Agriculture Committee on Sept. 21 that he had formally recommended that the president "consider an emergency proclamation establishing quotas on the import of Canadian wheat," and U.S. Trade Representative Mickey Kantor declared that "we're looking at moving very quickly on the [proposal for import quotas on] wheat."

Farm-state senators have picked an unfortunate time to denounce imports, since U.S. durum wheat prices—roughly $4.50 a bushel—are far above federal target prices (prices picked by congressmen to guarantee most full-time farmers a generous profit). But the reason that politicians are clamoring now is that they smell a chance to cut a deal with Mr. Clinton. Some senators are trying to ransom their votes to open the border with Mexico via Nafta with a Clinton administration promise to close the border to Canada.

While northern Midwest senators busily denounce Canadian imports, their states actually may be hurt more by the sharp cutbacks in wheat production caused by federal acreage idling programs.

U.S. production of durum wheat has nosedived since 1981, falling from 5.8 million acres annually to just over two million acres in 1983. The Conservation Reserve Program (CRP), under which the government pays farmers to idle their land for 10 years, is the largest single set-aside program. Sen. Kent Conrad (D., N.D.) complained in 1992 that the CRP has "absolutely wiped out small town after small town as we took land out of production." North Dakota farmers may be enraged by the durum imports in part because, while Canadian farmers are planting fence-row-to-fencerow, much of the U.S. farmland that could produce durum wheat has been semi-permanently shut down by the CRP.

Even though U.S. farmers are not even growing enough durum to meet U.S. consumption, the U.S. government is still spending lavishly to dump U.S. durum wheat on world markets. The U.S. will subsidize the exports of more than 30 million bushels of durum wheat this year—roughly equal to the amount of Canadian imports. On Sept. 23, the Agriculture Department announced massive subsidies of durum wheat exports to South Africa—entitling American taxpayers to pay a subsidy of $1.75 per bushel for the export of wheat. The department will spend roughly $700 million to dump wheat on world markets this year. Wheat export subsidies have become so generous that they are undercutting unsubsidized exports of U.S. corn.

The combination of falling U.S. production of durum and artificially increased demand for durum caused by export subsidies has driven the U.S. durum price above the world price. Naturally, the high prices have been a signal to foreign producers that the U.S. market needs more durum.

If the U.S. restricts Canadian wheat imports, the U.S. price of durum will likely spike higher. This would put American pasta makers at an even greater disadvantage against imports. Foreigners can buy U.S. wheat much more cheaply than can American food manufacturers. U.S. imports of pasta and pasta products have more than doubled since 1985, when the Agriculture Department began dumping U.S. wheat on the world market at fire-sale prices. The U.S.

lavishly subsidized durum exports to Turkey, where the wheat was processed into pasta and exported back to the U.S. Industry experts predict that if Mr. Clinton restricts Canadian wheat imports, some U.S. pasta-making plants could move to Canada.

U.S. senators are loudly denouncing Canadians for exporting subsidized wheat. But in 1991, federal farm policy forced American taxpayers and consumers to pay wheat farmers subsidies equal to 78% of the total value of the wheat produced in the U.S., according to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. Federal farm policy has turned wheat production—a historic American strength—into a heavy burden on the national economy.

Rather than disputing over a few bushels of Canadian imports, the debate should focus on how the U.S. government has turned wheat production into a perpetual burden on American taxpayers. Prior to the federal takeover of agriculture in the 1930s, American wheat farmers were a symbol of national pride. Nowadays, federal subsidies per full-time wheat farmer far exceed what the U.S. government is providing per household of food stamp recipients.

Unfortunately, "the wheat industry is in serious decline," as Bruce Weber of Cargill Inc., the nation's largest grain exporter, complained last year. Stephanie Patrick of Cargill observed that the decline in wheat exports is "reflected in the virtual closing of the Texas Gulf, a region once dense with wheat-export facilities and the jobs that went with them."

The U.S. would be unwise to treat Canada like some kind of lop-eared hound dog that can be kicked with impunity. Canada is the U.S.'s most important trading partner, and the Canadian government has promised to retaliate against the U.S. for any restrictions on durum imports. Support for Nafta in Canada is already anemic, and one more U.S. protectionist action against Canadian imports could spell Nafta's demise.

Mr. Clinton should not export the U.S. food manufacturing industry by restricting wheat imports. Buying votes for Nafta by imposing import quotas on Canadian wheat would be like someone pawning his automobile to pay for a tankload of gasoline.●

BETHUNE-COOKMAN COLLEGE

● Mr. MACK. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate considered and approved the conference report on the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education appropriations bill. In this context, I would like to take a few moments to highlight an important project at Bethune-Cookman College, a historically black college in Daytona Beach, FL. I appreciate the previous comments made by the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education on the merits of this project, although I am disheartened that no funds were provided to the college for this fiscal year.

Over the last 6 years, Bethune-Cookman College has undertaken a plan to construct the Mary McLeod Bethune Memorial Fine Arts Center named in honor of Mary McLeod Bethune, the founder and first president of the college. The center will house a much-needed performing arts auditorium, a conference center and training facility. The college's hotel, motel, restaurant, and club management training program, currently administered out of a portable classroom, will be permanently housed in this facility and will provide hands-on professional management training to minority students. The new center will serve 1,000 additional students, most of whom come from low-income families.

The fine arts center will also serve a national and international constituency. The student body at Bethune-Cookman represents almost all 50 States as well as many countries around the world. The new facility, with its 3,000-seat auditorium, will host national and international conferences and meetings representing varied social and academic interests.

Phase I of the fine arts center has been completed. Last year, phase II of the project—construction, maintenance, and endowment of the center—was authorized. Recognizing the important role historically black colleges and universities, such as Bethune-Cookman, play in our young people's lives, President Clinton requested $12.5 million to fund phase II in his fiscal year 1994 investment package for education. Unfortunately, because of competing priorities, the Mary McLeod Bethune Memorial Fine Arts Center was not funded this year.

I appreciate that Chairman HARKIN is prepared to revisit the issue of funding for phase II of this center in future years. I am mindful of the budget constraints the Congress currently faces, an the importance of prioritizing initiatives for Federal funding. With this in mind, I remain hopeful that the Congress will recognize the tremendous benefits this project will have for our young people, and, as a result, will fund this project as a priority item next year.●

ORDERS FOR TOMORROW

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in recess until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, October 20; that following the prayer the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date; that the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; and that the Senate then resume consideration of H.R. 3116, the Department of Defense appropriations bill.

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

RECESS UNTIL TOMORROW AT 9:30 A.M.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate today, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess as previously ordered.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 8:27 p.m., recessed until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 20, 1993, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 19, 1993:

U.S. INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

MARK L. SCHNEIDER, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, VICE JAMES HENRY MICHEL, RESIGNED.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING U.S. ARMY RESERVE OFFICERS FOR PROMOTION TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTIONS 593(A), 3371 AND 3384, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. DONALD F. CAMPBELL [redacted]
BRIG. GEN. PETER W. CLEGG [redacted]
BRIG. GEN. LINDSAY M. FREEMAN [redacted]
BRIG. GEN. LEONARD L. HOCH [redacted]
BRIG. GEN. THOMAS P. JONES [redacted]
BRIG. GEN. HOWARD T. MOONEY [redacted]
BRIG. GEN. THOMAS J. PLEWES [redacted]
BRIG. GEN. RICHARD F. REEDER [redacted]
BRIG. GEN. RICHARD E. STORAT [redacted]
BRIG. GEN. FRANCIS D. TERRELL [redacted]
BRIG. GEN. JOHN M. VEST [redacted]
BRIG. GEN. ROBERT H.G. WAUDBY [redacted]

To be brigadier general

COL. MICHAEL E. DUNLAVEY [redacted]
COL. JAMES L. BAUERLE [redacted]
COL. MELVIN R. JOHNSON [redacted]
COL. BRUCE B. BINGHAM [redacted]
COL. MICHAEL R. MAYO [redacted]
COL. ROBERT J. WINZINGER [redacted]
COL. JOHN G. KULHAVI [redacted]
COL. RODNEY D. RUDDOCK [redacted]
COL. ROBERT L. LENNON [redacted]
COL. JOHN J. GREEN, JR [redacted]
COL. JAMES C. LARSON [redacted]
COL. CLIFFORD L. MASSENGALE [redacted]
COL. ROBERT A. LEE [redacted]
COL. NORMAN B. BURDETT [redacted]

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR PERMANENT PROMOTION IN THE U.S. AIR FORCE, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 628, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, AS AMENDED, WITH DATE OF RANK TO BE DETERMINED BY THE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE.

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

To be colonel

ROBERT G. WORTHINGTON [redacted]

THE FOLLOWING OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 531, WITH A VIEW TO DESIGNATION UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 8067, TO PERFORM DUTIES INDICATED WITH GRADE AND DATE OF RANK TO BE DETERMINED BY THE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE PROVIDED THAT IN NO CASE SHALL THE FOLLOWING OFFICERS BE APPOINTED IN A HIGHER GRADE THAN THAT INDICATED.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonel

SAMAR K. BHOWMICK [redacted]
DAVID A. DIORIO [redacted]
DAVID T. RIGDON [redacted]

To be lieutenant colonel

RAYMOND T. BARBERA [redacted]
JERRY M. DAVENPORT [redacted]
KENNETH R. DAVIS [redacted]
WILLIAM C. SMITH [redacted]
FORREST C. YANCEY, JR [redacted]

To be major

CHRISTIAN R. BENJAMIN [redacted]
ALAN B. BERG [redacted]

To be captain

JAMES P. BONAR [redacted]

DENTAL CORPS

To be colonel

PAUL A. EDWARDS [redacted]

To be lieutenant colonel

JOSEPH A. BARTOLONI, JR [redacted]

STEVEN B. BLANCHARD [redacted]
MICHAEL F. SHEDLOSKY [redacted]
MICHAEL W. SMITH, [redacted]

To be major

VINCENT J. TAKACS, [redacted]
ROBERT P. WOLFENDEN, [redacted]

THE FOLLOWING INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINTMENT AS RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE, IN GRADE INDICATED, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 593, WITH A VIEW TO DESIGNATION UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 8067, TO PERFORM THE DUTIES INDICATED.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

GERALD L. GUYER [redacted]
VICTOR H. MACINTOSH [redacted]

THE FOLLOWING AIR FORCE OFFICERS FOR PERMANENT PROMOTION IN THE U.S. AIR FORCE, IN ACCORDANCE WITH TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTIONS 624 AND 1552, WITH DATE OF RANK TO BE DETERMINED BY THE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE.

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

To be colonel

DAVID F. ANTOON [redacted]

To be major

ERNEST G. WEEKS [redacted]

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE U.S. OFFICERS FOR PROMOTION IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, U.S.C. SECTIONS 593(A) AND 3385:

ARMY PROMOTION LIST

To be colonel

THOMAS N. BORDNER [redacted]
JASPER CARPENTER [redacted]
KENNETH E. COTTRILL [redacted]
THOMAS W. DALTON, JR. [redacted]
CARROLL L. EDGE [redacted]
DONALD R. FRANKLAND [redacted]
JON J. GIDDINGS [redacted]
RANDALL C. GRAHAM [redacted]
DONALD W. HRYNYSHYN [redacted]
JAMES A. KLYNSTRA [redacted]
THOMAS E. LITTLE [redacted]
MELVIN G. PFENDER [redacted]
OSCAR L. RAMOS-MELENDEZ [redacted]
TERRELL T. REDDICK [redacted]
ANDREW M. SCHUSTER [redacted]
JAMES L. SMITH [redacted]
LYNN R. STREMME [redacted]

THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS

To be colonel

GERALD D. GALLOWAY [redacted]

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

To be colonel

HARRY K. CRAFT [redacted]

ARMY NURSE CORPS

To be colonel

MAYO P. MORRIS [redacted]

ARMY PROMOTION LIST

To be lieutenant colonel

KEITH J. BOBENMOYER [redacted]
BARBARANETTE T. BOLDEN [redacted]
LEON C. BOWLIN [redacted]
WENDELL F. BRAXTON [redacted]
LARRY J. DAUGHTRY [redacted]
JOSEPH P. DEJOHN [redacted]
ROY L. DRAKE, JR. [redacted]
BRUCE N. ECKERSON [redacted]
THOMAS D. EDWARDS [redacted]
JAMES R. LAPPANA [redacted]
RHETT C. LEARY [redacted]
EUGENE C. MARTIN [redacted]
EDWARD M. MCCLURE [redacted]
PAUL D. MCKITTRICK [redacted]
RAFAEL A. MURIEL, JR. [redacted]
CASSEL J. NUTTER, JR. [redacted]
ANTHONY J. OCONNOR [redacted]
JOSEPH J. POPTIC, II [redacted]
LAWRENCE H. ROSS [redacted]
ROBERT J. STAIERT [redacted]

THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

FRANK M. BREZINA [redacted]
WILLIAM J. RODEN [redacted]
KENNETH S. SOLLARS [redacted]

ARMY NURSE CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

LYNNETTE D. KENNISON [redacted]

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS OF THE MARINE CORPS RESERVE FOR APPOINTMENT INTO THE REGULAR MARINE CORPS UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 531:

To be captain

JEFFREY A. BAUMERT [redacted]
ERIC V. BRYANT [redacted]
THEODORE E. CALDWELL, JR. [redacted]
ELOY CAMPOS [redacted]
RICHARD E. CARRASCO [redacted]
ROBERT J. CHARETTE [redacted]
EDWIN B. COYL, III [redacted]
VINCENT S. CRUM [redacted]
MARSHALL DENNEY, II [redacted]
PATRICK D. FORD [redacted]
JOSEPH E. GEORGE [redacted]
ERIC C. HANLY [redacted]
DONALD K. HANSEN [redacted]
RICHARD G. JETHON [redacted]
ALAN D. LECLERC [redacted]
ERIC J. LEVESQUE [redacted]
BRIAN R. MCINTYRE [redacted]
MICHAEL A. OHALLORAN [redacted]
LAYTON R. PLUNKETT [redacted]
PAUL A. POND [redacted]
RICHARD R. RIDENOUR, JR. [redacted]
ROSS E. SCANIO [redacted]
WILLIAM R. SELLARS [redacted]
DOUGLAS T. STEELE [redacted]
THOMAS D. WEIDLEY [redacted]
JEFFREY R. WOODS [redacted]

To be first lieutenant

CHRISTOPHER J. CROTEAU [redacted]
DARRIN DENNY [redacted]
KENNETH E. ENNEY, JR. [redacted]
PAUL K. LITTLE, I [redacted]

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS OF THE REGULAR MARINE CORPS FOR APPOINTMENT AND DESIGNATION AS UNRESTRICTED OFFICERS IN THE REGULAR MARINE CORPS UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTIONS 531 AND 5589:

To be captain

FRANCIS E. CROUCHER [redacted]

To be first lieutenant

THOMAS W. HEASLEY [redacted]
JEFFREY A. RIPA [redacted]

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 531, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, WITH GRADE AND DATE OF RANK TO BE DETERMINED BY THE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE PROVIDED THAT IN NO CASE SHALL THE OFFICERS BE APPOINTED IN A GRADE HIGHER THAN CAPTAIN.

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

ABEL, KENNETH F [redacted]
ABEL, TERRY B [redacted]
ABRAHAM, ARNOLD J [redacted]
ABRAMSON, MARK A [redacted]
ADAM, TIMOTHY A [redacted]
ADAMES, MICHAEL F [redacted]
ADAMS, JORDAN C [redacted]
ADAMS, KIMBERLY A [redacted]
ADAMSON, PAUL L [redacted]
ADDINGTON, DALE R [redacted]
ADDISON, BENJAMIN W [redacted]
ADEE, REX E [redacted]
ADELSEN, KEVIN P [redacted]
ADRIAN, ANDREW J [redacted]
AGHAJANIAN, CARA A [redacted]
AGINS, DAVID M [redacted]
AGUSTIN, KENNEDY F [redacted]
AHERN, MATTHEW J [redacted]
AHERN, MICHAEL T [redacted]
AIKEN, DERRICK A [redacted]
AKERS, LORIN F [redacted]
AKIN, THOMAS E [redacted]
ALANIZ, ARCADIO JR [redacted]
ALDRICH, GARY E [redacted]
ALEXANDER, JAMES H [redacted]
ALEXANDER, MARK A [redacted]
ALICATA, THOMAS J. III [redacted]
ALLEN, DAVID R [redacted]
ALLEN, LANNIE C [redacted]
ALLEN, LLOYD W [redacted]
ALLEN, ROBERT B [redacted]
ALSTON, RUSSELL R [redacted]
ALVARADO, LAURANCE O [redacted]
AMOS, BRIAN D [redacted]
AMOS, JOSEPH D [redacted]
ANDERSON, ALBERT J [redacted]
ANDERSON, DAVID M [redacted]
ANDERSON, JEFFREY [redacted]
ANDERSON JOHN H [redacted]
ANDERSON, JON K [redacted]
ANDERSON, LARS C [redacted]
ANDERSON, TIMOTHY A [redacted]
ANDREAS, CRAIG A [redacted]
ANDREPONT, JANET A [redacted]
ANDRY, LINDA M [redacted]
ANTRIM, JOHN E [redacted]
APOSTOLIDES, JOHN E [redacted]
APPLEYARD, JAMES H. JR [redacted]
ARBOGAST, MARK A [redacted]
ARCH, TIMOTHY J [redacted]
ARMENTROUT, CHARLES F [redacted]
ARMITSTEAD, JOHN N [redacted]
ARMSTRONG, DOUGLAS A. [redacted]
ARNOLD, DIANE M [redacted]
ARNOLD, PRESTON F [redacted]
ARQUIETTE, STEVEN J [redacted]
ARRINGTON, WILLIAM H. III [redacted]
ARTHUR, WILLIAM C [redacted]
ASHE, DAVID J [redacted]
ASHLEY, MILE [redacted]
ASHMORE, MITCHELL B [redacted]
ASTRAN, ANTONIO A [redacted]
ATCHISON, GREGORY M [redacted]
ATKINS, DALE W [redacted]
AUSTIN, KURT L [redacted]
AVERY, MARK A [redacted]
BADURA, TODD A [redacted]
BAGWELL, WALTER S [redacted]
BAILEY, PETER C [redacted]
BAILEY, THOMAS N [redacted]
BAKER, BRADLEY R. [redacted]
BAKER, SCOTT W [redacted]
BAKER, TODD G [redacted]
BALDWIN, TODD K [redacted]
BALENTINE, BRADLEY J [redacted]
BALKE, JOHN J [redacted]
BALL, JAMES A. IV [redacted]
BALTES, RICHARD L [redacted]
BANIK, NEAL L [redacted]
BANKOS, BRENDAN EDWARD [redacted]
BANKS, RONALD L [redacted]
BANNACH, BRYAN E [redacted]
BARBER, GEORGE A. JR. [redacted]
BARKDULL, DAVID R [redacted]
BARKER, PAUL N [redacted]
BARLOW, KAREN L [redacted]
BARNES, DONALD A [redacted]
BARRETT, PATRICK E [redacted]
BARTELT, MARK N [redacted]
BARTHOLOMEW, CORY C [redacted]
BARTHOLOMEW, ROBERT L [redacted]
BARTON, PHILIP J [redacted]
BASTIN, DALE L [redacted]
BATES, DANIEL P [redacted]
BATES, STEVEN P [redacted]
BATHURST, TARA L [redacted]
BAUER, KENNETH J [redacted]
BAUER, PAUL D [redacted]
BAUGH, DALLAS A. JR [redacted]
BAUM, CATHERINE A [redacted]
BAXTER, PAUL A [redacted]
BAYESA, EVELYN M [redacted]
BAYNES, JOHN T. JR [redacted]
BEAL, LONNY E [redacted]
BEAN, DEBRA F [redacted]
BEARDEN, JAMES B [redacted]
BEASLEY, DAVID M [redacted]
BEAUCHAMP, ARTHUR F [redacted]
BECHT, THOMAS [redacted]
BECK, JOHN P [redacted]
BECKER, PHILIP J [redacted]
BEDNAR, MARK [redacted]
BEEBE, JAMES M [redacted]
BEEN, DAVID B [redacted]
BEERMAN, CHARLES T [redacted]
BEISSNER, JAMES J [redacted]
BELCHER, BRUCE C [redacted]
BELIC, JOHN E [redacted]
BELIVEAU, JON A [redacted]
BELL, JERI A [redacted]
BELL, ROBERT A [redacted]
BELLER, FRED W. JR [redacted]
BELLINGHAUSEN, DONALD F [redacted]
BELLISSIMO, DALE V [redacted]
BELLOWS, ERIC A [redacted]
BENDING, MICHAEL S [redacted]
BENEDETTO, GARY D [redacted]
BENEWAY, SANDRA J [redacted]
BENNETT, BARRY D. JR [redacted]
BENTLEY, KEVIN J [redacted]
BERG, CRAIG N [redacted]
BERGES, WILLIE A [redacted]
BERGMAN, KENNETH C [redacted]
BERNAL, BRENDA K [redacted]
BERRY, HARRY A [redacted]
BERTE, JOSEPH J., III [redacted]
BERTRAND, DANIEL L [redacted]
BESSEY, JUDD A [redacted]
BETHANY, DAVID ALLEN [redacted]
BETTINGER, JOHN G [redacted]
BIEGGER, JOHN D [redacted]
BIGGS, MARY E [redacted]
BILBREY, RANDALL C [redacted]
BILLINGS, RICHARD A [redacted]
BILLINGS, RICHARD J [redacted]
BIRGE, LINDA L. L [redacted]
BLACK, BRUCE A [redacted]
BLOCHER, CHARLES C [redacted]
BLOOM, PETER J [redacted]
BLUMHAGEN, ALAN L [redacted]
BOERNER, TIMOTHY J [redacted]
BOLIN, JOHN A [redacted]
BOLSTAD, BRADLEY J [redacted]
BONORDEN, JOE B [redacted]
BONTLY, GARY J [redacted]
BONTRAGER, MARK D [redacted]
BORDEN, RICK J [redacted]
BORDEN, STEVEN M [redacted]
BOSTON, ROBERT S [redacted]

BOUILLERCE, BRENDA M [redacted]
BOWEN, JAMES W [redacted]
BOWER, DAVID M [redacted]
BOYER, JAMES E [redacted]
BOYKIN, PATRICK H [redacted]
BOYSON, TUCK E [redacted]
BRADEN, PAUL E [redacted]
BRADFORD, RANDALL R [redacted]
BRADLEY, MARK T [redacted]
BRAND, MATTHEW C [redacted]
BRANDT, MARK D [redacted]
BRANSON, JAMES T [redacted]
BRANTING, JEFFREY C [redacted]
BREDVIK, DUWAYNE E [redacted]
BREED, DAVID SCOTT [redacted]
BREIER, JEFFREY [redacted]
BRENNAN, CHARLES R [redacted]
BRENNEMAN, KENNETH C [redacted]
BRENNER, DANA H [redacted]
BRETT, TIMOTHY C [redacted]
BRIDGES, KAREN M [redacted]
BRISTOW, DOUGLAS J [redacted]
BRITT, KEVIN A [redacted]
BROOKS, KIM R [redacted]
BROOKS, ROBERT T. JR [redacted]
BROWN, CRAIG E [redacted]
BROWN, DALE R [redacted]
BROWN, EDWARD B. JR [redacted]
BROWN, JEFFREY D [redacted]
BROWN, JEFFREY S [redacted]
BROWN, JON D [redacted]
BROWN, MARK A [redacted]
BROWN, MICHAEL D [redacted]
BROWN, MICHAEL E [redacted]
BROWN, MICHAEL E [redacted]
BROWN, RUSS J [redacted]
BROWN, SAMUEL J [redacted]
BROWN, TIMOTHY D [redacted]
BROYLES, DON E [redacted]
BRUNNER, DONALD L., JR [redacted]
BRUNS, JAMES W [redacted]
BRYAN, RICHARD G., JR [redacted]
BUBULKA, JOSEPH P [redacted]
BUCK, ALAN R [redacted]
BUCK, TED W [redacted]
BUCKLEY, DONALD H [redacted]
BUNCH, ROBERT D [redacted]
BURCHFIELD, RICHARD L [redacted]
BURGESS, SUSANNE S [redacted]
BURKET, ALAN [redacted]
BURNS, ALVIN C., JR [redacted]
BURNS, JOHN P [redacted]
BUSCH, WILLIAM C [redacted]
BUSENITZ, DAVID S [redacted]
BUTNER, ERIC A [redacted]
BUTZ, JOEL T [redacted]
CABIGAS, JOHN V [redacted]
CADDO, MATTHEW [redacted]
CADE, WILLIAM B. III [redacted]
CAINE, SCOTT P [redacted]
CALISTI, SCOTT R [redacted]
CALLAHAN, KATHLEEN D [redacted]
CALLAWAY, MICHAEL W [redacted]
CALVIN, JAMES B., JR [redacted]
CAMIRE, DAVID F [redacted]
CAMPBELLCURRIE, DAWN M [redacted]
CANDIA, AGUSTIN G [redacted]
CANFIELD, BRADY W [redacted]
CANNE, ARTHUR R [redacted]
CANTARANO, THOMAS S [redacted]
CANTOYA, CHARLES [redacted]
CANTWELL, ROBERT A [redacted]
CAPOBIANCO, JOHN J [redacted]
CAPPELLO, JOSEPH J., JR [redacted]
CARDENAS, MANUEL A [redacted]
CAREY, PAUL [redacted]
CAREY, THOMAS F [redacted]
CARLISLE, LEWIS H [redacted]
CARLSON, JOSEPH D [redacted]
CARON, STEVEN C [redacted]
CARR, MARY F [redacted]
CARRION, PETER A [redacted]
CARROLL, MICHAEL J [redacted]
CARTER, JOHN A [redacted]
CARTER, JOHN Y. G [redacted]
CASON, WINONA N [redacted]
CATO, DOUGLAS C., JR [redacted]
CAVE, PAUL E [redacted]
CECCHI, MARK J. [redacted]
CECIL, DANNY A [redacted]
CEDERHOLM, RICHARD A [redacted]
CHAI, WALTER S. D [redacted]
CHAISSON, KENNETH M [redacted]
CHAMBERS, LACEY JAIMAE T [redacted]
CHANDLER, DAVID B [redacted]
CHAPIN, MARK E [redacted]
CHAPMAN, GREGORY S [redacted]
CHAR, GLENN K. M [redacted]
CHARLES, FREDERIQ [redacted]
CHEATHAM, THOMAS N [redacted]
CHEBLI, WALID, T [redacted]
CHEEK, BRADY C [redacted]
CHERINKA, ROBERT E [redacted]
CHIAVACCI, THOMAS J [redacted]
CHISHOLM, MICHAEL R [redacted]
CHONG, UK [redacted]
CHRISTENSEN, VICTOR T [redacted]
CHRISTIAN, CATHLEEN C [redacted]
CISSELL, LEO D [redacted]
CLARK, RANDALL J [redacted]
CLARK, ROLAND D [redacted]
CLARK, STEPHEN A [redacted]
CLAYTON, MARK R [redacted]
CLAYTON, TIMOTHY R [redacted]
CLEVERINGA, SCOTT R [redacted]
CLIFTON, LYNDON E [redacted]
COBURN, KENNETH E [redacted]
COELHO, DANIEL J [redacted]
COFFINDAFFER, TERRY W [redacted]
COHEN, DONALD E [redacted]
COLAN, PETER W [redacted]
COLBY, DONALD R [redacted]
COLE, JOSEPH E [redacted]
COLLAT, MICHAEL L [redacted]
COLLETTA, JOHN E [redacted]
COLLINS, JAMES C [redacted]
COLLINS, RUSSELL S [redacted]
COLLINS, STEPHEN J [redacted]
COLPITTS, JEFFREY H [redacted]
COMER, SHARON L [redacted]
CONLON, EVELYNE M. TRAUB [redacted]
CONNELL, JOSEPH P [redacted]
CONNOLLY, MARK S [redacted]
CONNOR, CHARLES [redacted]
COOLEY, JACK R [redacted]
COPPER, CRAIG A [redacted]
COPPER, DEANNA L [redacted]
COPPER, LAWRENCE A [redacted]
COPE, LINDA L [redacted]
CORDERO, DAVID L [redacted]
COREY, STEPHEN R [redacted]
COREY, TOBY L [redacted]
CORK, HERBERT L. III [redacted]
CORKUM, DAVID B [redacted]
CORNELL, PATRICIA A [redacted]
CORNELL, WILLIAM F [redacted]
CORR, MICHAEL J [redacted]
CORRENTE, KAREN M [redacted]
COSTANZI, MICHAEL [redacted]
COSTELLO, DANIEL S. JR [redacted]
COTMAN, RICHARD M [redacted]
COURVILLE, SHANE P [redacted]
COWAN, JEFFREY L [redacted]
COWLES, STEVEN A [redacted]
COX, KEITH M [redacted]
COX, LAWRENCE J [redacted]
CRAIB, KENNETH B. JR [redacted]
CRAIG, KEVIN L [redacted]
CRAIG, ROBERT L [redacted]
CROTTY, FRANCIS M [redacted]
CULEK, EARL F [redacted]
CULLITON, JAMES W [redacted]
CUMMINGS, ERIK G [redacted]
CURRIE, PAMELA E [redacted]
CURRY, HARMON H. JR [redacted]
CUSICK, TODD E [redacted]
DAGHER DANNY F [redacted]
DAHLGREN, KEITH A [redacted]
DALIDA, ANTHONY C [redacted]
DALONZO, WILLIAM J [redacted]
DALRYMPLE, JENNIFER J [redacted]
DALY, JOHN P [redacted]
DANIELSON, GARY R [redacted]
DANNUNZIO, JOHN J [redacted]
DASTUR, KEITH R [redacted]
DAUGHERTY, ROGER L. JR [redacted]
DAVEY, TERENCE A [redacted]
DAVIS, DANIEL W [redacted]
DAVIS, HOWARD C [redacted]
DAVIS, JAMES A [redacted]
DAVIS, JEFFREY S [redacted]
DAVIS, KATHY B [redacted]
DAVIS, MICHEAL D [redacted]
DAVIS, RAYMOND E [redacted]
DEARY, DAVID S [redacted]
DEATON, GARY L [redacted]
DECKER, TODD [redacted]
DECOCO, BARRY J [redacted]
DEFENBACH, PHILIP S [redacted]
DEFRANZA, FREDERICK [redacted]
DEIHL, MONTGOMERY C [redacted]
DEIST, LAWRENCE R [redacted]
DEITZ, SCOTT E [redacted]
DEKAM, PETER F [redacted]
DELAGARZA, ENRIQUE T [redacted]
DELARGY, DANIEL M [redacted]
DELAUDER, BRADEN H [redacted]
DELEON, ARTHUR A [redacted]
DELTORO, ROBERT [redacted]
DEMARCO, NICHOLAS J [redacted]
DEMBY, BYRON G [redacted]
DEMKOWICA, KENNETH M [redacted]
DENMARK, CHARLES E [redacted]
DENNIS, JOSEPH B [redacted]
DENNISON, TIMOTHY J [redacted]
DEPALMA, RALPH A. JR [redacted]
DEPEW, STERLING P [redacted]
DESTASIO, ROBERT A [redacted]
DEVINCENZI, DEAN R [redacted]
DEVINE, LEO M [redacted]
DEWITT, MARK R [redacted]
DEYONKER, LEO G. III [redacted]
DICUS, CRAIG ALAN [redacted]
DIEKEMA, GARY L [redacted]
DIESING, WILLIAM E. III [redacted]
DIESSNER, STEVEN D [redacted]
DIETZIUS, STEVEN C [redacted]
DILLARD, JAMES E [redacted]
DILLON, MARY K [redacted]
DISHONG, DONALD J [redacted]
DIXON, BYRON L [redacted]
DOBSON, RHEA E [redacted]
COCKERY, WAYNE S [redacted]
DODSON, BRIAN M [redacted]
DODSON, ROCKSAND [redacted]
DOMBROWSKI, JOSEPH S [redacted]
DONNELLY, JAMES M [redacted]
DONOVAN, PATRICK H [redacted]
DOOLEY, LIAM NMN [redacted]
DORAZIO, PAUL A [redacted]
DOSTER, THOMAS R [redacted]
DOUBLE, PAUL T [redacted]
DOUCETTE, PAUL V [redacted]
DOUGLAS, ROBERT A [redacted]
DOWGWILLO, EDWARD A [redacted]
DOWLING, MARIA J [redacted]
DRAGUSH, GEORGE M. JR [redacted]
DRAKE, ARNOLD C [redacted]
DRAZIN, MORDECAI N [redacted]
DREHER, BERT L [redacted]
DREHER, JOHN P [redacted]
DRISCOLL, DANIEL A [redacted]
DRISCELL, MERVIN C [redacted]
DRODDY, VINCENT A [redacted]
DUCKETT, JR., DONALD P [redacted]
DUCROS, BERNARD J [redacted]
DUDGEON, JOSEPH L [redacted]
DUDLEY, TRENT O [redacted]
DUFFEK, BRIAN K [redacted]
DUGGER, STERLING K [redacted]
DUNCAN, ROBERT T [redacted]
DUNNING, GEORGE E. JR [redacted]
DUNNING, STEVEN W [redacted]
DUNPHY, THERESE C [redacted]
DURHAM, FORREST A [redacted]
DUROCHER, PHILLIP T [redacted]
DUSEK, THOMAS G [redacted]
EATON, DENNIS O [redacted]
EATON, MICHAEL R [redacted]
EDINGTON, STEVEN B [redacted]
EDRIDGE, NEIL A. D [redacted]
EDWARDS, MARK M [redacted]
EFFERSON, MICHAEL E [redacted]
EHLERS, ROBERT S. JR [redacted]
EICHHORN, TIMOTHY A [redacted]
EICHIN, MARK H [redacted]
EICKHOFF, CRAIG S [redacted]
EISERT, GERARD H [redacted]
ELDRIDGE, GOLDA JR [redacted]
ELIASON, SHERRY A [redacted]
ELIEL, ERIK H [redacted]
ELLIOTT, RAYMOND A [redacted]
ENGEL, CHARLES D [redacted]
ENGLE, JOSEPH M [redacted]
ENOLD, SCOTT A [redacted]
ENRIGHT, SCOTT B [redacted]
ERNEST, JON K., [redacted]
EROLIN, ALEXANDER A [redacted]
ERTELL, SETH B [redacted]
ESCHENBURG, LOYE M [redacted]
ESQUENAZI, JERRY [redacted]
ESS, RICHARD E [redacted]
ESTELL, TIMOTHY W [redacted]
EVERSOLE, JOSEPH L [redacted]
FARIAN, PAUL D [redacted]
FALCINELLI, GREGORY C [redacted]
FARAH, JOYCE D [redacted]
FARIES, JOSEPH C [redacted]
FARLEIGH, THOMAS H [redacted]
FARRAH, MICHAEL C [redacted]
FARRELL, JOSEPH P [redacted]
FARRELL, WILLIAM E [redacted]
FAULK, ROBERT S. JR [redacted]
FAVETTI, MARK T [redacted]
FAY, JENNIFER L [redacted]
FEATHER, LISA R [redacted]
FECTEAU, JEAN M [redacted]
FELLERS, RUSSELL D [redacted]
FERGUSON, RICHARD P [redacted]
FERNAU, JOHN C [redacted]
FERRARACCIO, CHRISTOPHER M [redacted]
FERRARO, JOSEPH S [redacted]
FETSCH, JOSEPH T [redacted]
FETTERS, CHARLES R [redacted]
FICK, MATTHEW P [redacted]
FIEDLER, WILLIAM A [redacted]
FIFIELD, STEPHEN F [redacted]
FILIPKOWSKI, VINCENT D [redacted]
FINGAR, WILLIAM JR [redacted]
FINK, MERRILL P [redacted]
FINNEFROCK, JODELLE A [redacted]
FISHEL, BRADLEY J [redacted]
FISHER, JAMES D [redacted]
FISHER, TYRON [redacted]
FITCHEN, CHRISTOPHER H [redacted]
FITZSIMMONS, FREDRIC S [redacted]
FITZSIMMONS, PETER G [redacted]
FITZWATER, BRIAN K [redacted]
FLANAGAN, JOHN M [redacted]
FLORENCE, JAMES A [redacted]
FLORY, JEFFREY J [redacted]
FLOWERS, BERNARD [redacted]
FLYNN, ROSS W [redacted]
FOLK, VICTOR R [redacted]
FOLSE, ELDRED J [redacted]
FONTANA, NEAL D [redacted]
FORG, WILLIAM B [redacted]
FORMAN, KEITH K [redacted]
FORNELL, GORDON E. JR [redacted]
FORREST, ERIC S [redacted]
FORSBACKA, MATTHEW J [redacted]
FORTE, JOHN A. JR [redacted]
FORTNEY, JOSEPH C [redacted]
FOSSUM, TERRY L [redacted]
FOSTER, THOMAS J [redacted]
FOTTER, JEFFREY A [redacted]

FOURMAN, DAVID L xxx-xx-...
FOX, KEVIN L xxx-xx-...
FOX, LAURENT J xxx-xx-...
FRANCKOWIAK, MICHAEL A xxx-xx-...
FRANE, JEFFREY J xxx-xx-...
FRASER, BERNADETTE J xxx-xx-...
FRASER, DARREN A xxx-xx-...
FREANEY, MARK S xxx-xx-...
FREDERICK, ALEXANDER A xxx-xx-...
FREELAND, MICHAEL C xxx-xx-...
FREEMAN, THOMAS H xxx-xx-...
FRENCH, JONATHAN xxx-xx-...
FRIES, BRENIER T. JR xxx-xx-...
FRISBIE, PATTI L xxx-xx-...
FRISKE, TIMOTHY W xxx-xx-...
FRITZ, JAMES L xxx-xx-...
FROEHLICH, CHRIS T xxx-xx-...
FRONCEK, FRANCIS X xxx-xx-...
FUOTI, FRANK C xxx-xx-...
FURCINI, STACY A.K xxx-xx-...
FURST, DOUGLAS A xxx-xx-...
FUST, ARNOLD xxx-xx-...
FYFE, GLENN C xxx-xx-...
GALANTE, VICTOR A xxx-xx-...
GALINDEZ, JUAN xxx-xx-...
GALLAGHER, BRYAN J xxx-xx-...
GALLAGHER, MICHAEL S xxx-xx-...
GALLOWAY, JOHN D xxx-xx-...
GAMBERA ROBERT J xxx-xx-...
GAMBLE, BRYAN V xxx-xx-...
GANT, RUFUS M. III xxx-xx-...
GARCIA, ANTHONY J xxx-xx-...
GARDINER, THEORDORE E xxx-xx-...
GARDNER, KEVIN L xxx-xx-...
GARDZINA, PETER M xxx-xx-...
GARLAND, PETER J xxx-xx-...
GARLAND, STEVEN D xxx-xx-...
GARNSEY, JEANNINE L xxx-xx-...
GARRETT, DAVID S xxx-xx-...
GARRETT, GREGORY xxx-xx-...
GARRETT, GREGORY xxx-xx-...
GARRETT, JAMES A xxx-xx-...
GAVINO, AMANDO B xxx-xx-...
GEARHART, MARTIN R xxx-xx-...
GEHRED, PAUL A xxx-xx-...
GENTRY, KERRY M xxx-xx-...
GEORGE, DAVID L xxx-xx-...
GEORGE, LAURA J xxx-xx-...
GEORGIADIS BASIL D xxx-xx-...
GERKEN, MARK J xxx-xx-...
GIBBS, DARREN R xxx-xx-...
GIBSON, DAVID J xxx-xx-...
GIBSON, DUANE D xxx-xx-...
GIBSON, STEPHEN B xxx-xx-...
GIEGLER, BERNARD L xxx-xx-...
GILES, DAVID P xxx-xx-...
GILLESPIE, DAVID L xxx-xx-...
GILLESPIE, FRANK M. JR xxx-xx-...
GINGELL, ROBERT J. J xxx-xx-...
GINGERY, MICHAEL E xxx-xx-...
GIRTIN, GREGG A xxx-xx-...
GIRTON, JANET A xxx-xx-...
GLASGOW, DAVID G. JR xxx-xx-...
GLASS, LAWERENCE F xxx-xx-...
GLEASON, DENNIS R xxx-xx-...
GOFF, JAMES R xxx-xx-...
GOODRICH, TERRY L xxx-xx-...
GOODWIN, RONALD R xxx-xx-...
GORDON, MITCHELL R xxx-xx-...
GORMAN, NANCY A xxx-xx-...
GORMAN, TODD D xxx-xx-...
GORSKI, GREGORY S xxx-xx-...
GOSHEN, LA VERN xxx-xx-...
GRADT, KEVIN A xxx-xx-...
GRAFTON, CLIFFORD S xxx-xx-...
GRAHAM, KEITH A xxx-xx-...
GRAHAM, SCOTT A xxx-xx-...
GRAHAM, WILLIAM V xxx-xx-...
GRAHN, CHARLES D xxx-xx-...
GRANDY, JAMES E xxx-xx-...
GRANT, STEVEN D xxx-xx-...
GRAVELLE, DEBRA J xxx-xx-...
GRAY, MARK A xxx-xx-...
GRAY, STEVEN G xxx-xx-...
GRECO, MICHAEL J xxx-xx-...
GREEN, BLENUS G xxx-xx-...
GREEN, DANIEL J xxx-xx-...
GREEN, FORREST C xxx-xx-...
GREENWOOD, DANIEL A xxx-xx-...
GREGORY, FREDERICK D. JR xxx-xx-...
GREGORY, SANDRA M xxx-xx-...
GRENKE, MICHAEL S xxx-xx-...
GRIFFIN, THOMAS A xxx-xx-...
GRIMES, DAVID A xxx-xx-...
GRISAMORE, CHARLES C xxx-xx-...
GROSSMAN, LUKE G xxx-xx-...
GROTH, KAREN L xxx-xx-...
GRUBER, BERNARD J xxx-xx-...
GRUMBACH, FUSUN S.K. xxx-x...
GUIDRY, KIM A xxx-xx-...
GUILL, DARYL W xxx-xx-...
GUIMOND, PHILIP W xxx-xx-...
GUNN, BRUCE F xxx-xx-...
HABER, MATTHEW E xxx-xx-...
HACKETT, TODD C xxx-xx-...
HADDICK, SCOTT S xxx-xx-...
HAFER, DAVID E. JR xxx-xx-...
HAINES, SCOTT A xxx-xx-...
HALE, MARK A xxx-xx-...
HALL, JAMES R., II xxx-xx-...
HALLIDAY, PAUL M xxx-xx-...
HALIGAN, PATRICK J.E xxx-xx-...

HALLMAN, JAMES A xxx-xx-...
HALLORAN, PATRICK J xxx-xx-...
HALSE, CHARLES J xxx-xx-...
HAMBLETON, PAUL L xxx-xx-...
HAMBLETON, ROXANA, M xxx-xx-...
HAMILTON, JAMES D xxx-xx-...
HAMILTON, STEVEN E xxx-xx-...
HAMMETT, WILBUR J xxx-xx-...
HANAK DAVID W xxx-xx-...
HANKS, ELIGAH xxx-xx-...
HANLON, JAMES F xxx-xx-...
HANSEN, ALLEN D xxx-xx-...
HANSEN, BRETT D xxx-xx-...
HANSEN, TIMOTHY A xxx-xx-...
HANSON, DOUGLAS xxx-xx-...
HARBULA, SCOTT R xxx-xx-...
HARDY, BRUCE E xxx-xx-...
HARDY, DAVID F xxx-xx-...
HARGETT, LESLIE xxx-xx-...
HARKEY, LORING C xxx-xx-...
HARLER, DOUGLAS H xxx-xx-...
HARMS, TIMOTHY W xxx-xx-...
HARPER, BRIAN S xxx-xx-...
HARRINGTON, MICHAEL xxx-xx-...
HARRINGTON, SEAN P xxx-xx-...
HARRIS, ALLAN D xxx-xx-...
HARRIS, GEORGE D xxx-xx-...
HARRIS, MARK W xxx-xx-...
HARRIS, MIKE S xxx-xx-...
HARRIS, PAUL D xxx-xx-...
HARRISON, WALTER K xxx-xx-...
HARVEY, SCOTT D xxx-xx-...
HARVEY, WINIFORD D xxx-xx-...
HASELTINE, TIMOTHY A xxx-xx-...
HASKINS, MARK S xxx-xx-...
HAUCK, CLARENCE E xxx-xx-...
HAUCK, RALPH W., JR xxx-xx-...
HAUGRUD, ANTHONY L xxx-xx-...
HAUSMANN, JEFFREY A xxx-xx-...
HAY, FRANCIS J xxx-xx-...
HAZLETT, MICHAEL A xxx-xx-...
HEAD, SIDNEY A xxx-xx-...
HEBING, BRADLEY P xxx-xx-...
HEDGEPETH, MARK E xxx-xx-...
HEEMSKERK, EDWARD T., JR xxx-xx-...
HEFLIN, JERRY D xxx-xx-...
HEFNER, PHILLIP R xxx-xx-...
HEIRES, DANIEL J xxx-xx-...
HELMICK, BRENT A xxx-xx-...
HELMING, JAY B xxx-xx-...
HENRICKS, BRENT S xxx-xx-...
HENNEY, HOLLY F xxx-xx-...
HENNING, ROBERT J xxx-xx-...
HENSLEY, SUZAN xxx-xx-...
HENSON, JEFFREY S xxx-xx-...
HENSON, JOHN D xxx-xx-...
HERMANN, BRIAN G xxx-xx-...
HERMLING, TODD R xxx-xx-...
HERNANDEZ, EFRAIN xxx-xx-...
HERNANDEZ, MICHAEL W xxx-xx-...
HERNANDEZ, OSCAR A xxx-xx-...
HEROD, DAN D xxx-xx-...
HERRICK, SCOTT M xxx-xx-...
HERRING, DONALD M xxx-xx-...
HERRING, MARGARET A xxx-xx-...
HERRMANN, FREDERICK M xxx-xx-...
HESS, JEFFREY M xxx-xx-...
HESS, PAMELA H xxx-xx-...
HESTERMAN, TERRY J xxx-xx-...
HEYDT, CAROLYN J xxx-xx-...
HEZELTINE, PHILIP H xxx-xx-...
HICKEY, DANIEL P xxx-xx-...
HICKS, JAMES T xxx-xx-...
HICKS, MARK S xxx-xx-...
HIGH, SCOTT W xxx-xx-...
HILL, FARRIS C xxx-xx-...
HILL, SCOTT WILLIAM xxx-xx-...
HILMANDOLAR, RUSSELL K xxx-xx-...
HIMLEY, THOR O xxx-xx-...
HINES, WARREN D xxx-xx-...
HINGA, CLARK D xxx-xx-...
HIPWELL, DEAN T xxx-xx-...
HO DEREK S xxx-xx-...
HOFELICH PETER D xxx-xx-...
HOFFMAN, DARRYL R xxx-xx-...
HOFFMAN, JOHN R xxx-xx-...
HOFFMAN, TERRY L xxx-xx-...
HOFFMANN, ERICH E xxx-xx-...
HOGAN, TIMOTHY D xxx-xx-...
HOH, MICHAEL W xxx-xx-...
HOLDAWAY, ERIC J xxx-xx-...
HOLDEN, WAYNETTE L xxx-xx-...
HOLEM, BARRETT G xxx-xx-...
HOLLEY, STACY H xxx-xx-...
HOLMAN, GILES B xxx-xx-...
HOLMBECK, LYNN C xxx-xx-...
HOOD, PAUL T xxx-xx-...
HOOGE, JAMES K xxx-xx-...
HOOKASSIAN GHEVOND xxx-xx-...
HOOPER, GARTH W xxx-xx-...
HOPKINS, TEDRICK R xxx-xx-...
HOPKINSON RUSSELL, H xxx-xx-...
HORN, JANICE M xxx-xx-...
HORNSBY, ALBERT B., III xxx-xx-...
HOSLEY, DAVID L., JR xxx-xx-...
HOSTETLER, WILLIAM J xxx-xx-...
HOWARD, ANTHONY W xxx-xx-...
HOWARD, MICHAEL D xxx-xx-...
HOWARD, PHILLIP L., III xxx-xx-...
HOWARD, RANDALL L xxx-xx-...
HOWARD, SHERRY E xxx-xx-...
HOWE, GARY P xxx-xx-...

HSIA, ALEXANDER H xxx-xx-...
HUBLER, LARRY W. JR xxx-xx-...
HUDELSTON, KENNETH W. III xxx-xx-...
HUDSON, DAVID A xxx-xx-...
HUEBSCH, MICHAEL J xxx-xx-...
HUERTA, PATRICK S xxx-xx-...
HUFF, JAMES F. JR xxx-xx-...
HUFFAKER, SUSAN L xxx-xx-...
HUGHES, KEITH D xxx-xx-...
HUGHES, PETER J xxx-xx-...
HUGHES, RICHARD N xxx-xx-...
HULL, ALAN ROBERT xxx-xx-...
HUMMON, JENNIFER A xxx-xx-...
HUNT, ROBERT P. JR xxx-xx-...
HUNTER, TERRY E xxx-xx-...
HUNTINGTON, JOSEPH A xxx-xx-...
HUSTON, ROBERT A xxx-xx-...
HUTCHINSON, CONNIE C. xxx-xx-...
HUTCHISON, KENNETH F xxx-xx-...
IMRICH, GREGORY L xxx-xx-...
IOSSI, ALAN J xxx-xx-...
ISAACS, ANN L xxx-xx-...
JACKSON, HERBERT E. JR xxx-xx-...
JACKSON, JACQUELINE R xxx-xx-...
JACKSON, THOMAS E. xxx-xx-...
JACYNO, JOSEPH R xxx-xx-...
JAECQUES, STEPHEN J xxx-xx-...
JAMES, DOUGLAS J xxx-xx-...
JAMES, SCOTT E. xxx-xx-...
JAMES, STEPHEN S xxx-xx-...
JAMES, THOMAS J xxx-xx-...
JAMESON, ROBERT A. JR xxx-xx-...
JANECZKO, STEVEN J xxx-xx-...
JANTZEN, DOUGLAS L xxx-xx-...
JEFFERSON, CHARLENE D xxx-xx-...
JENKINS, DANIEL K xxx-xx-...
JENS, KEVIN J xxx-xx-...
JENSEN, JAY D xxx-xx-...
JENSEN, KERI L xxx-xx-...
JETT, THOMAS W xxx-xx-...
JOHNSON, CHAD W xxx-xx-...
JOHNSON, CHRISTOPHER J xxx-xx-...
JOHNSON, DAVID R xxx-xx-...
JOHNSON, DONALD L xxx-xx-...
JOHNSON, DOUGLAS B xxx-xx-...
JOHNSON, HARRY J xxx-xx-...
JOHNSON, MICHAEL W xxx-xx-...
JOHNSON, ORESTE M xxx-xx-...
JOHNSON, STEPHEN D xxx-xx-...
JOHNSON, TATE A xxx-xx-...
JOHNSON, WAYNE C xxx-xx-...
JONES, ERIC M xxx-xx-...
JONES, JAMES R. JR xxx-xx-...
JONES, TONISH E xxx-xx-...
JORDAN, CHRISTOPHER A xxx-xx-...
JORDAN, JON E xxx-xx-...
JORDAN, WILLIAM G. JR xxx-xx-...
JORGENSEN, BARBARA J xxx-xx-...
JORGENSEN, ERIC A xxx-xx-...
JORGENSEN, RICHARD J xxx-xx-...
JOST, KEVIN D xxx-xx-...
JOY, WILLIAM E xxx-xx-...
JUILLERAT, DAVID H xxx-xx-...
KABBAN, EMIL B xxx-xx-...
KAMPMEYER, PHYLLIS T xxx-xx-...
KANTRA, ROSS A xxx-xx-...
KAPLAN, JOHN J xxx-xx-...
KAPOOR, SHIV K xxx-xx-...
KARL, KIP R., 373747717
KARMALI, RUSTAM xxx-xx-...
KAUFFMAN, CHRISTOPHER, D xxx-xx-...
KAVALIERATOS, GERALD xxx-xx-...
KAZZIE, MIKE, F xxx-xx-...
KEELON, JOSEPH C xxx-xx-...
KELLAS, ROBERT B xxx-xx-...
KELLER, STEPHEN L xxx-xx-...
KELLEY, DOUGLAS D xxx-xx-...
KELLY, KEVIN J xxx-xx-...
KELLY, THOMAS J xxx-xx-...
KENEMUTH, MICHAEL R xxx-xx-...
KENNEDY, DAVID C xxx-xx-...
KENNEDY, DAVID M xxx-xx-...
KENNEDY, JONATHAN P xxx-xx-...
KENNEDY, SEAN L xxx-xx-...
KENNETT, THOMAS J xxx-xx-...
KENT, JAMES E xxx-xx-...
KERN, GREGORY, J xxx-xx-...
KIEHN, JAMES P xxx-xx-...
KIEL, WESLEY J xxx-xx-...
KILBURN, BRADLEY D xxx-xx-...
KIMBALL, JOHN A., III xxx-xx-...
KIMBALL, STEVEN A xxx-xx-...
KIMM, MICHAEL R xxx-xx-...
KINDRED, JOHN R xxx-xx-...
KING, JACK E. JR xxx-xx-...
KING, JACK R xxx-xx-...
KING, JAMES R. JR xxx-xx-...
KING, ROBERT T xxx-xx-...
KINLIN, DONALD L xxx-xx-...
KINNAN, CHRISTOPHER J xxx-xx-...
KINNEY, MARK J xxx-xx-...
KIRKPATRICK, FRANKLIN M xxx-xx-...
KITOWSKI, ROBERT S xxx-xx-...
KLAVIK, PETER H xxx-xx-...
KLEIN, KENNETH S xxx-xx-...
KLETT, THOMAS R xxx-xx-...
KNAPP, ROBERT M xxx-xx-...
KNECHT, KEVIN J xxx-xx-...
KNIGHT, JACK T. JR xxx-xx-...
KNISELY, JOEL F xxx-xx-...
KNOELL, ROGER E xxx-xx-...
KNOTT, RICHARD L xxx-xx-...

KNUDSON, MICHAEL L. xxx-xx-...
KNUTSON, STEVEN V. xxx-xx-...
KOBOLD, MICHAEL R. xxx-xx-...
KOBOLD, TAMI L. xxx-xx-...
KOEHLER, ROBERT M. xxx-xx-...
KOHN, DAVID J. xxx-xx-...
KOLCH, KURT M. xxx-xx-...
KOMARNITSKY, KRISTIN D. xxx-xx-...
KOOPMAN, JOHN RODGER xxx-xx-...
KORHONEN, JENNIFER M. xxx-xx-...
KORMANIK, JAMES M. xxx-xx-...
KOROW, KAREN A. xxx-xx-...
KOSOBUCKI, RICHARD D. xxx-xx-...
KOSTRZEWA, PATRICK J. xxx-x-...
KOTT, JAMES F. xxx-xx-...
KOUBA, ERIC T. xxx-xx-...
KRAKIE, GEORGE J. xxx-xx-...
KRALIK, WILLIAM J. xxx-xx-...
KRAMBEER, TODD J. xxx-xx-...
KRAMER, EDWARD R. xxx-xx-...
KRAMER, RUSSELL E. xxx-xx-...
KRAUTKRAMER, TARA M. xxx-xx-...
KREGER, BARRY K. xxx-xx-...
KREISELMEIER, CHRISTINE M. xxx-xx-...
KRIMMEL, JAMES J. xxx-xx-...
KROEGER, DAVID R. xxx-xx-...
KUGEL, CHRISTOPHER T. xxx-xx-...
KUHN, WILLIAM K. xxx-xx-...
KUMINKA, DAVID J. xxx-xx-...
KUPPER, KELVIN E. xxx-xx-...
KURTZ, RUSSELL D. xxx-xx-...
KUTZ, JOHN T. JR. xxx-xx-...
LAFAVE, CRAIG L. xxx-xx-...
LAIBLE, JAMES C. xxx-xx-...
LAMAR, DOMINIC C. xxx-xx-...
LAMARRE, RICHARD S. xxx-xx-...
LAMB, SCOTT A. xxx-xx-...
LAMBERT, BRUCE A. xxx-xx-...
LAMONT, GEROGE H. xxx-xx-...
LANDERS, ROBIN H. xxx-xx-...
LANDOCH, ANDREW J. xxx-xx-...
LANGENDERFER, MARK G. xxx-xx-...
LANGFORD, BILLY R. xxx-xx-...
LANIER, CARL J. II xxx-xx-...
LANKE, CHERYL L. xxx-xx-...
LANZA, DAVID J. xxx-xx-...
LARGENT, KELLY A. xxx-xx-...
LASALLE, JOHN P. xxx-xx-...
LASK, JOSEPH M. xxx-xx-...
LAUGHON, MARK A. xxx-xx-...
LAWRENCE, CHRISTOPHER J. xxx-xx-...
LAWRENCE, DORIS A. xxx-xx-...
LAWRENCE, PAUL J. JR xxx-xx-...
LAWSON, JAMES A. JR. xxx-xx-...
LAWSON, RANDOLPH S. xxx-xx-...
LAYFIELD, J. DAVID xxx-xx-...
LEARD, DAVID M. xxx-xx-...
LEARY, WILLIAM G. III xxx-xx-...
LEATHERMAN, RICHARD E. xxx-xx-...
LEE, CHRIS P. xxx-xx-...
LEE, DAVID B. xxx-xx-...
LEE, DENNIS J. xxx-xx-...
LEE, DIANA K. xxx-xx-...
LEE, JON P. xxx-xx-...
LEGG, BILLY G. xxx-xx-...
LENTO, NICHOLAS C. xxx-xx-...
LESLIE, PARTICIA A. xxx-xx-...
LESLIE, WILLIAM D. JR xxx-xx-...
LEVINE, ROBERT L. xxx-xx-...
LEWIS, CHRISTOPHER N. xxx-xx-...
LIBBERT, HOWARD xxx-xx-...
LIGHTNER, ROBERT C. xxx-xx-...
LILLIE, BRIAN J. xxx-xx-...
LILLY, MARK D. xxx-xx-...
LIND, JONATHAN W. xxx-xx-...
LINDELL, ROBERT M. xxx-xx-...
LIPTAK, JOHN J. xxx-xx-...
LISKA, STEPHEN W. xxx-xx-...
LIVINGSTON, SCOTT A. xxx-xx-...
LLOYD, GREGORY F. xxx-xx-...
LOCKLEAR, CHARLES C. JR. xxx-xx-...
LOCKWOOD, JON T. xxx-xx-...
LOCKWOOD, VICKI K. xxx-xx-...
LOHN, CLAYTON xxx-xx-...
LORRAINE, ERIC C. xxx-xx-...
LOUD, MICHAEL S. xxx-xx-...
LOURAKE ANDREW xxx-xx-...
LOVELESS, WAYNE R. xxx-xx-...
LOVING, STEVEN S. xxx-xx-...
LOWE, CHRISTOPHER W. xxx-xx-...
LUCA, ROBERT xxx-xx-...
LUDWIG, HERBERT D. JR. xxx-xx-...
LUETKEMEYER PAUL C. xxx-xx-...
LULKA, MARK F. xxx-xx-...
LYGA, THOMAS J. xxx-xx-...
LYON, MICHAEL T. xxx-xx-...
MACEACHRON, JEFFREY xxx-xx-...
MACLEAN, MARK J. xxx-xx-...
MADDEN, DANIEL J. xxx-xx-...
MADDEN, PATRICK C. xxx-xx-...
MADSON, STEVEN W. xxx-xx-...
MAGINNIS, DAVID L. xxx-xx-...
MAHAN, CRAIG A. xxx-xx-...
MAHAN, SHARON F. xxx-xx-...
MAHON, DEIRDRE A. xxx-xx-...
MAKEKAU, CHARLES K. xxx-xx-...
MAKI, CRAIG W. xxx-xx-...
MALCOLM, JEFFREY xxx-xx-...
MALLOY, VICTOR L. xxx-xx-...
MALONEY, BRIAN W. xxx-xx-...
MALOY, MICHAEL N. xxx-xx-...
MAMMEN, ROLF E. xxx-xx-...
MANES, BRYAN S. xxx-xx-...
MANNING, TIMOTHY J. xxx-xx-...
MARCHETTI, MICHAEL A. xxx-xx-...
MAROCCHINI, THOMAS ANTHONY xxx-xx-...
MARSHALL, DAVID I. xxx-xx-...
MARSOLF, MONTY A. xxx-xx-...
MARTIN, CHRISTOPHER S. xxx-xx-...
MARTIN, DANIEL S. xxx-xx-...
MARTIN, HAROLD M. xxx-xx-...
MARTIN, JOHN M. xxx-xx-...
MARTIN, MANUEL D. xxx-xx-...
MARTIN, PETER J. xxx-xx-...
MARTINEZ, RAMIRO xxx-xx-...
MASSEY, DONALD S. xxx-xx-...
MASSEY, GRIFFITH S. xxx-xx-...
MATHIAS, KARL S. xxx-xx-...
MATSON, STEPHEN M. xxx-xx-...
MATSUSHIMA, MARK J. xxx-xx-...
MATTINGLY, GERALD L. xxx-xx-...
MAULDIN, RANDY A. xxx-xx-...
MAURER, RICHARD R. xxx-xx-...
MAY, DAVID J. xxx-xx-...
MAYO, MICHAEL A. xxx-xx-...
MAYS, KIRK M. xxx-xx-...
MCANENY, PAUL J. xxx-xx-...
MCBETH, MARK D. xxx-xx-...
MCCALLA, JENNIFER E. xxx-xx-...
MCCARTNEY, ROBERT S. xxx-xx-...
MCCAULEY, ROBYN L. xxx-xx-...
MCCLOSKEY, THOMAS C. xxx-xx-...
MCCOLLUM, GARY L. xxx-xx-...
MCCOOL, RICHARD I. xxx-xx-...
MCCORMICK, JOHN K. xxx-xx-...
MCCOSH, DOUGLAS P. xxx-xx-...
MCCOY, STEVEN R. xxx-xx-...
MCCREADIE, ROBERT H. xxx-xx-...
MCCREADY, TODD G. xxx-xx-...
MCDERMOTT, BRIAN F. xxx-xx-...
MCDERMOTT, KEVIN S. xxx-xx-...
MCDERMOTT, TRACE J. xxx-xx-...
MCDONALD, ROBERT D. xxx-xx-...
MCDOWELL, PAUL J. xxx-xx-...
MCELDERRY, BRADLEY T. xxx-xx-...
MCELROY, KEVIN J. xxx-xx-...
MCELVEEN, DAVID M. xxx-xx-...
MCFADDEN, JOHN L. xxx-xx-...
MCFADDEN, KEVIN A. xxx-xx-...
MCGANN, JAMES A. xxx-xx-...
MCGETTRICK, GARVIN A. xxx-xx-...
MCGINNIS, SCOTT D. xxx-xx-...
MCGLONE, JERRY H. xxx-xx-...
MCGRAW, THOMAS R. xxx-xx-...
MCHUGH, WILLIAM P. xxx-xx-...
MCIRVIN, JAMES R. xxx-xx-...
MCKAY, JOSEPH R. xxx-xx-...
MCKEE, DONALD J. xxx-xx-...
MCKENZIE, FRANCIS R. xxx-xx-...
MCKENZIE, SCOTT J. xxx-xx-...
MCKINNEY, KRIS F. xxx-xx-...
MCKINNEY, SCOTT E. xxx-xx-...
MCKINNON, GEORGE A. xxx-xx-...
MCLAUGHLIN, KATHLEEN R. xxx-xx-...
MCNEELY, STEVEN D. xxx-xx-...
MCQUAID, SEAN J. xxx-xx-...
MEADE, SHANNON P. xxx-xx-...
MECHAM, SHAWN K. xxx-xx-...
MEE, MICHAEL J. xxx-xx-...
MEEKER, MARTHA A. xxx-xx-...
MEHLHOP, DAVID J. xxx-xx-...
MEIKLE, DOUGLAS A. xxx-xx-...
MEISSNER, KEITH L. xxx-xx-...
MELANCON, PHILLIP W. xxx-xx-...
MELENDEZ, PABLO F. xxx-xx-...
MELTON, EDWARD C., III xxx-xx-...
MELUSEN, GARY R. xxx-xx-...
MENARD, ROBERT C. xxx-xx-...
MENELEY, TERRY L. xxx-xx-...
MERCER, BARBARA J. xxx-xx-...
MERKEL, KENNETH G., II xxx-xx-...
METZ, JEFFREY D. xxx-xx-...
METZLER, ALAN R. xxx-xx-...
MEYER, MARK A. xxx-xx-...
MEYER, RUSSELL W. xxx-xx-...
MICELI, CHRISTOPHER xxx-xx-...
MICHEL, MARK A. xxx-xx-...
MICHETTI, JOHN P. xxx-xx-...
MICK, THOMAS L. xxx-xx-...
MILLER, DAVID J. xxx-xx-...
MILLER, KRISTINE T. xxx-xx-...
MILLER, MICHAEL A. xxx-xx-...
MILLER, TERRY R. xxx-xx-...
MILLS, MYRA S. xxx-xx-...
MINTO, PATRICK G. xxx-xx-...
MISIAK, BRIAN K. xxx-xx-...
MISKOVICH, ANDREW, III xxx-xx-...
MISTRETTA, MICHAEL JR xxx-xx-...
MITCHELL, DONNA A. xxx-xx-...
MITCHELL, JOHN L. xxx-xx-...
MITCHELL, RICHARD K. xxx-xx-...
MITCHNER, LEONARD A. xxx-xx-...
MITTMANN, KURT H. xxx-xx-...
MITTUCH, STEPHANIE A. xxx-xx-...
MIX, DANIEL G. xxx-xx-...
MOBLEY, DAVID B. xxx-xx-...
MOLNAR, ANDREW J. xxx-xx-...
MONK, KRISTINA B. xxx-xx-...
MONNEY, BRET A. xxx-xx-...
MONTGOMERY, JON B. xxx-xx-...
MONTGOMERY, MARC A. xxx-xx-...
MOORE, CHRISTIAN E. xxx-xx-...
MORALESFIGUEROA, RAFAEL xxx-xx-...
MORANI, STEVEN, J. xxx-xx-...
MORENOBONET, ALBERTO xxx-xx-...
MORGAN, ERIC xxx-xx-...
MORLEY, JOHN C. xxx-x-...
MORRIS, BRETT E. xxx-x-...
MORRIS, CHRISTINA M. xxx-xx-...
MORRIS, MARK, R. xxx-xx-...
MORRIS, MICHAEL J. xxx-xx-...
MORRIS, TIMOTHY R. xxx-xx-...
MORRIS, WILLIAM A. xxx-xx-...
MORRIS, ZANE F. xxx-xx-...
MORRISON, DARYL RAY xxx-xx-...
MORRISON, GREGORY xxx-xx-...
MORROW, MATTHEW H. xxx-xx-...
MORSE, CHARLES C. xxx-xx-...
MOSS, KENNARD S, III xxx-xx-...
MOTY, EUGENE B. JR. xxx-xx-...
MOTZ, NORBERT A. xxx-xx-...
MOWBRAY, LAURA K. xxx-xx-...
MOXLEY, PAMELA A. xxx-xx-...
MOYERS, ANTHONY D. xxx-xx-...
MOZZETTA, PAUL J. xxx-xx-...
MUFFLER, RICHARD E. JR xxx-xx-...
MULLIGAN, KENNETH E. xxx-xx-...
MULLINS, EDWARD R. xxx-xx-...
MURDOCK, DENTON K. xxx-xx-...
MURPHY, JAMES E. xxx-xx-...
MURPHY, KENNETH R. xxx-xx-...
MURPHY, MICHAEL L. xxx-xx-...
MURPHY, MONTE J. xxx-xx-...
MURPHY, RICHARD M. xxx-xx-...
MURPHY, STEPHEN M. xxx-xx-...
MURPHY, WILLIAM P. xxx-xx-...
MURRAY, KEVIN R. xxx-xx-...
MUSSER, SCOTT L. xxx-xx-...
MYERS, GREGORY A. xxx-x-...
MYERS, MICHAEL A. xxx-xx-...
MYERS, ROBERT M. JR xxx-xx-...
NACLERIO, NICHOLAS J. xxx-xx-...
NAGLEY, ANDREW G. xxx-xx-...
NALEWAIK, TIMOTHY P. xxx-xx-...
NANAGAS, GABRIEL R. xxx-xx-...
NARMOUR, DOUGLAS R. xxx-xx-...
NEAL, BRAD A. xxx-xx-...
NEALY, KENNETH E. xxx-xx-...
NEALY, TERRY F. xxx-xx-...
NEIL, KIRK M. xxx-xx-...
NEILSON, JEFFREY A. xxx-xx-...
NEISS, ROLAND D. xxx-xx-...
NELSON, ERIC L. xxx-xx-...
NELSON, JAMES C. xxx-xx-...
NELSON, KIM M. xxx-xx-...
NELSON, RICHARD C. xxx-xx-...
NELSON, RICHARD S. xxx-xx-...
NELSON, SAMUEL F. xxx-xx-...
NEUENFELDT, WAYNE M. xxx-xx-...
NEWBERRY, JOHN D. xxx-xx-...
NEWMAN, ROBERT H. JR xxx-xx-...
NEWSOME, DAVID C. xxx-xx-...
NICHOLS, DON F. xxx-xx-...
NICKLES, THOMAS D. xxx-xx-...
NICODEMUS, GREGORY W. xxx-xx-...
NIEMEYER, LUCIAN L. II xxx-xx-...
NIKODEM, THOMAS E. xxx-xx-...
NOMURA, MICHAEL T. xxx-xx-...
NORDSTROM, GREGORY C. xxx-xx-...
NORKAITIS, PAMELA J. xxx-xx-...
NORRIS, ROGER K. xxx-xx-...
NORTHUP, CHARLES W. xxx-xx-...
NOSAL, DAVID ALAN xxx-xx-...
NOWACZYK, MICHAEL A. xxx-xx-...
NUGENT, JAMES G. xxx-xx-...
NUGENT, WILLIAM E. xxx-xx-...
NUNN, MARK E. xxx-xx-...
NUSSMAN, CHARLES T. xxx-xx-...
OAKS, BARTON C. xxx-xx-...
OATES, DANIEL D. II xxx-xx-...
OBRAY, PRESTON E. xxx-xx-...
OCASIO, JUAN J. xxx-xx-...
OCONNELL, MARTIN E. xxx-xx-...
ODOM, DAVID L. xxx-xx-...
ODOM, EARL B. III xxx-xx-...
OESTERLE, DONALD T. JR xxx-xx-...
OGDEN, DARYL A. JR xxx-xx-...
OHALLORAN, PAUL J. xxx-xx-...
OLIVE, STEVEN G. xxx-xx-...
OLSON, RICHARD C. xxx-xx-...
OMARA, RAYMOND P. xxx-xx-...
OMUNDSEN, DAVID K. xxx-xx-...
ONEAL, JIMMIE L. JR xxx-xx-...
ORLANDO, VINCENT A. II xxx-xx-...
ORNSTEDT, RONALD A. xxx-xx-...
ORTIZ, RONALD A. xxx-xx-...
OSBORNEHENSLEY DOLORES M. xxx-xx-...
OSMER, LOUIS C. xxx-xx-...
OWENS, BRETT L. xxx-xx-...
OWENS JOHATHAN H. xxx-xx-...
OWENS, THOMAS E. xxx-xx-...
OWENS, WILLIAM B. JR xxx-xx-...
PAAL, DAVID M. xxx-xx-...
PABST, DAVID J. xxx-xx-...
PACELLA, VINCENT A. JR xxx-xx-...
PAGE, LYNN D. xxx-xx-...
PAGE, STUART T. xxx-xx-...
PALUMBO, JEFFREY A. xxx-xx-...
PANGRAC, ELIZABETH A. xxx-xx-...
PARISEAU, DAVID A. xxx-xx-...
PARISH, DONALD A. xxx-xx-...
PARKER, ANN MARIE xxx-xx-...
PARKER, JAMES T. xxx-xx-...
PARKER, JOHN L. xxx-xx-...
PARKER, RANDALL O. xxx-xx-...
PARKINSON, KELLY J. xxx-xx-...

PARSONS, TIMOTHY R xxx-xx-...
PASTOR, PETER T xxx-xx-...
PATMORE, JOHN D xxx-xx-...
PATRICK, RONALD J xxx-xx-...
PATTEN, SCOTT E xxx-xx-...
PATTERSON, MARK ALLAN xxx-xx-...
PATTERSON, RANDALL W xxx-xx-...
PATTON, DOUGLAS J xxx-xx-...
PAYNE, JEANNINE C xxx-xx-...
PEARCY, RICHARD E xxx-xx-...
PECKO, JOHN L xxx-xx-...
PEDERSEN, BRYON L xxx-xx-...
PEDERSEN, SANDRA S xxx-xx-...
PETT, MICHAEL E xxx-xx-...
PEHRSON, CHRISTOPHER J xxx-xx-...
PELLETIER, SANDERS DARLENE xxx-xx-...
PENLAND, MICHAEL W xxx-xx-...
PENNINGTON TODD D xxx-xx-...
PENNINGTON, WALLACE A xxx-xx-...
PEPPERS, VERNON L xxx-xx-...
PEPPIN, PETER C xxx-xx-...
PEPPLER, LAURA L xxx-xx-...
PEREZ, JOHN D xxx-xx-...
PERKINS, LEE ANN xxx-xx-...
PERRY, MONTY R xxx-xx-...
PERSIAN, THOMAS E xxx-xx-...
PETERSON, BRENNAN C xxx-xx-...
PETERSON, RONNIE E xxx-xx-...
PETTERLE, JOEL W xxx-xx-...
PETTY, MICHAEL R xxx-xx-...
PFEIFER, TIMOTHY J xxx-xx-...
PHILBRICK, VINCENT A xxx-xx-...
PHILLIPS, JOEL S xxx-xx-...
PHILLIPS, MARK R xxx-xx-...
PHILLIPS, MATTHEW T xxx-xx-...
PHILLIPS, MICHAEL K xxx-xx-...
PHILIP, BRYANT D xxx-xx-...
PICHE, PATRICK A xxx-xx-...
PIERCE, SCOTT D xxx-xx-...
PIERGROSSI, TODD M xxx-xx-...
PIERSON, CHARLENE A xxx-xx-...
PIETRASZUK, LESTER F xxx-xx-...
PILLAR, MARY C xxx-xx-...
PILOT, DAVID J xxx-xx-...
PINCINCE, MARC D xxx-xx-...
PINSKI, STEVEN D xxx-xx-...
PIXLEY, DANIEL J xxx-xx-...
POAST, JOHN EDWARD III xxx-xx-...
PODKIN, DOUGLAS P xxx-xx-...
POLETE, DAVID A xxx-xx-...
POLISE, WILLIAM V xxx-xx-...
POND, DAVID L xxx-xx-...
PONTAGE, ALEJANDRO R. JR xxx-xx-...
PORT, LORELEI D xxx-xx-...
PORZEL, DALE R xxx-xx-...
POUND, DEAN A xxx-xx-...
POWER, MARK W xxx-xx-...
POWERS, SCOTT A xxx-xx-...
POWLEY, CHARLES B xxx-xx-...
PRAZAK, MICHEL D xxx-xx-...
PRECHTEL, JOHN B xxx-xx-...
PRENOT, WILLIAM E xxx-xx-...
PRESTON, DAVID L xxx-xx-...
PRESTON, LESTER E xxx-xx-...
PREWITT, DAVID S xxx-xx-...
PRICE, LARRY G xxx-xx-...
PRICE, MARY C xxx-xx-...
PRICHARD, JEFFERY W xxx-xx-...
PROVENCAL, BRADFORD A xxx-xx-...
PROVOST, ROBERT J xxx-xx-...
PROVOST, SCOTT A xxx-xx-...
PRUITT, SHARON K xxx-xx-...
PRYOR, JEANNA L xxx-xx-...
PYLES, JOHN S xxx-xx-...
QUALLS, BRYANT A xxx-xx-...
RAGUSA, JEFFERY J xxx-xx-...
RAHN, JENNIFER A xxx-xx-...
RAMOS, PEDRO A xxx-xx-...
RANALLI, STEVEN A xxx-xx-...
RANGEL, STEPHEN A xxx-xx-...
RASMUSSEN, MARK E xxx-xx-...
RATCHFORD, BRIAN L xxx-xx-...
RATTERREE, PATRICIA A xxx-xx-...
RAWLINGS , RONALD M xxx-xx-...
RAWLS, JAMES S xxx-xx-...
RAY, STEPHEN A xxx-xx-...
READ, MICHAEL F xxx-xx-...
REAGAN, RONALD D xxx-xx-...
REAM, GEORGE S xxx-xx-...
REDDECLIFF, RICHARD M xxx-xx-...
REECE, TERENCE L xxx-xx-...
REED, MICHAEL D xxx-xx-...
REED, MICHAEL D xxx-xx-...
REED, RICHARD NEAL xxx-xx-...
REED, TIMOTHY S xxx-xx-...
REES, DAVID J xxx-xx-...
REETER, KATHLEEN K xxx-xx-...
REGISTER, MARTIN D xxx-xx-...
REIFSCHNEIDER, DANIEL S xxx-xx-...
REILLY, BRIAN J xxx-xx-...
REISMAN, MERRY E xxx-xx-...
RENDE, MIKI S xxx-xx-...
REPETA, SCOTT A xxx-xx-...
RESLER, JOHN M xxx-xx-...
RESNIK, STANLEY M xxx-xx-...
RESTAINO, JOHN P xxx-xx-...
REY, DAVID A xxx-xx-...
REYES, ELONZO D xxx-xx-...
REYNOLDS, NELSON J xxx-xx-...
REZZONICO, WAYNE M xxx-xx-...
RHODEN, JOHN W xxx-xx-...
RICARD, FRANCINE D xxx-xx-...
RICE, CARLOS F xxx-xx-...
RICHARD, JOHN C xxx-xx-...
RICHARDS, RANDY J xxx-xx-...
RICHARDSON, DANIEL L xxx-xx-...
RICHARDSON, PATRICK F xxx-xx-...
RIDEOUT, ROBERT Q xxx-xx-...
RIEMENS, VAN LAARE JAMES C xxx-xx-...
RIGSBY, BRIAN S xxx-xx-...
RILEY, RAY A xxx-xx-...
RILEY, TIMOTHY L xxx-xx-...
RIORDAN, TIMOTHY M xxx-xx-...
RITCHIE, PAUL M xxx-xx-...
RIVERA, CYNTHIA M. xxx-xx-...
ROACH, JOHN D xxx-xx-...
ROBBINS, DANIEL J xxx-xx-...
ROBEL, JULIE M xxx-xx-...
ROBERTIELLO, ANTONY G xxx-xx-...
ROBERTS, BLAKE A xxx-xx-...
ROBERTS, DAVID W xxx-xx-...
ROBERTS, GLENN E xxx-xx-...
ROBERTS, JEFFREY W xxx-xx-...
ROBERTS, LESTER N xxx-xx-...
ROBERTS, MARK J xxx-xx-...
ROBERTS, RONALD K xxx-xx-...
ROBERTSON, JAMES M xxx-xx-...
ROBINSON, AARON N xxx-xx-...
ROBINSON, ALAN R xxx-xx-...
ROBINSON, BRAD E xxx-xx-...
ROBINSON, BRIAN S xxx-xx-...
ROBINSON, BRYAN, K xxx-xx-...
ROBINSON, DANIEL S xxx-xx-...
ROBINSON, STEVEN M xxx-xx-...
ROCCO, ROBERT F xxx-xx-...
ROCHE, LAWRENCE C xxx-xx-...
ROCKWELL, CHRISTY L xxx-xx-...
RODEHEAVER, JEFFREY M xxx-xx-...
ROGERS, JAMES E xxx-xx-...
ROGERS, KENNETH H xxx-xx-...
ROGOWSKI, PAUL J xxx-xx-...
ROMANI, JAMES S xxx-xx-...
RONES, WILLIAM H. JR xxx-xx-...
ROQUEMORE, DARLENE M xxx-xx-...
ROSE, DAVID H xxx-xx-...
ROSE, SCOTT A xxx-xx-...
ROSE, STEVEN V xxx-xx-...
ROSENQUIST, DEAN E xxx-xx-...
ROSS, CHARLES E. JR xxx-xx-...
ROSS, DONALD W xxx-xx-...
ROSS, VINCENT N xxx-xx-...
ROSSELIT, KURT S xxx-xx-...
ROTH, ROBERT W xxx-xx-...
ROTHENFLUE, JAMES A xxx-xx-...
ROUTT, WILLIAM G xxx-xx-...
RUANE, MATTHEW J xxx-xx-...
RUGG, STEVEN A xxx-xx-...
RUMRILL, JEFFREY N xxx-xx-...
RUSSELL, DOUGLAS D. JR xxx-xx-...
RUSSELL, JOHN S xxx-xx-...
RUSSELL, SCOTT E xxx-xx-...
RUTLIN, GRANT G xxx-xx-...
RYAN, PATRICK T xxx-xx-...
RYAN, THOMAS W. xxx-xx-...
RYERSE, MATTHEW D xxx-xx-...
SAELID, PER I xxx-xx-...
SAENZ, JOSE L xxx-xx-...
SALOMON, DAVID G xxx-xx-...
SAMPSON, KEVIN J xxx-xx-...
SAMUEL, SUSAN M xxx-xx-...
SANCHEZANDINO, JOSE A xxx-xx-...
SANDAHL, DANIEL J xxx-xx-...
SANHEINRICH, DAMIAN H xxx-xx-...
SANKS, TERRY M xxx-xx-...
SANSOUCI, MARGITH A xxx-xx-...
SANTANIELLO, JOHN A xxx-xx-...
SANTOS, EDWIN xxx-xx-...
SAPINOSO, DEXTER M xxx-xx-...
SARIC, WILLIAM G xxx-xx-...
SAUL, SCOTT H xxx-xx-...
SAXON, THOMAS R. xxx-xx-...
SAYSON, ARMIN M xxx-xx-...
SCAGLIONE DION xxx-xx-...
SCHADDELEE FRANK W xxx-xx-...
SCHADEGG, THOMAS P xxx-xx-...
SCHAEFER, JEAN M xxx-xx-...
SCHAIBLE, MARK R xxx-xx-...
SCHAUB, GEORGE P xxx-xx-...
SCHAUBER, DONALD M. JR xxx-xx-...
SCHEEL, CAMERON J xxx-xx-...
SCHEPPS, STEVEN xxx-xx-...
SCHERER, PAUL E xxx-xx-...
SCHIFF, TODD C xxx-xx-...
SCHILDER, JON xxx-xx-...
SCHLIMM, KARL A xxx-xx-...
SCHMIDT, CHRISTINE M xxx-xx-...
SCHMIDT, DANIEL M xxx-xx-...
SCHMITT, JOHN J., JR xxx-xx-...
SCHNEIDER, JAMES C xxx-xx-...
SCHOLLMEYER, JEFFREY R xxx-xx-...
SCHROEDER, PHIL J xxx-xx-...
SCHROEDER, RICK E xxx-xx-...
SCHROEDER, SCOTT A xxx-xx-...
SCHULTZ, GREGORY W xxx-xx-...
SCHUSTER, JAMES B xxx-xx-...
SCHWALM, ERIC L xxx-xx-...
SCHWARZKOPF, THOMAS J xxx-xx-...
SCOGGINS, SHANE P xxx-xx-...
SCOTT, BYRON L xxx-xx-...
SCOTT, DAVID J xxx-xx-...
SCOTT, MATTHEW E xxx-xx-...
SCRIPTER, DAVID H xxx-xx-...
SCRUITSKY, WILLIAM R xxx-xx-...
SCULLY, MARK D xxx-xx-...
SEARCY, BRIAN G xxx-xx-...
SEARFOSS, KURT A xxx-xx-...
SECHREST, JOANNE B xxx-xx-...
SELADIS, JAMES P xxx-xx-...
SELLERS, GREGORY S xxx-xx-...
SENSENIG, WILLIAM H. JR xxx-xx-...
SEYER, TARYN L xxx-xx-...
SHANKS, TIMOTHY F xxx-xx-...
SHANLEY, SHAWN P xxx-xx-...
SHAPIRO, SCOTT D xxx-xx-...
SHARRETT, PETRA L xxx-xx-...
SHARTLE, GARY F xxx-xx-...
SHAW, ANTHONY C xxx-xx-...
SHAW, WAYNE L., II xxx-xx-...
SHEASLEY, ALAN C xxx-xx-...
SHEEHAN, PAUL V xxx-xx-...
SHEPHERD, GLEN A xxx-xx-...
SHEREDA, MARIA Y xxx-xx-...
SHERIDAN, SCOTT F xxx-xx-...
SHERLOCK, BRADLEY D xxx-xx-...
SHERMAN, WILLIAM A xxx-xx-...
SHELVIN PAUL xxx-xx-...
SHEWELL, CYNTHIA A xxx-xx-...
SHIELDS, JOHN R xxx-xx-...
SHIELDS, ROBERT W xxx-xx-...
SHOATES, KEITH B xxx-xx-...
SHOEMAKER, JAMES ALLAN I xxx-xx-...
SHORES, ROBERT C xxx-xx-...
SHREWSBURY, STEPHEN M xxx-xx-...
SHUTTY, PAMELA A xxx-xx-...
SIBILLE, WARREN T xxx-xx-...
SIEGLE, ROBERT M xxx-xx-...
SILKOWSKI, ERIC xxx-xx-...
SILVANIC, DOROTHY A xxx-xx-...
SIMCOX, FRANK W. IV xxx-xx-...
SIMMONS, SCOTT W xxx-xx-...
SIMS, WILSON T. JR xxx-xx-...
SINDEL, MICHAEL W xxx-xx-...
SINOPOLI, PAUL L. J xxx-xx-...
SISSON, ROBERT A xxx-xx-...
SKINNER, WARDLAW E. III xxx-xx-...
SLATE, DANIEL J xxx-xx-...
SLATON, JOHN S xxx-xx-...
SLAUENWHITE, TIMOTHY A xxx-xx-...
SLUPSKI, JOSEPH E xxx-xx-...
SMALLIDGE, DAVID S xxx-xx-...
SMILEY, STEVEN E xxx-xx-...
SMITH, ANDREW J xxx-xx-...
SMITH, DOUGLAS L xxx-xx-...
SMITH, GARY A xxx-xx-...
SMITH, GREGORY C xxx-xx-...
SMITH, JAMES R. JR xxx-xx-...
SMITH, MARK R xxx-xx-...
SMITH, MICHAEL E xxx-xx-...
SMITH, MICHAEL S xxx-xx-...
SMITH, RANDOLPH G xxx-xx-...
SMITH, RICHARD E. III xxx-xx-...
SMITH, ROBERT J. JR xxx-xx-...
SMITH, RUSS E xxx-xx-...
SMITH, RUSSELL E xxx-xx-...
SMITH, SCOTT F xxx-xx-...
SMITH, STEPHEN A xxx-xx-...
SMITH, WAYNE A xxx-xx-...
SMITH, WESLEY E xxx-xx-...
SMITHHART, DAVID A xxx-xx-...
SMOLLER, AARON D xxx-xx-...
SNYDER, DONALD A xxx-xx-...
SNYDER, GEORGE H xxx-xx-...
SO, JOHN PYONGSUK xxx-xx-...
SOBIESKI, JOANNA J xxx-xx-...
SOLI, KATHLEEN F xxx-xx-...
SOLIS,MIGUEL A xxx-xx-...
SOLOMON, MICHAEL R xxx-xx-...
SOLORZANO, PATRICE A xxx-xx-...
SOMES, THEODORE A xxx-xx-...
SORENSEN, JAY C xxx-xx-...
SOUZA, GRAIG A xxx-xx-...
SPAGNUOLO, CHRISTOPHER F xxx-xx-...
SPAIN, DONALD R xxx-xx-...
SPALLA, BRYAN DAVID xxx-xx-...
SPANGLER, JON R xxx-xx-...
SPEAR, RANDALL A., JR xxx-xx-...
SPELTZ, DAVID J xxx-xx-...
SPENCER, JEFFREY L xxx-xx-...
SPENCER, LANCE H xxx-xx-...
SPENCER, MICHAEL W xxx-xx-...
SPILGER, KURT M xxx-xx-...
SPITZ, JOSEPH A xxx-xx-...
STAFFORD, CHRISTOPHER xxx-xx-...
STAGGENBORG, DANIEL J xxx-xx-...
STAHL, LAWRENCE M xxx-xx-...
STANKEVITZ, DARRYL L xxx-xx-...
STANTON, VALISE A xxx-xx-...
STARK, WAYNE W xxx-xx-...
STARKEY, PAUL L xxx-xx-...
STARKWEATHER, DON C xxx-xx-...
STATHOPOULOS, THOMAS xxx-xx-...
STCYR, GERALD C xxx-xx-...
STEFFENS, DAVID J xxx-xx-...
STEIN, JEFFREY A xxx-xx-...
STEINBECK, JOHN W. III xxx-xx-...
STENSON, DANIEL F xxx-xx-...
STEPHENS, PAUL D xxx-xx-...
STEPPLING, WILLIAM A xxx-xx-...
STEUCK, JAY C xxx-xx-...
STEWARD, ERIC J xxx-xx-...
STEWART, ALBERT K xxx-xx-...
STEWART, DANA L xxx-xx-...
STEWART, JAMES A xxx-xx-...
STINSON, MICHAEL J xxx-xx-...
STONE, ELMER C., JR xxx-xx-...
STONE, KEVIN L xxx-xx-...

STONE, LAURENCE K xxx-xx-...
STOSS, LAURA A xxx-xx-...
STOWERS, MICHAEL K xxx-xx-...
STUERMER, RAYMOND J xxx-xx-...
SUFFRIDGE, CHARLES S xxx-xx-...
SULLIVAN, RUSSELL E xxx-xx-...
SULLIVAN, SANDRA G xxx-xx-...
SUMMERS, JOHNNY D xxx-xx-...
SUTTON, BENJAMIN M xxx-xx-...
SWAIN, ARRON R xxx-xx-...
SWALLOW, WILLIAM L xxx-xx-...
SWANSON, SCOTT R xxx-xx-...
SWOGGER, RAYMOND A xxx-xx-...
SWYGERT, ALAN J xxx-xx-...
SYSMA, DAVID A xxx-xx-...
SZLACHTA, THOMAS E xxx-xx-...
TABB, TODD A xxx-xx-...
TALARICO, JOHN xxx-xx-...
TATE, RANDALL J xxx-xx-...
TAVENNER, RICHARD D xxx-xx-...
TAYLOR, MARK J xxx-xx-...
TAYLOR, RODERICK K xxx-xx-...
TAYLOR, RODNEY L xxx-xx-...
THIELEN, KURT E xxx-xx-...
THIELEN, SCOTT D xxx-xx-...
THIEM, TERRY L xxx-xx-...
THOMAS, SHARON C xxx-xx-...
THOMPSON, CHRISTOPHER E xxx-xx-...
THOMPSON, JEFFREY A xxx-xx-...
THOMPSON, ROBERT E xxx-xx-...
THOMPSON, ROBERT C xxx-xx-...
THORNE, DARRELL W xxx-xx-...
TILTON, DAVID W xxx-xx-...
TINDAL, FREDERICK C xxx-xx-...
TINGHITELLA, JOSEPH A xxx-xx-...
TIPSWORD, CHRISTOPHER L xxx-xx-...
TITTINGER, JAME xxx-xx-...
TIZZARD, THERESA F xxx-xx-...
TOBIN, KEITH E xxx-xx-...
TOLAND, RONALD J xxx-xx-...
TOLBERT, DOUGLAS S xxx-xx-...
TOPPERT, GARY A xxx-xx-...
TORPEY, TIMOTHY C xxx-xx-...
TORWEIHE, DANIEL R xxx-xx-...
TOUCHTON, JOHN H. III xxx-xx-...
TOUGHLIAN, EDWARD N xxx-xx-...
TOWNE, DAVID G xxx-xx-...
TOWNES, TIMOTHY P xxx-xx-...
TRACHSEL, WALTER G xxx-xx-...
TRAVERSE, JAMES D xxx-xx-...
TRELEAVEN, JAMES E xxx-xx-...
TRICKEL, THOMAS E xxx-xx-...
TRISSELL, KEVIN T xxx-xx-...
TROMBLEY, GERALD J xxx-xx-...
TRUAX, TODD M xxx-xx-...
TRUCHAN, MARK xxx-xx-...
TUCK, BRIAN L xxx-xx-...
TUCK, GIOVANNI K xxx-xx-...
TURCOTTE, MARK J xxx-xx-...
TURNER, STUART L xxx-xx-...
TWEEDT, LLOYD T xxx-xx-...
ULMER, AMOS B xxx-xx-...
URIE, KIMBERLEY I xxx-xx-...
UTSCH, THOMAS F xxx-xx-...
VACCARO, MICHAEL J xxx-xx-...
VALERO, LAURA J xxx-xx-...
VALHA, DARRIN M xxx-xx-...
VALLIERE, DAVID D xxx-xx-...
VANBELKUM, L.J xxx-xx-...
VANDERVEER, DAVID G. JR xxx-xx-...
VANDEUSEN, PETER L xxx-xx-...
VANDOREN, MICHAEL A xxx-xx-...
VANN, ALVIN M. JR xxx-xx-...
VANVLIET, GLENN R xxx-xx-...
VAUGHN, BRIAN T xxx-xx-...
VELA, RENE A. JR xxx-xx-...
VELEZ, AGUSTIN, E xxx-xx-...
VEST, EDWARD J xxx-xx-...
VETSCH, RICHARD A xxx-xx-...
VICARI, GEORGE JR xxx-xx-...
VICE, DOROTHY L xxx-xx-...
VICKER, DAVID F xxx-xx-...
VILELLA, CARLOS J xxx-xx-...
VILLACREZ, JOSEPH A. JR xxx-xx-...
VINEBURG, KENNETH A xxx-xx-...
VIRCIGLIO, FRANK C xxx-xx-...
VISCO, MARK F xxx-xx-...
VOGEL, RANDALL L xxx-xx-...
VOLZ, WILLIAM T xxx-xx-...
VONBROCK, DAVID H xxx-xx-...
VONOSTERHELDT, PAUL C xxx-xx-...
VOORHEES, JEFFREY S xxx-xx-...
WAGER, REBECCA J xxx-xx-...
WAHONICK, DONALD R. JR xxx-xx-...
WAITE, DAVID M xxx-xx-...
WAITE, MARK K xxx-xx-...
WALDROND, FEDERICO G xxx-xx-...
WALDROP, RENEE G xxx-xx-...
WALKER, ROBERT M xxx-xx-...
WALKER, WARD A., xxx-x...
WALLACE, SHAWN P xxx-xx-...
WALSH, JOHN A xxx-xx-...
WALTER, DANIEL A xxx-xx-...
WALTERS, GREGORY J xxx-xx-...
WALTERS, STEVEN M xxx-xx-...
WARD, CARL E xxx-xx-...
WARD, MARK A xxx-xx-...
WARD, MICHAEL T xxx-xx-...
WARD, MICHAEL T xxx-xx-...
WARD, TERRY xxx-xx-...
WARDLAW, BARRY G xxx-xx-...
WARTELL, ERIC R xxx-xx-...
WATKINS, DOUGLAS A xxx-xx-...
WATKINS, ERIC E xxx-xx-...
WATSON, MELISSA L xxx-xx-...
WATSON, PHILIP R xxx-xx-...
WATTS, KEVIN C xxx-xx-...
WEAKLAND, GAIL A xxx-xx-...
WEATHERMAN, SHANNON D xxx-xx-...
WEAVER, JAMES M xxx-xx-...
WEBB, JOLISA xxx-xx-...
WEBBER, JEFFERY D xxx-xx-...
WEBER, ERIC C xxx-xx-...
WEBER, SCOTT D xxx-xx-...
WEBER, TIMOTHY F xxx-xx-...
WEEKS, MICHAEL R xxx-xx-...
WEINGARTNER, JAMES D xxx-xx-...
WEIR, RICHARD A xxx-xx-...
WEIRICK, CLYDE A xxx-xx-...
WEIRICK, MARY R xxx-xx-...
WEIS, STEVEN C xxx-xx-...
WELCH, JON C xxx-xx-...
WELLER, MICHAEL M xxx-xx-...
WELLER, STEVEN J xxx-xx-...
WENDT, DERON L xxx-xx-...
WENIGER, DAVID L xxx-xx-...
WENZL, MICHAEL R xxx-xx-...
WERNER, GUY C xxx-xx-...
WEST, JOHN W xxx-xx-...
WESTCOTT, HARRY F xxx-xx-...
WESTEREN EVIN R xxx-xx-...
WESTERMEYER, ROGER H xxx-xx-...
WESTMARK, CAROLYN S xxx-xx-...
WHARTON, BRENT A., xxx-xx-...
WHIDDON, JEFFREY L xxx-xx-...
WHINNERY, MARK S xxx-xx-...
WHITE, JEFFREY S xxx-xx-...
WHITE, KAREN S xxx-xx-...
WHITE, MARK S xxx-xx-...
WHITE, NATHAN A xxx-xx-...
WHITE, RANDALL G xxx-xx-...
WHITE, TRAVIS W xxx-xx-...
WHITEMAN, WILLIAM R xxx-xx-...
WICKERSHAM, WILLIAM R xxx-xx-...
WIGGINS, SCOTT R xxx-xx-...
WILCOX, SCOTT L xxx-xx-...
WILCOX, STEVEN D xxx-xx-...
WILDES, FRANCIS F xxx-xx-...
WILKE, BRIAN S xxx-xx-...
WILKERSON, JAMES M xxx-xx-...
WILKERSON, SANDRA L xxx-xx-...
WILKIE, DEBORAH S xxx-xx-...
WILKIE, WILLIAM D xxx-xx-...
WILLIAMS, CHRISTOPHER L xxx-xx-...
WILLIAMS, CRAIG A xxx-xx-...
WILLIAMS, DARRYL E xxx-xx-...
WILLIAMS, JEROME xxx-xx-...
WILLIAMS, STEPHEN H xxx-xx-...
WILLIAMS, TIMOTHY N xxx-xx-...
WILLIAMS, WALTER B xxx-xx-...
WILLIAMS, WILLIE J. JR xxx-xx-...
WILLIAMSEN, JOSEPH S xxx-xx-...
WILLIAMSON, DOW A xxx-xx-...
WILSON, HAROLD L xxx-xx-...
WILSON, JAMES D xxx-xx-...
WILSON, KEITH S xxx-xx-...
WILSON, ROBERT D xxx-xx-...
WILTCHIK, MARK A xxx-xx-...
WINFIELD, DARRELL G xxx-xx-...
WINGREEN, MARK S xxx-xx-...
WINKLER, ANNE M xxx-xx-...
WINSTEAD, JOHN S xxx-xx-...
WINTERS, DAVID M xxx-xx-...
WINTERS, MICHAEL F xxx-xx-...
WINTERSTEEN, ROBERT J xxx-xx-...
WISE, PHILIP L xxx-xx-...
WITHAM, RANDY L xxx-xx-...
WITLOX, ANNETTE Y xxx-xx-...
WITTENBERG, STANLEY C xxx-xx-...
WOLF, JULIA A xxx-xx-...
WOLLSLAGER, JOHN C xxx-xx-...
WOLVERTON, THOMAS J., xxx-x...
WOOD, BRUCE A xxx-xx-...
WOOD, DAVID R xxx-xx-...
WOOD, ERIC R xxx-xx-...
WOOD, PAUL R xxx-xx-...
WOOTEN, WAYNE J xxx-xx-...
WOOTON, KEVIN B xxx-xx-...
WORTMAN, RONALD J xxx-xx-...
WRIGHT, CHESTER A. JR xxx-xx-...
WRIGHT, COLIN J xxx-xx-...
WRIGHT, ROCKFORD B xxx-xx-...
WYMAN, CHRISTOPHER J xxx-xx-...
WYNDHAM, CHARLES M. IV xxx-xx-...
YAMADA, ERNEST K xxx-xx-...
YAMASHITA, JON ADEN H xxx-xx-...
YOUNG, FRANK C. D xxx-xx-...
YOUNG, JACK W xxx-xx-...
YOUNG, MONTE W xxx-xx-...
YOUNG, ROBERT B. JR xxx-xx-...
YOUNG, SEANTA C xxx-xx-...
YOUNGSON, MICHAEL J., xxx-x...
ZAGATA, JAMES RICHARD xxx-xx-...
ZAMOT, NOEL xxx-xx-...
ZARBANO, ANTHONY E xxx-xx-...
ZEITLER, CATHERINE M xxx-xx-...
ZIENER, WILLIAM H. JR xxx-xx-...

THE FOLLOWING OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 531, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, WITH A VIEW TO DESIGNATION UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 8067, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, TO PERFORM DUTIES INDICATED WITH GRADE AND DATE OF RANK TO BE DETERMINED BY THE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE PROVIDED THAT IN NO CASE SHALL THE OFFICERS BE APPOINTED IN A GRADE HIGHER THAN CAPTAIN.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

BAKER, JOHN W xxx-xx-...
BARKER, PHILIP A xxx-xx-...
BARNES, ELWOOD M xxx-xx-...
BELL, OLEDIA F xxx-xx-...
CANNON, PAUL L xxx-xx-...
CLEMONS, ROBERT B. III xxx-xx-...
CUNNINGHAM, GREGORY B xxx-xx-...
DAVENPORT, JOHN M xxx-xx-...
DUNN, ROBERT D. JR xxx-xx-...
GALLAGHER, ROBERT A xxx-xx-...
GOSSELIN, LAWRENCE G xxx-xx-...
JAMES, JEFFREY A xxx-xx-...
LAMY, RAYMOND J xxx-xx-...
LOVETT, MICHAEL J xxx-xx-...
MCCAIN, STEVEN P xxx-xx-x...
MCFARLAND, FREDERICK xxx-xx-...
MORENO, ANTONIO O xxx-xx-...
NELMS, DANIEL H xxx-xx-...
NOLAN, JOHN H. JR xxx-xx-...
ODELL, ROBERT E xxx-xx-...
PHILLIPS, ROBERT N xxx-xx-...
SCHAICK, STEVEN A xxx-xx-...
SIEFKES, STEVEN C xxx-xx-...
SORROW, EVA CHRISTINE xxx-xx-...
UNDERWOOD, GARY E xxx-xx-...
WHEELER, CHERRI S xxx-xx-...
WHITE, ALAN J xxx-xx-...
WILSON, DONALD R xxx-xx-...

NURSE CORPS

ADKINS, SAMMY J xxx-xx-...
ALLEN, KAREN J xxx-xx-...
ANDERSON, BETTY L xxx-xx-...
ANTOKAL, JEFFREY G xxx-xx-...
AUSPRUNG, KATHRYN E xxx-xx-...
BAILEY, LINDA L xxx-xx-...
BAILEY, ROCHELLE E xxx-xx-...
BALL, SUSAN F xxx-xx-...
BARCLAY, CAROL A xxx-xx-...
BATES, DANA B xxx-xx-...
BEAVERS, DAVID A xxx-xx-...
BELL, CAROLYN M xxx-xx-...
BENNETT, IDA L xxx-xx-...
BERRY, MARIE L xxx-xx-...
BETTS, SHELLEY L xxx-xx-...
BILLS, STEVEN A xxx-xx-...
BLURTON, DEBORAH A xxx-xx-...
BOHAN, KEVIN J xxx-xx-...
BOOTH, DANNY L xxx-xx-...
BOST, SUSAN M xxx-xx-...
BOUCHARD, MICHAEL W xxx-xx-...
BOWDEN, ALLISON W xxx-xx-...
BOYER, BARBARA A xxx-xx-...
BRAMER, ALLYSON J xxx-xx-...
BREIER, CLIFFORD G xxx-xx-...
BREITBACH, KELLY J xxx-xx-...
BROUSSARD, TERRY J xxx-xx-...
BROWN, MICHAEL S xxx-xx-...
BROYLES, BARBARA A xxx-xx-...
BROYLES, TINA M xxx-xx-...
BRUBAKER, PATRICIA S xxx-xx-...
BRUMBAUGH, BARBARA L xxx-xx-...
BRUMMETT, BILLY J xxx-xx-...
BURCH, RODNEY J xxx-xx-...
BURKE, NOREEN A xxx-xx-...
BURNHAM, ROBERT R xxx-xx-...
BURRY, MARJORIE M xxx-xx-...
BUSBY, EMILY B xxx-xx-...
CAMPSIE, JEANNE L xxx-xx-...
CARNAGHI, MARY E xxx-xx-...
CAYETANO, SYLVIA E xxx-xx-...
CHAMBLISS, SHERI L xxx-xx-...
CHAPAWILSON, LYDIA M xxx-xx-...
CHAPPELL, JOHNNY R xxx-xx-...
CHAPPELL, THOMAS M xxx-xx-...
CIFELLI, PATRICIA M xxx-xx-...
CLARAVALL, LESLIE M xxx-xx-...
CLAREY, BERYL M xxx-xx-...
COFER, KAREN F xxx-xx-...
CONLON, MINH CHAU T xxx-xx-...
CORREIA, MARIO G xxx-xx-...
COUP, PAULA J xxx-xx-...
COYNER, BEVERLY J xxx-xx-...
CRAWFORD, GEORGIA M xxx-xx-...
CROUCH, HELEN K xxx-xx-...
CUTLER, CATHY G xxx-xx-...
DANIELS, WILLIAM M xxx-xx-...
DARIUS, JEFFREY C xxx-xx-...
DIFFEE, PAMELA D xxx-xx-...
DONOGHUE, DEBRA J xxx-xx-...
DONOVAN, LAUREEN M xxx-xx-...
DONWERTH, JENNIFER J xxx-xx-...
DOTY, DEBRA L xxx-xx-...
DOYLE, TAMMY J., xxx-x...
DRAKE, THURMAN L xxx-xx-...
DRENNON, SUSAN C xxx-xx-...
DUNKLEE, DENISE M xxx-xx-...
DUNNE, CARRIE L xxx-xx-...
EADES, ROBERT L. F xxx-xx-...
EDWARDS, MARILEE L xxx-xx-...
ESPINOZA, ELVIRA R xxx-xx-...
FELD, SUZANNE F xxx-xx-...
FELDMAN, THERESA L xxx-xx-...
FILLIPPI, SUZANNE S. M xxx-xx-...
FISK, SUSAN D xxx-xx-...
FLAGG, DEBORAH K xxx-xx-...
FLANAGAN, WINIFRED L xxx-xx-...
FLEMING, PATRICK B xxx-xx-...

FLYNN, THOMAS J. JR. xxx-xx-...
FOLEY, DARLENE L xxx-xx-...
FOOS, MARY J xxx-xx-...
FOSTER, LAURA A xxx-xx-...
FOX, JENNIFER A xxx-xx-...
GARZA, ALEX xxx-xx-...
GERKE, DANIEL E xxx-xx-...
GLATTFELT, JERRY L xxx-xx-...
GLAVAN, KATRINA A xxx-xx-...
GODDARD, DIANE M xxx-xx-...
GONZALEZ, CYNTHIA L xxx-xx-...
GREGORICH, PAMELA A xxx-xx-...
GUICHARD, MAUREEN F xxx-xx-...
HANSON, ARLENE S xxx-xx-...
HARRIS, MICHAEL L xxx-xx-...
HARRISON, YVONNE xxx-xx-...
HART, DIANE E xxx-xx-...
HARVEY, JERRY R. JR xxx-xx-...
HEMKER, CATHLEEN A xxx-xx-...
HENLEY, MARLENE xxx-xx-...
HIGGINS, MARY M xxx-xx-...
HILL, MARVIN D xxx-xx-...
HOLT, KARYN E xxx-xx-...
HOYLE, BILLIE L. xxx-x...
HUDSON, JANET C xxx-xx-...
HUGHES, JUDITH A xxx-xx-...
HUGHES, PATRICIA A xxx-xx-...
HUGHES, ROBIE V xxx-xx-...
HUTCHINS, AMELIA L xxx-xx-...
IRWIN, BRENDA K xxx-xx-...
JACKSON, LORETTA F xxx-xx-...
JANO, SUSAN xxx-xx-...
JARRETT, ELEANOR C xxx-xx-...
JEFTS, BARBARA xxx-xx-...
JONES, MICHELLE H xxx-xx-...
JUERS, JULIE A xxx-xx-...
KEEVER, KATHY J xxx-xx-...
KEPHART, LINDA J xxx-xx-...
KIMBALL, DIANE M xxx-xx-...
KING, KRISTY G xxx-xx-...
KNUDSON, JOHN D xxx-xx-...
KOCH, MARISSA xxx-xx-...
KRAUSE, BARBARA A xxx-xx-...
KRIEGHFLEMING, GUYLENE D xxx-xx-...
KUHN, LORI A xxx-xx-...
LANDRUM, TSU CYNTHIA M xxx-xx-...
LAWSON, KATHLEEN A xxx-xx-...
LEITNAKER, JOHN R xxx-xx-...
LESAINT, PAUL W xxx-xx-...
LESS, CYNTHIA A xxx-xx-...
LINDQUIST, LEIGH A xxx-xx-...
LOGAN, JANET K xxx-xx-...
LONGEST, ROBIN I xxx-xx-...
LOWE, GREGG S xxx-xx-...
LUCAS, DAVID W xxx-xx-...
MAGUIRE, KATHLEEN ZELLER xxx-xx-...
MAHONEY, MADONNA J xxx-xx-...
MANLEY, JUDY L xxx-xx-...
MANNING, MIA K xxx-xx-...
MANUEL, ANGELA F xxx-xx-...
MARIANO, GOUVEIA TAMZI M xxx-xx-...
MARTINEZ, JUAN F xxx-xx-...
MATTER, TAMARA S xxx-xx-...
MCAMISH, RICHARD A xxx-xx-...
MCCANDLESS, BARBARA E xxx-xx-...
MCFADDEN, MARY F xxx-xx-...
MCGOWAN, GENEVIEVE xxx-xx-...
MCKINNEY, TANYA R xxx-xx-...
MCKISSICK, BARBARA D xxx-xx-...
MCMANUS, TERENCE J xxx-xx-...
MCTAGGART, CAROL L xxx-xx-...
MERCER, JANET M xxx-xx-...
MILEY, ANGELA D xxx-xx-...
MILLER, JODY D xxx-xx-...
MILLER, VIVIAN L xxx-xx-...
MILLWATER, TERESA L xxx-xx-...
MITCHELL, ROBYN A xxx-xx-...
MOORE, ANNETTE xxx-xx-...
MOORE, LOURDES D.R xxx-xx-...
MOORE, SHARON Y xxx-xx-...
MORRILL, CAREY A. C xxx-xx-...
MULHEARN, MICHAEL J xxx-xx-...
MURPHY, LAURA C xxx-xx-...
MURPHY, LYNN P xxx-xx-...
MURTOLA, DEBORAH K xxx-xx-...
MYERS, DAVID L xxx-xx-...
NEFF, MARIA K xxx-xx-...
NOE, AMY E xxx-xx-...
NORDEL, PATRICIA A xxx-xx-...
NORTHERN, ROBERT D. JR xxx-xx-...
ODONNELL, DIANA R xxx-xx-...
OTTO, TIMOTHY R xxx-xx-...
OWEN, BRENDA L xxx-xx-...
PAGAN, MARIA C xxx-xx-...
PARKER, VALERIE S xxx-xx-...
PARR, PHILLIP E xxx-xx-...
PATE, RUSSELL E xxx-xx-...
PATTON, BRADLEY H xxx-xx-...
PETERSEN, PENNY L xxx-xx-...
PETERSON, KARL R xxx-xx-...
PETRIC, DINA M xxx-xx-...
PIETROCOLA, MARLENE R xxx-xx-...
POCHANT, ROBIN, R xxx-xx-...
POLITO, VICTOR P xxx-xx-...
POSO, MELINDA L xxx-xx-...
POUND, JERE M., IV xxx-xx-...
PRESTON, KELLY R xxx-xx-...
RADEMACHER, PATRICIA A xxx-xx-...
RAY, MARINA C xxx-xx-...
REYESGONZALEZ, DOLORES xxx-xx-...
RICE, DOMINICA R xxx-xx-...
ROBERSON, CYNTHIA D xxx-xx-...
ROBERSONHOWIE, KARI W xxx-xx-...
ROBERTS, EDWIN T xxx-xx-...
ROBINSON, DIANE W xxx-xx-...
ROBINSON, JULIETTE xxx-xx-...
ROBINSON, MICHAEL A xxx-xx-...
ROME, DARLA C xxx-xx-...
ROYER, KENT D xxx-xx-...
SASSER, SHERRY J xxx-xx-...
SAUNDERS, SHERRIE L xxx-xx-...
SAYLES, SHARON B xxx-xx-...
SCHMIDT, LISA A xxx-xx-...
SCOTT, EVERLENE D xxx-xx-...
SEAVERS, LINDA A xxx-xx-...
SHEEHAN, CAROL M xxx-xx-...
SHELTON, JEAN M xxx-xx-...
SHERCLIFFE, LUCIA S xxx-xx-...
SHERCLIFFE, RYAN M xxx-xx-...
SHERWOOD, JENNIFER L xxx-xx-...
SHOVELTON, LAWRENCE M xxx-xx-...
SMITH, AUDRENE A xxx-xx-...
SMITH, DOREEN A xxx-xx-...
SMITH, GREGORY A xxx-xx-...
SMITH, JOSEPH R xxx-xx-...
SMITH, KENDA C xxx-xx-...
SNOOZY, KATHRYN E xxx-xx-...
SPIKOWSKI, CARLA M xxx-xx-...
SPILLERS, WANDA B xxx-xx-...
SPROUL, ANNE C xxx-xx-...
ST. AMOUR, ALINE M xxx-xx-...
STACKHOUSE, PAMELA H xxx-xx-...
STRANO, NAOMI E xxx-xx-...
STRIGLIO, ROBERT xxx-xx-...
SUAREZ, JAIME E xxx-xx-...
SULLINS, JACQUELINE C xxx-xx-...
SUMMERS, BEVERLY J xxx-xx-...
SUTTON, CECELIA W xxx-xx-...
TABARY, DENISE M xxx-xx-...
TALLA, HANNA T xxx-xx-...
TARLETON, DEBORAH A xxx-xx-...
TAYLOR, ANGELA M xxx-xx-...
TENACE, TAMMY R xxx-xx-...
TISUE, LISA E xxx-xx-...
TURTURRO, MICHAEL G xxx-xx-...
UEBEL, CHRISTINE S xxx-xx-...
USHER, CARY M xxx-xx-...
VOGELSANGWATSON, CYLYSCE D xxx-xx-...
WADE, DARLENE E xxx-xx-...
WALL, EUGENE J. J. JR xxx-xx-...
WALLACE, JANICE D xxx-xx-...
WALTHER, BILLIE J xxx-xx-...
WARWICK, MARY E xxx-xx-...
WASHINGTON, KIMBLE R xxx-xx-...
WATSON, NINA A xxx-xx-...
WEAVER, MELANIE H xxx-xx-...
WILLIAMS, NANCY J xxx-xx-...
WILLIAMS, PATRICK J xxx-xx-...
WILSON, JANET L xxx-xx-...
WILSON, KAREN G xxx-xx-...
WILSON, KELLY D xxx-xx-...
WITT, MARGARET H xxx-xx-...
YOUNG, DEBORAH C xxx-xx-...
ZOLLMANN, PAUL J xxx-xx-...

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

ALLEN, DAVID M xxx-xx-...
ALMIND, MARILYN M xxx-xx-...
ARENDS, JERRY A xxx-xx-...
BLAISSE, PAUL F xxx-xx-...
BLYTHE, LISA K xxx-xx-...
CARLOS, MARK E xxx-xx-...
CAUCH, CHRISTOPHER D xxx-xx-...
COLE, DONALD xxx-xx-...
DARLING, KENNETH R xxx-xx-...
DAVIS, JAMES M. JR xxx-xx-...
DELANEY, KATHLEEN A xxx-xx-...
FEINBERG, MARK S xxx-xx-...
FREENEY, JAMES P. SR xxx-xx-...
GARRISON, DAVID W xxx-xx-...
HAGGERTY, JOSEPH P xxx-xx-...
HAMILTON, TERRY W xxx-xx-...
HARRISON, JOSEPH JR xxx-xx-...
HART, RICHARD C xxx-xx-...
HAYHURST, ROBERT E xxx-xx-...
HEYNE, LORN W xxx-xx-...
HINES, DANIEL F xxx-xx-...
KELLY, JEB S xxx-xx-...
KORMOS, WILLIAM J. JR xxx-xx-...
KOSEWICZ, EDWARD P xxx-xx-...
KOSSIVER, DAVID G xxx-xx-...
KRAS, KRZYSZTOF xxx-xx-...
LOVE, ROBERT B xxx-xx-...
LOWRY, STEVEN S xxx-xx-...
MANCHESTER, KATHRYN S xxx-xx-...
MCGILVRA, TROY P xxx-xx-...
MCNULTY, KEVIN M xxx-xx-...
MOORE, JUDITH E xxx-xx-...
MOORE, THOMAS C xxx-xx-...
MORGAN, DANIEL K xxx-xx-...
MUELLER, THERESA M xxx-xx-...
NELSEN, CHARLES W xxx-xx-...
PARKS, JOHN K xxx-xx-...
PERDUE, MARK A xxx-xx-...
PICKERT, DAVID A xxx-xx-...
RAINES, CALVIN xxx-xx-...
RAMSEY, JOHN E xxx-xx-...
READER, PATRICIA A xxx-xx-...
REESE, DIANE M xxx-xx-...
ROSADO, JAIME L. JR xxx-xx-...
ROSENBAUM, VICTOR J xxx-xx-...
RYAN, EARL B xxx-xx-...
SANCHEZ, SCOTT J xxx-xx-...
SCHELL, MICHAEL G xxx-xx-...
SCHOTT, MICHELE M xxx-xx-...
SHELLEY, SUSAN xxx-xx-...
SMITH, LINDA J xxx-xx-...
SPADE, GEORGE E. II xxx-xx-...
WAGNER, THOMAS S xxx-xx-...
WARWICK, MICHAEL A xxx-xx-...
WATKINS, KIRSTEN F xxx-xx-...
WESTON, GILMER G. III xxx-xx-...
YAP, GLENN A xxx-xx-...

BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES CORPS

ACOBA, MICHAEL T. xxx-xx-...
ALEXIS, MARTIN xxx-xx-...
ALFORD, RONNY G xxx-xx-...
ANGELOARCEO, CARMEN D xxx-xx-...
APPFEL, NANCY C xxx-xx-...
ATCHLEY, DANIEL H xxx-xx-...
BAUMAN, LISA B xxx-xx-...
BECK, PAULA R xxx-xx-...
BEDARD, MARY E xxx-xx-...
BERNACKY, BRUCE J xxx-xx-...
BIRGENHEIR, MICHAEL R xxx-xx-...
BLACK, STEVEN E xxx-xx-...
BLAKLEY, KEVIN C xxx-xx-...
BOARDMAN, CHARLES H. IV xxx-xx-...
BREHMHEITMAN, KATHLEEN A xxx-xx-...
BRENNING, WILLARD A. JR xxx-xx-...
BRETON, JOSEPH G xxx-xx-...
BURR, TEE J xxx-xx-...
BYRNES, TERENCE M xxx-xx-...
CABERTO, STEVEN C xxx-xx-...
CALVANOCARPENTER, ELIZABETH xxx-xx-...
CAMPBELL, ROBERT J xxx-xx-...
CHITWOOD, JOHN L xxx-xx-...
COGBURN, CYNTHIA D xxx-xx-...
COLE, JAMES M xxx-xx-...
COOK, MARY A. xxx-xx-...
COSTA, JANELLE E xxx-xx-...
CRONIN, KATHLEEN M xxx-xx-...
DART, TODD S xxx-xx-...
DAWSON, ROBERT A xxx-xx-...
DECLET, JOSE R xxx-xx-...
DIDONNA, LEWIS J. JR xxx-xx-...
DODGE, PETER A. SR xxx-xx-...
DOMINIK, MARY E xxx-xx-...
DOYLE, DANIELE N xxx-xx-...
DUBOIS, DONALD F xxx-xx-...
EGGERS, FREDRICK A xxx-xx-...
FARNUM, RICHARD W xxx-xx-...
FEASTER, JOSEPH A xxx-xx-...
FLYNN, MARK T xxx-xx-...
FONSECA RIVERA, JOSE M xxx-xx-...
FRASCO, MICKRA K xxx-xx-...
GILLEN, JEFFREY C xxx-xx-...
GREER, GARY xxx-xx-...
GREGOIRE, STEPHEN H xxx-xx-...
GRISE, DARRELL S xxx-xx-...
GUDGEL, LARRY D xxx-xx-...
HAMMIEL, DAVID A xxx-xx-...
HAND, MICHAEL D xxx-xx-...
HARRINGTON, LAWRENCE K xxx-xx-...
HERMANN, AILEEN E xxx-xx-...
HITTLE, LAWRENCE D xxx-xx-...
HOUSE, KAREN M xxx-xx-...
JERMYN, HELEN W xxx-xx-...
JESZKE, GLORIA J xxx-xx-...
JONES, ROBERT M xxx-xx-...
KING, WALTER B. JR xxx-xx-...
KIRBY, HOMER E. III xxx-xx-...
KLAUDER, MICHAEL J xxx-xx-...
KLECZEK, DAVID J xxx-xx-...
KLINE, ANDREA J xxx-xx-...
KROON, KAREN R xxx-xx-...
LARSON, WENDY M xxx-xx-...
LINSCOMB, SUBRINA V.S xxx-xx-...
LITTLE, CATHERINE xxx-xx-...
LOHSE, JANICE M xxx-xx-...
MADISON, GREGORY E xxx-xx-...
MALLERY, JANE M xxx-xx-...
MALLETT, MARK S xxx-xx-...
MARKS, STACEY O xxx-xx-...
MCMILLAN, NAOMI H xxx-xx-...
MILLER, NANCY S.H xxx-xx-...
MONTGOMERY, NOEL D xxx-xx-...
MOORE, MARLIN K xxx-xx-...
MULCARE, JOSEPH P xxx-xx-...
MULLINS, JAMES A xxx-xx-...
PAUL, MARC W xxx-xx-...
PLANTE, PARKER T xxx-xx-...
POST, DOUGLAS A xxx-xx-...
PUTNAM, JOHN L xxx-xx-...
ROGERS, JOSEPH S xxx-xx-...
SCOTT, SHELIA P xxx-xx-...
SEIDERER, ARTHUR W xxx-xx-...
SHAFFER, MICHELE L xxx-xx-...
SMITH, JOHN D xxx-xx-...
SMITH, KAREN J xxx-xx-...
SMOLIK, TAMI A xxx-xx-...
STOKES, MARTHA A xxx-xx-...
STONE, FRED P xxx-xx-...
SUMAN, JEANMARIE xxx-xx-...
TAYLOR, ROBERT L. JR xxx-xx-...
THOMASOS, CHARITY J xxx-xx-...
THRASHER, ANGELA V xxx-xx-...
TURNER, MICHAEL R xxx-xx-...
TUTT, RONALD C xxx-xx-...
VOIGT, STEPHEN L xxx-xx-...
WALKER, AMY L xxx-xx-...
WEAVER, JOSEPH G xxx-xx-...
WEIBY, GARY M xxx-xx-...
WEINGARTNER, NANCY E xxx-xx-...
WEST, DENISE M xxx-xx-...

WESTON, KERSHAW L. xxx-xx-...
WILLIAMS, MICHELE A. xxx-xx-...
WILSON, ROBERT J. xxx-xx-...
WONCHALA, DAVID P. xxx-xx-...
YOUNG, PETER M. V. xxx-xx-...
ZRIMM, SHEILA J. xxx-xx-...

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR PROMOTION IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 3370:

ARMY NURSE CORPS

To be colonel

AFFE, PATRICIA A. xxx-xx-xx...
ALLBRITTEN, DOROTHY xxx-xx-x...
ALLMAN, CELIA A. xxx-xx-x...
BARTLETT, JOSEPHINE xxx-xx-xx...
BOATRIGHT, CONNIE xxx-xx-x...
BOLCAR, BLINN S. xxx-xx-x...
BRASWELL, LORRAINE xxx-xx-x...
CADORETTE, SYLVIA xxx-xx-x...
CALDWELL, MATTIE I. xxx-xx-x...
CHISM, ERNESTINE R. xxx-xx-x...
CROTWELL, PATRICIA xxx-xx-x...
DIVINE, JEANETTE M. xxx-xx-x...
FOSTER, ARNEDA M. xxx-xx-x...
FUTRELL, RONALDA xxx-xx-x...
GARCIA MARY A. xxx-xx-x...
GUADETTE, LAUREN L. xxx-xx-x...
GERMAIN, MARY P. xxx-xx-x...
GRIFFIN, ROGER D. xxx-xx-x...
GUNN, OMEGA xxx-xx-x...
HALE, JANET H. xxx-xx-x...
HARRELL, JANIE D. xxx-xx-x...
HELMER, YVONNE G. xxx-xx-x...
HEMMING, BONNIE J. xxx-xx-x...
KAUTZ, NANCY J. xxx-xx-x...
LYNCH, JOAN A. xxx-xx-x...
MACH, NANCY E. xxx-xx-x...
MATTSON, MARTHA C. xxx-xx-x...
MCINTOSH, PHYLLIS xxx-xx-x...
MUNFORD, SHIRLEY A. xxx-xx-x...
O BRYANT, ANGELINE xxx-xx-x...
PELUSO, SUSAN S. xxx-xx-x...
ROCKWELL, KATHLEEN xxx-xx-x...
SALZER, JUDITH S. xxx-xx-x...
SEWARD, GEORGIA A. xxx-xx-x...
SHARPS, PHYLLIS W. xxx-xx-x...
SIMONS, CHERYL M. xxx-xx-x...
STEVENS, GERTRUDE xxx-xx-x...
STEWART, CHERYL J. xxx-xx-x...
SWEAT, RUTH E. xxx-xx-x...
TOMS, KATHLEEN M. xxx-xx-x...
VALLIERE, MELENNA xxx-xx-x...
WEVER, JOANN xxx-xx-x...
WRIGHT, MARY J. xxx-xx-x...
ZOLOCK, THERESA J. xxx-xx-x...

DENTAL CORPS

To be colonel

BODENHEIM, MARK B. xxx-xx-x...
DUFRESNE, JOSEPH V. xxx-xx-xx...
DUKE, THOMAS E. xxx-xx-x...
DUNCAN, JAMES D. xxx-xx-x...
WHITEHILL, HARRY V. xxx-xx-x...
WRIGHT, CHARLES L. xxx-xx-x...

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonel

ALLEN, ROBERT K. xxx-xx-x...
ALVAREZ, FAUST M. xxx-xx-x...
BERGIN, DONALD J. xxx-xx-x...
BERKOWITZ, ROY E. xxx-xx-x...
BICKEL, ARTHUR S. xxx-xx-x...
BURNER, SCOTT H. xxx-xx-x...
CLARK, DANIEL G. xxx-xx-x...
COPPLE, HAL E. xxx-xx-x...
EAGAR, RONALD M. xxx-xx-x...
FENSTERER, FREDERI xxx-xx-xx...
GREENFIELD, GERALD xxx-xx-x...
HANNA, JOHN H. xxx-xx-x...
HECKER, JAMES N. xxx-xx-x...
KWA, SEW L. xxx-xx-x...
LAURIDSEN, JOHN xxx-xx-x...
LOWTHIAN, JOHN T. xxx-xx-x...
MACCAUGHELTY, THOM xxx-xx-x...
MARTIN, LLOYD D. xxx-xx-x...
MATHEWS, THOMAS G. xxx-xx-x...
MCGUIRK, DONALD L. xxx-xx-x...
NOLAN, BRIAN T. xxx-xx-x...
OLEGARIO, EDUARDO xxx-xx-x...
ONGCAPIN, EMELIE H. xxx-xx-x...
PATTERSON, HUBERT xxx-xx-x...
PFEIFER, WILLIAM F. xxx-xx-xx...
REED, HOLLIS T. xxx-xx-x...
SEXTON, CURTIS C. xxx-xx-x...
SINGER, IRWIN S. xxx-xx-xx...
SLEPIAN, JACOB Z. xxx-xx-x...
STINSON, HELEN M. xxx-xx-x...
STOCKMAL, ROBERT G. xxx-xx-x...
STONE, IRVIN K. xxx-xx-x...
WILKERSON, RICKY D. xxx-xx-x...
ZEPEDA, MARIA C. xxx-xx-x...

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

To be colonel

FANTASIA, FRANK R. xxx-xx-x...
LIEVSAY, ALVIN L. xxx-xx-x...
MANGELSDORFF, ARTH xxx-xx-x...
PIRES, ABILIO W. xxx-xx-x...
PORTER, JOHN D. xxx-xx-x...
RUTALA, WILLIAM A. xxx-xx-x...
SCANLON, STEPHEN C. xxx-xx-x...
SULLIVAN, JOSEPH M. xxx-xx-x...
WARE, BONNIE L., JR. xxx-xx-x...
WEST RONALD E. xxx-xx-x...

VETERINARY CORPS

To be colonel

BRIGHTMAN, ALAN H. xxx-xx-x...

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS OF THE MARINE CORPS RESERVE FOR PERMANENT APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF COLONEL UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION x...

ADAMS, STEPHEN S. xx...
ANDERSON, CHARLES A. xx...
ARGO, JAMES R., JR. xx...
ARGUEDAS, ALFREDO J. x...
ASHLEY, JAMES M. xx...
BACON, ALLAN R., JR. x...
BAUMGARTNER, CARY xx...
CARTER, LUTHER F. x...
COONEY, KATHRYN P. xx...
CUNNINGHAM, THOMAS E. xx...
DAVIS, ALAN R. xx...
EASTERDAY, STEVEN G. x...
EICHORN, ROBERT P. x...
EVANS, EDMUND E. xx...
FANNING, LARRY G. xx...
FELTENBERGER, FISHER A. xx...
FISHER, STEPHEN T. xx...
FRUCHTNICHT, HAROLD J. xx...
FUHRMANN, RONALD J. x...
GARVEY, KEVIN A. xx...
GHARST, THOMAS L. xx...
GONZALES, LAWRENCE D. xx...
GOTT, LAWRENCE D. xx...
GRABOW, CHADLEE C. x...
HALUSKA, JAMES E. xx...
HAYNIE, JAMES E. x...
HEINECKE, JOHN J. x...
HESS, JAMES R. x...
HILEMAN, ANDREW F. xx...
JACKSON, CHARLES H. x...
JAHAASKI, RAYMOND A. xx...
JAMES, DENNIS E. x...
JENDRESAK, STANLEY A. JR. xx...
JONES, BRETT A. x...
KAIRIS, JEROME D. xx...
KENNEY, ROBERT E. xx...
KERR, PHILIP A. xx...
LAVERDURE, PATRICIA F. xx...
LEE, GAINES T. x...
LEITCH, LARRY L. xx...
MAGINNIS, MICHAEL B. xx...
MATRANGA, DOMINICK x...
MCMULLEN, BRIAN G. xx...
MOORE, TOMMY L. x...
MORGA, DENNIS A. xx...
MROCZKOWSKI, DENNIS P. xx...
MURPHY, KEVIN J. x...
NEWMAN, JOHN J. xx...
OHLS, GARY J. xx...
OWEN, JACK E. JR. xx...
PAYNE, THOMAS G. xx...
PERKINS, HIRAM M. xx...
PFEIL, PATRICIA L. xx...
PHARO, STEPHEN A. xx...
RORAFF, RALPH W. x...
ROUTSON, SAMUEL J. x...
SAMUELSON, WAYNE P. xx...
SAVAGE, CHARLES D. xx...
SEAL, PETER R. xx...
SEISER, GARY C. x...
SKILES, STEPHEN C. x...
SMITH, WALTER L. x...
TARRANT, KENNETH W. JR. x...
URENOVICH, MICHAEL C. x...
VENTURE, DANIEL T. xx...
WAGNER, THOMAS C. II xx...
WILSON, GARY I. xx...
WOOD, CRAIG W. x...

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS OF THE MARINE CORPS FOR PERMANENT APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 624:

ALEXANDER, JOSEPH A. JR. xx...
ALLES, RANDOPLH D. x...
ANDERSON, MICAHEL C. xx...
ASTYK, LAWRENCE W. xx...
BARILICH, STEVEN F. xx...
BARR, DENNIS J. xx...
BEAL, DENNIS W. xx...
BEATY, ROBERTA L. x...
BECKER, CHRISTOPHER L. xx...
BLASIOL, LEONARD A. xx...
BODE, KENNETH D. xx...
BOGGS, JOHN T. JR. xx...
BOURGEOIS, GORDON C. x...
BRIGGS, WAYNE E. xx...
BROCK, GEORGE S. x...
BROIN, MARK L. x...
BROOKS, TIMOTHY E. xx...
BUCHINGER, PHILIP E. x...
BURGESS, ROLAND N. xx...
BUSH, FELIX M. x...
BYRD, ROY R. x...
CALDWELL, GEARY A. xx...
CARLTON, RANDY B. xx...
CARR, DONALD P. xx...
CASH, STEVEN J. x...
CHAMPION, ARON K. x...
CHESTER, ROBERT S. xx...
CHRISTOPHER, SAMUEL H. IV x...
CLARK, MICHAEL E. xx...
CONNER, MARK A. x...
CONNOLLY, TIMOTHY, JR. xx...
COONEY, JAMES J. xx...
CRAIG, RALPH D. xx...
DALY, MICHAEL F. xx...
DANTONIO, ERNEST C. xx...
DAWSON, RALPH D. xx...
DOUGHTY, MICHAEL J. x...
DOYLE, SCOTT A. xx...
DUBOIS, VINCENT M. JR. xx...
DUNFORD, JOSEPH F. JR. xx...
DUVA, MICHAEL x...
EDWARDS, MICHAEL T. xx...
ESPINOZA, ALFRED J. xx...
EVANS, BETHEL Q. III xx...
FEARING, ZENAS E. JR. xx...
FENLON, BRIAN T. x...
FERRIS, TIMOTHY B. x...
FLANAGAN, JOHN S. II xx...
FLYNN, COLLEEN M. xx...
FREITAS, MARK xx...
GARRISON, ROBERT G. x...
GIBSON, MARK J. x...
GRANT, FREDERICK H. xx...
GRIFFIN, OTIS, JR. xx...
GRIMES, JOHN M. x...
GURGANUS, CHARLES M. x...
HANNUM, PATRICK H. xx...
HARBIN, KENNETH S. x...
HARDWICK, JON T. xx...
HEALEY, MICHAEL J. x...
HEALY, DAVID A. xx...
HEISINGER, MICHAEL J. xx...
HEMLEBEN, JOHN F. xx...
HERNDON, CHARLES M. JR. x...
HESTIR, WILLIAM R. xx...
HILLIKER, TERRY L. xx...
HOUSE, DONALD C. JR. x...
HOWARD, JOSEPH D. x...
HUGHES, MICHAEL J. xx...
INGLES, RALPH W. x...
INMAN, KENNETH A. JR. x...
JANNELL, RICHARD E. x...
JOHNSON, DAVID C. xx...
JORGENSEN, DAVID A. x...
JOYCE, CHRISTOPHER K. x...
JULIAN, ARLOW A. xx...
KENDRICK, ROBERT M. xx...
KERRICK, DAVID T. xx...
KIMLICK, MICHAEL F. x...
KINNEAR, THOMAS M. xx...
KNAPP, ROBERT J. xx...
KNIGHT, ROSA K. xx...
KNOLL, STUART L. x...
KNUTZEN, ROBERT M. x...
KRAUS, JOHN E. x...
KRAUSS, HENRY J. JR. x...
KREJMAS, JOSEPH J. JR. xx...
KRUSE, JOHN E. xx...
LADD, PAUL L. x...
LAHASZOW, ANDREW J. xx...
LANDOLFI, DAVID J. xx...
LAVIGNE, MICHAEL W. xx...
LEBLANC, PAUL W. xx...
LEEMAN, KEVIN H. x...
LEONE, VINCENT R. JR. xx...
LEONHARDT, KENT A. xx...
LOGAN, DUANE B. x...
LYNCH, MAUREEN M. x...
MACAK, WILLIAM C. x...
MACDONALD, JOHN F. JR. xx...
MARINEY, CLARENCE xx...
MARRIOTT, MICHAEL A. x...
MCCLESKEY, HOWELL G. xx...
MCCONNELL, GARY M. xx...
MCMAINS, JAMES W. xx...
MCMEANS, STUART R. x...
MEADE, WILLIAM M. xx...
MEDINA, JOSEPH V. xx...
MEHALIC, CHARLES J. x...
MERRITT, DENNIS I. x...
MEYERS, CRAIG F. x...
MEYERS, THOMAS J. x...
MILLER, BLAISE P. xx...
MILLS, RICHARD P. xx...
MILLS, SIDNEY E. JR. xx...
MOEDER, JOSEPH E. xx...
MONTGOMERY, DOUGLAS J. xx...
MORIARTY, PATRICK R. xx...
MORIN, GREGORY S. xx...
MUGNO, CHARLES V. x...
MURRAY, BRYAN K. xx...
MUSCA, JOSEPH I. xx...
NALL, MARK A. xx...
NANS, CLAYTON F. xx...
NANS, CRYSTAL M. xx...
NAVARRE, RODERIC S. x...
NEHER, RONALD O. xx...
NEIMEYER, CHARLES P. x...

NEWMAN, PHILLIP L. [redacted]
NOLAN, MARTIN R. [redacted]
NYBERG, ERIC N. [redacted]
ODONNELL, JAMES H. [redacted]
O'NEAL, RANDY R. [redacted]
O'NEILL, GORDON C. [redacted]
OPEL, CRAIG E. [redacted]
PAPAY, JOSEPH A. JR. [redacted]
PELLEGRINI, MICHAEL D. [redacted]
PENN, DAVID T. [redacted]
PIERCE, MERRILL L. JR. [redacted]
PINO, EUGENIO G. [redacted]
PISANO, PAUL J. [redacted]
PRIEST, RAYMOND W. [redacted]
RANKIN, JOHN J. [redacted]
REAGAN, FRANKLIN V. [redacted]
RECTOR, GEORGE E. JR. [redacted]
REES, JOHN T. [redacted]
REGNER, MICAHEL R. [redacted]
REIF, CHARLES W. [redacted]
REINHOLD, GARY M. [redacted]
RICHARDSON, RODNEY C. [redacted]
RILEY, CHESTER A. III [redacted]
ROBERTS, JERRY A. [redacted]
ROBINSON, MICAHEL L. [redacted]
ROHLFS, PAMELA F. [redacted]
ROHLFS, WILLIAM G. JR. [redacted]
SALINAS, ANGELA [redacted]
SALZMAN, DAVID A. [redacted]
SANDERSON, WILLIAM A. [redacted]
SASS, ARTHUR H. [redacted]
SCEPUREK, JOHN M. [redacted]
SCHILLING, JOANNE L. [redacted]
SHAW, JUDITH C. [redacted]
SHORT, JOHN S. JR. [redacted]
SIMMONS, WALTER W. [redacted]
SMART, BRUCE S. [redacted]
SMYTHE, ANA R. [redacted]
SOVACOOL, MICHAEL A. [redacted]
SPARKS, JOHN E. JR. [redacted]
SPENCER, RICHARD W. [redacted]
SPIESE, MELVIN G. [redacted]
STICKLEY, HARRY P., III [redacted]
SUTER, JOHN R. [redacted]
TAYLOR, CAROLYN L. [redacted]
THALER, THOMAS F. [redacted]
THOMPSON, DENNIS C. [redacted]
TODSEN, PETER B. II [redacted]
TOOLAN, JOHN A. JR. [redacted]
TYRRELL, TOMMY L. JR. [redacted]
VALLANDINGHAM, CHARLES E. JR. [redacted]
VIETTI, KEVIN A. [redacted]
WAGONER, WILLIAM O. [redacted]
WALIZER, FRANK A. [redacted]
WALKER, LAWRENCE G. [redacted]
WASHABAUGH, BRADFORD G. [redacted]
WATSON, KENNETH C. [redacted]
WEITEKAMP, DANIEL F. [redacted]
WELTSCH, MICHAEL D. [redacted]
WHITLOCK, GEORGE J. [redacted]
WIECKOWSKI, WESLEY [redacted]
WILCUTT, TERRENCE W. [redacted]
WILKINSON, JEFFREY L. [redacted]
WILLS, ROBERT L. [redacted]
WINN, DAVID M. [redacted]
WINTERS, KEVIN H. [redacted]
WYATT, BENJAMIN G. [redacted]
YACKLEY, THOMAS M. [redacted]
YOFFEE, WADE [redacted]

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS OF THE MARINE CORPS RESERVE FOR PERMANENT APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION [redacted]:

ANDRUS, JAMES C. [redacted]
APPLEGATE, DOUGLAS L. [redacted]
ARCHER, THOMAS E. II [redacted]
BALESKIE, FRANK A. [redacted]
BENES, JEFFREY P. [redacted]
BERG, RONALD M. JR. [redacted]
BERGMEISTER, FRANCIS X. [redacted]
BERKLEY, JOHN W. [redacted]
BEVERLY, BRENT J. [redacted]
BODDIE, ARVIN [redacted]
BOLES KENNETH L. [redacted]
BREWER, KEVIN B. [redacted]
BRUEN, JOHN P. [redacted]
BURGER, DOREEN M. [redacted]
BURGESS, ANITA E. [redacted]
BURKE, JAMES B. [redacted]
BULTER, STEVEN R. [redacted]
BYNUM, HORACE C. [redacted]
CAREY, JOHN A. [redacted]
CARR, MICHAEL A. [redacted]
CASSIDY, TIMOTHY J. [redacted]
COLELLA, THOMAS V. [redacted]
COMEAU, JOHN R. [redacted]
CORY, JEFFREY A. [redacted]
CRITES, JAMES M. [redacted]
DAILY, MICHAEL N. [redacted]
DAVIS, PAUL W. [redacted]
DIAZ, MIGUEL A. JR. [redacted]
DILLON, TERESA L. [redacted]
DUKE, ROGER S. [redacted]
DUNNE, JACK H. III [redacted]
EDMONDS, RICHARD L. [redacted]
ESPITIA, RICARDO J. [redacted]
FITZGIBBONS, LEONARD J. [redacted]
FORRESTER, MICHAEL F. [redacted]
FOX, WARREN E. [redacted]
FREEMAN, ANTHONY [redacted]
GALLO, WILLIAM V. [redacted]
GHIGNA, RICHARD W. [redacted]
GILBERT, JOHN T. [redacted]
GIRON, BRUCE A. [redacted]
HALLIN, ELIZABETH A. [redacted]
HANKINS, WILLIAM B. III [redacted]
HANSEL, ROBERT S. [redacted]
HASKINS, LEON J. [redacted]
HUGGINS, WALLACE J. JR. [redacted]
JOHNSON, WILLIAM F. [redacted]
KAMINSKI, TIMOTHY J. [redacted]
KELTZ, BARBARA M. [redacted]
KNOBEL, PHILIP E. [redacted]
KOVACK, GEORGE S. [redacted]
LARSON, JOHN T. [redacted]
LINDSEY, JAMES E. [redacted]
LONGLEY, JAMES B. JR. [redacted]
LOSCHIAVO, PAUL S. [redacted]
LUCENTE, DEBORAH L., [redacted]
LUNDBLAD, KAREN L. [redacted]
MCDONALD, MARK A. [redacted]
MCGUIRE, PAUL X. [redacted]
MCHALE, PAUL F. JR. [redacted]
MIJA, THEODORE L. [redacted]
MILLER, JONATHAN S. [redacted]
MIRAKOVITS, ALFRED L., JR. [redacted]
MONTAGNINO, JOSEPH R. [redacted]
MOORE, DARRELL L. [redacted]
MOORE, WILLIAM E. III [redacted]
MOY, WAY P. [redacted]
MURPHY, KEVIN T. [redacted]
MYERS, KENNETH P. [redacted]
OGORZALY FRANK D. [redacted]
PAPAK, ROBERT D. [redacted]
PEAK, STEVEN A. [redacted]
PEARL, JONATHAN D. [redacted]
PETRINO, JOHN E. [redacted]
PETTIT, DOUGLAS W. [redacted]
PHILLIPS, JERRY L. [redacted]
RADTKE, WILLIAM A. III [redacted]
REESE, STEPHEN K. [redacted]
REITER, STEVEN L. [redacted]
RENSCH, GWENDOLYN E. [redacted]
ROGERS, MARK W. [redacted]
RUTH, JOHN P. [redacted]
SANTAANA, MEGAN G. [redacted]
SANTUCCI, ROBERT C. [redacted]
SCANDALITO, DANIEL J. JR. [redacted]
SEABOLT, DENNY G. JR. [redacted]
SIGLER, RALPH J. [redacted]
SMITH, CHARLES F. [redacted]
SMITH, GREGORY L. [redacted]
SOUZA, PAUL F. [redacted]
SPARKMAN, GEORGE T. JR. [redacted]
STANCIK, GARY M. [redacted]
STANLEY, PAUL T. [redacted]
STANLEY, ROCK E. [redacted]
STEFFEY, CHARLES S. [redacted]
TURCOTT, BRIAN P. [redacted]
VINSKEY, MARGARETE A. [redacted]
VIVIANO, JOHN R. [redacted]
WAAGE, ROBERT N. [redacted]
WARD, CHARLES E. JR. [redacted]
WARD, ROBERT E. JR. [redacted]
WARSHAWSKY, BRUCE R. [redacted]
WERSEL, RAYMOND W. [redacted]
WESSELING, DAVID C. [redacted]
WILSON, PAUL T. [redacted]
WILSON, PHILIP A. [redacted]
WINN, FLOYD H. JR. [redacted]

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS OF THE MARINE CORPS FOR PERMANENT APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF MAJOR UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 624:

ABE, TIMOTHY C. [redacted]
ABRAHAM, LOUIS P. [redacted]
ALSTON, ALLEN D. [redacted]
ANDERSON, WILLIAM M. [redacted]
ANDRUS, PAUL M. [redacted]
ANGEL, ROGER D. [redacted]
ASHE, MATTHEW T. JR. [redacted]
BABBIE, RAYMOND C. [redacted]
BACHELLER, JOHN S. [redacted]
BARE, JEFFREY J. [redacted]
BARNEY, LOREN D. [redacted]
BARTON, BRIAN M. [redacted]
BATT, DANIEL C. [redacted]
BEISWANGER, JOHN W. [redacted]
BENSON, CRAIG F. [redacted]
BERGERIA, WILLIAM J. [redacted]
BERRY, JOHN C. JR. [redacted]
BOCKER, PETER E. [redacted]
BOLICK, GEORGE M. [redacted]
BORROR, PAUL J. [redacted]
BOSTON, TERRY P. [redacted]
BRADY, CHARLES P. [redacted]
BRADY, FRANCIS X. [redacted]
BRENSTUHL, THOMAS R. [redacted]
BRIEHL, PETER J. [redacted]
BROADSTONE, HERMAN C. [redacted]
BROWN, JAMES T. [redacted]
BUMGARNER, TONY L. [redacted]
BURAN, ROBERT S. [redacted]
BUTTERS, MICHAEL K. [redacted]
CAMPBELL, BOYD W. [redacted]
CANTRELL, MARK E. [redacted]
CANTY, JEREMIAH D. [redacted]
CENTER, WESLEY D. [redacted]
CHARBONEAU, DAVID P. [redacted]
CHILDS, THERESA J. [redacted]
CLARK, CHRISTOPHER E. [redacted]
CLARKSON, EDWARD M. II [redacted]
CLAYPOOL, ROBERT E. [redacted]
CLEMMER, JAMES D. [redacted]
CLINGMAN, ANGELA B. [redacted]
CLUBB, TIMOTHY L. [redacted]
COLEMAN, RICHARD D. JR. [redacted]
COLLETTE, CARL L. [redacted]
COLLINS, THOMAS N. [redacted]
CONGER, EDWARD G. [redacted]
CONKLIN, JAMES T. [redacted]
COTTRELL, SCOTT C. [redacted]
COVER, WILLIAM J. IV [redacted]
CROSS, KELLY D. [redacted]
CROUCH, MICHAEL L. [redacted]
CROUSE, KEN R. [redacted]
CROWE, WILLIAM B. [redacted]
CRUZ, VINCE E. [redacted]
CURTIN, LAWRENCE M. JR. [redacted]
CWICK, MARK J. [redacted]
DALLABETTA, MARK A. [redacted]
DAMREN, PAUL L. [redacted]
DANTONIO, PAUL A. [redacted]
DAULTON, JAMES T. JR. [redacted]
DAVIS, NORMAN C. [redacted]
DEVLIN, PETER H. [redacted]
DEVLIN, THEODORE E. [redacted]
DINDA, PAUL [redacted]
DINGER, RONALD A. [redacted]
DOBBINS, RICHARD E. JR. [redacted]
DONOVAN, MICHAEL J. [redacted]
DOOLEY, SUSAN G. [redacted]
DRAIN, PETER A. [redacted]
DUNGAN, MARK A. [redacted]
EAHEART, STEVE A. [redacted]
EDWARDS, MINERVA S. [redacted]
ELLIOTT, ANTHONY C. [redacted]
EMERSONLEE, SYLVIA [redacted]
ETTORE, MICHAEL L. [redacted]
EVANS, IRVIN E. III [redacted]
FAULKNER, WILLIAM M. [redacted]
FERRER, ROBERT N. JR. [redacted]
FITZGERALD, JOHN J. JR. [redacted]
FLEMING, CLARK R. [redacted]
FLOWERS, JAMES N. [redacted]
FOLSOM, STEVEN A. [redacted]
FOSNAUGH, CARL J. III [redacted]
FULHAM, ROBERT G. [redacted]
FUNDERBURKE, DENNIS E. [redacted]
FUNK, GARY W. [redacted]
GAGE, DARYL W. [redacted]
GAITA, JOHN T. [redacted]
GAMMELL, BRADLEY R. [redacted]
GANDEE, LINDA M. [redacted]
GARANT, PIERRE C. [redacted]
GARFIELD G. G. [redacted]
GASKINS, GERALD H. [redacted]
GEARHARD, GLENN E. [redacted]
GEORGE, GREGG L. [redacted]
GLODOSKY, JOHN P. [redacted]
GLOVER, RUSSELL E. [redacted]
GRACE, JAMES D. [redacted]
GRACZYK, DONALD A. [redacted]
GRAHAM, SCOTT A. [redacted]
GREENWOOD, PAUL E. [redacted]
GUZIK, DENNIS M. [redacted]
HABERBOSCH, CURTIS E. [redacted]
HACKETT, EDWARD G. [redacted]
HAGWOOD, DERLE G. JR. [redacted]
HALL, NICHOLAS J. [redacted]
HAMASHIN, LLOYD J. JR. [redacted]
HAMILTON, CHARLES M. [redacted]
HAMMOND, JAMES W. III [redacted]
HAMMOND, RANDALL W. [redacted]
HANSCOM, STEVEN M. [redacted]
HARMS, THOMAS G. [redacted]
HARRIS, STEPHEN G. [redacted]
HARVEY, JOHN J. JR. [redacted]
HAWLEY, JEFFREY W. [redacted]
HELLIGRATH, MICHAEL A. [redacted]
HENDRY, ROBERT L. [redacted]
HENKLE, STEVEN R. [redacted]
HEYWOOD, STEPHEN K. [redacted]
HODGES, ADELE E. [redacted]
HOFFMAN, EVERETT S. [redacted]
HOLTER, ROBERT D. JR. [redacted]
HOM, DONALD D. [redacted]
HOUSER, BRUCE M. [redacted]
HOUSTON, GORDON N. [redacted]
HUGHES, ROBERT E. [redacted]
HULBERT, BRIAN E. [redacted]
INGERSOLL, ALVAH E. III [redacted]
JACKSON, KEVIN A. [redacted]
JACKSON, KURT M. [redacted]
JACKSON, MICHAEL E. [redacted]
JACKSON, TIMOTHY J. [redacted]
JAMMAL, OSAMAH A. [redacted]
JANZEN, LESLIE N. [redacted]
JESSON, WILLIAM S. [redacted]
JONAS, TIMOTHY P. [redacted]
JOYCE, FRANIC P. III [redacted]
KANE, JOHN J. III [redacted]
KASSELMANN, JAMES R. [redacted]
KATZ, JONATHAN L. [redacted]
KELLY, DAVID [redacted]
KELLY, JOHN F. [redacted]
KENNEDY, JOHN C. [redacted]
KENNEDY, MICHAEL R. [redacted]
KERCHNER, SCOTT E. [redacted]

KERNS, ROBIN W. [redacted]
KINDER, RALPH E. [redacted]
KING, PHILIP H. [redacted]
KOENIG, JOHN A. [redacted]
KOLKMEYER, ANTHONY E. [redacted]
LAND, DENNIS R. [redacted]
LANDRUM, BRUCE D. [redacted]
LANG, WILLIAM S. [redacted]
LANHAM, ROBERT W. [redacted]
LEACH, RAYMOND J. [redacted]
LEARD, THOMAS E. [redacted]
LINGAR, JAMES D. [redacted]
LISSNER, KENNETH X. [redacted]
LONG, LAWRENCE J. JR. [redacted]
LUECK, MICHAEL E. [redacted]
MACK, DANIEL W. [redacted]
MALONEY, MARK M. [redacted]
MANUEL, STEVE G. [redacted]
MANZANO, EDWIN B. [redacted]
MATTHEWS, DAVID H. [redacted]
MCARTHUR, DORMAN O. [redacted]
MCCALLISTER, JOYCE L. [redacted]
MCCARTHY, LAURA J. [redacted]
MCCARTY, JOHN R. [redacted]
MCCOYD, KEVIN P. [redacted]
MCCUSKER, MICHAEL J. [redacted]
MCDANIEL, EDWARD R. [redacted]
MCERLEAN, MICHAEL W. [redacted]
MCGOVERN, ROBERT D. [redacted]
MCGRANE, STEPHEN J. [redacted]
MCKENNEY, LARRY B. [redacted]
MCKENZIE, ROBERT H. III [redacted]
MELTON, WILLIAM G. [redacted]
MERRITT, DALLAS III [redacted]
MESSER, RICK J. [redacted]
MILLER, MARK A. [redacted]
MILLER, TIMOTHY L. [redacted]
MINARIK, STEVEN A. [redacted]
MITCHELL, DAVID L. [redacted]
MITCHELL, JOHN E. JR. [redacted]
MOCK, FREDERICK C. [redacted]
MOLITOR, MARK L. [redacted]
MOODY, BENJAMIN W. [redacted]
MORRISON, ARCHIBALD VI [redacted]
MORTON, ULYSSES L. JR. [redacted]
MULLIGAN, MICHAEL J. [redacted]
MULLINS, KELLY B. [redacted]
NAYLOR, MICHAEL G. [redacted]
NELSON, ANDREW H. [redacted]
NELSON, EDWARD J. [redacted]
NICHOLSON, WILLIAM F. [redacted]
NOONAN, PATRICK D. [redacted]
OGERSHOK, JAMES A. [redacted]
OLDLAND, HARRY G. III [redacted]
OLEARY, PAUL J. JR. [redacted]
OLSON, ALLEN S. [redacted]
OSTERMAN, JOSEPH L. [redacted]
OWEN, MICHAEL L. [redacted]
PARKER, CARL T. [redacted]
PARRAN, JAMES V. [redacted]
PATCH, PHILIPP M. [redacted]
PEARSON, BARRY D. [redacted]
PETERS, CALVIN D. [redacted]
PIERSON, MICHAEL T. [redacted]
PINTO, MARK E. [redacted]
POLIZZI, SANTO [redacted]
POPE, DANIEL D. [redacted]
POTWIN, ALBERT E. [redacted]
PROUDFOOT, CHRISTOPHER N. [redacted]
QUAGGE, TIMOTHY E. [redacted]
RAHM, JOHN T. [redacted]
RASCHTSCHENIA, LARRY S. [redacted]
REYNOLDS, SHAUGNESSY A. [redacted]
RICE, ROBERT D. [redacted]
RICE, ROBERT K. [redacted]
RISHEL, ERIC C. [redacted]
RISO, BRIAN J. [redacted]
RITZDORF, SHIRLEY M. [redacted]
ROBERTS, DONALD F. [redacted]
ROBINSON, DAVID M. [redacted]
RODEBAUCH, RITCHIE L. [redacted]
RODENBECK, NEIL H. [redacted]
ROLAF, ERIC L. [redacted]
ROLLINGER, MARTIN G. [redacted]
RUFF, STACEY A. [redacted]
SALINAS, PHILIP L. [redacted]
SAMPLES, DAVID W. [redacted]
SAMPSON, DONALD W. [redacted]
SANNY, JAMES T. SR. [redacted]
SANSONE, RODMAN D. [redacted]
SANTACROCE, MICHAEL A. [redacted]
SANTIFORT, RODNEY [redacted]
SANTIFORT, SABRINA S. [redacted]
SATTERFIELD, JEFFERY A. [redacted]
SATTERFIELD, ROBERT C. [redacted]
SCHNEIDER, HENRY J. JR. [redacted]
SEATON, JAMES B. III [redacted]
SEGARRA, ERIC L. [redacted]
SEMPF, MARK C. [redacted]
SHEHAN, JOE M. [redacted]
SHUE, JEFFREY P. [redacted]
SHULTIS, BRADLEY N. [redacted]
SIMONEAU, PAUL D. [redacted]
SIMPSON, STEVEN S. [redacted]
SIZEMORE, GREGORY K. [redacted]
SKOPOWSKI, PAUL F. [redacted]
SMITH, DAVID A. [redacted]
SMITH, EDWARD J. [redacted]
SMITH, PHILIP E. [redacted]
SNOW, JOHN E. [redacted]
SPARTONOS, MICHAEL A. [redacted]
SPASOJEVICH, DAVID L. [redacted]
SPIDAL, DENNIS A. [redacted]
SPRUILL, GARY M. [redacted]
STARKEY, FRED O. JR. [redacted]
STEPHENS, MICHAEL K. [redacted]
STICKEL, RICHARD C. [redacted]
STRAIGHT, BOBBY G. [redacted]
STUMP, CATHERINE M. [redacted]
STUMP, JOHN P. III [redacted]
STURDEVANT, GREGG A. [redacted]
SYKES, DAVID L. [redacted]
TABAK, JAMES J. [redacted]
TATE, WILLIAM S. [redacted]
THIEN, ROBERT S. [redacted]
TISSUE, PHILLIP C. [redacted]
TOON, DAVID L. [redacted]
URIBE, GILBERT A. [redacted]
VANDENBERGHE, RAYMOND J. JR. [redacted]
VANHOUTEN, JOHN S. [redacted]
VAZQUEZ, JOSE F. [redacted]
VEITEL, MARTY S. [redacted]
VINCZE, LESLIE S. [redacted]
VINDICH, DAVID A. [redacted]
WARKER, PETER M. [redacted]
WARREN, GARY E. [redacted]
WASSINK, JOHN R. [redacted]
WAUGH, MAX J. [redacted]
WAYMAN, RONALD B. [redacted]
WEBER, LAWRENCE K. III [redacted]
WEBSTER, JAMES R. [redacted]
WEST, ROBERT S. [redacted]
WESTERBECK, MARK A. [redacted]
WETZELBERGER, WILLIAM E. [redacted]
WHITWORTH, LLOYD R. [redacted]
WILLIAMSON, MARC A. [redacted]
WOLTMAN, CLYDE M. [redacted]
WOOD, NOEL S. [redacted]
WORSLEY, ROGER J. [redacted]
YELDER, CHRISTOPHER E. [redacted]
ZAUTCKE, DONALD W. [redacted]
ZELNIS, CHARLES R. [redacted]
ZIEGENFUSS, PAUL C. JR. [redacted]

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED COMMANDERS OF THE RESERVE OF THE U.S. NAVY FOR PERMANENT PROMOTION TO THE GRADE OF CAPTAIN IN THE LINE, IN THE COMPETITIVE CATEGORY AS INDICATED, PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION [redacted]

UNRESTRICTED LINE OFFICERS

To be captain

ABELES, JOHN CHRISTIAN
ALBRACT, RANDAL THEODORE
ALDER, EDGAR ANDREW
ALDRICH, DAVID OLIVER
ALLISON, CHRISTOPHER DUANE
BAST, MICHAEL K
BENNET, KEARNEY DOUGLAS
BENNET, VAUGHN
BENSON, LARRY JOE
BITTMAN, WILLIAM CHARLES
BLACKWOOD, HUGO GRANGER
BLOUGH, ALLEN RANDOLPH
BRANUM, JAMES DAVID
BRODERICK, THOMAS EDWARD
BROWN, DEAN ROBERT
CABELKA, TIMMY DEAN
CALISE, KENNETH JOHN
CARELLO, LARRY DONALD
CAREY, SANDRA H
CHAMPION, EDWARD LARUE JR
CHARLES, JAMES LAWRENCE
CHRISTMAN, LINDA CHERYL
CHRISTMAN, PATRICK LEE
CLARK, JAMES ROBERT JR
CLARK, ROBERT MARTIN
CLAUSEN, STEPHEN RADCLIFF
COCHRAN, MICHAEL JAMES
COCKRELL, KENNETH DALE
CORDES, BRUCE ALLEN
CORY, JOHN ALAN
COSGROVE, RONALD PATRICK
COTTON, JOHN GOULD
CREWS, THOMAS BOULDIN JR
DEAN, KENNETH EUGENE
DEPEDER, ANDREW ANGELO
DOUGLAS, BARRY COLE
EDVARDSEN, JOHN JOSEPH
EPPERSON, ROBERT MARK
ERBELE, DOUGLAS JAMES
EVANS, JOHN JAMES
FAUST, WILLIAM ALEXANDER
FERGUSON, ROBERT KORBEL
FITZGERALD, PAUL VINCENT III
FOSKETT, ARTHUR KEVIN
FOX, TALLY BERNARD
FURSMAN, BERYL DENISE
GIESSING, GEORGE CONRAD III
GOOD, BEVERLY FRANCES
GOREHAM, LEONARD ALBERT
GRINSPOON, ALAN MARSHALL
GUNDERSON, EDWARD CHARLES
HALLAM, STEPHEN CULLITON
HAMMETT, CHARLES WILLOUGHBY
HANLEY, JOHN THOMAS JR
HANSEN, ALLEN ROSS
HARRISON, ROBERT WAYNE
HELMER, DALE PAUL
HENDRICKSON, PAUL BRIAN
HINES, JOHN ROBERT JR
HOPKINS DONALD DAVID
HUEGERICH, THOMAS PAUL
HULBERT, DAVID JOSEPH
HULTBERG, RANDY STEWART
HUNTER, RONALD EUGENE
HUTCHINSON, JONATHAN CLAY
JANES, CHARLES ENOS
JOHNSON, NICHOLAS RONALD
JOHNSTON, MARY ANN
KALAFAT, MAX EUGENE
KELLEY, MICHAEL DAVID
KELLOG, STEVEN CURTIS
KENNEDY, WILLIAM ALOYSIUS JR
KING, LARRY ARLIN
KOCH, MARK RANDOLPH
KOHRING, MARK WILLIAM
KOWALCZYKBECKWORTH, JOAN ANN
KURZ, WILLIAM CHRISTOPHER
LANDERS, GREGORY PATRICK
LEE, WILLIAM EUGENE
LEECH, JAMES NATHAN
LEONARD, WILLIAM AUGUSTINE J
LUNDY, ALLEN FRANCIS
MACKLIN, ROBIN MYLES
MARCUSSEN, WILLIAM JAMES
MASSION, DENNIS DANIEL
MCCARTHY, JOSEPH BRUCE
MCCAUSLIN, KEVIN R
MCCLESKEY, KEVIN BRIAN
MCCOLLUM, JOHN WILLIAM
MCGALLIARD, BRUCE EDWARD
MCHENRY, JOHN STEWARD
MCINTOSH, JOHN ALEXANDER III
MCVEY, BARRY STEVEN
MERCKER, RAYMOND FRANCIS
MEYER, LELIA MICHELE
MILLER, ALBERT
MILLER, BURT EDWARD
MOORE, WILLIAM THOMAS III
MORAN, RICHARD
MORGAN, WILLIAM RANDALL
MULLANEY, MICHAEL JOHN
MURPHY, JAMES JOSEPH III
MUSSELMAN, ROBERT PHILLIP JR
NANCARROW, CLIFFORD ALLAN
NOLAN, ROGER THOMAS
NORTH, ROBERT HUDDLESTON
OSLUND, JOELLEN DRAG
OSWALD, STEPHEN SCOT
PACE, ANNETE
PACHE, EUGENE PAUL
PATTERSON, ROBERT FOX
PECHONIS, JOHN SAMUEL
PENGUE, MARCY LOUIS JR
PFRIMMER, JOHN GRAY
PILLI, JOHN FRANK JR
POPPY, STEVEN CHARLES
PORTER, ALAN EMMIT
PRICE, GENE HILL
PUHRMANN, DALE LORENZ
REGAN, SUSAN KATHERINE
REIN, DOUGLAS JOSEPH
RICHARDON, RALPH BLAINE
RIVERA, ROBERT
RODJOM, THOMAS JOSEPH
ROGERS, JOSEPH EDWARD
RUSH, DOUGLAS KEVIN
SANDERS, MAX FRANKLIN
SCOTT, THOMAS EARLE
SCUDDER, RONALD LEE
SHAFFER, NEAL DEAN
SHAW, NED OSBON
SHELTON, MICHAEL CHASE
SHERMAN, CHRISTOPHER MARK
SMITH, ROBERT DORSEY JR
SNEDEN, KATHLEEN MARIAN
SPRIGGS, DAVID ARTHUR
STAIGER, JOHN AXTON JR
STEIN, WILLIAM BLANE
STEPHESON, ROBERT ALEXANDER
STICINSKI, DON LEO
STRASSHEIM, THOMAS JOHN
TANDBERG, SHARON PRESTHUS
TAYLOR, TIMOTHY MARTIN
TESORIERO, THOMAS JOSEPH
THOMPSON, ELSA BRANCH
TIMMERMAN, CLAUDE EVANS, JR.
TODD, MURRAY REDMON
VANHORN, ROBERT GORDON
VOSILUS, DIANE CARACASIS
WALKKY, KENNETH JAMES
WALKWITZ, JON JEFFREY
WALTERS, DANIEL ROBERT
WARFORD, WALTON ROBERT, JR.
WATT, GEORGE PHILIP, JR.
WENZE, GLORIA TRANSITS
WEST, RAY FERRIS, JR.
WHITELATCH, CRISTA CLAAR
WILCOX, ARTHUR MANIGAULT, JR.
WILKINSON, GERALD EDWARD
WILLIAMSON, LARRY ARTHUR
WILSON, STEVEN DALE
WRIGHT, ROOSEVELT RUBEN, JR.
YOUNG, FRANCIS
YPERMAN, BERNARD GEORGE
ZANDER, ANDREW THOMAS
ZANDER, WARREN EDWIN
ZIMET, MICHAEL IRVIN
ZMUDA, RAYMOND ANTHONY, JR.

UNRESTRICTED LINE OFFICERS (TAR)

To be captain

AUTEN, DONALD EDWARD
FOURSHA, SAMMY LEE
GREETIS, GREGORY JOHN
JOHNSON, KENNETH A.
KAUFMAN, GREGORY DOUGLAS
KIRWAN, JOHN R.
LEWELLING, DALE ALEXANDER
LUCAS, BRYAN DORAN
NORTON, HOWARD CHRISTOPHER
OSTROWSKI, GREGORY R.
RHODENBAUGH, RAPH MARK
SMITH, ROY MICHAEL
WIEGAND, ROY ALBERT

ENGINEERING DUTY OFFICERS

To be captain

ARMENIA, MICHAEL PETER
BAUMAN, WILLIAM EUGENE
BENEVIDES, FRANCIS LEO P.
BEUKEMA, PAUL
DEGRASSIE, JOHN SIDNEY
DICK, REAY STEWART, JR.
DIETER, KENNETH ALBERT
ENGLER, ROYCE ALAN
GREENLEES, JAMES NIXON
HESS, WILLIAM CURTIS
JOHNSON, JOHNNY WAYNE
JOUANNET, PETER RICHARD
KEENAN, JOHN JOSEPH, JR.
KING, WILLIAM BRUCE
MANNING, ROBERT WARREN
MARTSOLF, STEVEN WESLEY
SCHERF, PAUL HENRY, JR.
SHEBALIN, PAUL VALENTINE
TURISCO, THOMAS FRANK
WAKEFIELD, ROBERT D.
WEBB, JOHN OLIVER, JR.

AEROSPACE ENGINEERING DUTY OFFICERS (ENGINEERING)

To be captain

MCMAHAN, MICHAEL ROY
MINNICH, JOHN HOLLOWAY, III
MOORE, ROBERT CHARLES
ROSS, JOHN CLYDE
SODERBERG, ERIC JARVIS
SOMERS, JAMES WILFORD
STEVENS, RONALD WALTER
STRATTON, RAYMOND WAYNE

AEROSPACE ENGINEERING DUTY OFFICERS (MAINTENANCE)

To be captain

FITZHUGH, JOHN EDWIN, II
MALONE, LAURENCE JAMES
PRYOR, HERSHEL WILSON, JR.
SCHACHTER, FRANK

AEROSPACE ENGINEERING DUTY OFFICERS (MAINTENANCE) (TAR)

To be captain

BARNETT, EBEN E.

SPECIAL DUTY OFFICERS (MERCHANT MARINE)

To be captain

BAJOWSKI, FRANCIS KENNETH, JR.
DEHLER, MICHAEL W.

SPECIAL DUTY OFFICERS (CRYPTOLOGY)

To be captain

COOK, MICHAEL JOHN
DICKIE, JOHN NEVIN
SIEGEL, SAMUEL LEE

SPECIAL DUTY OFFICERS (INTELLIGENCE)

To be captain

ALFORTISH, ANTHONY CARPRI
ASHCRAFT, LEE
AUSTIN, KENNETH BURDETTE, JR.
BIEHLER, ARTHUR FRANCIS, JR.
BRINKMAN, DANIEL JOHN
BROWN, GORDON LAVELLE, JR.
BURKS, EDWARD LEE
CHEN, FRANCIS
CHERNOFF, ALBERT RICHARD
COX, DAVID LAWRENCE
DAZ LINO, CHARLES, II
DOUGHERTY, WILLIAM FRANCIS
DOUGLAS, JOHN PAUL
DUNN, PETER HAINES
DYER, DWIGHT DEWEY
ELLIOTT, EARL CARTER
FOGGIN, JAMES HENDERSON
GANNE, PATRICK ROLAND
GASTGEB, DAVID CHARLES
GRIFFING, CAROLYN KAY T.
GUGISBERG, MARK ROBERT
GUNDERSON, HALVOR PETER
HALBIG, MICHAEL CARLOS
HANNA, ALVIN TERRY, JR.
HARMAN, JOHN DAVID
HONAN, MICHAEL PATRICK
HUDDLESTON, COLIN CAMPBELL
JOHNSON, VICTORIA RAE
KING, KIM ALVA
KIRBY, THOMAS MICHAEL
LANCASTER, JOEL RAY
LAYMAN, JAMES HAROLD, JR.
LIARDON, DARRELL LEE
LUSSIER, NORMAND VICENT
MALLOY, DENNIS EDWIN
MCMASTER, MARLA JILL
MCPHERSON, VICTOR HOLIDAY
MILLER, ROBERT ARRINGTON
MITANI, MICHAEL KIYOSHI
MORRIS, JOHN JOSEPH
NAYLOR, WILLIAM MARK
PARE, JOHN ALFRED
PARHAM, LOUIS
PAUL, DAVID LOREN
POWER, TIMOTHY HENDERSON
ROLLANDI, VICTOR LAWRENCE
SELIG, CHARLES DENNIS
SOURBEER, GEOFFREY SCOTT
SUTTON, TERENCE MORRISON
TURNER, JAMES LAWRENCE
VERDEL, THOMAS HEARNE III
WALAITIS, WILLIAM RALPH
WEBSTER, BOBBY RONALD
WILSON, DONALD HAL
WRIGHT, CATHERINE SCHOONMAKE
YATES, WILLIAM ELLISON

SPECIAL DUTY OFFICERS (INTELLIGENCE) (TAR)

To be captain

BROOKS, STANLEY PRESTON

SPECIAL DUTY OFFICERS (PUBLIC AFFAIRS)

To be captain

HATFIELD, TERRY MICHAEL
WILLIAMS, DENNIS STANLEY

SPECIAL DUTY OFFICERS (OCEANOGRAPHY)

To be captain

DAUGHENBAUGH, JOHN STEWART

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED COMMANDERS OF THE RESERVE OF THE U.S. NAVY FOR PERMANENT PROMOTION TO THE GRADE OF CAPTAIN IN THE STAFF CORPS, IN THE COMPETITIVE CATEGORY AS INDICATED, PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 5912:

MEDICAL CORPS OFFICERS

To be captain

ARLINGHAUS, FRANK HENRY
AUSTIN, DAVID ANTHONY
BAILEY, RONALD OAKLEY
BAKER, JOHN A
BARBER, FRANCIS AUGUSTINE
BARVICK, EDWARD JAMES
BOYDEN, FREDRIC MARTIN
BRANCATO, DONALD HAYWOOD
BRIGHT, JOHN RAY
CARTAGENA, MIGUEL A
CASSIDY, SCOTT
CASTLE, CHARLES A
CATCHINGS, TIMOTHY TITUS
CIANFLONE, ALEXANDER
COFFMAN, RALPH BAILEY
COUNIHAN, COLLEEN M
DAVIS, ERNEST JAMES, JR.
DOMINO, TERRY GAYLE
DONOVAN, JOHN P
DRUM, EDWARD ALLEN
EHRLICH, EDWARD NORMAN
ELLEDGE, ELLIOTT FREDERICK
ELLIS, VIVIAN ELIZABETH
ENRIGHT, JAMES ROBERT
FAGAN, STEVEN JOSEPH
FEERICK, JOHN PAUL
FISHER, WINFIELD STITT
FORT, RICHARD A
GARDNER, CHARLES RAYMOND
GARRISON, JOHN MCHENRY
GIEDRAITIS, JOHN BENJAMIN
GRIFFIN, LARRY PAUL
GRUNERT, GEORGE MCCLOY
HARKNESS, CHARLES L
HARRIS, CURTIS NORMAN
HIGGS, WILLIAM THOMAS
HOLMAN, WILLIAM ADDISON
HOSKINS, IFFAT ABBASI
HYINK, WENDELL J
JONES, LYNWOOD ALEXANDER
KENT, HAROLD L
KING, JOHN WESLEY
KUMAR, VASANTHA A R
LARSON, CHARLES ADRIAN
LEECH, RICHARD C
LUCAS, RICHARD CHARLES
MALETZ, FRANK W
MCCARREN, PETER
MEDINARUIZ, ARTURO
MILLER, WILLIAM FARRING
MURRAY, DAVID W.
NIXON, DANIEL WALKER
NOACK, NELLEEN G.
NUAR, FRANK LABIB
OLDEN, KEVIN WILLIAM
PAPADIMOS, THOMAS JOHN
PARKS, DAVID PAUL, JR.
PITROWSKI WILLIAM C.
PUDHORODSKY, GREG STEPH
SAMESHIMA STEVEN SAIGE
SCHMITT, JAMES KENNETH
SINGZON JAIME MERIDA
SMICK, LARRY BRENNE
SMITH, CARL VERNON
SMYTH, LAWRENCE T., JR.
STOVER, JAMES FRED
TESAR, CHARLES B.
THOMAN MARK EDWARD
WALKER, MICHAEL L.
WATTS, DAVID R.
WILCOX, JOHN RICHARDSON
ZALESKI, HENRY IGNATIUS
ZEMNICKAS, WILLIAM VINC
ZUCKER, KARL ALBERT

DENTAL CORPS OFFICERS

To be captain

BENTLEY, GEOFFREY D.
BURJETKA, MIRA GEORGE
CRINE, JAMES DAVID, II
DEMAGGIO, BERNARD ROBERT
FETTER, KENNETH A.
GOLDSTEIN, JOEL C.
HORTON, EDWARD C., JR.
IRONS, ROY L.
KADESH, JEFFERY B.
KASKE, HERBERT M.
KRAJC, JOSEPH P.
KRAUSE, KERRY JACK
LIBBY, LEWIS S., III
MAPES, WILLIAM MICHAEL
MAYER, JOSEPH PAUL, JR.
POPE, BRUCE MICHAEL
REIDY, EDWARD T., III
ROMARY, DENNIS COLLINS
RUNDBAKEN, ROGER P.
SAVORD, ERVIN GEORGE, JR.
TRAMMELL, CALVIN D.
WOLANIN, ALFRED J., JR.
ZILLNER, ROBERT JAMES

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS OFFICERS

To be captain

BAILEY, LARRY W.
BENNETT, JAMES DOUGLAS
BERGNER, JAMES STEPHEN
LIDDELL, SCOTT KENT
MARTINEZ, GILBERT HERRE
SCHUH, MARLIN DARWIN
STAHL, ARCHIE ALAN
STRUNK, HAROLD KENNETH

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS OFFICERS

To be captain

CARLETTI, JAMES SILVIO
CRABTREE, DANIEL B.
FLYNN, PATRICK JEROME
GAY, MICHAEL HUBERT
GROAT, JOHN SINCLAIR, JR.
JANIGIAN, BRUCE J.
KASPER, ROBERT J.
MORGAN, JAMES FREDERICK
NIESEN, JEFFREY SCOTT
PETERSON, JAMES RALPH
SMITH, KERSCHIEL DINIVA
STEMPLEWICZ, JOHN THOMA
SUNDGREN, HELEN HOWELL
WHITE, ROBERT D.

NURSE CORPS OFFICERS

To be captain

BALACKI, MARGARET FOOTE
KARSTETTER, SARA LOUISE
KELLEY, KATHLEEN
LARSON, MARTHA LOUISE
LATHAM, JOSEPH FLOYD
MORRIS, ELIZABETH MCCLO
PATE, MARY ELLEN MCHALE
PATTERSON, CATHERINE AN
POLAK, BARBARA STEEL
SLAVONIC, MARTHA JEAN
WILLIS, ODETTE PATRICIA

SUPPLY CORPS OFFICERS

To be capitain

BAUMAN, DANIEL JOSEPH, JR.,
BECKER, CARL P.
BELL, EUGENE FREDERICK
CAPTOR, RICHARD ALLEN
CHAMBERLAIN, WILLIAM JOSEPH
EBERT, CHRISTOPHER JOHN
FURST, BARBARA SCOTT
GABEL, GLENN PAUL
LEVINE, HENRY PAUL
MURRAY, ALEXANDER HOMER
ORTEGA, PETE RUBEN
PATE, RONALD MILSTON
POTTER, MICHAEL CURRIE
PRESTON, VERNON LEROY
RIGHI, MICHAEL LOUIS
STORCH THOMAS MICHAEL
THORPE, JOHN ROSS
TOM, LYLE KIM UNG
WILLIAMS, CHARLES ARTHUR

SUPPLY CORPS OFFICERS (TAR)

To be captain

HENSLEY, JOHN W.

CHAPLAIN CORPS OFFICERS

To be captain

COOK, JAMES L.
ROSS, RALPH MCKINELY
STONER, GARY WAYNE

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS OFFICERS

To be captain

AMES, THOMAS CLARK
BUSHEY, RANDALL KENNETH
HILLMAN, BENJAMIN FRANKLIN, I
JOHNSON, RONALD NORMAN
KIRSCH, ARNOLD
MCGARRAH, JAMES MITCHELL
PRATHER ROYACE HOUSTON
RODRIGUEZ JAMES THOMAS
SYLVERSON, WILLIAM ALFRED

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS OF THE RESERVE OF THE U.S. NAVY FOR PERMANENT PROMOTION TO THE GRADE OF COMMANDER IN THE LINE, IN THE COMPETITIVE CATEGORY AS INDICATED, PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STAES CODE, SECTION 5912:

UNRESTRICTED LINE OFFICERS

To be commander

ABATE, RONALD DAVID
ADAMS, CHARLES DAVID, JR.,
ALLES, JAMES RICHARD
ANDERSON, RAYMOND VINCENT, JR.
ANDREWS, DOUGLAS MARTIN
ARCHDEACON, FRANCIS JOSEPH
ARD, JEFFREY ALLEN
ARRINGTON, RANDALL STEVEN
ATKINS, JIMMY EUGENE
AVERY, KENNETH LARUE
BAETZEL, KAREN L.
BALINT, MICHAEL KEVIN
BARAN, GREGORY W.
BARNHART, DEBORAH EDWARDS
BEARSS, DANIEL V.
BEAUCHAMP, MICHAEL JORDAN
BEILKE, ROBERT LEO
BENNETT, GEORGE BERKLEY
BENNETT, JOAN CAROL
BENNETT, ROBERT MICHAEL
BENTLAGE, ROGER ERIC
BERG, PAUL D.
BIGLEY, MICHAEL JOSEPH
BOONE, TIMOTHY R.
BOSOWSKI, STEPHEN NMN
BOWDEN, RONALD ERNEST
BOZDECHVEATER, PAULINE MARIE
BRIGANTI, DOUGLAS HENRY
BRISTOW, WILLIAM KREINER
BROWN, DAVID LYNN
BRUNSKILL, MICHAEL ROSS
BUEL, TOBY JON
BURGESS, MARY ELIZABETH
BURNS, JAMES WILLIAM
BURT, TERRILE LEE
BURTNER, KEITH EDWARD
BUTLER, CAREY RANDALL
CALDER, ALEXANDER WALCOTT
CALLAWAY, ROBERT KENDALL
CANNAN, DANIEL E.
CAPPS, LYNNE WELLS
CAPPS, WARREN LOUIS
CAPRIO, FRANK M.
CARPENTER, STANLEY DEAN
CARRIER, PETER L.
CARROLL, COLIN JOSEPH
CARROLL, ROBERT NMN JR.
CHABAL, MATTHEW
CHISOLM, WALTON BUCKLEY
CLARDY, GEORGE LEIGHTON
CLEMONS, WILLIAM LAWRENCE
COFFEY, JOHN TIMOTHY
COHN, MICHAEL D.
COLES, DAVID L.
COLMAN, PAUL TILDEN
CONKEY, DENIS RAY
CONRAD, DONALD CHARLES
COOPER, GREGORY JOHN
COOPER, RICHARD BENJAMIN
COSTEN, LAUREL MARIE
COX, DANIEL LEE
CROSS, BRUCE JAMES
DAHL, SCOT ALAN
DALTON, STEVEN EARL
DAVIDOSKI, MARK WILLIAM
DAWSON, CHARLES F.
DECOSTA, DANIEL LEE
DEDRICKSON, CHARLES R.
DEMPSEY, WILLIAM C., JR.
DEPPE, JILL NOREEN
DESRUISSEAUX, GEORGE LIONEL
DICKUP, WILLIAM A.
DITZLER, DAVID PATRICK
DIXON, ELLA JEAN
DOULONG, DAVID HUFF
DRAKELEY, GEORGE MORRIS, III
DRESWICK, JOHN ANTHONY
DRYDEN, DOUGLAS KRING
DUNCAN, LEONARD W.H.
DUPRE, NORMAN BERNARD
DURHAM, BRIAN JAY
DWYER, MARK THOMAS
DZIECIOLOWSKI, LISA R.
ECKSTEIN, STEVEN HARRY
EDWARDS, MEREDITH AUSTIN
EDWARDS, NORMAN MARSHALL
EDWARDS, RUTH CAROLE
ELDER, ROBERT THURSTON
ELLIOTT, JOHN SELDON
ELLIS, MARK STEVEN
ENOLE, DANIEL T.
ENSZ, RICHARD CARLYLE
ERIKSEN, MICHAEL CLYDE
ERISMAN, ALAN EDWIN
EVANS, THOMAS WAYNE
FARLEY, CHARLES GRANVILLE
FARMER, ALAN CARL
FENNIG, CHRISTOPHER G.
FILIAK, PAUL PETER
FILIPPELL, MICHAEL EDMUND
FILLIPOW, STEVEN A.
FINERAN, PAUL W.
FINLEY, MICHAEL STAED
FISHER, HOLLY JO
FITZGERALD, REBECCA LOUISE
FITZMAURICE, PATRICK JOSE, JR.
FLORIN, CRAIG ARTHUR
FONTENOT, PAUL RICHARD
FORMAN, RICHARD EARL, JR.
FOSTER, DAVID HEATH
FRANKLIN, JEFFREY WAYNE
FRYAUF, MARK THOMPSON
FUGATE, GLENN DAVID
FULLHART, CHARLES DAVID
GADZALA, JACK NMN
GAETANO, GLENN THOMAS
GARDNER, JOHN EVAN
GARDNER, PHILLIP JOHN
GELSOMINO, JOSEPH ANTHONY
GIRDLER, NEAL NORMAN
GLOVER, LANNY BRUCE
GLENN, KEVIN CHRISTOPHER
GOODWIN, FRANCIS R.
GOSS, GORDON WESLEY
GRASMEDER, JON MARTIN, JR.
GREEN, SCOTT WILLIAM
GRIFFIN, RANDY LLOYD
GRIMLAND, DAVID BRANSON
GRISCHY, MICHAEL CHARLES
GRISHAM, JIMMY D.
GWYN, JAMES R.
HAFER, DALE VINCENT
HAGEN, MARK DAVID
HALL, THOMAS DAVID
HANCOCK, ARTHUR WAYNE
HANDROP, RONALD STEPHEN
HARA, KENNETH JAY
HARDWICK, DAVID LESLIE
HART, LEO HERMAN, III
HARTMANN, FRANCIS XAVIER, JR.
HARTSHORNE, STEVENS JOSEPH
HARTZOG, JOHN R.
HASKELL, EMERY LLOYD
HAVLICK, RONALD GEORGE
HAYES, RICHARD ANDREW
HERBERT, GEORGE JON

HELBIG, CHARLOTTE MARIE
HERBIG, JAMES WILLIAMS
HERRMANN, THOMAS
HESSION, WILLIAM PATRICK
HIGGINS, MICHAEL MARTIN
HILDEBRAND, GEORGE ALLAN, II
HIVELY, KIRK EUGENE
HOLLIS, HOWELL CENTER
HONECK, MARK W.
HORNE, RICKY LEE
HORTON, STARR W.
HUERTH, ALAN LEE
HUFFMAN, PAUL WILLIAM
HUNT, DENNIS JOHN
HUSS, MARVIN CLINTON
IKELER, ALFRED EVES, JR.
ISOM, JAMES A.
JARVI, DENNIS JOHN
JENKINS, JAY THEODORE
JOLLIFFE, JOHN E.
KAMENSKY, ROBERT JOSEPH
KANE, EDWARD JAMES
KARY, EDMUND GEORGE
KATCHER, STEVEN ARTHUR
KELLEY, PETER EDWARD
KELSEY, DONNA C. GREENLEAF
KENNEDY, ANNELIESE L.
KESWICK, CHRISTOPHER A.
KIEFER, GEORGE FRANCIS, JR.
KIRCHENHEITER, BRUCE WILLIAM
KIRK, MARK ANDREW
KIRKLEY, MARK LUKE
KISELICA, VINCENT J.
KLOPE, JOSEPH CHESTER JR.
KNAB, DAVID KELLUM
KOLK, DAVID S.
KOMRAUS, DAVID K.
KOPP, ROBERT WILLIAM
KORCHOWSKY, GEORGE WILLIAM
KOSACK, KURT OVERTON
KOZICZ, MARK S.
KRANZ, MICHAEL A.
KRUG, PETER J.
KRUSE, ROBERT J.
KUNBERGER, PAUL E.
LABUDA, GARY L.
LAKIS, ROBERT A.
LANGER, MAYBETH
LARICK, WILLIAM ARVEL
LATHROP, JONATHAN EUGENE
LAUDER, JOEL AARON
LAVALLEE, COURTLAND, R. JR.
LEAKE, ROBERT ELLSWORTH III
LEEDS, MARTHA COLLINS
LEHMAN, MARYANN KOKUS
LEWIS, ALAN O.
LLOYD, ROBBIN GRAY
LOGAN, KENNETH JOSEPH
LOWEN, DANIEL JARED
LUKE, RAMON EUGENE
LUTTGEN, ROBERT HALL
LYLES, KEVIN SEAN
MAGUIRE, ELIZABETHANN B.
MALONEY, STEPHEN EDWARD
MANN, MICHAEL DAVID
MANSFIELD, PAUL B.
MARBLE, DAVID C.
MARKS, CHARLES FREDERIC, JR.
MARTIN, ROBERT WARREN
MARTIN, WILLIAM B.
MCALILEY, JOSEPH PEYTON
MCANANEY, EDWARD GEORGE
MCAULIFFE, WARREN
MCCAIN, WILLIAM D.
MCCLOSKEY, SEAN K.
MCDONOUGH, TIMOTHY RYAN
MCLAUGHLIN, ROBERT W.
MCMAHON, BARRY JOHN
MCNAMARA, JOHN JOSEPH
MCNAMARA, TERESA BERNADETTE
MCPHILLIPS, THOMAS MORE
MESSENGER, JAMES
MESSERSCHMIDT, JOHN G.
METZGER, ROBERT L.
MICHEELS, SCOTT RAMSEY
MILLER, CHARLES T.
MILLER, EUGENE A.
MILLER, FORREST A.
MINTON, REBECCA HIGHFIELD
MITCHELL, ROBERT HARRISON
MORET, DOUGLAS HENRY
MULVANEY, ROBERT MICHAEL
MURPHY, HARRY A.
NAKAMURA, DONALD FUMID
NEARY, GREGORY DONALD
NICHOLS, HERMAN ARMOUR
NOHE, KATHLEEN ELAINE
OARD, DOUGLAS WILLIAM
ODONNELL, RICHARD B.
OROURKE PATRICK EDWARD
OSLOVAR GEORGE M.
OSTROM PAULA LYNNE
PASSELL DONALD HILLARY
PAVLICK MICHAEL JOSEPH
PEEBLES EDWARD LYNN
PEPPER KENNETH OWEN
PETERSON HARRY EDWIN
PIFER KEVIN JAMES
PILAND VALERIE HINKLE
PLUMLEE RICHARD ALLEN
POTTER, ROBERT ALLEN, JR.
POWELL DAVID ROBERT
PRATTON SAMUEL D.
PROVOW LESLIE ELIZABETH DOU
PUGLIESE PAUL ANDREW
RACOOSIN JOHN MARK
RALPH DOUGLAS RAY
RALSTON DAVID KNIGHT
RAMSAY BRYAN JOHN
REARER THOMAS C. JR.
REDMOND, DONALD DUANE, JR.
REED JAMES NOEL
RICE JOSETTE LESLIE
RICE STEVEN TERRY
RICKERT GARY STEVEN
RING PAUL DUANE
RITCHIE JOSEPH CARLTON JR.
ROBERTSON LYN TAYLOR
ROBLES MARIO JR.
RODGERS PHILIP L.
ROELANT JAMES GREGORY
ROEMER EILEEN JANE
ROSE GEORGE HERMAN
RUDLOFF DENNIS ALLEN
RUIZ FERNANDO A.
RUTH DOUGLAS ALAN
SANFORD JAMES CHARLES
SCHAEFER THOMAS R.
SCHELLER HENRY REINHOLD JR.
SCHEURICH NORMAN CLAIR JR.
SCHLAGHECK DAVID ROBERT
SCHLOSS PHILIP WILLIAM
SCHOCK FEDERICK FORREST IV
SCHOENBERGER CLIFFORD ARTHU
SCHROEDER MARK ALAN
SCHUNK EDWARD ANTHONY
SEABERG RICHARD
SEFFEL GARY ALAN
SHATYNSKI MICHAEL MARK
SHEFFIELD GLENN A
SHERMAN MARK WILLIAM
SHERRILL WILLIAM DALE
SHOTSBERGER PAUL GAHLEN
SIMON DANNIELLE NAN
SIMPSON DAVID MYLES
SMITH ERIC MICHAEL
SMITH KEVIN ROEBLING
SMITH STEVEN DALE
SOBE CRAIG MARTIN
SOLKSHINITZ STEPHEN EDWARD
SPARKS NANCY LYNN
SPELLISSY BRAIN EDWARD
STAHL ERIC SCOTT
STAPP CHARLES PHILLIP
STEELMAN MARK BRADLEY
STEPHAN JOHN AUDLEY
STOLL DARRELL MARK
STOLLE ROBERT J.
STOUFFER JILL WINDLE
SUMNER JAMES GERALD
SWIENTON DANIEL EDWIN
TATE WILLIAM HERBERT
TEAGUE MICHAEL M.
THOMAS KIRK FRANCIS
THOMPSON WILLIAM GREGORY
TINDALL KEITH DAYMOND
TOMB KIMBERLY ANNE
TOPP WALTER STEPHEN
TOURNAS ALEXANDER WILLIAM
TRIPODI JAMES
TROUTMAN BRUCE ALLEN
TRUDE CHARLES REESE
TRUDELL JERRY
TUGGLE WILLIAM COKE
TZITZURA VASLE THOMAS
VANDYKEN ROBERT DEAN
VENOHR BETTY DARLENE WALKER
VINCI DONALD WILLIAM
VORTHERMS DANIEL R.
VOYTEK RICHARD A.
WAGGENER, ANNA THOMPSON
WAGNER, JOHN ARTHUR
WALSH, FRANCES KAY
WARD, BRIAN DEAN
WARDROP, ELLEN ANN
WESTHAUS, RANDALL THOMAS
WESTWOOD, GEORGE EDWARD, III
WILCOX, THEODORE ARTHUR
WILLIAMS, SHARON MORRISON
WILMOTH, DOUGLAS EUGENE
WILSON, DAVID S.
WINTER, DEBORAH KOVACICH
WISEMAN, ROBERT JEFFERY
WOLCOTT, DEBRA JANIELLE
WOOD, RANDEL W.
WOOD, WINSTON D.S.
WOOLWAY, THOMAS MARTIN
WOOMER, JERRY JAMES
WRAY, ROBERT O., JR.
WUESTNER, ROBERT
YABUT, BERNARDO RAMIREZ
ZELLER, BERTRAND LOUIS

UNRESTRICTED LINE OFFICERS (TAR)

To be commander

BEIGEL, LARRY JASON
BELLANT, RAYMOND EUGENE, JR.
BICKERTON, JAMES ALLEN
BOLTON, CLINTON STAFFORD, JR.
BRASMER, TIMOTHY MATTHEW
BRAZIER, DEAN ANTHONY
CARLOCK, M. KRISTINE
CORTES, EDGAR JOHN
DARLING, STEVEN BRADFORD
DILUCENTE, DENNIS JAMES
DOVE, LARRY EUGENE
DUCKWORTH, FREDERICK BRADLEY
DUVALL, GILLIAM ELROY
EAGEN, MICHAEL MARTIN
FARRELL, CHARLES AMBROSE
FERGUSON, MICHAEL PATRICK
FITZGEREL, BETSY A.
HACKETT, PETER MARK
HANSON, WILLIAM DAVID
HORLBECK, JOHN W.
HORSMAN, DOUGLAS EDWARD
HOWELL, ROBERT D., JR.
HRBACEK, MARY JEAN
JOLLY, PHILIP CHARLES
KENNEDY, MICHAEL JAMES, JR.
KNUTSEN, ROBERT ROY
LANDON, JOHN MICHAEL, II
LANE, WILLIAM JOHN
LANGE, ROBERT JOHN
MARTIN, JAMES ROBERT
MARZETTA, DEAN ROBERT
MCMANUS, THOMAS M.
MONTGOMERY, DAVID LEO
MORGAN, BARBARA PALMER
MULDOON, JOHN JOSEPH
NORDMEYER, DOUGLAS STUART
PRINDLE, RONALD WAYNE
RAMIREZ, ADOLF ARVIZU
REZENDES, LORRIE ELAINE
ROBINSON, JOHN WALTON
SANDGREN, DAVID W.
SASSMAN, ROGER WAYNE
SEVERSON, DANIEL MARK
SIDDONS, PHILIP KEMBLE
SINNETT, KEVIN PATRICK
SKIBER, CAROL ANN
SLAVEN, WALTER B.
SMITH, RONALD L.
SMITH, THOMAS G.
TATE, ROBERT JOSEPH
TOEDT, ELIZABETH MARY
WATSON, EDMOND DALE
WATTERS, WILLIAM JOSEPH
WENN, PATRICK ROBERT
WILSON, STEVEN RICHARD
WOLF, JEFFREY GUY
WRIGHT, WILLIAM ALLYN

ENGINEERING DUTY OFFICERS

To be commander

ARCANO, JOSEPH T.
BURNETTE, ROBERT VANCE
CLARK, NEILL VAN
DREHER, LAWRENCE JOHN
ELHOLM, ERLING SIGURD
HAMILTON, STEVEN WILBER
JANIKOWSKY, LINDA CROCKETT
KRAHN, STEVEN LEE
MARTONE, DOUGLAS ARTHUR
NELSON, DREW DOUGLAS
SEEGER, HOWARD CARL
SEXTON, DONALD RAY
SHUGART, TIMOTHY BRUCE
SPOSATO, WILLIAM THOMAS
STIEGELMEYER, GARY LYNN
WELTER, DAVID D.

AEROSPACE ENGINEERING DUTY OFFICERS (ENGINEERING)

To be commander

MATHRE, JOHN MARK
WEIGEL, KURT MITCHELL

AEROSPACE ENGINEERING DUTY OFFICERS (MAINTENANCE)

To be commander

CLARK, JAMES MCALISTER, IV
ERICKSON, JAMES HOWARD
MEASE, FRANK BARCLAY
STOLLE, ROBERT CARL
SZALWINSKI, DUANE E.
WITHINGTON, PAUL, II

AEROSPACE ENGINEERING DUTY OFFICERS (MAINTENANCE) (TAR)

To be commander

GUMPRIGHT, ROBERT E., JR.
HUNT, EARL RAY
RALSTON, CARL DENNIS

SPECIAL DUTY OFFICERS (MERCHANT MARINE)

To be commander

ALLEN, FREDERIC
HYNES, GEORGE WALTER, JR.
MCKINLEY, WILLIAM MICHAEL
OSBORNE, NORMAN EDWARD
PRADA, GEORGE BARRY
PURIO, WALTER PATRICK
RICHARDSON, JOHN WILLIAM, JR.

SPECIAL DUTY OFFICERS (CRYPTOLOGY)

To be commander

BONAR, DAVID LINWOOD
GARCIA, VICENTE CHAVEZ
GRIBBIN, JOSEPH JENKINS
LEMLEY, EDWIN PHILLIP
LINDSEY, GARY JAMES
LOPEZ, GORDON K.
PRACK, ARTHUR EDWARD, III
RUTH, EDWARD JAMES
SMITH, GEORGE ALAN
STABACH, CAROLYN MARIE
STILES, RICHARD GLEN
STUBBS, HEIDHAUSEN INES RUTH
VANHISE, JOHN WESLEY
VEATCH, WALTER DANIEL, JR.

SPECIAL DUTY OFFICERS (INTELLIGENCE)

To be commander

ACLIN, JOHN J.J.
ALCOCK, HUGH DORSEY, JR.
ATWILL, WILLIAM
BAGGETT, MORRIS EDWARD, JR.
BARDELL, TIMOTHY W.
BELL, RONALD LEE
BENNETT, GERALD LINTON
BEYER, LOUIS JOHN
BRINK, BENJAMIN MCALESTER
BROCKER, KEITH STEVEN
BRUNSON, RONALD BURKE
CARLSON, LAWRENCE ROY
COLEMAN, MICHAEL DENNIS
CONNELLY, JACK PETER
DAMISCH, PETER WHITON
DEROSE, PHILLIP A.
DEVRIES, DONALD CHARLES
DODGE, WILLIAM CHARLES
ERICKSON, MICHAEL LEE
FLOYD, CHARLES THOMAS
FOURNIER, DONNA J.
FRACK, JOSEPH ENGELBERT
FRECHETTE, MELVIN CHARLES
FREUND, GLORIA NMN
FURCHNER, DAVID KEITH
GAYLE, STEPHEN MICHAEL
GILBRIDE, ANN DEBAETS
GRAF, FRED
GRIMSLEY, ELIZABETH BOARDMAN
HAMPSHIRE, DAVID
HAUBNER, MICHAEL JOSEPH
HOFFMAN, CHARLES KURT II
HOLE, CHERYL DENISE
HOLT, KAY MYERS
HUNSAKER, CHRISTOPHER JAMES
HUSTON, JAMES WEBB
JAMES, FRED MORRISON, JR.
KAMRADT, HENRY DWIGHT
KEEGAN, JOHN CHARLES
KELLEY, JAMES WILLIAM, JR.
KIMBERLIN, DENNIS GENE
KNISLEY, HAROLD L., III
KNUTSON, JEFFREY LEE
KOBAYASHI, LARRY SHIGEKI
KOWAL, NORBERT WIESLAW
KREITZER, KEETON KELLEY
KUROWSKI, JOHN M.
LABAK, STANLEY J.
LEGGETT, GREGORY KEITH
LUCCHESI, CARLO LUCA
MANOLESCU, TIMOTHY ALAN
MARBURGER, RANDY VANCE
MARCHANT, BYRON F.
MARLING, GWYNNETH
MARTINEZ, RICHARD PHILLIP
MAYER, GARY JOHN
MCDONALD, GARY WAYNE
MCNEILLY, DENNIS NMN
MEANEY, MICHAEL LAWRENCE
MILHEIM, RUSSELL J., III
MILLARD, BRADLEY JAMES
MILLER, DANIEL PATRICK
MUMMAH, ROGER EUGENE
NELOWET, ALBERT FRANKLIN, III
ODONNELL, RAYMOND VINCENT
OKIMURA, RAYMOND
OLSON, EARLE ZANE
OSBORN, JOHNNY RAY
PACKER, CYNTHIA DEE
PIERCE, DONALD EDWARD
POTOCHNIK, VENTZEL JACOB
QUIGLEY, MARY CATHERINE
RATACZAK, MARK HAROLD
REVEAL, KENNETH HARVEY
RICH, DAVID ALAN
ROBERTS, CHARLES EDWARD
ROBERTS, WILLIAM CHARLES
SCHMITZ, JOSEPH E.
SEVIGNY, THEODORE THOMAS, JR.
SHAY, RICHARD FRANKLIN
SHULTZ, STANLEY PETER
SIEGE, STEVEN THEODORE
SISCO, BARBARA ANDERSON
SMITH, PHILIP JAMES, III
SPRUILL, CLIFTON EARL WILKINS
STONE, ROBERT E.
SUBKO, JEFFREY B.
THIELMAN, KENNETH JAMES
TOOMEY, MICHAEL JOSEPH, JR.
TURNER, BRUCE ERWIN
WHITMER, JOHN KENT
WICKLUND, BUCK
WIEDORN, MACUSHLA M.
WILBUR, DANIEL EUGENE
WILLIAMS, JAMES KENNETH
WITHERS, JEROME B., III

SPECIAL DUTY OFFICERS (INTELLIGENCE) (TAR)

To be commander

MAZZA, RICHARD CHARLES

SPECIAL DUTY OFFICERS (PUBLIC AFFAIRS)

To be commander

GOLDEN, PATRICK STAFFORD
HARNAR, JAMES ALLEN
HARTSHORNE, CARRIE ELIZABETH
NERUDA, MICHAEL EDWARD
RONZIO, MARGARET JEANNE
WILSON, ANDREW H.
YEAGER, THOMAS ANTHONY
ZAGANO, PHYLLIS

SPECIAL DUTY OFFICERS (OCEANOGRAPHY)

To be commander

FAGEN, RAYMOND ROY
MCNITT, JAMES ALLERTON
SULLIVAN, KATHRYN DWYER

LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS (LINE)

To be commander

SINNOKRAK, ROBERT LOUIS
TSUJIMURA, REUBEN TERUO

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS OF THE RESERVE OF THE U.S. NAVY FOR PERMANENT

PROMOTION TO THE GRADE OF COMMANDER IN THE STAFF CORPS, IN THE COMPETITIVE CATEGORY AS INDICATED, PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 5912:

MEDICAL CORPS OFFICERS

To be commander

BAKER, LEE THOMAS
BARTHOLD, HAROLD JOSEPH
BENDT, ROBERT RICHARD
BESSETTE, RICHARD A.
BLACKBURN, WARREN A.
BOWLER, ULYSSES SIMPSON
BRANNON, CHARLES TRAVIS
BRAY, JACK GALEN, JR.
BREUNER, CORA COLLETTE
BRYSON, BETTY LEE
BURCHMAN, COREY A.
CHAMBERS, MICHAEL EDWARD
CHILTON, BARBARA GENE
CHRISTIANSON, ERIC ELLIS
CICORA, RALPH A.
CLIFTON, CHARLES LAMAR
CORWIN, JAMES HOWELL
COWDIN, HUGH PENDLETON
CRENSHAW, ANDREW HOYT J.
CRISTIN, JOHN L.
DELCAMBRE, JOHN BRUCE
DENNEN, LAWRENCE EDWARD
DEVANEY, KENNETH O.
DEVLIN, MICHAEL FRANCIS
DOHERTY, MARK GERARD
DOLAN, ROBERT PAUL
EDWARDS, THOMAS B.
ELSHIRE, HARRY DONEL, III,
ENGLISH, JAMES F.
ERTL, JANIKA PAUL
FABIAN, DAVID R.
FARR, LARRY DAMON
FARRIS, PHILIP RANDALL
FERRER, EDWARD BARTHOLO
FLANAGAN, JOHN F.K.
FRASER, HUGH ERSKINE
GALLA, JAN DAVID
GARBER, VERA
GEBHART, JAMES RICHARD
GILPIN, ALLEN BRUCE
GLASGOW, GARY DOUGLAS
GLEASON, BARRY
GONZALEZ, JUAN ANTONIO
GOODNOUGH, STEPHEN ROBERT
GRECO, FRANK ANTHONY
GREER, ROBERT COLLINS, IV
HALL, KENT N.
HALL, THOMAS R.
HARDEN, WESLEY RENNIE, III
HARRIS, ANDREW
HEROLD, WILLIAM LEROY
HINKS, ROBERT PAUL
HOFFMANN, DAVID M.
HOLMES, CHERIE A.
HOSINSKI, JEANNE M. GUIN
HUGHES, DENNIS EDWARD
JENTZ, IRENE A.C.
JOHNSON, STEPHEN HARRIS
JUST, NORMA JEAN
KAMENAR, ELIZABETH
KIKTA, MICHAEL J.
KIMELHEIM, ROBERT ALAN
KING, RICHARD WILLIAM
KISER, DONALD RAYMOND
KNAUER, HOPE ELIZABETH
KNOBLOCH, RONALD PAGE
KREUZER, DAN FREDRICK
KUKULKA, RICK ALLEN
LANTELME, BRUCE EDWARD
LEONI, JAMES F.
LIEBERMAN, JOSHUA MITCH
LIVENSTEIN, HARRY PAUL
LOVELESS, ERIC A.
LUI, RAPHAEL
MACKENZIE, NICOL IAN
MALONE, DANNY R.
MARTIN, FRANKLIN MCLAIN
MCCLELLAN, DAVID SCOTT
MCCULLOUGH, TIMOTHY JOH
MCGILL, THOMAS WAYNE
MCNAMARA, WILLIAM HOWAR
MILLER, DAVID OWEN
MILLS, VERN ANDREAS
MONESTERSKY, JESSE HARR
MORECI, JAMES ANTHONY
NEWELL, DONALD EDWARD
ODORIZZI, MARK GEORGE
OLSHAKER, JONATHAN STUA
PALOS, MIGUEL MARTIN
PARTINGTON, JONATHAN PH
PATTERSON, MICHAEL SMIT
PERKINS, TERRY R.
PFEIFER, JOSEPH LAWRENCE
PRIOR, CHARLES A.
PROKOPCHAK, RICHARD
PUDIMAT, MARY ANN
REYNOLDS, CHARLES PATRI
RHODES, DANNY CLYDE
ROBERTSON, DAVID L.
ROUSE, JOE PHILIP
SCHWARTZ, PAUL ERIC
SCOTT, DAVID JAMES
SMIT, JAMES HENRY
SMITHERMAN, KENTON OSBO
SPARKS, ALFRED DAVID
STAGGS, DENNIS RAY
STAINKEN, BRIAN FREDERI
STEVENS, ROM ANTHONY
STROUSE, WAYNE S.
SWALLOW, WILLIAM BRUCE
THORP, ADAM TREDWELL IV
TOMPKINS, JOHN FULTON I
TORP, ERIC CARL
TRESCOT, ANDREA M.
VULGAMORE, JOSEPH M.
WALLERSTEIN, RALPH O. JR.

DENTAL CORPS OFFICERS

To be commander

ADAMS, RANDALL DURRANT
BARD, ROBERT A.
BIALEK, RUTH ANN
BOWMAN, ANNE ELIZABETH
BRIGHTMAN, PETER S.
DICKIE, JON DOUGLAS
DOBYNS, MICHAEL L.
DOLL, BRUCE ALFRED
FABRE, DAVID DOUGLAS
FALCON, PAUL
FASIG, KENNETH MICHAEL
GARRETT, WANDA FAYE
GODBOLD, DAN EARL
HOFF, STEPHEN CRAIG
JOHNSON, JEFFREY ROLAND
KAURICH, MICHAEL JOHN
MAHAN, STANLEY R.
MAMBER, JUDITH SHEILAH
MARLAND, LLOYD WILLIAM
MAZZEO, FRANK JR.
MCCULLAR, BRUCE HAYDEN
MILLER, JAMES LARRY
MOCKNICK, MICHAEL CHARL
MOSSBERG, CARL LUDVIG
MOUNSDON, THOMAS ALBERT
NISHIOKA, GARY JIM
PETRELLA, KAREN MARISE
PHILLIPS, RICHARD JOHN
PUCHER, JEFFERY JOSPEH
SABOL, JOHN G.
SACHS, SCOTT ALAN
STEPHENS, CLAUDE R., JR.
SZYMANSKI, MICHAEL ALLA
THALER, JOHN JOSPEH
THOMAS, THEODORE BRANDO
VOGLER, GERALD LINUS

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS OFFICERS

To be commander

AHERN, DENNIS E.
ALVAREZ, SAUL SAINT
BARNHART, FRANCIS J.
BARRICK, IVAN JOHN
BASH, DENNIS MURRAY
BECK, HARRY ALAN
BERESKY, CHRISTINE
BEST, CONNIE LEE
CARLSON, ROBERT MARSHAL
CHANCE, GEORGE REDDING
COLE, CHARLES ALLEN
CONGER, REX DALE
DILLON, RICHARD WILLIAM
DUNCAN, GREGORY LEE
FARLEY, RICHARD LEE
FISHER, JAMES LYNDAL
GARCIA, RAYMOND PARRA
GRIGGS, TIMOTHY MONROE
GRUBBS, GENE BOBBITT
HAGER, DEAN DAVENPORT
HASKETT, PRISCILLA ANN
HAZEN, PETER C.
HOBSON, DAVID WAYNE
JACKSON, CHARLES FREDER
JOYAL, JAMES KEVIN
KAHN, KENNETH ROMAN
LEIDIG, GEORGE FRANCIS
MARRESE, MARYLYNN
MATHEWSON, PAUL GARRETT
MCMANUS, CHARLES EARNES
MEYER, LLOYD GARTH
MONROY, MAUREEN ELIZABE
MYNHEIR, KIMBERLY ANN
NORRIS, PETER JUSTIN
O'DONNELL, MICHAEL DENNI
PEDEN, ANN MARIE
REDDAN, MARK JOSPEH
RUSS, CAROL ANN
SMITH, MARK ALLEN
STANFORD, MICHAEL
STATON, BOBBY GERAL
TITUS, CHARLES D.
TYRE, TIMOTHY EDWARD
WATERMAN, CHERYL MARIE
WIESENTHAL, MICHAEL DEN
WILSON, STEPHEN EDD
WISNIEW, JEROME ANTHONY
YOUNGER, ROBERT DALE
ZIGNEGO, CHRISTIAN

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS OFFICER

To be commander

ALESSIO, GEORGE PAUL, JR.
ARAMONY, WILLIAM SAAD
BRADSTREET, RANDI RUTH
BRUDER, DALE RICHARD
BRYAN, JOHNATHAN WERBER
CAPONE, LUCIEN III
CASHION, AMANDA LINN
CASSMEYER, JAMES FRANCI
CAUTHEN, ROBERT HOWARD
COOK, GLEN ANDRE
DAVENPORT, TERESA JOANN
DAVID, JAMES EDWARD
DEAN, ELIZABETH MARGARE
DUNDON, JEFFREY R.
EATINGER, ROBERT JOSEPH
EBERSOLE, EUGENE FRANCI
FABIAN, JOHN ARTHUR III
FRANK, CARL JOHN
FRESHER, BRIAN LEO
GITIN, NEIL FLECK
HILTON, HELEN JEAN
JEFFERY, STEPHEN GLEN
JOHNSTON, DOUGLAS ALAN
JONES, FAYE ERMA
JONES, RANDY KANE
KELLEY, MARYJANE BORGER
LAU GAYLE, JOHN HEEN CH
MEISNER, JOYCE PENNEY
METCALFE, ROBERT DAVIS
METZGER, KENNETH JOHN
MILLER, JAMES ARNOLD
O'BRIEN, MARK ANTHONY
OHANLAN, EDWARD VINCENT
RAFFETTO, SHACKLEY FRED
RIGTERINK, DANIEL PHILL
RINTEL, HOWARD SHELDON
ROBERTSON, MORGAN MCNEE
RUSSE, LAURENCE PRINCE
SABATH, ROBERT PETER
SCALLY, ERIN LOUISE
SHELLEY, HENRY CORNELIU
TEMPLIN, STEVEN HENRY
VOLLENWEIDER, DAVID OTH
WELSH, GEOFFREY SYMONS
WILCOX, BRUCE ANDREW
WILLIAMS, MARK STEPHEN

NURSE CORPS OFFICERS

To be commander

ABELS, IRENE ANN
ABERNATHY, DEBORAH ALLA
ADAMS, CHARLOTTE LEE
ADAMS, KATHERINE ANN
ANDERSON, SUSAN N. WHALE
ASHBROOK, KAY A.
BAILEY, MARY PFIESTER
BALESTRINI, NANCY E.
BLACKBURN, KAREN FOSTER
BRAUN, MAURA MAHON
BRAY, KATHY SUE
BROWN, SHERRY LEE
BURANOSKY, MARYK QUAID
BUSS, DONNA S.
CARL, DOROTHY JEANNE
CERVENKA, BECKY JO
CHENEY, EARL THOMAS, JR.
CLAYTON, BRIAN LEE
CROWLEY, PATRICIA LYNN
CZARNECKI, JOHNGY MARGU
DEMARCHE, LINDA PERRY
DOUGHERTY, JUDITH EMERS
DOUGLAS, NANCY VIOLA
DROLL, MICHAEL ALAN
EARHART, LINDA AMICK
EMERSON, JOEL RAY
FOX, DONNA MARIE
GREENE, JEANNE MARIE
HARDING, MARY ELIZABETH
HENDRICKS, MARY JO
IIAMS, BARBARA ANN
IRVINE, JUDITH DIANE
JONES, ELAINE KATHRYN
JOY, CHRISTINA
KLANCHAR, LYNN ANN
KOSKI, CHERYL LYNN
KOTACKA, MARYJO
LAPPERT, PATRICE ANN
LAUBSCHER, PRISCILLA JE
LAWRENCE, ROSEANN FINUC
MALONE, TRACY ANN
MANN, CAROL PATIENCE
MARINO, JOANNE LOUISE
MATTOCK, KAREN MURPHY
MCCARTHEY, NANCY MARIE
MCKELVY, THERESA MARSHA
MCNAMARA, DIANE MARIE
MCNAMARA, MELVANTE KAY
MELIDOSIAN, VIVIAN G.
MERRILL, SUSAN EMCH
MOLLERE, GAIL ELIZABETH
MOON, MARY VICTORIA
MORAN, VICKY JO
MORENO, CATHY ANN
MURPHY, ROBERT PATRICK
NAYLON, STEPHEN CHARLES
NORRIS, THOMAS JOSEPH
OBRIEN, CRISTINE JO
OGDEN, MARY ETHEL
OSBORN, PAMELA CONNOR
PAYNE, BRENDALEE CONSTA
PENCE, DIANE LYNN
PIERCE, JOHN FRANCIS
POST, DOROTHY J.
PRIOR, GERALYN J.
PUDEN, KAREN
REINHART, CHERYL ANN
RHETTASMITH, ALICE
RICHARDSON, SUSAN STILL
RICHSTEIN, PAULA KATHLE
ROBERS, JUNE MELODY
ROHRET, TERESA JACKSON
RUSSELL, ANN JULIA
SCHAFER, CORA MARIE
SELJESKOG, MARGARET ANN
SESSIONS, CATHERINE PAS
SHEANCRAIG, MONICA MARY
SHEPHARD, CAROL LYNN
SOLBERG, REBECCA ANN
STAUBIN, PAMELA ANN
STEVENS, RENEE MARIE
STILLING, KATHLEEN MARI
STOKKE, CATHY MYERS
SUTTON, SUZANNE SIRES
TAYLOR, JUDITH FRANCES
THOMPSONBOWERS, JEAN EL
TOLER, MELISSA ANN
UNDERDAHL, PATRICIA JO
WARD, AMY ELIZABETH
WARD, DEBRA SUE
WENNER, MARGARET SCHOEN
WESTFALL, SUSAN LYNN
WHEELER, MARY SUE
WINGATE, SUZANNE JOYCE
YOUNG,LARUA MAY

SUPPLY CORPS OFFICERS

To be commander

AHERN, ROBERT E., JR.
ANDERSON, DAVID KEVIN
ANDERSON, NICHOLAS ARVID
BERNETSKIE, JOHN ALLEN
BOYD, DAVID O.
BROWN, JESS EARL
BRYANT, EDWARD EARL
CAUGHEY, STEPHEN R.
COOPER, LAWRENCE OLIN
CRITES, DAVID EDWARD
DAY, DAVID PATRICK
DEASY, JOHN HENRY
DESMOND, LAWRENCE LOUIS
DUTTON, ROBERT RANDALL
EDDY, DANA GORDON
EPPLE, ERWIN LYNN
FERNHOLZ, ROBERT GENE
FLEISCHMANN, STEPHEN RAY
FLUTY, LARRY LEE
FOX, JEFFREY DEAN
GAISSERT, JOHN WALTER
GARDNER, DONNA MICHELE
HAMILTON, STEVEN KEITH
HEILMAN, MARK DAVID
HOLLAND, TONI JEAN
HOLT, DAVID LEE
HORECHNY,MARTIN FLORIAN
HOV, DAVID THOR
HOV, MARY RUTH
JANISCH, JOHN SCOTT
JONES, STEPHEN E.
KORONKA, STEPHEN
KUKLIS, GREGORY MICHAEL
LYNCH, PAUL FRANCIS
MARTIN, ORALEE CAROL
MCAVOY, THOMAS HENRY
MCCORMICK, ROGER ALLEN
MCDIVITT, JOHN DOUGLAS
MCGEADY, MICHAEL JOSEPH
MIKAC, JOSEPH S.
NOONAN, GREGORY WESTON
PASKEY, WALTER JOSEPH, JR.
PENDERGRASS, RUSSELL G.
POTTER, MICHAEL LEO
REDPATH, SHARON HANSEN
RITCHEY, PATRICK ARTHUR
ROGERS, RICHARD MATTHEW
ROTH, ROBERT A.
RUGGIERO, RALPH LOUIS
SCIORTINO, ROBERT CHARLES
SPICER, TERRELL ANN
STAPLES, GARY ROY
STEWART, LEWIS EDWARD
SWINEFORD, MICHAEL CHARLES
TYLOR,TIMOTHY JOSEPH
TELEP, DANIEL NMN, JR.
THIBODAUX, BYRD CLOVIS
VOGT, BRIAN J.
WALSH, SUSAN JOLIE
WATKINS, GUY CARLTON, JR.
WATSON, RICHARD REID
WELTZIEN, BRIAN DOUGLAS

SUPPLY CORPS OFFICERS (TAR)

To be commander

CHRISTIAN, RONALD DWAYNE
COX, THOMAS LEARY
CYPERT, RONALD L.
HAYDEN, MICHAEL JAY
LOVGREN, GARY WAYNE
NIENHAUS, ANDREW M.

CHAPLAIN CORPS OFFICERS

To be commander

ACKER, WILLIAN BLANTON, III
HAMBLIN, GERALD FRANKLIN
HARRIS, HAROLD
HARTMAN, JACK L.
HIGGINS, THOMAS LYNN
IMPERATORE, GEOFFREY ROBERT
KESSLER, GEORGE ALBERT
KRUEGER, HAROLD ALLAN
LARSEN, PETER MICHAEL
MILLS, LADSON FRAZIER, III
RODRIGUEZ, ROBERT JOSEPH
RUSSO, LAWRENCE JOSEPH, JR.
SASSAMAN, ROBERT WILLIAN
SCOTT, BILLY JOE

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS OFFICERS

To be commander

ALVERSON, JERRY B
BATTLE, MARK ANTHONY
BECKMAN, THOMAS GEORGE
BELL, JAMES MAXSON
CARTER, THOMAS GORDON
CLEBAK, KAROL THOMAS, JR.
CONTI, ANTHONY MICHAEL
FAIST, JOHN ALLAN
FREEMYERS, MICHAEL CARL
GREENWOOD, OLVICE L.
HAYES, LOY SIMMONS, JR.
KEIL, GARY J.
LEAVELL, DANIEL ADELBERT
LEE, DENNIS JUEN
MANROD, WILLIAM ERNEST III
MCVICAR, DOUGLAS J.
MONTGOMERY, THOMAS C.
MOORE, CHARLES LEANDER, JR.
OPITZ, MARTIN EDWARD
PAINTER, WILFRED LEWIS, JR.
SCHRADER, DENNIS R.
SHREVE, JOSEPH ANDREW
SMITH, ALFRED W.
SNOWDEN, RAYMOND DURWOOD
STEPHENSON, DANIEL K.
THIGPEN, WILLARD MCADOO, JR.
WARD, JOSEPH COLLINS
WEATHERS, LAWRENCE G., III
WESTERFIELD, ROBERT ADRIAN
WOOD, RICHARD FRANKLIN
YURICK, THOMAS JOSEPH

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED U.S. NAVAL RESERVE OFFICERS, TO BE APPOINTED PERMANENT LIEUTENANT COMMANDER IN THE LINE OF THE U.S. NAVY, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 531:

LINE, USN, PERMANENT

To be lieutenant commander

ALEY, CHARLES L., III
ANDERSLAND, DAVID L.
BAKER, KATHERINE C.
BAKER, STEPHEN M.
BARKUS, ROBERT D.
BEDINGFIELD, ROBIN C.
BREWER, ROBERT A., JR.
BURKE, STEPHEN V.
BUTTRUM, WILLIAM F.
CALANTROPO, RICHARD J.
CARSON, JAMES P.
CLAYTON, MICHAEL J.
COLTON, JAMES K.
CONNORS, CHRISTOPHER G.
CUTTING, RICHARD B.
FORGE, WILLIAM C., II
FOSTER, DAVID B.
GARBER, BRUCE D.
GERAGOTELIS, JOHN M.
GERBERDING, ROBERT K.
GOUGH, JOHN F., JR.
HANKINS, JOSEPH W.
HARRELL, RONALD L.
HOBBS, TIMOTHY L.
HORTON, DAVID B.
JEPSON, JAMES M.
JOHNSON, BRADLEY D.
KEEN, CHARLES T., III
KOACH, DANIEL T.
KUST, BRYAN H.
LAGIER, MARK T.
LEEDS, TERENCE E.
LUCAS, STEVE A.
LYLES, MARIA
MALMSTROM, JAY A.
MAULDIN, PHILLIP C.
MCCLOSKEY, ROBERT M.
MCGARRY, JOHN D.
MERCER, MICHAEL F., JR.
MILLER, JOSEPH R.
MOORE, FREEMAN L., JR.
MOULIN, MARK D.
NEWMAN, ROBERT D.
OBER, ROY A., III
PALA, ANTHONY J., JR.
PALMISANO, GAIL J., F.
PAREDES, ROBERT E.
PURDOM, ROBERT M.
ROLSON, KAREN L.
RYBOLD, EDMUND K., JR.
SHANLE, LELAND C., JR.
SHUMAKER, WESLEY M.
SIMERVILLE, JAMES G.
SPERBECK, JAMES D.
STEVENS, NORA G.
SULLIVAN, GREGORY J.
TINKER, DEBRA A.
TYMAN, ROBERT B.
VANZWIENEN, RAYMOND E.
VAUGHN, WILLIAM A.
VOGEL, MICHAEL T.
WEDDING, THOMAS E.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED U.S. NAVAL RESERVE OFFICERS, TO BE APPOINTED PERMANENT CAPTAIN IN THE MEDICAL CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVY, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 531:

MEDICAL CORPS, USN, PERMANENT

To be captain

CARNES, ROBERT S.
LIMJOCO, URIEL R.
OLAFSON, RAYMOND P.
PALEOLOGO, FRED P.
RIVERAALSINA, MANUEL E.
SIMMONS, LEO B., JR.
WILLENBERG, NATALIE A.
YARBROUGH, WILLIAM M.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED U.S. NAVAL RESERVE OFFICERS, TO BE APPOINTED PERMANENT COMMANDER IN THE MEDICAL CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVY, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 531:

MEDICAL CORPS, USN, PERMANENT

To be commander

ABEL, MARK F.
ANDERSON, GARY B.
ANDERSON, RUSSELL S.
BELL, WILLIAM F.
BOCK, GERALD W.
BROWN, DAVID M.
BUCCAMBUSO, TERRY J.
CARPENTER, BRUCE W.
CHETHAM, TAMARA, L.
COCKRELL, JOSEPH R.
CONNITO, DAVID J.
COVEY, DANA C.
DELACEY, WILLIAM A.
DEMARCO, JAMES K.
FLAX, BRUCE L.
FOX, STEPHEN D.
HAWKINS, RICHARD E.
HAWORTH, CHARLES S.
HENDERSON, FRASER C.
JEWELL, EDWARD W., III
JOHNSON, LEONARD A.
KAWESKI, SUSAN
KOEHLER, RICHARD H.
LANDSTROM, JERONE T.
LAROCCO, ANTHONY, JR.
LEBAR, RANDI D.
LUEBBERT, MARILYN M.
MAHER, JOHN M.
MALLARI, JESUS V.
MARTY, AILEEN M.
MCKENNA, PATRICK H.
MENDOZA, TERESITA P.
METH, BRUCE M.
MORISSETTE, JEFFERY C.
NAPIERKOWSKI, STANLEY A.
NEMEC, RICHARD L.
OLSHAKER, ROBERT A.
OVE, PETER N.
PADGETT, DOUGLAS E.
PARFITT, RICHARD C.
ROBERTS, LAWRENCE H.
ROBINSON, DOUGLAS B.
RUSSELL, HOWARD L.
SALMON, RICHARD F.
SAYERS, MICHAEL E.
SHERIDAN, MARK V.
SKEEN, MARK B.
SOVICH, STEVEN M.
SPINGARN, STEPHANIE A.
STEELE, CARL E.
STEWART, FRANCES I.
TIDWELL, JAMES L.
TURTON, DAVID B.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED U.S. NAVAL RESERVE OFFICERS, TO BE APPOINTED PERMANENT LIEUTENANT COMMANDER IN THE SUPPLY CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVY, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

SUPPLY CORPS, USN, PERMANENT

FLANARY, MICHAEL W.
TISAK, FRANCIS X.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED U.S. NAVAL RESERVE OFFICERS, TO BE APPOINTED PERMANENT CAPTAIN IN THE CHAPLAIN CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVY, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 531:

To be captain

CHAPLIN CORPS, USN, PERMANENT

LARRIVIERE, MARSHALL R.
ROCK, STEPHEN B.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED U.S. NAVAL RESERVE OFFICERS, TO BE APPOINTED PERMANENT COMMANDER IN THE CHAPLAIN CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVY, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 531:

To be commander

CHAPLAIN CORPS, USN, PERMANENT

COYLE, PATRICK P.
GUBBINS, JOHN M.
JONES, ALPHONSO
MILEWSKI, ROBERT F.
MCLAUGHLIN, PAUL F.
SIMONS, GARY G.
SIMS, TIMOTHY C.
SOTO, CHARLES
STAHL, MARTIN R.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED U.S. NAVAL RESERVE OFFICERS, TO BE APPOINTED PERMANENT LIEUTENANT COMMANDER IN THE CHAPLAIN CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVY, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

CHAPLAIN CORPS, USN, PERMANENT

ABLESON, BRADFORD E.
ANDERSON, CHARLES J.
BAUSMAN, WENDY L.
BEESON, DAVID D.
BORDEN, RONIE D.
BORGER, THEODORE R.
BROWN, WALTER M., JR.
BROWN, WILLIAM D.
CHAPMAN, RANDALL A.
CHRISTIAN, JAMES R.
CIENIK, KENNETH C.
COOK, THOMAS E., JR.
CRAIG, MICHAEL R.
CRALL, ROBERT L.
DAVIS, ROBERT M., JR.
DEMARCO, GREGORY R.
DILLON, JEROME V.
EGAN, BRENNAN R.
ELLIS, JAMES K.
FERRELL, LARRY P.
FRANKLIN, KENNETH M.
GALLE, JOHN A.
GEFALLER, MARK A.
GERVACIO, ADRIAN R.
GIBSON, DAVID L.
GILBERT, JAMES P., JR.
GRAGG, STEPHEN T.
GRAY, GERALD L.
GWALTNEY, PHILLIP E.
HATMAN, WAYNE D., JR.
HERNANDO, HENRY L.
HOLLEY, HOWARD F.
HUNT, CHRISTOPHER L.
JERGE, DONALD W.
JOSLYN, JAMES W.
KESSLER, CHARLES R.
KRANS, GLEN A.
LANTZ, TIMOTHY S.
LEBRON, ROBERT E.
LEIBOLD, JAMES C.
LOGAN, THOMAS W.S.
MARRERO, EMILIO, JR.
MARSHALL, ROBERT W.
MCCLANAHAN, ROBERT P., JR.
MCCORD, KENT
NGUYEN, AN B.
NIX, DAYNE E.
PAUL, JOSEPH C.
PERDUE, WILLIAM G., JR.
POOLE, JOHNNY W.P.
PURSER, ROBERT D.
QUARLES, CHARLES D.
RANARD, HARVEY E., JR.
RHODES, JEFFREY E.
RICHARDS, ROGER C.
RODES, KENNETH J.
ROSS, DEREK K.
ROYSDEN, DANIEL E.
ROZIER, RENDELL R.
SHUPPERT, WILLIAM T.J.
SILVEIRA, RICHARD J.
SLAGLE, ARTHUR M.
SMITH, STEVEN L.
SMITH, THOMAS R.
THEURER, TIMOTHY L.
TRIMBLE, JEFFERY C.
TWAMLEY, JAMES S.
VANINWAGEN, CHRISTOPHER C.
WADDELL, JERRY A.
WEAVER, BRYAN J.
WEBB, THOMAS E.
WHEATLEY, ROBERT C.
WILDER, DAVID S.
WHEATLEY, ROBERT C.
WILDER, DAVID S.
WILKINS, OLRIC R.
WRIGLEY, PAUL R.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED U.S. NAVAL RESERVE OFFICER, TO BE APPOINTED PERMANENT LIEUTENANT COMMANDER IN THE CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVY, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 531:

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS, USN, PERMANENT

To be lieutenant commander

BEROTTI, JAMES V., JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED U.S. NAVAL RESERVE OFFICER, TO BE APPOINTED PERMANENT COMMANDER IN THE MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVY, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 531:

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS, USN, PERMANENT

To be commander

HOWELL, WILLIAM

THE FOLLOWING NAMED U.S. NAVAL RESERVE OFFICERS, TO BE APPOINTED PERMANENT LIEUTENANT COMMANDER IN THE MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVY, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 531:

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS, USN, PERMANENT

To be lieutenant commander

BLANKS, JEAN A.
BOBECK, ANN
CHURILLA, ALBERT M.
DUKOVICH, MITCHELL
FORREST, VIRGINIA J.
HEINEMANN, PHILLIP C.
HIGHT, NANCY G.
KUJAWA, KATHLEEN I.
MORASH, ROBERT C., JR.
PARKER, JAMES B.
POPPELL, EDITH Y.
PRICE, MARTIN G.
RADOIU, CHRISTINE M.
SHIRAISHI, DAVID Y.
SLAUGHTER, MARTHA M.
WARD, DEBRA L.
ZAYASHOOD, MARIA, D.A.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED U.S. NAVAL RESERVE OFFICERS, TO BE APPOINTED PERMANENT COMMANDER IN THE NURSE CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVY, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 531:

NURSE CORPS, USN, PERMANENT

To be commander

BRENNAN, RAMA F.S.
DRABEK, LINDA C.
GUSTAFSON, CAROL A.R.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED U.S. NAVAL RESERVE OFFICERS, TO BE APPOINTED PERMANENT LIEUTENANT COMMANDER IN THE NURSE CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVY, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 531:

NURSE CORPS, USN, PERMANENT

To be lieutenant commander

ALBARES, PAUL L.
COPPAGE, LISA J.
DAVIS, BRIAN L.
JONES, KAREN M.
MILLER, KENNETH P.
MILLER, MICHAEL A.
MURPHY, MARY A.
PETERS, GLYNDA S.
PHILLIPS, REBECCA A.
RIEGLE, ANNA R.
SERBIN, KATHRYN M.
TATE, DOREEN E.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Tuesday, October 19, 1993*

The House met at 11 a.m.

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

We remember those near and dear to us, O loving God, that You would keep them in Your care and support them by Your spirit. In the quiet solitude of our own hearts we place before You the names of our family, our friends and colleagues, all those about whom we care, and we pray that You will endow them with every blessing and confer upon them the confidence of Your benediction. May each of us come to experience the assurance of Your grace, the promises of love and life, and the glory of eternal hope and peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOBSON] please come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HOBSON led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces that it will limit to 10 Members on each side requests for 1-minute recognition.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H. Con. Res. 160. Concurrent resolution to correct the enrollment of H.R. 3123.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2446) "An act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.", and that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 13, 17, 20, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 38, 40, and 42, to the above-entitled bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2518) "An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.", and that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 11, 15, 23, 24, 34, 41, 49, 54, 57, 58, 65, 68, 69, 74, 92, 104, 108, 111, 117, 123, 124, 129, and 133, to the above-entitled bill.

THE SSC JURASSIC PORK MAKES A COMEBACK

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, earlier this summer I stood in this well and spoke about Jurassic Pork, the superconducting super collider. This House voted overwhelmingly, 280 to 150, to kill the funding for the super collider.

That vote represented the single largest spending cut in any appropriations bill this year.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, this Jurassic Pork is far from being extinct. Through a labyrinth of parliamentary trickery, this SSC has again reared its dinosauric head. Today we have a chance finally to kill the largest piece of pork in the Federal budget. Huge cost overruns, with out-of-control spending by the contractor, have wasted millions of taxpayer dollars.

Many of my colleagues point to their own budget-cutting votes and to their zeal in cutting the budget to the tune of hundreds of thousands to a few million dollars.

This, Mr. Speaker, is a chance to kill $13 billion of Federal spending. I ask the Members of the House to vote "no" and kill the superconducting super collider.

BLURRED FOREIGN POLICY, CONGRESSIONAL INTERFERENCE POINT TO CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, we appear to be on the verge of a constitutional crisis in this country. The President's power and responsibility to execute our Nation's foreign policy is being encroached upon by the legislative branch in ways that threaten to weaken the Office of the Presidency, and blur the lines that separate our branches of Government.

The inept conduct of our Nation's foreign policy, by a President who was largely untested on this subject during his campaign for office, has brought an outcry from the American people and a power-grab by some Members of Congress. The vacuum left by a visionless foreign policy that better resembles a teach-in by U.N. bureaucrats than a sovereign superpower, is being filled by voices on this end of Pennsylvania Avenue that have no business micromanaging affairs of state.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress rightfully should advise and speak its mind on issues of national interest. However, only one voice should be heard beyond our water's edge—and the responsibility for that voice should fall squarely on the President's shoulders. In the interest of this and future Presidents, the Congress should stay out of these matters of state and permit the Commander in Chief, and the American people, the clear lines of accountability that our Founding Fathers, intended.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1994

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

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the conference report on energy and water appropriations for fiscal year 1994. I particularly object to increased funding for an unnecessary, expensive, and potentially dangerous breeder reactor, the advanced liquid metal reactor [ALMR].

But I do not oppose the conference report based simply on one program. I have a broader concern. This report undermines both bodies' attempts to make responsible deficit reduction choices.

During and after the budget debate some Members, and even the Democratic caucus itself, mentioned cuts

made by this House, such as the ALMR, in speeches and letters to constituents to show a commitment to cutting spending. But we make these hard choices in vain when conferees do little to uphold the will of the House they represent. The urgent need for deficit reduction dictates that conferees should adopt the lower approved funding level for many programs on which the two bodies disagree. Instead, this conference committee has chosen the higher number in 11 of 14 cases of disagreement on Department of Energy civilian programs. The final result of this conferencing up is that bill before us contains more total spending than either body's original bill.

Members cannot creditably claim to heed the call to cut spending first if we allow the process to undermine our efforts. Let us send the message that hard-won deficit reduction is too important to be sacrificed for expediency when final deals are done.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Members to vote "no" on the conference report in its current form.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES PAGE BOARD

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to section 127 of Public Law 97-377, the Chair appoints as Members of the House of Representatives Page Board the following Members of the House:

Mr. KILDEE of Michigan; and
Mr. TOWNS of New York.

APPOINTMENT TO THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 491 of the Higher Education Act, as amended by section 407 of Public Law 99-498, the Chair appoints on the part of the House, Mr. Thomas A. Butts of Ann Arbor, MI, to the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

APPOINTMENT TO THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE RECORDS OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 2702 of 44 U.S.C., as amended by Public Law 101-509, the Chair appoints the following member to the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress on the part of the House:

Mr. Richard F. Fenno, Jr., of Rochester, NY.

REAPPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR., FEDERAL HOLIDAY COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 4(a) of Public Law 98-399, as amended by Public Law 101-30, the Chair reappoints as members of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Federal Holiday Commission the following Members of the House:

Mr. WHEAT of Missouri;
Mr. SAWYER of Ohio;
Mr. REGULA of Ohio; and
Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut.

APPOINTMENT TO THE TASK FORCE TO MAKE FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AT MILITARY BASES SCHEDULED FOR CLOSURE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 2923 of Public Law 101-510, the Chair appoints Mr. Don Gray of Fort Washington, MD, to the Task Force to Make Findings and Recommendations for Environmental Restoration at Military Bases Scheduled for Closure.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 9355(a) of title 10, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Air Force Academy the following Members of the House:

Mr. DICKS of Washington;
Mr. HOAGLAND of Nebraska;
Mr. HEFLEY of Colorado; and
Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS TO THE ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 3(a) of Public Law 86-380, the Chair appoints to the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations the following Members of the House:

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey;
Mr. MORAN of Virginia; and
Mr. SCHIFF of New Mexico.

□ 1110

A TRIBUTE TO MAINE HEROES

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

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, this past week the State of Maine laid to rest two of its bravest sons, Sgt. Thomas Field of Lisbon and M. Sgt. Gary Gordon of Lincoln. We gave them the tribute and honor these heroes deserved. Both soldiers were killed in heavy fighting in Somalia. Gary Gordon was trying to save the crew of a downed helicopter, which included another Maine soldier, Tom Field, and Michael Durant, who was taken as a prisoner of war.

I'd like to pay homage to these men's courage and to their bravery, and for paying the highest price a nation can ask of its soldiers—to give their lives for their country.

Across the country, in other hometowns, grieving families and friends have also paid their last respects to the other brave men who died. This is a troubling time for our Nation. It is a difficult time for the families of our fallen heroes. These men are the pride of America. They touch the hearts of a nation.

At a similar time of national mourning, Abraham Lincoln said this of America's fallen heroes: "That from these honored dead, we take increased devotion to their cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion. That we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain."

From this day onward, each and every one of us here must ensure that the deaths of these men shall not have been made in vain, and that we continue to remember the sacrifices they made for their country in the name of honor, liberty, freedom, and courage.

SUNDRY MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

SUPPORT NORTH AMERICAN FREE-TRADE AGREEMENT

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, with crises in Somalia, Haiti, Bosnia, and Russia, why create another one, Latin America, by rejecting the North American Free-Trade Agreement?

In less than a month, we will be voting on NAFTA. In my opinion, this will be one of the most important votes of this session.

According to a New York Times poll, roughly 50 percent of the American public knows nothing about NAFTA. It is our job to get the word out, that NAFTA will create jobs for Americans.

Unfortunately, we are still hearing a lot of scare stories about U.S. jobs being "sucked" south of the border. Yet, if this is really true, why are Japan and other Asian nations so worried about NAFTA?

According to a recent study by the University of Tokyo sponsored by Japan's Economic Planning Agency, NAFTA will make life more difficult for Japan and Southeast Asia.

NAFTA is a good agreement. Let us not put our heads in the sand by rejecting it.

TERMINATE THE SUPERCONDUCTING SUPER COLLIDER

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, later today the House will face a crucial test that will determine whether we are serious about cutting the deficit and whether our words will be backed up with our deeds. I refer, of course, to the vote on the energy and water appropriations conference report. We will offer a motion to recommit with instructions to terminate this superconducting super collider [SSC].

One could hardly ask for a more precise test of the House's seriousness. The energy and water conferees have tried to appease Members' appetite for budget cutting by tossing us a few morsels of pork. But the pork in this report is in reality a red herring—if I may say so—the pork projects in this bill are designed to distract Members and throw them off the trail of their true quarry—giant, low priority, costly, mismanaged projects like the SSC. So today's vote pits pork against purpose.

Todays' vote is a test of whether the House is willing to have its budget cutting efforts sabotaged by a small group of conferees following their own agenda. The House voted overwhelmingly—by 280 to 150—to kill the SSC in June, but the conferees capitulated to the Senate's desire to continue funding. If we accept this action from the conferees then the House amounts to nothing more than a very expensive version of Boys' State—just going through the motions of governing and leaving the tough decisions to others.

Let's show the American people that we're serious about budget cutting. Vote to recommit the energy and water bill and terminate the SSC.

CONSTITUTION DOES NOT SEPARATE GOD FROM AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, for decades Girl Scouts have recited a solemn pledge, "To serve God and country." Very simple, very straightforward. But this week the Girl Scouts may change their pledge to one of the following: Option A, to serve Allah, the Creator; or, Option B, a pledge to serve nothing or no one at all.

Mr. Speaker, this is amazing. I think this is going a little too far. The Constitution may separate church and state, but the Constitution never separated God and the American people.

I think this politically correct business is way off the deep end, and, in fact on this issue, it may end up on the Richter scale.

But let me say this: What is next? Will the politically correct begin referring to God as a significant other? By God, beam me up.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RICHARDSON). The Chair reminds individuals in the gallery not to use any manifestation of approval or disapproval.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE EDWARD LEFFLER

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in sorrow over the passing of Edward Leffler.

He was a friend, a person whose positive spirit enriched the lives of all who knew him.

He was a professional whose skill guided the careers of many of music's great contemporary artists including the Beatles, Rolling Stones, Carpenters, Osmonds, and most recently Jude Cole and Sammy Hagar and Van Halen.

But beyond helping stars reach their potential, he created meaningful employment for thousands of working people: lighting technicians, recording engineers, record salesmen and women, ticket takers, and hosts of others behind the entertainment scene—working people who paid their bills, fed their families due to the business sense and leadership skills of Ed Leffler.

Ed was an American entrepreneur of the first order, a loving father to his twins Andrew and Ashley and an anchor of calm and decency in a tumultuous music arena.

He was a good human being who died of cancer. In that he is just a statistic. But as an individual he made his mark, did a professional job that provided entertainment for hundreds of millions and lived an honorable life.

Ed Leffler was much admired by me and many others. He will be missed.

MAWS (MARIN ABUSED WOMEN'S SERVICES) STUDY

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the Marin Abused Women's Services in the Sixth District of California for the completion of their groundbreaking study on the role that men can take in preventing domestic violence.

It is particularly timely that the report findings were reported now—during Domestic Violence Awareness Month.

Mr. Speaker, this study is the first of its kind because it examines men's relationship to the problem of domestic violence and outlines steps that men can take to play a role in abuse prevention. Up until now, Mr. Speaker, domestic abuse was viewed as a woman's problem, that required women's solutions. This report challenges that notion, and I encourage all my colleagues to read it.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, Congress can, and must, play a vital role in combating domestic violence. We can start by passing the Violence Against Women Act. I urge my colleagues in both Chambers to cosponsor the bill and work for its passage.

Mr. Speaker, a woman is battered every 15 seconds, or 6 million times each year. Every year, 4,000 women are battered to death. Women's very lives depend on the actions of each of us.

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR DEMOCRACY IMPORTANT FOR AMERICA

(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, later today we are going to be facing one of the most important national security votes that we will have in this session of Congress. I am referring to the attempt that is going to be made by my colleague from Pennsylvania to delete funding for the National Endowment for Democracy.

Mr. Speaker, there are some who have argued that bringing about this cut for the National Endowment for Democracy will be very good for deficit reduction. Frankly, using that as a deficit reduction plan sounds like cutting off your arm to successfully bring about a weight loss plan.

We have succeeded in defeating communism in spots throughout the world, but democracy has not yet succeeded. We need to ensure that we maintain funding for this very important National Endowment for Democracy so that Ronald Reagan's dream of ensuring democracy through ballots and not bullets succeeds.

□ 1120

A RESPONSIBILITY TO CUT SPENDING

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

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Speaker, today we face a major test of whether or not the majority is going to rule and cut spending for the people of this country. Not only at stake is the vote on the

superconducting super collider that we will hear much about today but also the conference bill on energy and water appropriations has restored total funding, indeed, increased funding for next year for the amount to be spent on the advanced liquid metal reactor, which a large majority of the House of Representatives voted to kill and the administration called upon us to cut.

Mr. Speaker, in addition, this bill, in 11 instances out of 14 differences between the House and Senate, took the highest expenditure level that either House adopted, meaning that there was no intent, no will to make the cuts that we have all been advocating around this country.

The test is to vote to recommit or to reject the conference report on the energy and water appropriations.

UNREALISTIC NUMBERS

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, experts from all corners are already questioning the economic feasibility of the not-yet-final Clinton health plan. The numbers revealed so far just do not add up. One economist concludes the White House may have understated the cost by $300 billion. Top administration officials, including Chief Economist Laura Tyson, privately dismiss the plan's rosy economic predictions—withholding constructive criticism in a show of misguided political loyalty. Entitlement spending already consumes more than 60 percent of our budget galloping ever faster to keep up with ever more promised benefits. Before we spend ourselves into oblivion we need to stop and remember the choice is not Clinton's health plan or no plan at all. There are other better choices—and guess what—we can implement those choices without making ourselves sick with more debt.

KILL THE SUPERCONDUCTING SUPER COLLIDER

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

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year 280 Members of this body voted to terminate funding for the superconducting super collider. This was the largest single cut in any appropriation bill adopted by this body this year.

Unfortunately, the other body included funding for the super collider in their version of the Energy and water appropriation bill. The conference committee did not include one Member of this body who voted with the huge majority, when it went to conference, to terminate funding for the collider.

It should come as no surprise that the conference committee quickly adopted the Senate position and ignored the will of 280 Members of this body, nearly two-thirds on both sides of the political aisle.

Today we will vote on that conference committee report. Mr. Speaker, we must stick to our position in the House and kill the super collider and save the taxpayers of this country at least $10 billion.

I urge my colleagues to support our efforts to recommit the conference report with instructions to terminate funding for the super collider. This is our chance today to demonstrate to the American taxpayers that we are serious about cutting the deficit and cutting Federal spending. I urge my colleagues to stick to their position.

THE REAL CLINTON HEATH PLAN

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

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, once again, there is a big disconnect between what President Bill Clinton says and what President Bill Clinton does. This time, it is on health care. President Clinton says his health plan does not rely on price controls and health rationing. But read President Clinton's plan.

Page 68 of the Clinton health plan, available in bookstores across America, says this: "A provider may not charge or collect from a patient a fee in excess of the fee schedule adopted by an alliance." Translation—the Clinton plan imposes national health care price controls, pure and simple. Health industry analyst J.D. Kleinke, writing in the Wall Street Journal, says the Clinton price controls will "curtail all new drug development for currently untreatable diseases." He says that is, and I quote, "tantamount to euthanasia."

What Bill Clinton says and what Bill Clinton does. Two different things, Mr. Speaker. That is why we need action now on a health plan. Let us enact the Republican health plan, "Action '93."

IN SUPPORT OF NAFTA

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of NAFTA and I'd like to address my comments to those in the House who have concluded that NAFTA would be good for our constituents, good for our working people, and good for the country, but who are concerned because some of our constituents have genuine fears about the plan, in part because of the fear-mongering they have been exposed to.

What I would like to say is that there is an antidote for fear and that is truth. It has been my personal experience that if a Member of Congress shares with their constituents the truth about NAFTA many of those fears are converted to confidence.

When I have gone into townhall meetings and asked my constituents whether they wanted me to knock down Mexican trade barriers so that we could export more to Mexico, and thereby create jobs, they told me unequivocally, "yes." They would want me to vote for such a treaty. Of course, this is exactly what NAFTA does, and when I tell them this they respond with more hope and less fear. We have been sent here to make considered judgments. Many of our constituents haven't had the time or even interest to read this treaty. It is our responsibility to cast more light on this treaty. When we do so we will all agree that Roosevelt was right. "All we have to fear is fear itself," and that the Good Book is right—"Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall set you free."

CLINTON'S "WALDO" HEALTH CARE PLAN

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

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I think we should dub the Clinton administration's health plan "the Waldo health care bill." Let me show you why.

There is a lovable little fellow named Waldo. As any of you who have children know, this is a "Where's Waldo?" book. Waldo has made a career out of being very hard to find. This is the Clinton health care plan briefing book. This accompanied the President's address to the Nation on health care weeks ago. Page after page of rhetoric. In both books you will be hard pressed to find the central character. With this health care bill, President Clinton is well on his way to surpassing Waldo in the hard to find, impossible to pin down category.

In fact, the only real difference between the two is that you can rest assured that Waldo is in the picture. If you don't believe me ask any 3-year-old and they'll find him. But, after weeks of waiting, the Clinton health care plan is still not in the picture. If you don't believe me, ask any Member of Congress and they'll tell you they haven't seen it.

Mr. Speaker, it's time to ask the question—where's the bill, Bill?

NATIONAL MAMMOGRAPHY DAY

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

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, every year for the past 4 years, National

Breast Cancer Awareness Month has received greater participation and interest. It is clear that this commemorative has been very effective in increasing the public awareness of this disease. But fighting breast cancer is more than just awareness. That is why I am so happy that yesterday the President signed into law a resolution that I introduced designating today as "National Mammography Day."

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important day because it focuses on the early detection of breast cancer. The National Cancer Institute has estimated that there will be a total of 183,000 cases of breast cancer in 1993, with 46,000 deaths.

There is no known cure for breast cancer. Until we find a cure, early detection and treatment is the best chance that we have against its early stages. This is an essential part of our early detection.

At the present time, there is some controversy over the need of an annual mammogram. But as a survivor, I can tell my colleagues that I am living proof that an annu ' mammogram can save a life.

Yes, our mothers and our daughters and our wives, our sisters are all being diagnosed with this disease rapidly. So early detection can greatly increase the odds of their survival.

I would like to thank President Clinton and my colleagues who helped to make this day possible.

A CALL FOR INVESTIGATION AT DOE

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, how many bureaucrats does it take to change a light bulb?

According to the CBS program "60 Minutes" this past Sunday night, if it is the Department of Energy, it takes 43.

As "60 Minutes" reported that it took two people to actually change the bulb at the DOE Savannah River Plant in South Carolina.

But it took 41 people to write over 300 pages of work orders telling how to go about it.

No wonder that almost everyone except the most liberal among us have lost faith in our Federal bureaucracy to do anything economically or efficiently.

As "60 Minutes" also reported that the Savannah River Plant has over 20,000 employees, many with nothing to do, and producing nothing whatsoever.

That, in spite of this, DOE paid out over $200 million in totally unnecessary overtime.

That, despite the wasteful operation going on there, millions of taxpayer dollars have been paid in bonuses, including $4.7 million in unauthorized bonuses that it took DOE 2 years to discover.

I call on Energy Secretary O'Leary to immediately and personally investigate these very serious charges by "60 Minutes."

□ 1130

WAKE UP CONGRESS, PEOPLE IN AMERICA VOTE

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

Mr. APPLEGATE. Mr. Speaker, farmers are paid money not to grow food, yet 31 million Americans are going hungry. Millions of manufacturing jobs have left the country, yet 36 million Americans are living in poverty. The United States has the best medical technology in the world, and yet, among the industrial nations of the world we are 18th in life expectancy, we are 24th in infant mortality, because it is not available to everybody; and 37 million Americans have no health insurance.

The rich are getting richer, the poor are getting poorer, and yet we are spending and sending billions of dollars more to every other country in the world to help their economic structure, and many in Congress say nothing is broke.

Wake up Congress, the people also vote.

SUPPORT OUR TROOPS

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, over the past weekend, I visited Fort Benning, GA, on the occasion of its 75th anniversary. Fort Benning had much to celebrate, but as I talked with many of the career soldiers, I found their morale is suffering greatly.

Mr. Speaker, as the events in Somalia and Haiti are played out on the international scene, many of these career soldiers are reminded of Vietnam. They know what it was like to return from a political war as heroes on the battlefield but unappreciated at home.

Mr. Speaker, I visited one of our wounded soldiers who is still recovering, at Martin Army Hospital, from his close encounter in Somalia. He was the victim of a political mission gone sour. His colleagues asked me to deliver a message to this Congress: Give us the means and the support and we can accomplish any military mission.

Mr. Speaker, I add my own advice to this Congress and this President. Use the military wisely and with force but do not ask our troops to be politicians. They are proud soldiers who deserve our support in every way possible.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RICHARDSON). The Chair will entertain one additional 1 minute on each side.

FORT BENNING'S 75TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the home of the infantry and the dedicated soldiers at Fort Benning, GA. Fort Benning was established 75 years ago, on October 7, 1918. Since its beginning, Fort Benning has trained our Army's leaders—George C. Marshall, Omar Bradley, Dwight Eisenhower, George Patton, Joseph Stillwell, Colin Powell, and Norman Schwarzkopf. And Fort Benning remains the primary training base for combat leaders—infantrymen, rangers, airborne. Fort Benning's soldiers stand ready to defend human rights and our national security, many paying the ultimate price. World War II and Desert Storm, were won in the classrooms and in the training areas of this Georgian post. In the 1940's, the Big Red One, trained there; as did Patton's 2d Armored Division. The 11th Air Assault Division was activated at Fort Benning, and later merged with the 2d Infantry Division to form the 1st Cavalry Division which gained fame in the rice paddies and mountains of Vietnam. Fort Benning units have served with distinction in Panama, Southwest Asia and are serving in Somalia. I salute Fort Benning, its history and its leaders. I also salute their families who have stood by these men and women during the call of duty. Fort Benning remains a vibrant platform for the projection of America's combat power, wherever, whenever it is needed.

Mr. Speaker, happy birthday to Fort Benning.

ANNOUNCING SPECIAL ORDER ON STATUS OF TROOPS IN 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, when I last spoke on the floor Friday afternoon, I said I was going to Somalia, even if I had to fly commercial through Nairobi. Thankfully, Les Aspin, our Secretary of Defense, supported my request for the trip and I was able to hitch a ride on a transport plane headed to Somalia to deliver lumber. I spent about 40 hours in the air to have some time on the ground in Somalia yesterday morning. I will do an hour special order tonight to report on my trip.

One pertinent observation is that we have the finest young men and women in the field ever, equally as impressive as our troops in Desert Storm.

I see my colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] on the floor. I would say to the gentleman that all our troops over there ask if we would help make sure that they get the same benefits as the soldiers who served in Desert Storm. They are in combat conditions over there, and we have had 26 men killed in action just since August 8. The least we can do is give them tax-exempt status.

Mr. Speaker, I also said Friday that there was one American body left unidentified, the fourth man dragged through the streets of Mogadishu. He was identified by his mother on Monday night. He is William David Cleveland, Jr., 32 years of age, five children. He was desecrated in the streets of Somalia, but is finally home on his beloved American soil.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2491, DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 275 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 275

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report and amendments reported from conference in disagreement on the bill (H.R. 2491) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report are waived. The conference report, amendments in disagreement, and motions printed in the joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference to dispose of amendments in disagreement shall be considered as read. It shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, to consider a motion offered by Representative Stokes of Ohio or a designee that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 113 and concur therein with the amendment printed in section 2 of this resolution. That motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on that motion to final adoption without intervening motion.

SEC. 2. The amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 113 is as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert: ": *Provided further*, That, pursuant to Public Law 102-486, an amount equal to not more than 50 percent of all utility energy efficiency and water conservation cash rebates received by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration may be made available for additional energy efficiency and water conservation measures, including facility surveys: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this Act to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall be available for other than termination costs of the advanced solid rocket motor program.

"Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the amounts appropriated in this Act for fiscal year 1994 shall be: $4,853,500,000 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration 'Space flight, control and data communications', $517,700,000 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration 'Construction of facilities', $7,529,300,000 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration 'Research and development', $1,480,853,000 for the Environmental Protection Agency 'Hazardous substance superfund', $1,998,500,000 for the National Science Foundation 'Research and related activities', and $110,000,000 for the National Science Foundation 'Academic research infrastructure'".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes of debate time 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 purposes of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 275 provides for the consideration of the conference report on H.R. 2491, making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994.

The rule waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration.

The rule further provides that the conference report, amendments in disagreement, and motions printed in the joint explanatory statement to dispose of amendments in disagreement shall be considered as read when called for consideration.

In addition, unlike the rule which the House considered last week, this rule makes in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, a motion which would allow the House to express its will concerning the advanced solid rocket motor programs. The motion, to be offered by Chairman STOKES or his designee, provides that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 113 and concur therein with an amendment printed in section 2 of the rule. The motion is debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion without intervening motion.

The amendment to Senate amendment 113 which this rule makes in order states, "none of the funds provided in this Act to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall be available for other than termination costs of the advanced solid rocket motor program." By making this motion in order, the rule gives the House exactly what the advanced solid rocket motor program's critics have requested: a specific, clear, and forthright opportunity to expressly end the program.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report on H.R. 2491, the bill for which the committee has recommended this rule, provides $87.6 billion for vital national initiatives, including veterans' health, environmental protection, housing assistance, and space.

We are already 19 days into the 1994 fiscal year. The continuing resolution expires Thursday. I ask my colleagues to support the rule so that we may proceed with consideration of the merits of this vital legislation.

□ 1140

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] has ably explained the provisions of the rule.

The focus of debate on this measure has been the ASRM Program, and I would like to remind my colleagues of the other significant programs funded by this bill.

H.R. 2491 provides essential funding for programs to meet the critical needs of our Nation's veterans, and to accommodate the housing requirements of the elderly and the needy.

We need to move expeditiously on this appropriation bill, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule so that we can proceed with consideration of this conference report.

There will be an effort made today to do away with the ASRM Program. I think that it is imperative that we go forward with this measure and get it signed by the President. Our veterans cannot be denied help. We know that we need our HUD programs. We need the various independent agency programs. And I do not know why there would be any opposition to this measure. It would be based only on technicalities, in my opinion.

We must fight to save our Selective Service System. In the case of a national emergency, we cannot let that system go down the drain. And I support the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] in his efforts to preserve it and to keep it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished Republican chairman emeritus for yielding me this time. I rise to state that I intend to call for a recorded vote on this rule, but it is not

because I believe this rule is inherently unfair. I will call a vote to make note of a major inconsistency between the rhetoric of some on the other side regarding Senate legislative amendments and their actions to mitigate this problem.

Mr. Speaker, during nearly 6 months of hearings in our Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, one recurring complaint stood out. It was made by authorizing committee chairmen who contend that the Appropriations Committee is usurping their jurisdiction by accepting Senate legislative amendments in appropriations conference reports that would otherwise be subject to a point of order in the House.

Mr. Speaker, this is a legitimate problem that needs to be addressed, but I would remind my colleagues that current House rules provide a remedy. For example, clause 2 of rule XX requires that these Senate amendments be brought back to the House for a separate vote in technical disagreement. However, it is the Rules Committee, on behalf of both the authorizing committees and the appropriations committee, that consistently waives points of order against these provisions.

This is the reason I was both surprised and pleased to see a letter that was sent to the chairman of the Rules Committee on October 5 by the chairmen of four major authorizing committees. I will place the letter in the RECORD. In the letter, these committee chairmen state:

The purpose of this letter is to request that the Committee on Rules not grant any waivers of points of order against clause 2(c) of Rule XXI (prohibiting legislation in an appropriations bill) and clause 2 of Rule XX (prohibiting House conferees from agreeing to the Senate amendments which would violate clause 2 of Rule XXI) for any appropriations conference report.

Guess what, Mr. Speaker. There are 20 Senate amendments in the VA–HUD appropriations conference report which constitute legislating in an appropriations bill, and this rule waives points of order against those provisions.

The distinguished subcommittee chairman, Mr. STOKES, noted that these amendments do not create major policy problems, and that they would have been in order as limitation amendments in the House committee-reported bill.

The first point is open to interpretation, but the chairman is right on the second point, Mr. Speaker. However, because the House did not defeat the motion to rise, these amendments are still in violation of clause 2 of rule XX.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time for the rhetoric of this issue to be matched by action. If my colleagues are serious about restoring the prerogatives of the House and reducing the number of legislative provisions in appropriations conference reports, then a "no" vote on this rule is the only appropriate vote.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the letter previously referred to, as follows:

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

Hon. JOHN JOSEPH MOAKLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Rules, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you may know, over the last several years, we have repeatedly raised concerns about the practice of including Senate-added legislative provisions in conference reports on appropriations bills. In that regard, we have appreciated your assistance and consideration of the positions of the authorizing committees. To further resolve those concerns, we offered an amendment to the House Rules which was adopted by the Democratic Caucus and included in the Rules of the House for the 103rd Congress. Under clause (2)(b)(2) of rule XXVIII, the chairman of an authorizing committee with jurisdiction over the legislative matter reported in technical disagreement now has the right to offer a preferential motion to insist on disagreement. We believe that this amendment will help to restore the prerogatives of the House and significantly reduce the number of legislative provisions in appropriations bills. As the House begins to consider the first set of appropriations conference reports under the amended rule, we and other chairmen of the authorizing committees plan to monitor the reports carefully for any inclusion of legislative language.

The purpose of this letter is to request that the Committee on Rules not grant any waivers of points of order against clause 2(c) of rule XXI (prohibiting legislation in an appropriations bill) and clause 2 of rule XX (prohibiting House conferees from agreeing to Senate amendments which would violate clause 2 of Rule XXI) for any appropriations conference report. We believe that any Senate amendments proposing to add legislative language should follow regular order and be brought back to the House for a separate vote on technical disagreement. Providing blanket waivers of points of order, or providing waivers to permit the conference report to contain legislative language, would substantially infringe on the prerogatives of the authorizing committees and vitiate the effect of the amendment to the House Rules adopted by the Caucus and the House early this session.

We appreciate your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

JOHN D. DINGELL,
GEORGE E. BROWN, Jr.,
GEORGE MILLER,
NORMAN Y. MINETA,
Members of Congress.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for giving me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule. But in the amendments and disagreement I will vote for the Senate amendment to fund the Selective Service System. This motion will be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. Speaker, really, now is not the time to eliminate the Selective Service System. If this motion by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is defeated, the Director of Selective Service has told me only yesterday that he will close down the whole system on December 1. In other words, the local boards in your communities are out of business, the State Selective Service offices controlled by the Governor of each State are out of business.

This is a drastic step we are getting ready to take here with only one committee having taken action on this major issue.

I point out also, Mr. Speaker, in the case of an emergency and the Selective Service System had to call up young men, the big problem is with calling up doctors, nurses, and health care professionals. The Director tells me that within 42 days he has the software, the computers and equipment to get these doctors and nurses on board to treat in a minimal conflict where young men are hurt. At this time we do not have the medical professionals to do it. It is a terrible mistake today if we eliminate the Selective Service System, and I hope our colleagues will vote not to do this.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the ranking member of the Committee on Rules.

□ 1150

Mr. SOLOMON. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for yielding this time to me.

I also thank him for his support of the motion that I am to make later on when we take up the VA–HUD and Independent Agencies conference report. My motion will ask this body to recede to the Senate position which would restore the funds to maintain the Selective Service System.

Ladies and gentleman, later on this morning we are going to be taking up the Commerce/State/Justice appropriation conference report. That bill has another amendment in disagreement which deals with the National Endowment for Democracy. When that amendment came on the floor some time ago, I voted to cut the National Endowment for Democracy because I felt that it was not being effective.

I am going to change my vote on NED this afternoon. I am going to support it now because something critical is happening over in the former Soviet Union, in Russia. Elections are being called over there, and the country is standing at the crossroads.

This could be one of the most critical elections in the history of this world. The National Endowment for Democracy is going to be able to utilize its resources to make sure that those elections are fair and democratic. The whole future of the world depends on that.

Ladies and gentlemen, something else depends on that, too, and that is the Selective Service System. My

amendment to keep Selective Service System funded failed several weeks ago by just 1 vote, not counting the delegate votes. By one vote, the House decided to abolish the Selective Service System. Since that time, there has been a coup attempt over in Russia. We all know what happened there. We all know what happened in Somalia, where we lost 18 members of our Armed Services in a very, very tragic situation. We know what is happening in Bosnia today.

We need to maintain the Selective Service System.

I do not have to tell you that today we depend on an all-voluntary military. We get a cross-section of American young men and women from all across this country.

Mr. Speaker, since we depend on this all-voluntary military, it is absolutely imperative that our military recruiters be able to define which young men and women are available for the military today.

In many instances, in many schools across the Nation, our recruiters are being denied the ability to go on campus. The only way they have to get the names of young men and women, in order to sit down and explain to them what an honorable career the U.S. Armed Forces are today, is from the list maintained by the Selective Service System.

If we are going to maintain this all-voluntary military, we have to have this backup situation.

I ask Members, when I offer that motion on behalf of myself and the gentleman from Mississippi, Congressman MONTGOMERY, to think about that. Reverse your votes, let us pass this amendment to maintain the necessary funds.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

Mr. ROEMER. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, let me read two sentences from this new rule adopted by the Committee on Rules.

First of all, the language that I testified on last week recommending that the Rules Committee adopt, this is the Rules Committee language:

> It shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, to consider a motion offered by Representative Stokes of Ohio or a designee that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 113 and concur therein with the amendment printed in section 2 of this resolution.

What that means, Mr. Speaker, written in the rule:

> *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this act for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall be available for other than termination costs of the advanced solid rocket motor program.

As somebody who fought very, very hard against the rule when this came up before, I believe this rule is in order and is a good rule because it does firmly resolve two questions: First, the question of the advanced solid rocket motor, something that the House has spoken to very, very adamantly in the past, with 379 votes against that program on a previous straight up-and-down amendment; 305 votes against that particular program on a rule. We do not want this program going forward on the merits.

It is over budget, and it is not needed from a scientific basis.

Second, Mr. Speaker, I think that the integrity of this institution, of the House, is being listened to by this rule. We have voted so many times in the House of Representatives to kill programs. We send them over to the Senate, and they come back either with the same funding or increased funding.

I think this rule insures that this will go back to the Senate and that the Senate knows that we are firm, we are committed, we are in unison, we do not want this program coming back to the House at all. We have finally put a nail in the coffin and a stake in the heart of the advanced solid rocket motor.

Again, I commend the Committee on Rules for their hard work.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN].

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Stokes amendment to terminate the ASRM, advanced solid rocket motor.

Mr. Speaker, and I wish to commend Chairman STOKES for his outstanding leadership on this difficult issue.

If you were one of the 378 Members of this body who voted earlier this year to terminate the ASRM you can support this rule and the Stokes amendment which the rule provides for.

This is what we have all waited for, for a long, long, time.

At last we have been able to terminate a large, expensive, and wasteful Federal program, one of the few successes in this regard that I can remember.

While many of my colleagues would rather see the $58 million over and above the $100 million provided for the ASRM termination costs go toward deficit reduction, or to stay within the NASA budget, I say to you the Stokes' amendment is the preferred position. Let me explain why.

Let us not deceive ourselves that the $58 million would have gone toward deficit reduction if it had not been transferred to the EPA, the NASP, and National Science Foundation.

Under the House budget rules, that money would not have gone toward the deficit, but rather, would be available for use in other appropriations bills and we all know around here that money available is money used.

Second, the $58 million will go toward worthwhile projects. The NASP is a leading-edge technology in aviation that this country must pursue if we are to maintain our technological superiority in the critical area of aerospace.

And the Superfund in EPA is always in need of resources to work on the backlog of cleaning up the Superfund sites in practically every State.

I wish to raise another point, Mr. Speaker.

If the $58 million in ASRM funding had not been taken out of the NASA budget, there would have remained the possibility that NASA would have come under great pressure to reprogram that money just to keep the ASRM program on life support, thereby allowing the ASRM to survive another day.

The Stokes amendment will preclude that. If we pass the Stokes amendment, the ASRM is dead once and for all.

I urge a "yes" vote on the Stokes amendment.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I must say that it is important to me, this Member, that the House know the quality of leadership the gentleman has shown on this issue. He has worked very intently on behalf of the interests of the country, and his district as well. I have great respect for the work he has done. I certainly hope the House recognizes the quality of the work and the level of interest the gentleman has shown regarding ARSM. Without his leadership this rule would not be before us. I certainly respect the work he has done.

Mr. HANSEN. I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] for his kind words, and I thank the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished member of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman emeritus for yielding this time to me.

I am a little troubled by what we heard in the Committee on Rules regarding the disposition of this $157 million that we are supposedly saving the taxpayers by this action that we are going to take up.

Americans may be surprised to hear that we are not actually saving this money. We are not applying this money to reduce our enormous Federal deficit. In fact, the bulk of these funds, at least $100 million and probably more, are going to be needed to close down the program that we are talking about closing down. More than $50 million, under the rule, will be reprogrammed for other, existing programs

covered in the bill. So let us be clear about what we are doing: None of the funds we are saving are actually being saved in the way that most Americans define saving—that is, putting money aside to put off debts or plan to save for a rainy day or whatever.

□ 1200

We are not reducing the debt or the deficit. This is not a promised rescission. This is spending $157 million a different way, but it is still spending it. Changing the label does not reduce the debt, and frankly it does not fool Americans.

Instead of focusing on real cuts that will actually save money, President Clinton is talking about major new Federal programs in at least six different policy areas: health care, crime, education, national service, welfare, and job retraining.

These are all important areas. How are we going to pay for them? The President is asking for more and bigger Government. Those things cost lots of money; but if we continue to compute savings from cuts the way it is being proposed to do in this particular appropriations bill, then I say, hold on to your wallets, America, because Uncle Sam and President Bill are going to be coming around one more time and it is going to be higher taxes for all of us, and none of us want that. This is not the way to save money.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this rule.

I think it is so important that this be adopted, contrary to the opposition of some Members of this body. We must protect our veterans. We must encourage HUD to build housing for those who need it. We need to fund the independent agencies included in this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. 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 SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, further proceeding on this resolution will be postponed until later today.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2501

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove the name of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] as a cosponsor of the bill, H.R. 2501.

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

There was no objection.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2519, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 276 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 276

Resolved, That all points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2519) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, are waived. The motions printed in the joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference to dispose of amendments in disagreement shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 276 is the rule providing for the consideration of the conference report on H.R. 2519, the Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 1994. The rule waives all points of order against the conference report. The rule also provides that the motions printed in the joint explanatory statement of the conference committee to dispose of amendments in disagreement, shall be considered as read.

This legislation, Mr. Speaker, appropriates funds for the Commerce, Justice and State Departments, for the federal judiciary, and for related agencies. The final agreement is fiscally sound while providing needed funds to carry out our responsibilities relating to crime, immigration, competitiveness, and international peacekeeping. This final agreement is $219 million less than the fiscal year 1993 funding level, and $1.5 billion less than was requested by the administration. The report includes five amendments including three small business issues, one relating to the International Trade Administration and one matter relating to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration [NOAA]. All of these amendments have been reviewed and cleared by the authorizing committees.

Mr. Speaker, this is an excellent rule which received unanimous support in the House Rules Committee. I urge my colleagues to adopt it.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me first state that there are a number of good provisions in this conference report. To address the problems of illegal immigration along our southern border, it provides for 600 new Border Patrol agents and $40 million for INS detention facilities. In addition, it will allow us to reconsider that ill-fated vote in July to eliminate funding for the National Endowment for Democracy.

The chairman of the subcommittee will ask the House to recede to the Senate amendment on NED and provide $35 million for this important national security program.

Without question, Mr. Speaker, NED will continue to help those struggling to maintain freedom and democracy in Russia, Eastern Europe, the Baltics, and Central America. NED programs are committed to strengthening democratic institutions through ballots rather than bullets. NED is also our best hope for bringing democracy to totalitarian bastions like China, Vietnam, and Cuba.

Despite these programs, Mr. Speaker, I am compelled to ask for a no vote on this rule.

When the Commerce, Justice, State appropriations bill was first reported out of the Appropriations Committee, it followed the Natcher model by going straight to the floor without a rule. I applauded that decision because it meant the bill was considered under the established rules of the House.

Regrettably, this conference report contains a slew of pork-barrel earmarks that violate House rules regarding scope and legislating in an appropriations bill. While I do not want to take these rules violations lightly, I am specifically concerned about violations of rules 20 and 28, which require a separate House vote on Senate nongermane and legislative provisions.

As I mentioned during the debate on the VA-HUD appropriations conference report rule we constantly hear complaints from authorizing committee chairmen that the Appropriations Committee is usurping their jurisdiction by accepting Senate legislative and nongermane amendments. In fact, in testimony before our Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, the Speaker stated:

> It is difficult sometimes to conclude authorizing jurisdiction with the Senate because of the tendency of the Senate to move these questions through the appropriations process.

Mr. Speaker, this problem will continue to be a source of friction between

our two Chambers unless we act to put a stop to it. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I urge a no vote on this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I include the letter to which I referred earlier in my statement, as follows:

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

Hon. JOHN JOSEPH MOAKLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Rules, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR. MR. CHAIRMAN: As you may know, over the last several years, we have repeatedly raised concerns about the practice of including Senate-added legislative provisions in conference reports on appropriations bills. In that regard, we have appreciated your assistance and consideration of the positions of the authorizing committees. To further resolve those concerns, we offered an amendment to the House Rules which was adopted by the Democratic Caucus and included in the Rules of the House for 103rd Congress. Under clause (2)(b)(2) of the Rule XXVIII, the Chairman of an authorizing committee with jurisdiction over the legislative matter reported in technical disagreement now has the right to offer a preferential motion to insist on disagreement. We believe that this amendment will help to restore the prerogatives of the House and significantly reduce the number of legislative provisions in appropriations bills. As the House begins to consider the first set of appropriations conference reports under the amended rule, we and other Chairmen of the authorizing committees plan to monitor the reports carefully for any inclusion of legislative language.

The purpose of this letter is to request that the Committee on Rules not grant any waivers of points of order against clause 2(c) of Rule XXI (prohibiting legislation in an appropriations bill) and clause 2 of Rule XX (prohibiting House conferees from agreeing to Senate amendments which would violate clause 2 of Rule XXI) for any appropriations conference report. We believe that any Senate amendments proposing to add legislative language should follow regular order and be brought back to the House for a separate vote on technical disagreement. Providing blanket waivers of points of order, or providing waivers to permit the conference report to contain legislative language, would substantially infringe on the prerogatives of the authorizing committees and vitiate the effect of the amendment to the House Rules adopted by the Caucus and the House early this session.

We appreciate your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

JOHN D. DINGELL,
GEORGE E. BROWN, Jr.,
GEORGE MILLER,
NORMAN Y. MINETA,
Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the very diligent ranking member of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and the Judiciary of the Committee on Appropriations that deals with this issue, my friend and classmate, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me. I will be brief.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule. This bill is a good conference report. It needs to be approved, and I think it is noncontroversial.

□ 1210

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to just say during the discussion on the rule, however, that when the conference report comes up, I am going to take some time, and I hope we can have some other Members come to the floor and discuss some provisions that are in the statement of managers in this conference report that attempt to reform our contribution and our effort with the United Nations, particularly how the United Nations commits America's interests in these various peacekeeping operations around the world.

Mr. Speaker, we are now in 18 so-called peacekeeping operations around the world, including, of course, Somalia and Haiti, and there are more pending. We get billed right now 31.7 percent of the costs, not to mention, of course, the blood that is spilled by Americans and others in these so-called peacekeeping missions.

The conference statement of managers does two or three different things. First, it requires that the administration notify the Congress at least 15 days in advance of when they anticipate voting for another peacekeeping mission in the United Nations. It requires the administration to notify the Congress of the mission that is to be attempted, the goals, the cost, how we are going to get in and how we are going to get out, just so we can plan our budgetary work.

Also the statement of managers states that we are withholding 10 percent of our general contribution to the United Nations until they appoint an inspector general, as we have been insisting they do for years and years, to account for the waste, fraud, and abuse in the U.N. general budget.

In addition, the statement of managers requires the United States to notify the United Nations that we will not pay more than 25 percent of these peacekeeping costs. We are presently billed 31.7 percent. We believe that 25 percent is too much, given the nature of the world's economies, but certainly we should pay no more than 25 percent, which is the amount we pay of the general budget of the United Nations. This bill provides for just that.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge support of the rule and of the conference report, and I would request that those Members who would like to participate in these discussions about these U.N. peacekeeping efforts, what should be done, the cost, and the like, join in the general discussion when the conference report actually comes to the floor.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I urge a no vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for 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.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2445, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2445) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of Thursday, October 14, 1993, at page H7906.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL].

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY], and I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to yield time to other Members.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present the conference report on the fiscal year 1994 energy and water development appropriations bill for your favorable consideration. Our colleagues will recall that debate on this bill occurred in the House on June 24, and the bill was passed by a vote of 350 to 73. The Senate passed the bill on September 30 by a vote of 89 to 10.

Mr. Speaker, our conference committee meeting was held on Thursday, October 14. I wish to compliment our friends from the other body, particularly the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. JOHNSTON] the chairman of the Senate subcommittee, for the fine spirit of compromise displayed in the conference meeting. I also wish to thank my colleagues, the House conferees, for their support and their valuable contributions during the conference deliberations.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the conference action on the superconducting super collider. During the June debate on the bill, the House voted 280 to 150 to terminate the superconducting super collider. The Senate in September voted to fully fund the superconducting super collider by a vote of 57 to 42.

The conferees took very seriously the vote in both the House and Senate. The

conferees, of course, spent more time on this issue than any other in conference. We asked the Senate to recede to the House and they were adamant in their insistence on the Senate position. Like the House, the Senate has a right to their position. In order to eliminate gridlock, we have included the superconducting super collider in the conference and I urge your support.

Since the House and Senate action on this bill, the President, on October 12, pledged his strong support for the project and cited it as a project of highest priority to his administration. In fact, the President called me personally declaring his support. The Secretary of Energy, in a letter dated October 13, urged support of the project and advised of a number of management improvements. The conferees have expressed their intention to hold the Secretary of Energy to a limit on the total cost of the project of less than $11 billion.

Now I would like to comment on other aspects of the conference agreement.

In total the conference agreement is $130,664,000 below the President's budget request, and $26,064,000 below the subcommittee's 602(b) allocation for budget authority.

Mr. Speaker, for the various agencies and programs under the jurisdiction of the Energy and Water Development Subcommittee, the committee of conference recommends $22,215,382,000 in new budget authority. This amount is $130,664,000 below the budget request, $484,938,000 above the House bill and $22,765,000 above the Senate bill.

The conference agreement we present to you today is the culmination of many months of effort on the part of the House committee and the same review by the Senate committee. During this period we have heard testimony from hundreds of witnesses—contained in eight hearing volumes of thousands of pages.

The House considered the Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill on the floor over a 2-day period. The Senate had a total of 47 numbered amendments to the bill. But, within those 47 amendments, there were approximately 400 individual items in disagreement. The conference agreement represents the best efforts of the House and Senate conferees to achieve consensus on each of those items. Many items had to be reduced or changed to accomplish agreement with the Senate. In addition, we had to keep in mind the need to have a bill that was acceptable to the administration.

Your House conferees did their best to maintain the House position. However, to bring back a conference report that is within the budget allocation for the energy and water development programs, a great many items had to be compromised.

We would like more money for energy and the water projects. But, we have only limited funds for these items, and therefore, we cannot provide all of the funds for all of the programs and projects to the extent we would like.

Mr. Speaker, the conference agreement contains $3,907,130,000 in title I for the Army Corps of Engineers. This is $5,777,000 higher than the bill as passed by the House and $26,010,000 below the Senate-passed bill. These funds will finance 556 water resources projects in the planning or construction phase, and provide for urgently needed operation and maintenance activities at completed projects.

For title II, the Bureau of Reclamation, the conferees recommended a total of $910,294,000 which is $2,047,000 more than the House-passed bill and $2,935,000 more than the Senate-passed bill. This will fund 114 water resources projects in the planning or construction phase and provide funds for operation and maintenance of 36 projects.

In my view, the conference agreement provides for a financially prudent and environmentally sound water resources development program.

The conference agreement contains $16,964,840,000 for the Department of Energy programs in title III. This includes $3,223,910,000 for energy supply, research and development activities; $345,295,000 for power marketing administrations; $260,000,000 for the nuclear waste disposal fund; and $1,615,114,000 for general science and research activities. The energy accounts include $347,384,000 for solar, geothermal, hydropower, hydrogen research, and electric energy systems and storage; $341,364,000 for nuclear energy; $347,595,000 for magnetic fusion; and $801,965,000 for basic energy sciences. In addition, funding of $640,000,000 has been provided for the superconducting super collider. The conference agreement provides a total of $10,860,808,000 for atomic energy defense activities. Within this bill, $6,185,653,000 is provided for defense and nondefense environmental restoration and cleanup activities which is an increase of $644,412,000 over the fiscal year 1993 funding level.

Mr. Speaker, the conference agreement includes $433,118,000 for nine independent agencies and commissions in title IV, including the Appalachian Regional Commission, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. Speaker, there are several people who made it possible to complete the conference agreement. I want to make special note of the contributions made by two Appropriations Committee staff members. Lori Whipp has worked tirelessly and with incredible skill in putting this conference report together. All of the tables and scorekeeping computations needed to develop this bill were prepared by Tim Buck who consistently works under very tight deadlines imposed by the subcommittee. I would also like to thank Ken Hall, who has been on detail to the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development from the Corps of Engineers, for his assistance during the entire fiscal year 1994 appropriations process. Lori, Tim and Ken deserve our very special thanks for their help in bringing this bill to the House for its consideration today.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge the Members to support the hard work of my subcommittee and pass the conference report and amendments which will be presented to the House.

Mr. Speaker, at the end of my remarks I would like to insert a table in the RECORD which summarizes the financial aspects of the conference agreement.

I would like to call the Members' attention to several minor printing errors in the conference report printed in the October 14, 1993, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

On page H7908, column one, under Amendment No. 2, "engineers" should be "engineering"; and "currently" should be "concurrently".

On page H7909, column one, under Amendment No. 4, "authorization" should be "authorized"; "thought" should be "through"; "of" should be "to" and "if" should be "is".

On page H7909, column two, under Amendment No. 4, "are" should be "were".

On page H7947, column two, under Amendment No. 29, "most" should be "more".

On page H7947, column three, under Amendment No. 28, "ractor" should be "reactor".

FY 1994 ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2445)

	FY 1993 Enacted	FY 1994 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL						
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY						
Corps of Engineers - Civil						
General investigations	175,780,000	157,600,000	207,540,000	208,544,000	207,540,000	+31,760,000
Construction, general	1,360,503,000	1,206,237,000	1,389,138,000	1,441,167,000	1,400,875,000	+40,372,000
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee	351,182,000	343,000,000	352,475,000	348,875,000	348,875,000	-2,307,000
Operation and maintenance, general	1,596,668,000	1,657,700,000	1,691,350,000	1,673,704,000	1,688,990,000	+92,322,000
Regulatory program	86,000,000	92,000,000	92,000,000	92,000,000	92,000,000	+6,000,000
Flood control and coastal emergencies	190,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	-170,000,000
General expenses	142,000,000	148,500,000	148,500,000	148,500,000	148,500,000	+6,500,000
Oil spill research	.....	350,000	350,000	350,000	350,000	+350,000
Total, title I, Department of Defense - Civil	3,902,133,000	3,625,387,000	3,901,353,000	3,933,140,000	3,907,130,000	+4,997,000
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR						
Bureau of Reclamation						
General investigations	12,540,000	12,714,000	13,109,000	14,409,000	13,819,000	+1,279,000
Construction program	470,568,000	431,848,000	464,423,000	460,898,000	464,423,000	-6,145,000
Operation and maintenance	274,760,000	282,898,000	282,898,000	282,898,000	282,898,000	+8,138,000
Loan program	4,102,000	5,800,000	12,163,000	13,500,000	13,500,000	+9,398,000
(Limitation on direct loans)	(6,000,000)	(11,636,000)	(18,726,000)	(21,000,000)	(21,000,000)	(+13,000,000)
General administrative expenses	53,745,000	54,034,000	54,034,000	54,034,000	54,034,000	+289,000
Emergency fund	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	.....
Colorado River Dam fund (by transfer, permanent authority)	(-6,563,000)	(-7,168,000)	(-7,168,000)	(-7,168,000)	(-7,168,000)	(-605,000)
Central Utah project completion account	.....	21,000,000	25,770,000	25,770,000	25,770,000	+25,770,000
Utah reclamation mitigation and conservation account	.....	9,850,000	9,850,000	9,850,000	9,850,000	+9,850,000
Central Valley project restoration fund	.....	34,000,000	45,000,000	45,000,000	45,000,000	+45,000,000
Total, title II, Department of the Interior	816,715,000	853,144,000	908,247,000	907,359,000	910,294,000	+93,579,000
(By transfer)	(-6,563,000)	(-7,168,000)	(-7,168,000)	(-7,168,000)	(-7,168,000)	(-605,000)
TITLE III - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY						
Energy Supply, Research and Development Activities:						
Operating expenses	2,527,287,000	2,702,102,000	2,731,464,000	2,818,216,000	2,802,840,000	+275,553,000
Plant and capital equipment	488,506,000	454,070,000	436,170,000	431,070,000	421,070,000	-67,436,000
Total	3,015,793,000	3,156,172,000	3,167,634,000	3,249,286,000	3,223,910,000	+208,117,000
Uranium Supply and Enrichment Activities:						
Operating expenses	1,202,457,000	246,992,000	160,000,000	246,992,000	246,992,000	-955,465,000
Plant and capital equipment	83,863,000	100,000	.....	100,000	100,000	-83,763,000
Subtotal	1,286,320,000	247,092,000	160,000,000	247,092,000	247,092,000	-1,039,228,000
Gross revenues	-1,462,000,000	-70,000,000	.....	-70,000,000	-70,000,000	+1,392,000,000
Net appropriation	-175,680,000	177,092,000	160,000,000	177,092,000	177,092,000	+352,772,000
Uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund	.....	286,320,000	286,320,000	286,320,000	286,320,000	+286,320,000
General Science and Research Activities:						
Operating expenses	726,162,000	781,264,000	719,785,000	835,187,000	799,187,000	+73,025,000
Plant and capital equipment	691,622,000	804,927,000	474,329,000	779,927,000	815,927,000	+124,305,000
Total	1,417,784,000	1,586,191,000	1,194,114,000	1,615,114,000	1,615,114,000	+197,330,000
Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund	275,071,000	258,028,000	260,000,000	260,000,000	260,000,000	-15,071,000
Isotope production and distribution fund	5,000,000	3,886,000	3,910,000	3,910,000	3,910,000	-1,090,000
Environmental Restoration and Waste Management:						
Defense function	(4,831,547,000)	(5,428,112,000)	(5,185,877,000)	(5,106,855,000)	(5,181,855,000)	(+350,308,000)
Non-defense function	(709,694,000)	(1,003,798,000)	(1,003,798,000)	(1,003,798,000)	(1,003,798,000)	(+294,104,000)
Total	(5,541,241,000)	(6,431,910,000)	(6,189,675,000)	(6,110,653,000)	(6,185,653,000)	(+644,412,000)
Atomic Energy Defense Activities						
Weapons Activities:						
Operating expenses	4,010,209,000	3,350,648,000	3,244,656,000	3,248,930,000	3,248,656,000	-761,553,000
Plant and capital equipment	558,540,000	358,652,000	327,542,000	348,552,000	346,542,000	-211,998,000
Total	4,568,749,000	3,709,300,000	3,572,198,000	3,597,482,000	3,595,198,000	-973,551,000
Defense Environmental Restoration & Waste Management:						
Operating expenses	4,074,490,000	4,767,513,000	4,465,613,000	4,537,278,000	4,552,278,000	+477,788,000
Plant and capital equipment	757,057,000	660,599,000	720,264,000	569,577,000	629,577,000	-127,480,000
Total	4,831,547,000	5,428,112,000	5,185,877,000	5,106,855,000	5,181,855,000	+350,308,000

FY 1994 ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2445), continued

	FY 1993 Enacted	FY 1994 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Materials Support and Other Defense Programs:						
Operating expenses	2,227,602,000	1,808,970,000	1,729,283,000	1,654,246,000	1,654,246,000	-573,356,000
Plant and capital equipment	390,727,000	336,278,000	317,309,000	309,509,000	309,509,000	-81,218,000
Total	2,618,329,000	2,145,248,000	2,046,592,000	1,963,755,000	1,963,755,000	-654,574,000
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal	100,000,000	119,742,000	120,000,000	120,000,000	120,000,000	+20,000,000
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	12,118,625,000	11,402,402,000	10,924,667,000	10,788,092,000	10,860,808,000	-1,257,817,000
Departmental Administration:						
Operating expenses	397,876,000	405,922,000	393,458,000	393,458,000	393,458,000	-4,418,000
Plant and capital equipment	7,780,000	8,561,000	7,780,000	7,780,000	7,780,000	.....
Subtotal	405,656,000	414,483,000	401,238,000	401,238,000	401,238,000	-4,418,000
Miscellaneous revenues	-318,381,000	-239,209,000	-239,209,000	-239,209,000	-239,209,000	+79,172,000
Net appropriation	87,275,000	175,274,000	162,029,000	162,029,000	162,029,000	+74,754,000
Office of the Inspector General	30,362,000	31,757,000	31,757,000	30,362,000	30,362,000	.....
Power Marketing Administrations						
Operation and maintenance, Alaska Power Administration	3,577,000	4,010,000	4,010,000	4,010,000	4,010,000	+433,000
Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration	32,411,000	29,742,000	29,742,000	29,742,000	29,742,000	-2,669,000
Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration	21,907,000	33,587,000	33,587,000	33,587,000	33,587,000	+11,680,000
Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration	326,634,000	352,956,000	292,956,000	277,956,000	277,956,000	-48,678,000
(By transfer, permanent authority)	(6,563,000)	(7,168,000)	(7,168,000)	(7,168,000)	(7,168,000)	(+605,000)
Total, Power Marketing Administrations	384,529,000	420,295,000	360,295,000	345,295,000	345,295,000	-39,234,000
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission						
Salaries and expenses	158,639,000	165,375,000	165,375,000	165,375,000	165,375,000	+6,736,000
Revenues Applied	-158,639,000	-165,375,000	-165,375,000	-165,375,000	-165,375,000	-6,736,000
Total, title III, Department of Energy	17,158,759,000	17,497,397,000	16,550,726,000	16,917,500,000	16,964,840,000	-193,919,000
(By transfer)	(6,563,000)	(7,168,000)	(7,168,000)	(7,168,000)	(7,168,000)	(+605,000)
TITLE IV - INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
Appalachian Regional Commission	190,000,000	189,000,000	189,000,000	249,000,000	249,000,000	+59,000,000
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	13,000,000	15,060,000	15,060,000	18,060,000	16,560,000	+3,560,000
Delaware River Basin Commission:						
Salaries and expenses	325,000	333,000	333,000	333,000	333,000	+8,000
Contribution to Delaware River Basin Commission	475,000	488,000	488,000	488,000	488,000	+13,000
Total	800,000	821,000	821,000	821,000	821,000	+21,000
Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin:						
Contribution to Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin	485,000	498,000	498,000	498,000	498,000	+13,000
Nuclear Regulatory Commission:						
Salaries and expenses	535,415,000	542,900,000	542,900,000	542,900,000	542,900,000	+7,485,000
Revenues	-514,315,000	-520,900,000	-520,900,000	-520,900,000	-520,900,000	-6,585,000
Subtotal	21,100,000	22,000,000	22,000,000	22,000,000	22,000,000	+900,000
Office of Inspector General	4,585,000	4,800,000	4,800,000	4,800,000	4,800,000	+215,000
Revenues	-4,585,000	-4,800,000	-4,800,000	-4,800,000	-4,800,000	-215,000
Subtotal	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total	21,100,000	22,000,000	22,000,000	22,000,000	22,000,000	+900,000
Susquehanna River Basin Commission:						
Salaries and expenses	301,000	308,000	308,000	308,000	308,000	+7,000
Contribution to Susquehanna River Basin Commission	290,000	298,000	298,000	298,000	298,000	+8,000
Total	591,000	606,000	606,000	606,000	606,000	+15,000
Tennessee Valley Authority: Tennessee Valley Authority Fund	135,000,000	138,973,000	138,973,000	140,473,000	140,473,000	+5,473,000
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board	2,060,000	2,160,000	2,160,000	2,160,000	2,160,000	+100,000
Office of the Nuclear Waste Negotiator	.....	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	+1,000,000
Total, title IV, independent agencies	363,036,000	370,118,000	370,118,000	434,618,000	433,118,000	+70,082,000
Grand total:						
New budget (obligational) authority	22,240,643,000	22,346,046,000	21,730,444,000	22,192,617,000	22,215,382,000	-25,261,000
(By transfer)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....

□ 1220

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT], for the purpose of debate and to yield time as he chooses.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS].

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, our chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL], has explained where we are today and why we are in this condition. Going to conference with the other body is never an easy task. It is not that I am blaming the other body particularly for making it difficult, but a conference is just exactly that, trying to work out differences between the version passed by the House and the version passed by the Senate.

In this particular instance the House conferees were well aware of our responsibility, our charge, that we were obligated, at least morally, to support the House position. I think the House made a wrong decision when 4 months ago it decided to strike the money for the superconducting super collider. It is an expensive experimental vehicle, there is no question about that, but the United States must continue to be on the leading edge on research. If our children and our grandchildren are to continue to be competitive with the rest of the world, we must continue to explore the unknown. Science certainly is an area where we have to continue that research.

However, your conferees felt obligated to defend the House position on the superconducting super collider, which was one which we voted, of course, to eliminate the funds for construction of. I am going to talk about what funds were left in the bill shortly.

Nevertheless, when we went to the conference with the other body, there were some other differences in our bill. Those were more easily resolved than this one. We held the superconducting super collider to the last, and, after discussing it with the Senate in the conference, we broke up for an hour because we were unable to come to any conclusion. So we met separately for an hour, and then we met with them.

The Senate was adamant about retaining the $640 million that they had placed in the bill for the construction of the superconducting super collider. They said they would not give up on that. They said they had passed it easily in the Senate and had some votes in the Senate they had not used. So we were in a position where we were unable to resolve this.

After some considerable discussion with the other body, we came to the conclusion that we would go along with them and bring it back to the House, which is what we have done today.

Now, where are we today with the superconducting super collider? We know that the Government has spent a little over $2 billion at this site in Texas to build this superconducting super collider. We know that Texas has pledged $1 billion. We are not certain about some other foreign contributions. But we have built about 20 percent of the superconducting super collider. That much is completed at this point.

We also know the termination costs would be very expensive. We are unable to determine for certain how much those costs would be, but it is estimated to be more than $1 billion. So if we were to decide today or at some point in the future not to complete the superconducting super collider, we know we are going to have approximately $3 to $3½ billion invested in this and have absolutely nothing to show but a scar, a hole in the ground, and some buildings that have been built. So the termination of this would be expensive to the taxpayer also.

To complete this, we do not know exactly what it will cost, but there have been estimates as high as $11 billion. Secretary O'Leary in the Department of Energy has written us a letter today explaining she is trying to determine those costs. I do not think from the estimates we have been given by her that it will run that high, but we know it will run higher than approximately $8½ billion.

So the Congress today is faced with a situation, do we terminate this and have absolutely nothing left to show for it, or do we continue to build a science vehicle which in the next century will be probably very valuable to the United States?

But make no misunderstanding: If we do not go along with what the conferees have come back with, we will not be saving any money. The House, incidentally, put $220 million in our version for termination costs when it passed this. Assuming it is going to take at least that much next year and more for future years, we will absolutely save no money whatsoever and have nothing to show for it.

I did not sign the conference report because I did feel obligated to defend the House position, even though I do think the House position was wrong. Nevertheless, we will have absolutely nothing to show for this. We will not save any money.

The $640 million the Senate put in, if we take it out and the conference comes back, make no mistake about it, that money will be spent some other way, somewhere else. So those who think you will be saving money for the taxpayer by defeating the superconducting super collider today are wrong. No money will be saved.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER].

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, as the ranking member of the authorizing committee on several water projects in this legislation, I rise to commend the chairman and the distinguished ranking member.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to address provisions in the conference report on H.R. 2445, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1994. I particularly want to express strong support for various water resources projects and programs of the Army Corps of Engineers funded throughout the bill.

First, let me commend the conferees for their efforts. From the beginning, they have cooperated with the Public Works and Transportation Committee, the House's authorizing committee for corps' water resources programs. I especially want to thank members of the House Appropriations Committee. They have worked closely with me and others on the Public Works Committee to include funding to address not only the Nation's water infrastructure needs but those in Pennsylvania, as well.

The conference report includes $10 million for a critically needed environmental infrastructure and resource development program for south central Pennsylvania. The project, authorized in section 313 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992, would help the corps meet various environmental and economic needs of rural communities. As one of the provision's primary drafters, I can assure members that our intent was for the corps to accelerate normal procedures to get to actual construction as soon as possible.

The conference agreement is consistent with our intent regarding the section 313 program. It is also consistent with language from the House Appropriations Committee report—on H.R. 2445—describing how funds should be spent.

While it provides only $10 million of the $17 million authorized, it will help to get the corps moving in the right direction—beyond preliminary study and planning and swiftly into project construction and implementation. This is not merely study money; it is money to get various projects up and running. While $10 million is less than I had hoped for, $5 million for each of the Chesapeake Bay and Ohio River watersheds will be helpful in meeting the region's enormous needs.

It is important to note, Mr. Speaker, that the conferees specifically rejected the Senate's approach to funding and implementation of the south central Pennsylvania program. The Senate bill had provided only $700,000—barely enough to get the program moving beyond the conceptual stage and certainly not enough to get it moving quickly toward construction. The conferees, however, adopted the House's approach of providing a significant amount of funds from the construction general account to move the program into construction in fiscal

year 1994. Therefore, the intent is clear: This program is not to be constrained by drawn-out studies or lengthy preconstruction delays.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not thank Congressman JOHN MURTHA for the invaluable role he has played in both authorizing and appropriating funds for the south central Pennsylvania program. We worked together on the provision in the 1992 act and again in the drafting of funding provisions in this legislation. I appreciate his leadership and help.

I also appreciate the Appropriations Committee's willingness to address other water resources issues in south central Pennsylvania. For example, the conference report provides $400,000 for a watershed reclamation and wetlands pilot project for the broad top region. Also, it appropriates $450,000 for the corps to initiate a comprehensive study of the Juniata River corridor, including a reevaluation of the flood control needs of Tyrone, PA.

To avoid any possible confusion, I should also clarify our intent regarding the Juniata River basin study. The Senate bill included only $250,000—rather than $450,000 as in the House bill—and limited the scope of the study to just the Tyrone component. The conference agreement, adopting the House's approach, provides $450,000 for the Juniata River basin, including the Tyrone component.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have had the opportunity to clarify some of the provisions in the conference report. I appreciate the work of the conferees, not only as it pertains to Pennsylvania but also to the entire Nation's water resources and environmental infrastructure.

□ 1230

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. HUGHES]. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] has consumed 5 minutes.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], who is a key member of this subcommittee.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report on H.R. 2445.

This bill is about our future. It is about being prepared to meet the energy, water, and scientific challenges of the next century. And, it is about being a leader in our world community and here at home.

This bill is about remaining a world leader in high energy physics, that is true. The SSC, however, is only part of that story. There is funding in the bill for the B Factory which will keep this Nation on the leading edge of electron physics and keep the bay area of California a leading center for advanced technologies. There is money in the bill for the main injector at Fermi Lab. Fermi Lab has the highest energy proton colliding beam facility in the world. And with the main injector, Fermi Lab will remain a leader for the foreseeable future.

The conference report also puts our country firmly on a path to resume our position of world leadership in renewable energy technologies. The bill provides a significant boost to each and every renewable energy technology. With enactment of the bill, the Department of Energy will boldly and aggressively help move these technologies forward. The solar and renewable technologies represent the future of energy production, energy production without environmental degradation.

The conference report is also about the future safety of our people and their property. The bill includes over $4 billion in water resource projects in every State and every region of the country. This past summer we saw the devastation that can be wrought by flooding. We saw communities under water and property swept away. This bill is the cornerstone of our Federal efforts to look to the future and moves us in the direction of preventing similar tragedies all across this Nation.

If you have a flood threat or a water resource problem in your district, this bill no doubt provides the only hope of future relief.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this bill is about setting priorities and living within one's means. We have provided funding for the key energy, science, and water projects, and we have done so within our subcommittee allocation. We are under the President's budget request, under the 602(b) allocation, and under the amount appropriated last year. This is a fiscally restrained bill. We have lived within our limits. We have done our job, and each Member of the House can be proud of that.

This bill is about looking ahead, about making our economy stronger and our communities safer. I strongly urge a yes vote on the conference report.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the conferees on the Missouri River mitigation project and other water projects.

Mr. Speaker, this Member would like to express his strong opposition to the conferees decision to again ignore the will of the House of Representatives by restoring $640 million in funding for the superconducting super collider [SSC]. It would be acceptable to fund this massive project if we had the resources, and if it did not delay or prevent other valuable research and development projects; however, despite any assurances to the contrary, that obviously is not the case.

Last year, this Member and others voted in a bipartisan effort to cut funding for the superconducting super collider. Nevertheless, Senate and House conferees ignored this important House mandate and restored funding for the project in the House/Senate compromise legislation. This year, the House again voted overwhelmingly—280 to 150—to kill funding for the SSC, but regrettably, conferees have repeated their indifference to the will of the majority of the House by restoring funding for this enormous project.

This Member has consistently opposed funding for the SSC because it is a project we simply cannot afford. The massive amount of funds the SSC project requires—undoubtedly underestimated like all huge, public works and science projects—will drain funds from other worthy science and research and development programs. In its report entitled, "SSC is Over Budget and Behind Schedule," the GAO notes that 6 years the Department of Energy [DOE] has increased its estimated cost of the SSC project from $5.3 to $8.25 billion. Now, GAO reports—and the Department of Energy recognizes—that cost estimates for the SSC may exceed $11 billion. Mr. Speaker, this Member regrets that this conference report includes funding for the SSC.

Nevertheless, this Member recognizes that the 1994 Energy and Water Development Appropriations conference report for fiscal year 1994 includes funding for several related water projects that are important to many parts of our Nation.

Importantly, the conference report commendably provides funding for two Missouri River projects which are designed to remedy problems of erosion, loss of fish and wildlife habitat, and sedimentation. First, the bill provides $11.8 million for the Missouri River mitigation project. This funding is needed to restore fish and wildlife habitat lost due to the federally sponsored channelization and stabilization projects of the Pick-Sloan era. The islands, wetlands, and flat floodplains needed to support the wildlife and waterfowl that once lived along the river largely have been eliminated through the stabilization of the Missouri River. An estimated 475,000 acres of habitat in Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, and Kansas have been lost. Today's fishery resources are estimated to be only one-fifth of those which existed prior to the channelization of these stretches of the river.

Second, the conference report provides $200,000 for operation and maintenance and $74,000 for construction of the Missouri National Recreation River project. This project addresses a serious problem in protecting the river banks from the extraordinary and excessive erosion rates caused by the sporadic and varying releases from the Gavins Point Dam. These large erosion rates are a direct result of previous work on the river by the Federal Government.

In addition, the conference report provides funding for the continuation of several studies important to residents of Nebraska's First Congressional District. It provides continued funding for a floodplain study of the Antelope Creek which runs through the heart of Nebraska's capital city, Lincoln, and it enables the completion of a flood control study of the Burt Water Drainage District in Burt and Washington Counties.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this Member recognizes that the conference report also provides operation and maintenance funding for the Missouri River Water Control Manual as well as funding for Army Corps and Bureau of Reclamation projects in Nebraska's other two congressional districts at the following sites: Wood River; Papillion Creek and Tributaries Lakes; Gavins Point Dam, Lewis and Clark Lake; Harlan County Lake; Salt Creek and tributaries; Prairie Bend and North Loup Division.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes and 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, in just a few minutes there will be a motion to recommit this measure with instructions to terminate funding for the superconducting super collider. This is the most important and most significant test of this body's will to cut unnecessary spending that we will face all year.

The SSC really is not the issue here. The House has already spoken out loud and clear. We voted 280 to 150 to kill the SSC in June, because we felt that we could not afford the project. And what has happened since then?

The Secretary of Energy has raised the cost estimate for the project another $3 billion. It keeps going up and up and up. It started at $4.4 billion. Then it went to $5.9 billion, and we are talking about the taxpayers' money. Then it was up to $8.2 billion. Now it is up over $11 billion. And the end is not yet in sight.

She has also said she will make sure that the Department will stick to the $11 billion figure. We have heard that one before. Our previous Secretary of Energy said that, not one dime over $5.9 billion.

We are up over $11 billion. The collider is not the issue. The issue is whether House Members are willing to stick to their guns or be sabotaged by a small group of Appropriations conferees. The issue is whether we are going to continue to conduct business as usual in this Chamber or whether we are going to change in a way that will reduce the deficit. If we are going to be honest with the American people, that is the issue. The issue is whether the House is a genuine legislative body or merely a very expensive version of Boys' State, just going through the motions of governing and leaving the real decisions to others.

Our motion today will be very targeted. We are going to be very precise. It will save at least $9 billion, my colleagues. We have an opportunity to save $9 billion for the taxpayers.

That can only help other programs, despite the propaganda one hears from the proponents. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] says we will not save any money this year if we terminate the $640 million for the collider, because it will go to other projects. Sure, it will go to other projects, worthy projects. But next year and the year after that and the year after that, $9 billion. That is a day's work well done.

I urge my colleagues to vote their conscience and vote with the American people.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to commend my friend, the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL], and the ranking minority member. They have been fair in the way they have dealt with us on this issue. I appreciate that. I thank them for the time that they have given us here today.

Mr. Speaker, 280 Members voted earlier this year, nearly two-thirds on both sides of the political aisle, to terminate funding for the superconducting super collider. That is up from 232 last year.

In the other body, last year, 32 Senators voted to terminate funding for the super collider. This year there were 42 Members who voted "no."

My colleagues, it is clear that the tide is running in our favor. As Members learn more about the super collider, more Members in this body and in the other body do not think it is a good way to spend the taxpayers' money. I hope that we keep that in mind as we vote here today.

We are talking about real money. As has already been pointed out, $9 to $10 billion can be saved for the American taxpayers by eliminating the super collider. So when my friends say we are not going to save very much money, I disagree; $9 to $10 billion is a lot of money.

And to boil this down so that we can understand precisely what this means to our States, we have prepared a printout to show Members, State by State, what the super collider will cost them.

California taxpayers, listen up. This project is going to cost California taxpayers $1.5 billion; Georgia taxpayers, $254 million; Illinois taxpayers, $572 million; Kansas taxpayers, $103 million. That is our share of this super collider project. Michigan taxpayers, $405 million; and New York taxpayers, $940 million. That is their State's share of what this monstrosity is going to cost us.

I cannot explain that nor justify it to my taxpayers, and I do not believe my colleagues can explain it and justify it for their taxpayers.

Let me review just some of the basic reasons why more and more of our colleagues on both sides of the political aisle in both Houses of the Congress are now coming to our point of view.

First of all, the cost, as Members have already heard. We were told it was going to cost $4.4 billion. Wrong. The cost estimate then went up to $5.9 billion and then $8.25 billion, then to $11 billion, and now some people are saying it is going to cost $13 billion. And now the Secretary of Energy tells us, "We don't know what it is going to cost. We will tell you next June, and we will establish a baseline at that time, and we may even recommend terminating it at that time, if we can't build it for what they think we should be able to build it for."

Are we going to continue to be big suckers or not?

Now, in addition to that, we were told that we were going to get $1.7 billion in foreign contributions. We could not find enough suckers around the world to step up.

□ 1240

Today, Mr. Speaker, we have $65 million in the bank from people that probably depend upon us for foreign aid to help fund this project. We do not have anywhere near the $1.7 billion, and we are not going to get it.

Last year the chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology stood here in the well and said, "If we do not have those foreign contributions, I will oppose the project." I would say to the Members, we do not have those contributions. It is time to stand by our word for a change.

The next point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is this is the largest single cut in any appropriation bill. I believe, Mr. Speaker, it is time for this body and all the people in this body and the other body also to do something real to cut spending for the taxpayers of this country. We have all said we want to do it. Now we have a chance today to do it.

Two hundred and eighty of us here have already said we do not want to spend money for the SSC. The only reason, Members would flip-flop and vote differently today is because they are worried about a little bit of money in this bill for their districts. This is logrolling. This is pork barreling. It is the very thing that the taxpayers are absolutely livid about.

I urge my colleagues who are thinking about flip-flopping not to do that. I would say to these Members, their project is not in jeopardy if they stand on their principles and vote the way they did earlier this year.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLO], a very valued member of this subcommittee.

Mr. GALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2445 making appropriations for energy and water development for fiscal year 1994. As a member of this subcommittee, I would like to thank Chairman BEVILL and ranking member JOHN MYERS for their leadership. I would also like to thank the subcommittee and minority staff: Hunter Spillan, Bob Schmidt, Aaron Edmondson, Lori Whipp, Jeanne Wilson, Michelle Mrdeza, and Doug Wasitis for their expertise and knowledge on these important issues.

This year, as appropriators, we had a difficult task balancing our Nation's energy and water needs due to the fact of tight budget restraints. Even though this is not a perfect report, it is one that will continue to move this country toward energy independence and help to provide the technology base that the United States has enjoyed in the past.

This year's conference report is $132 million below the President's request

and $89 million below last year's bill. The subcommittee worked very hard to stay within its 602(b) allocation.

With this conference report we have made a significant long-term commitment to the development of new energy sources for our future needs. Often times we find it very difficult to look to the future for our energy needs. However, we must make the commitment now. We must provide the economic opportunities today. Without this investment we are dooming our future generations to a lower standard of living and less productive lives.

I believe this report takes the necessary step. Within this report we have funded programs that will make this country less dependent on foreign sources of energy. We have funded scientific research that will give us the edge and the capability to take this country into the 21st century.

I am also pleased that the committee increased funding for renewable energy sources. In particular, the committee provided important funding for our solar/photovoltaics and wind programs. The investment in these technologies will allow our country to become the leader in this field.

I also rise today in support of funding contained in the fiscal year 1994 energy and water development appropriations conference agreement for the fusion energy program. I want to express my sincere appreciation to Chairman BEVILL and my colleague Mr. MYERS for their leadership in the area of fusion research and for working with me to secure a fair funding level for all aspects of the program in fiscal year 1994.

I know my colleagues will agree that energy technology development is one of the most important scientific investments that we can make for the future. The outstanding work that is being done by the U.S. fusion research community—in concert with international partners—is a true testament to the application of science and technology to one of the country's most vexing problems: The development of environmentally sensitive energy alternatives for the future. Energy supply limitations, national security considerations, and environmental factors demand that we continue this promising investment.

There is little doubt that the demand for energy will increase significantly over the next few decades as the world population grows and as undeveloped countries gain the tools of economic development. We know that existing power stations are aging and will need replacing. To replace these facilities and to keep pace with the increases in energy demands worldwide, we will need central station power electricity. Generating that much energy without assaulting the environment is one of the most difficult challenges facing our world. Energy research is exactly the kind of investment the Federal Government should be making now, and fusion must be part of our investment strategy. Fusion has the advantage of deriving its fuel from ordinary water. Two inches of Lake Erie could produce more energy through fusion than all the energy in the world's oil reserves. With fusion, we would never run out of fuel and we would never have to go to war for it. There is no acid rain associated with fusion, no greenhouse gases, and fusion's basic waste product is ordinary inert helium gas.

Progress in fusion research and the contributions of plasma physics have been substantial. We are now on the brink of realizing some of the benefits of fusion research, and I am proud that New Jersey plays a leadership role in fusion development. At the Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory, scientists are preparing to embark on a series of historic experiments this winter that will set world records in fusion power production. In addition, a national team of scientists and engineers are designing the next generation advanced fusion device that will be built at Princeton, and I am pleased that the conferees included a total of $20 million in the conference agreement for the design of this machine, the Tokamak Physics Experiment [TPX].

I am also pleased that this detailed design work will include industrial participation in engineering design and research and development. It is time that industrial partners begin playing an active and strong role in the U.S. fusion program. The Secretary of Energy has assured me that the design contracts will be consistent with standard, phased industrial contracts with options for construction that would permit continuity and allow the project—if it should be approved in the future—to be completed in the most efficient and cost-effective manner.

TPX will push the frontiers of fusion technology in areas like superconducting magnets, low temperature cryogenic systems, nonradioactive materials, and robotics for remote maintenance. TPX's mission is unique in the world fusion program, and it is a smart step for the U.S. fusion program because it will help American industry build more efficient, smaller fusion power reactors. I want these machines to read "Made in the U.S.A." and TPX will help get American industry trained and experienced in fusion technology.

Another very exciting component of the U.S. fusion program is our participation in the international collaboration known as ITER, the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor. We are breaking new ground with ITER by working with our partners from the start on this important step in fusion development. Our partners in ITER realize the great potential for fusion energy and the Japanese and European investments in fusion now surpass our own. The Japanese and European programs have the benefit of strong industry involvement. America should move expeditiously to identify a site for ITER, and we should build our industrial base so that American workers can benefit from this exciting energy alternative and future energy markets.

Let me add that I agree with my colleague in the Senate, Chairman JOHNSTON, on the need for ITER negotiations to take a very high priority within the administration. Fusion has always been a bipartisan effort, and I was very pleased that the new administration considers fusion—TPX and ITER in particular—high priority investments. ITER started with Presidents Reagan and Gorbachev; the engineering design protocol was signed under President Bush; and now it is up to the new administration to take ITER a step further—host site identification. The executive branch—the President, his science adviser, the Office of Management and Budget, the State Department—need to move ITER and fusion to the top of their agenda so that progress doesn't stall. ITER negotiations are complicated and time-consuming, and we must continue the good progress that has been made. Congress must continue to do its part, too. The Senate has passed an authorization bill this year, and I will be working with my colleagues to pass a bill in the House as soon as possible.

Attached to my statement is a copy of a recent letter from the Secretary of Energy to Chairman JOHNSTON and Senator HATFIELD about TPX and the importance of moving ahead with design work in fiscal year 1994. The letter illustrates the important role of TPX in the U.S. fusion, and it underscores the importance of TPX to the international fusion program. ITER is a big step forward, but it isn't a smart step without TPX. We need TPX to make ITER and a fusion demonstration reactor smarter and more efficient. The Department of Energy and fusion scientists in this country have mapped out a long-term strategy to develop fusion energy. TPX is the next major domestic step in that plan. When we build TPX at Princeton, it will be the first major fusion machine built in this country since the 1970's. When we turn TPX on early in the next century, it will be the only major fusion device operating in this country.

Our investment in fusion is already paying off. The money is well invested and wisely spent—on an energy source for future generations that is cleaner, safer and more easily available. At the Princeton laboratory last week, one of the scientists—Dr. Russell Hulse—won a Nobel prize in physics for work that he did almost 20 years ago as a graduate student. Steady progress in fusion energy will pay off, too. Just as Hulse's work on astrophysics that begin almost 20 years ago lead to a Nobel prize

this year, so too will his work and the work of others in this promising field led to practical fusion power.

In addition, this report provides funding for a number of critical flood control projects throughout the United States. This year was a grim reminder of the devastation that occurs when mother nature lashes out. This has been one of the worse years in U.S. history for flooding.

The projects contained in this report will help to prevent property damage and loss of life in areas with recognized flooding problems. But even more important, this report includes projects that will prevent floods from occurring. The proper planning done by the Army Corps of Engineers has proven to be very effective. Even with the devastating floods that occurred in the Midwest this year, Federal levees and dikes held. The Army Corps is to be commended for their dedication and hard work.

This is a good conference report. Preparing for our future needs is never easy, but H.R. 2445 provides the insight and programs that will make it a little easier. I urge the adoption of this important report.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a letter to Senator J. BENNETT JOHNSTON, September 22, 1993, from Secretary O'Leary:

THE SECRETARY OF ENERGY,
Washington, DC., September 22, 1993.

Hon. J. BENNETT JOHNSTON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Energy, and Water Development, Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is a follow up to a meeting held September 8, 1993, in which you were briefed by the Department on our plans for United States participation in the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor program. The Department of Energy regards the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor as setting a standard of excellence for carrying out a collaborative international scientific endeavor, and we appreciate your interest and support.

I understand there was a candid and productive discussion of this program. However, my staff also reported that you see a need to delay our domestic initiative, the Tokamak Physics Experiment, until international agreement has been reached on beginning construction of the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor.

We strongly urge you to support our full $20 million request for continued design of the Tokamak Physics Experiment for the following reasons:

(1) The Tokamak Physics Experiment constitutes a forward-looking step for the United States fusion program and addresses issues in improved tokamak design and pulse length that go beyond the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor mission. It represents an experimental focus for the United States fusion program at the beginning of the next century when existing experiments will have been fully exploited.

(2) The Tokamak Physics Experiment has been conceived in such a way that it will be able to provide critical guidance for the operation of the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor. The size and scale of the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor enterprise as such that operational improvements derived from the tokamak design could save time and money.

(3) Another objective in the Tokamak Physics Experiment is to bring United States industry into the project very early in the design phase, in part to incorporate industrial manufacturing knowledge, but more importantly to provide an opportunity for technology transfer as the United States prepares to participate in the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor construction. Also, some of the technologies concerned, such as superconductivity, robotics, and computer control systems, have relevance beyond fusion.

(4) The proposed fiscal year 1994 budget of $20 million for the Tokamak Physics Experiment already constitutes a minimal start on preliminary design activities for the project. These funds are needed in order to continue the present design efforts, to bring industrial contractors into the design team, and to begin research and development that is needed to validate the design concepts.

From the beginning, the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor was designed to ensure equal participation from the four partners. With this concept of parity and shared responsibility, it represents an international endeavor that is already breaking new ground on both technical and political horizons. However, international agreement to begin construction will take considerable time even with the best intentions of all the participants.

The Tokamak Physics Experiment, on the other hand, is ready to move forward, and I urge that we continue the design process. This experiment will provide the United States with the technical basis to be a productive partner in a future international fusion program. Failure to proceed with the Tokamak Physics Experiment at this time will be perceived as a sign of weak resolve on the part of the United States fusion program and, thereby, will undercut our participation in the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor.

Again, the Department values your continued support of the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor project.

Sincerely,

HAZEL R. O'LEARY.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER], a senior member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY] was most eloquent in stating why this conference report should be voted down. The fact is that in 1990 this House, through the passage of legislation, set a base line of a maximum contribution of $5 billion for the superconducting super collider. It is now quite evident that the total Federal contribution, in order to get this job done, will be way, way over the amount because of the failure of the super collider management to accurately assess what the costs were, a lack of leadership by the Department of Energy, in both the Clinton and Bush administrations, to level with the public and with the Congress on how much this would cost, as well as an abject failure to get any foreign contributions that amount to anything.

The time has come to put the lid on further expenditures. We are hemorrhaging expenditures in superconducting super collider. This project does not deserve another year's grace by the Congress continuing to appropriate it. The only way parlimentarily that we will be able to stop expenditures for the SSC is to recommit this conference report, either with or without instructions, to the committee on conference, and for this House to give the message loud and clear to the conferees that they have got to ax the costs for the superconducting super collider if they wish to get this conference report passed.

I do not think anybody's pet project is in jeopardy, for those who want to be consistent in voting against the super collider. The time has come to say, "Enough is enough on this project." We are going to have to stand up, be tall, be consistent, and be counted on the motion to recommit.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA].

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I notice that people are against the project as pork barrel, and it has a lot of problems, and we do not really talk about the project, we just talk about all the excesses.

One of the things I would like to point out, and I think it is important, when I went out there to visit this project, and I was concerned before I went to visit it, I was not sure exactly what the focus of the project was. After talking to the scientists and after thinking about what had happened from, say, SDI, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY] said to me the other day the valuable, phenomenal communications results that we see today have all come from SDI.

I know it is tough to vote for R&D when the budget is so tough, but I would hope that the Members today would consider how important this type of basic research is to the country, and I would hope that they would support this conference report, which has been so delicately worked out.

We did the same thing last year. The Senate passed it and we defeated it. I hope that the Senate will prevail this time.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER], a member of the Subcommittee on Technology, Environment and Aviation of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, today we are debating the superconducting super collider and we are also debating the budget. We are debating the level of deficit spending this country will have.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about an $11 billion project. What is the purpose of this $11 billion project? When we

have interviewed the scientists on the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, the answers I get from them is, "We are spending this money to achieve a better understanding of the universe," $11 billion for a better understanding of the universe.

With the $11 billion spent on this project, we could build a fusion energy plant that would develop this new technology and give something real to mankind. We could develop technology that would make the air cleaner or our lives better, or we could bring down the level of deficit spending by not spending the money. This country is already spending $300 billion more per year than we are taking in. Talk about being doomed, we are doomed, our economy is doomed, if we cannot get ourselves to say no to projects like this that are totally unnecessary.

Mr. Speaker, I say vote "no" on the motion and vote "no" on the super collider.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUGHES). The Chair would advise the Members that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] has 12 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] has 10 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY] has 6 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], a senior Member of this House and of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into a colloquy with the distinguished floor manager of the bill. As the gentleman knows, the House committee report on the bill references a decision pending before the Department of Energy on whether to transfer certain highly enriched uranium fuel from the Portsmouth, OH, uranium enrichment facility to Oak Ridge, TN. The language notes the committee's concern about the effects of a transfer on the Portsmouth facility's employees and urges that, in the event of a transfer, retraining and relocation services should be provided to the affected employees. In light of that language, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Was it the committee's and the conferees' understanding that, notwithstanding the concern expressed, the decision on whether to transfer the fuel would be left to the Department of Energy and that the Department is to make that decision taking into account all relevant factors, including the impact of the decision on employment in both Ohio and Tennessee?

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

Mr. QUILLEN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman that that was, indeed, our intention.

Mr. QUILLEN. As I understand it, then, it was neither the committee's nor the conferees' intent to attempt to influence the department's decision on whether a transfer should be made. Is that correct?

Mr. BEVILL. The gentleman is correct. The intent was to be neutral on that question and to leave it to the Department to make the decision based on all relevant public policy considerations.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

□ 1250

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, earlier this summer I stood in this Chamber and spoke about Jurassic pork, the superconducting super collider. This House voted overwhelmingly, 280 to 141, to kill funding for the SSC. That vote represented the single largest spending cut in any appropriation bill this year.

Unfortunately, because of parliamentary trickery, this Jurassic pork is far from being extinct. Congressman DINGELL and the Energy and Commerce Committee's Oversight and Investigation Subcommittee held hearings on the incredible waste of the SSC. Witness after witness after witness came in and talked about huge cost overruns, and fraud, and abuse, and waste in this, the largest pork project in this Government.

Mr. Speaker, I am part of the freshman class which ran for Congress pledging to cut government waste. We can go home in our districts and talk about cutting a nickel here and a dime here and a little here and a little there, but, Mr. Speaker, voting no on this project is the way to send a message that we in fact are serious about cutting waste. If we mean it, it is time to put up or shut up.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON], a member of this subcommittee.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that this whole debate is focusing on just the SSC. This conference report contains many, many items that are so important to this Nation's energy and water resources. We are looking to the future in this bill.

This committee did a good job. The conference report is fair. But if we want to talk about the SSC, let us talk about some of the potentials out of this program. Everybody wants instant gratification with everything we do. We want this thing to pay off right now, basic research or no.

The fact is, ladies and gentlemen, we have some instant payoffs in the SSC. A very small grant was given to the Florida State University to develop some provisions for the SSC, and from that came a very unique plastic tubing that is now being used within the health industry for heart defects. We are saving big dollars. This is a great project. Let us vote for it.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO], who has worked very closely with this committee on a number of energy projects.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. Speaker, many of those who have stood in opposition to this bill today have talked about the fact that the SSC represents the largest single cut in the budget. The previous speaker mentioned, however, that there are many things in this budget, and the point I want to focus on is as we talk about cuts in this budget or any other budget, let us talk seriously about the budget process.

Right now, no matter what we do, whether we vote to cut this funding regarding the SSC or any other project, the money does not go to relieving the deficit. The money goes right back into the conference committee for spending on other projects. Under our budget system, a cut does not eliminate the baseline amount of money allocated under the 302(b) or 602(b) allocations.

The question here is whether we are going to continue the trend in our budgeting process of eliminating funding for research and development that keeps our country on the leading edge of science in this world. Since 1981, the amount of our budget allocated to R&D has dwindled from about 5 percent now down to about 2½ percent. We have to be ready and able to look forward to the future and we have to listen to the need for having that forward look.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. PASTOR].

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, as we discuss this conference bill, we forget that in this conference report we have some programs that are very environmentally sensitive.

If you vote for this conference report you will be voting for energy conservation. A number of programs that the Department of Energy wants to fund deal with energy conservation.

If Members vote for this conference report they are voting for renewable energy research and development, a 30-percent increase for research on solar energy, a 25-percent increase for geothermal energy, and there is also money for research on wind energy.

We want to get away from depending on foreign oil and foreign energy sources. So this conference report allows us to continue research on renewable energy resources.

If Members vote for this conference report they will be voting to clean up

our environment. Please support the conference report.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to make one quick point.

One of the things that I think has to be driven home here very clearly is that those of us who are rising today to oppose this conference committee report are not opposing other provisions in this bill. Our battle is very simple. It is funding for the super collider. That is what we are trying to kill.

Unfortunately, we have to go through this parliamentary quagmire to get the kind of vote that we want to and send a message again to the other body that we are not in favor of further funding of this project. And that is the point that I think we need to continually drive home.

I do not believe anyone believes that the chairman of our subcommittee is threatening anybody with removal of money from this bill if they vote with us to terminate the super collider.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2445, primarily because it provides billions of dollars for important Corps of Engineers projects, for Bureau of Reclamation projects in the Western States, and billions more for important research funding at the Department of Energy.

If the conference report is defeated, we would be putting in jeopardy funding for vital flood control that is critical to my district, in both Corps of Engineer as well as Department of Energy projects.

Arizona could lose possibly up to $400 million in projects in this bill. Arkansas could lose $50 million; California could lose $200 million; Colorado, $7 million; Delaware, $14 million; Florida, $50 million; Illinois, $200 million; Ohio, $15 million; Virginia, $30 million; and Nebraska could lose $18 million. The bill actually covers the whole country, but I use these States as examples, and I support their projects. They are meaningful and important projects. The State of Louisiana virtually survives because of them, and we know what happened in the floodways of Middle America this year. These are vital flood projects critically affecting the life and death of individuals who live in and around the waterways of this country. And the Corps of Engineers directly supports them, their livelihoods, and their communities.

I believe that the basic research in this bill is critical to scientific advancement. I support the super collider because I believe that it lays the foundation for intellectual achievement and prosperity of future generations, and for the development of science in our Nation and this world. I hope it is not defeated.

I know there is a lot of criticism about the project, but I believe it would be a tremendous mistake to defeat the project and beat this bill. Therefore, I urge adoption of the conference report and the defeat of any motion to recommit.

□ 1300

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report and in strong support of the super collider.

As a nation, we must carefully prioritize how we invest and spend our scarce public resources. We must invest wisely, with a careful eye to the future.

I believe the SSC is a very important investment in our future. Once complete, it will enhance our ability to conduct—and benefit from—high-technology research.

Its potential, scientific and economic, is enormous.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the arguments of those who would eliminate the SSC. However, I believe abandoning the super collider now would be a budgetary—and a scientific—mistake.

In fact, we are already beginning to see benefits today from our investment. The work on SSC is currently assisting in the development of our high-technology research capabilities, assisting in vital economic conversion, and helping reposition our defense industries.

I urge my colleagues to support the superconducting super collider.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK], a very outstanding member of this subcommittee.

Mrs. MEEK. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, the opponents of this conference report will use terms like "pork barrel," terms like "sabotage;" what they do not understand is the process that it takes to have something pass in this Congress. It takes both sides of this big beautiful facility we have here, both the House and the Senate.

The conferees on this have worked very hard to come to that decision where we can all work together. I want you all to understand, if you do not pass this conference report you will be misled by what you see isolated in one corner, and that is the super collider. The super collider is just one facet of this bill, one facet that they are using as a smokescreen to overcome things we are trying to do for the environment.

When you go back home to run in your district, you tell them that you spoke out against this conference report because it pushed very hard for the environment, that it pushed for science, that it pushed for research; it pushed for the future of this country.

So, if you can use that one-sided, slanted approach when you go back to your district, you will find out they do not want to hear what the SSC is all about, they want to know whether you voted for the environment, for research, and for the future of this country.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to myself.

I would just like to point out to my colleagues that one of the Nation's leading environmental organizations, Friends of the Earth, is strongly in support of our effort; one of the Nation's leading organizations concerned about the spending practices of Congress, the National Taxpayers Union, four-square in our corner; they want to terminate funding for the SSC.

One of the leading organizations concerned about the activities of Congress, Citizens Against Waste in Government, stands four-square with us.

We are on the side of the American taxpayers. Vote to terminate this project.

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

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST].

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the energy and water appropriations conference report.

Chairman BEVILL and the House conferees have brought back a bill that deserves your support. It includes funding for many important programs and projects benefiting people all across the Nation. I would like to focus for a moment on one of these—the superconducting super collider.

A lot has happened since the House last considered the SSC. Perhaps the most important is the way Secretary of Energy Hazel O'Leary has grabbed the reins and taken control of the project.

Secretary O'Leary announced in August that she was making changes in the way SSC construction is managed in response to concerns raised by the General Accounting Office and others. The changes include bringing in a new construction contractor with world-class business management experience to supplement the scientific capabilities of the present contractor.

Additionally, the Secretary ordered an internal DOE audit team to comprehensively examine the SSC as part of the management initiatives she announced in June. Their report, issued on September 1, confirmed that the project is currently 20 percent complete and that 73 major subcontracts that have been awarded to date have come in at approximately 7 percent under budget.

The report also contains a number of recommendations to help concentrate

attention and resources on the management issues that must be resolved to build the SSC as cost-effectively as possible. Secretary O'Leary is already in the process of implementing measures in response to the report's recommendations.

President Clinton and Secretary O'Leary strongly support the SSC on the basis that it will maintain the position of the United States as the world leader in scientific research. In his recent letter to Chairman Bevill, the President wrote that:

> The SSC represents a vital investment in our Nation's ability to maintain its preeminence in basic scientific research and to stimulate the development of new technologies in many areas critical to the health of the U.S. economy.

Mr. Speaker, the project is already 20 percent complete, with $2 billion having been invested. It would be a tragedy to walk away from a scientifically sound project at this stage.

I urge my colleagues to stand with President Clinton and Secretary O'Leary. They have responded aggressively to the concerns many of you had when the House first considered this issue. They have acted in good faith to take corrective steps to ensure that the SSC is managed efficiently.

The conferees are willing to give the President and Secretary O'Leary a chance—I urge my colleagues to do the same. Please vote for this conference report.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], a new member of the subcommittee, though certainly not a new Member of Congress or of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word of thanks to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL], and the ranking member on the subcommittee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS].

These two gentlemen have a great collective wisdom about them. They both have served in this House for a great number of years, they both have served as steering partners on this subcommittee for a great number of years, and they know what they are doing. They have taken into account practically every Member of this body in their needs in their own district for either a flood control project or a waterway or a navigation project, operation of a lake, an energy problem, the Appalachian Regional Commission project, or the TVA project. Practically every Member of this body has been to this subcommittee asking something. And practically everybody has been accommodated in one fashion or the other. So there is a lot of collective wisdom in this subcommittee.

I commend the chairman, Mr. BEVILL, and the ranking member, Mr. MYERS, for all of the hard work they do year-round on this subcommittee. Everybody in this body, indeed the whole country, benefits by the work of this subcommittee.

Now, the gentleman from Indiana, the ranking member, earlier said something about savings to the taxpayers that may or may not come from cutting out the superconducting super collider. I think we are all for cutting wasteful spending, we are all for reducing the deficit. But I say to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS], if he would join me in a colloquy, is it true that if we cut out the superconducting super collider, we would not be saving the taxpayers any money? Would the gentleman explain that?

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. I of course yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, there will be absolutely nothing saved for the taxpayers. We will spend it on this project or we will spend it on some other project, there is no question about it. I do not know of any time this House has refused to spend money that they have been allocated in a 602(b) allocation.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

First of all, I am amazed by a previous speaker who said that everybody has been accommodated in this bill and, therefore, we should vote for it.

There is no question that a lot of Members have been accommodated. They have been accommodated in an effort to get their votes for the super collider, which is what we are talking about here today. I hope Members are listening to this. We are battling today about whether we are going to spend another $9 billion to $10 billion for a project that 280 Members of this body previously voted against and the only reason they can justify flip-flopping now is because they have been accommodated. I hope Members do not sell out for a small project in their districts.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, the major debate on this conference report concerns the superconducting super collider, which I strongly support. But while other Members debate this issue, I would like to take a moment to highlight some other important energy science programs which fall under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology and which have received strong funding in this conference report.

Energy supply, research, and development programs, which are critically important in maintaining our energy security and in reducing the environmental impact of energy technologies, receive over $3.2 billion in this conference report. Included in this funding are both near-term demonstration projects in renewable energy and long-term projects like fusion which promise to supply a substantial portion of our energy needs in the 21st century. I am particularly pleased that the conference report so closely reflects the priorities set by our committee and by the entire Congress last year when we overwhelmly enacted the Energy Policy Act of 1992.

Let me highlight a few examples of how this report reflects those priorities. The bill increases funding for solar energy programs by over one-third from last year's levels, to a total fiscal year 1994 level of $252 million. The bill also creates a separate line item for research on hydrogen fuels, which offer great promise for a great variety of environmentally sound energy options in transportation and other areas. Both of these actions are in keeping with the priorities of the Energy Policy Act.

In addition, despite what the critics of the SSC may charge, the bill maintains strong funding for the high-energy physics and nuclear physics programs of the Department. These projects include the FERMI facilities in Illinois, the CEBAF facility in Virginia, and the newly approved B-factory in California, among others.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would ask Members to consider the fact that the conferees have done an excellent job in constraining the growth of earmarked projects throughout the bill. Last year when the energy and water appropriation came back from conference, the bill included 10 earmarked projects worth almost $100 million. As some of you may recall, I fought to have those projects struck from the bill. Just a few days later, those same projects came back from the defense appropriation's conference revived, fully funded and with a rule that protected them.

This year, the energy and water appropriations bill has come back from conference devoid of earmarks. On top of that, the academic earmarks that can be found in report language are notably smaller than those of the past 2 years. In fiscal year 1992 there were 67 academic earmarks worth $151 million in the bill and report. Last year, there were 60 academic earmarks worth almost $177 million in the bill and report. This year, so far as I can discern, there are only 10 academic earmarks worth $35 million. That represents a four-fifths drop in dollar value from the fiscal year 1993 figures.

While I would be happier if there were no earmarks in the accompanying report, I think the trend is a good one. Mr. Bevill deserves to be commended for his efforts to get academic earmarking under control. I think the

House and the American taxpayer owe him a debt of gratitude for his work this year.

I also want to point out, for the benefit of the Secretary of Energy, that report language is not binding on her agency. The report accompanying this bill is merely advice offered by a handful of Members of the legislative branch. In fact, there were only 10 Members of the House included in the energy and water appropriations conference. This means that only 2 percent of the Representatives in the House had a chance to weigh in on the report language attached to this bill and House rules preclude this body from amending or even voting on that report.

If the Secretary of Energy decides that some of the projects mentioned in the energy and water conference report are not as worthy as the programs she originally intended to fund, it is within her rights to ignore the report language and use funds as she sees fit. She would find this Member and the Science, Space, and Technology Committee would support her in that decision.

Mr. Speaker, this is an excellent conference report, and I urge all Members to support it.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I was inclined to vote against this, but when I heard what the gentleman from Kentucky said—we have not had the rollcall yet—I was just wondering if it is too late to be accommodated? I do not see the gentleman. Maybe he will give me an answer later.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 45 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, on June 17, 1992, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], who chairs the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology asked a rhetorical question. He asked, "Can we afford the super collider?" And he answered his question by saying, and I quote, "Mr. Chairman, after studying this issue closely, my conclusion is, no, not by ourselves. This Nation no longer has the resources to go it alone on a big science project."

The chairman continued by saying, "It has long been apparent that the Federal Government cannot afford to pay the full $8.2 billion cost of the SSC by itself." That is the chairman's remarks in June 1992.

Well, my friends, there is only one thing that has changed since then, and that is the cost is not $8.2 billion, it is at least $11 billion and probably closer to $13 billion. If we could not afford it at $8 billion, we darned well cannot afford it at $13 billion.

□ 1310

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS].

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, a previous Member spoke and said that we all want to cut waste and get spending under control. Well, that is hard to believe, because if it were true we would not have seen our national debt go from $800 billion to $4,300 billion in just 13 years.

We have a national debt of monumental proportions because Members do not want to cut spending.

In the next 5 years spending will go up 21 percent. The national debt will go up 42 percent, and $1.8 trillion will be added to the national debt. This can't continue.

We are going to spend $11 billion on basic research for the superconducting super collider but we cannot own that basic research. We cannot patent it. We can only patent how we commercialize the basic research.

We will have spent our $11 billion on the research while the Japanese and Western European nations will spend their money on commercializing what we spent a fortune to learn.

I urge my colleagues to realize this is a budget vote. House Members voted 280 to 150 to knock out the SSC on its merits. Now we are dealing with a political process that is not allowing a clear and decisive vote.

The motion of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] to recommit without instructions obfuscates the whole concept of what the House wants to do. We want a clean vote on the SSC. We need to kill this expensive public works project and not cave into the Senate. Vote to recommit this bill with instructions to support the House position to kill the superconducting super collider. And vote against the Myers motion.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN], a very valued member of this subcommittee.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting in this debate today, we can listen to the opponents of the superconducting super collider not debate the science. They agree the science is good.

We are talking in terms of cost. I think if we put it in terms of cost, we can look at the per capita cost to American citizens of less than 3 cents a year, 3 cents a year to perhaps buy into and complete the most important scientific program in this generation.

We will vote today on whether or not 15,000 Americans are going to lose their jobs. We worry about the North American Free-Trade Agreement and other defense conversions, but a vote to kill the super collider eliminates over 15,000 jobs in America, high tech, science, engineering jobs, destroys the dreams of students in 200 universities across this land, prevents us from doing the kinds of research, as my colleague, the gentleman from Florida, pointed out, that one simple grant has reduced the cost of heart transplants.

My colleagues, heart transplants cost $5,000 less today because of the superconducting super collider research.

Mr. Speaker, we ought to pass this conference report. We ought to vote for the SSC. We ought to invest in the future of America.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON], who knows more about this project than probably any Member in this Chamber.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report and in even stronger support of the SSC. In the 4½ minutes that I have remaining, I want to go through that project very quickly and I hope very succinctly.

Back in 1982, the U.S. scientific community convened a panel of experts to determine what was necessary to maintain the U.S. preeminence in high energy physics in the world community, which at that time was slipping to the Europeans. The members of this expert panel decided that if it proved to be feasible, we should in fact build the next generation high-energy particle accelerator, which we now know today as the SSC.

Since 1982, numerous panels have reviewed the SSC project, reviewed its concept, reviewed its science, and every panel that has looked at it has concluded, No. 1, it is good science; No. 2, it should be done; and No. 3, it is in the national interest to build this machine.

Beginning in 1986, there was an attempt to look around the country and see where the best site to build the project might be. There was a competition in which approximately 36 States competed. Seven finalist States were chosen, but the State of New York dropped out.

In 1988, the State of Texas was chosen to be the site for the SSC. Since that time over 2,000 world class scientists have moved to Texas, over 500 construction workers, are building the project, and around the country over 15,000 subcontractors and contractors are involved in some capacity.

I want everybody in this Chamber to hear the next statement. The latest audit that was done in August on the cost of the project showed that it is 19 percent complete and 6 to 8 percent under the budget—under the budget—19 percent complete, 6 to 8 percent under the budget.

When our worthy opponents talk about cost escalation, they are talking about the possible cost to complete the project. It is true that the cost to complete has gone up because of a conscious decision to stretch the project out.

The Clinton administration is asking for $640 million this year and $640 million each of the next 3 years. Under the Bush administration preliminary budget the SSC request would have been about $780 million this year and up to $1 billion each for the next 2 years.

If you take longer to build something, it is going to cost more.

Again, of money spent to date, the project is 19 percent complete, and 6 to 8 percent under budget.

The amazing thing is that the SSC has actually made progress this year. At various points in time there have been as many as six different investigatory committees and subpanels down in Texas and around the country investigating the project, and they still made progress. There are 14 miles of tunnels, the main surface buildings, and some of the best laboratories in the world complete and ready for operation.

If we vote to kill the super collider, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] has pointed out, we are not going to save any money. The money is going to be reallocated to various other projects in the bill.

Another important point to ponder is that the scientists that are building the SSC guarantee success. It is not like the space program back in the sixties where we hoped to make it to the Moon. SSC leaders guarantee that in the energy range of the super collider, 20 trillion electron volts, they are going to find some answers to some basic questions that mankind has been trying to answer for thousands of years. They guarantee that they will do that.

So what it really boils down to, Mr. Speaker, is a vote of confidence in the United States of America. If we vote today to kill the super collider and the conference report accepts that recommendation, we say that we do not have confidence in the future. We do not have confidence in our scientists. We do not have confidence in world cooperation in the scientific realm.

The budget amount for the SSC is less than six-tenths of 1 percent of the basic science budget of this Nation. It is less then 3 hours of Federal spending. That is what we are talking about.

Remember, the Senate has voted 57 to 42 for the project, and the other body has voted every year for the project. President Clinton, as did President Bush, strongly supports the SSC.

The SSC is the American dream machine for the next generation to develop the technology that will develop the jobs that will make our lives and the lives of our children and grandchildren better and better.

So with great respect, Mr. Speaker, I would ask when it comes time for the parliamentary maneuvering that you vote yes on the previous question and yes on the final vote for the Energy and Water conference report.

□ 1320

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to make a few more points.

Cost per job for this project, is approximately $74,000 per job. A previous speaker said that the cost per American citizen was 3 cents. Wrong. According to my calculations, Mr. Speaker, next year the Senate wants to spend $640 million. Last time I checked, the population of this country was about 250 million. So, simple arithmetic tells me that the cost for just next year alone will be about $2.60 per citizen.

It is that kind of math that has gotten us in the mess we are in today.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON].

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have tried very hard to understand the arguments against this report and against the super collider. I have listened very closely, and I simply do not understand it. I guess, because I am a nurse, I understand pain and suffering and the cost of health care, and I know the value of research, and I know the type of research the super collider can provide. I guess, because I am a business person, I know the value of having business products to sell, and I understand that researchers brought us many products over the years to sell. I understand, because I am from a working family, the value of having jobs, and I know it is this kind of research that is going to bring us jobs for the future and jobs for now.

We are beyond the cold war. We need conversion technologies. This is a kind of research that will bring it. This is a project that will look out for the future just as research in the past has looked out for where we are now. We would not have the mammograms, we would not have the scan machines, we would not have the vaccines, we would not have the VCR's.

Mr. Speaker, I am asking all my colleagues to support the report and support the super collider project.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUGHES). The gentleman from New York is recognized for 2¼ minutes.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to make some key points as we wind down this debate.

One, we heard from the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, upon which I serve, and he talked about this project. I would remind that distinguished chairman that last year in the well of this House he spoke eloquently for an amendment that I supported that said we would not proceed with this project if we did not have a commitment signed by the President of the United States that there were a minimum of $650 million in foreign contributions by June 1 of 1993. We have less than one-tenth of that.

Second, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make this point. This project started out costing $4.4 billion; and I say to the taxpayers, "Get this one. You ain't seen nothing yet. It started out at $4.4 billion. It's not even 20 percent complete, and it's not costing $5.3 billion. No, we've upped the ante. It's not $5.9 billion; no, we've upped the ante. It's not $8.25 billion; no, we've upped the ante. It's up over $11 billion, and it's less than 20 percent complete. For those of you who are concerned about the future health of America let me point out that, while we are going ahead with this turkey, worked at nine, two out of three applications for assistance worthy applications to the National Institutes of Health and the National Science Foundation from investigators, from scientists who have great promise are going unfunded. We can't give them the bucks because we are spending it all on this."

Mr. Speaker, we said we are going to have foreign contributions. We have not got the first yen yet, not the first deutsche mark, not the first peso. We are not getting foreign contributions. We are asked to fund this all ourselves, despite the fact that the House, by an overwhelming bipartisan vote, placed a 20-percent floor on foreign contributions.

Now what organizations outside this body have said they are with us? The National Taxpayers Union says, "Kill the SSC." The Citizens Against Government Waste says, "Kill the SSC." Friends of the Earth, one of the most respected environmental organizations, says, "Kill the SSC."

Why? Is it not good science? No, it is good science. It simply is not affordable science. We cannot afford to continue business as usual. We cannot afford a system where this House says by an overwhelming vote of 280 to 150 that we are going to reject something, and then within a matter of days we come back and say, "Nah, we didn't really mean it. We are going to proceed with that. We don't care. Throw caution to the wind. After all, it's only the taxpayers' dollars."

Taxpayers of America, I ask, "Do you think you're getting a good buy with this?"

The answer is clearly no, and do my colleagues know what the General Accounting Office said? The General Accounting Office says the SSC is behind schedule and over budget.

I say, "Defeat this, vote against the superconducting super collider for all the right reasons."

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. COPPERSMITH].

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Mr. Speaker, I wish we could balance the budget by cutting only bad programs, but there is an institutional issue here. The process

is giving us bad results. We have had a conference, but the conference increased spending. Whenever the House and the other body disagreed, in almost every case the conferees picked the higher number, and they saved other programs this House decided were not worthy of funding, like the advanced liquid metal reactor.

The super collider is a good program; I do not dispute its merits. But there is no easy way to cut this budget. We have to decide to cut among good programs. Believe me, if this was easy, we would have done it long ago.

I urge support from my colleagues who are trying to back up what the House did. I urge my colleagues to vote against the previous question on this conference report.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SHARP].

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote no on the previous question so that we can again reinforce what the House overwhelmingly voted to do, which is to cut this budget, and my concern, as that of my colleague from Arizona, goes beyond just the SSC. The fact is the House overwhelmingly voted to eliminate the advanced liquid metal reactor for many very positive reasons, which documents since that time now reinforce the correctness of the House position. But what has happened in the conference committee is the House activities have been overturned, the effort to cut the budget has been frustrated. Indeed the total bill now costs the taxpayers more than it did when it passed by either the House or the Senate because of the games that get played in the other body to win votes to keep alive what we cannot afford in this country.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious budget-cutting issue as to whether we will stand firm and whether we will make majority rule in this country.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HOAGLAND].

Mr. HOAGLAND. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, I am here also to urge that you vote "no" on the previous question.

As we all know too well, Americans around the country, and Nebraskans, have expressed great concern about the budget agreement we enacted last August, that necessary vote we cast in order to put us in the direction of a balanced budget. We made tough decisions in preparing that budget. Each of us would have done it differently if we could have, but it is something we had to do. And we did it with the promise that we would require additional cuts. Now is one additional opportunity.

To put this in perspective, we Nebraskans must recognize that our tax share of the super collider is a minimum of $62.7 million over the construction phase of the project under current estimates. Those estimates will no doubt grow, as they have in the past. Do we Nebraskans feel that the super collider is essential enough to the future of our country now to tax ourselves over $62 million? It may be desirable, but is it essential in a time when we are borrowing nearly a billion dollars a day to finance the Federal Government's activities?

I think not, Mr. Speaker. We should all vote "no."

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, those of us who are opposing the super collider are not doing so because we are against scientific research. Let me point out that the chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology in 1992 also said:

> To fund this project would require massive reductions in other critical science programs, including other high energy physics programs.

Keep that in mind, my colleagues. I hope every Member will come by the table here and look at how much this is going to cost the individual States, and I would like to have the attention of the majority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], who is certainly going to follow me here in just a second to wrap up for the proponents. He may focus on as how he can justify asking the taxpayers of Missouri to spend $202 million for this project.

Mr. Speaker, this is a simple question: Are we going to stand for our convictions and stand the ground that we took earlier this year when 280 Members of this body said "no" to future funding of the super collider?

□ 1330

I hope we do. Let us vote against the previous question on the motion to recommit and for the substitute motion to recommit.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kansas and the gentleman from New York say there will be reductions in vital research. Not true; $10.9 billion goes to NIH. That is a 5.9-percent increase, for 6,000 research grants. VA–HUD gets $3 billion for the National Science Foundation, a 10-percent increase. We are not suffering reductions.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUGHES). The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 45 seconds.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, we shortly will be voting on the previous question. If that previous question is defeated, it will not be a simple matter. An amendment will be offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY] that we knock out the $640 million added by the Senate. It then goes back to conference. That means all of the items will be reopened. Many things will be considered that many Members will not want to consider.

The Senate is difficult to deal with on this subject. We tried to deal with them the other day. I can tell Members it is not quite that simple.

So I am going to offer a straight motion to recommit, the most honest motion that can be made. There will be no sweetheart deal, no fancy language. It will be a simple motion to recommit and go back and work with the Senate once again.

But with instructions, you open up everything, such items as waste cleanup, so many things will be opened up. I do not know how we will come back.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a vote for the previous question, leaving the decision on the motion to recommit to the decision of Members.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], the majority leader.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The distinguished majority leader is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge that Members vote for the previous question and vote for the conference report. I know that in the minds of many Members, the superconducting super collider is the issue, and it is a very important issue. I think the position that the Members who have advocated the cutting out of the super collider is a legitimate position, and I think they are heartfelt in their concerns. And all of us are concerned about a budget that is spending too much money and a deficit that is too high, and all of us are looking for ways to cut the deficit.

But I urge Members today to stick with this conference report, because I believe strongly that this project is a sound project, for the deficit, for the budget, and for creating jobs in this country that we desperately need to create.

After the vote here a few weeks ago, I went to the site of the super collider. I had never been there. I have always been in favor of it, I have advocated it. But after the House voted in the way it did, I thought I had better go see it and talk to the people there about it.

Mr. Speaker, I come away from that visit even more convinced than I was before that we should continue this needed project. All over the country people are asking the same question. The question is, where are the jobs? We all talk about training, but training for what? We are in a tough world competition, with China, with Japan, Mexico, Europe, countries all over the

world. The truth is that today, in normal manufacturing processes, countries with much lower standards of living can produce products just as well as we can, and in some cases even better. The only way we will compete is if we are ahead in technology, ahead in the latest ideas that can be applied to products that we can manufacture, at least for a period of time, here in the United States.

The people in the scientific community and the people in our industrial community tell me that the kind of basic research that will go on in this project is precisely the kind of initial inquiry that we need that will translate into the telephones, into the computers, and all of the latest products that we are now making, 20 and 30 years from now.

I said when I argued before that Bob Galvin at Motorola supports this project, and said, "The new information from this basic research has energized the sustained growth that has caused companies like ours to grow 1,000 times in 50 years, to double in size every 5 years."

Mr. Speaker, it is an expensive project, but the expense is justified in terms of the ideas and the technology that will translate into the kinds of jobs that we have got to have in this society in the days ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to vote for the future of our economy.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I must admonish our conferees on this bill regarding the subject of volunteer hosts for the possible siting of an MRS. This is the acronym for "monitored retrievable storage," the plan within the civilian nuclear waste program to find a suitable area for the short-term holding of spent nuclear fuel rods prior to final disposal.

Since 1987, when Congress created the "nuclear waste negotiator" position, it has been this person's job to search for volunteer candidates to host such a site. Today the other body had a hearing on this administration's nominee for the negotiator's job, a man most of us know, former Member Dick Stallings of Idaho. However, language in this conference report will tie the negotiator's hands in proceeding with allocation of so-called 2(b) grants to tribes or local units of government that wish to further pursue hosting an MRS.

This body has committee report language to clarify that before receiving DOE money for further studies a tribe must gain consensus from elected officials of the State within which their reservation lies. The other body added legislative language which would have done likewise. Both of these solutions seemed heavy-handed from an Indian sovereignty standpoint, so the conferees simply decided to stop the DOE from handing out any more 2(b) grants at all.

Mr. Speaker, finding a volunteer host for both an MRS and a second deep geologic disposal site for spent fuel is an important part of our Nation's nuclear waste policy. By the action of this conference committee that policy has been derailed. I do not ask the conferees to go back in and fix this. It won't happen and I know it.

My point is to inform Members with nuclear power reactors in their districts that sooner or later they're going to hear from their constituents about spent fuel stacking up at the reactors back home. Remember then that the 103d Congress decided that working with volunteer hosts for interim storage of nuclear waste just wasn't important.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant opposition to further funding for the superconducting super collider [SSC].

If completed, the superconducting super collider would be the largest and highest energy particle accelerator in the world. This unique research tool could unlock some of nature's greatest mysteries and lead to a better understanding of our universe. The project would also attract some of the brightest physicists and scientists to the United States, lead to the development of critical technologies, and secure America's leadership position in fundamental physics research. For these reasons, I have consistently supported funding for the SSC since the Department of Energy [DOE] first initiated the project and made it a top priority of the Department.

However, over the past several years I have been troubled by reports of cost overruns and mismanagement of the project. Originally, DOE projected that the SSC would cost $5.9 billion. Then in 1990, the Energy Department conducted a comprehensive review of the project and estimated a cost of $8.2 billion. Just this past spring, the General Accounting Office released a report titled, "SSC Is Over Budget and Behind Schedule." Now, with the Clinton administration's plan to "stretch out" the project over several more years, the SSC is expected to cost between $11 and $12 billion.

With the mounting Federal budget deficit, it has become increasingly more difficult over the past couple of years for fiscal conservatives such as myself to justify voting for such an expensive scientific endeavor. Although I generally feel it was a worthy investment, I realize Federal spending has to be prioritized, and annual, upward revisions of the project's cost has been steadily eroding my support for the SSC.

What finally convinced me to vote against funding the SSC was its lack of international support. Like the space station *Freedom*, the SSC was considered a "big science" project that was too big to be shouldered by the United States alone. Therefore, the Energy Department promised foreign contributions toward the development of the SSC totaling $1.6 billion, but unlike the space station, the United States has only received a fraction of these foreign pledges.

During consideration of the fiscal year 1993 energy and water appropriations bill in 1992, I was prepared to vote against funding for the SSC. However, the adoption of an amendment offered by Science, Space, and Technology chairman, GEORGE BROWN and ranking Republican, BOB WALKER convinced me to give the Department of Energy another chance to secure international funding. The amendment made the release of Federal appropriations for the SSC contingent on the President's success in guaranteeing $650 million in foreign contributions by April 1, 1993. This amendment assured that the cost of the SSC would be shared by our international partners, so I voted in support of the SSC.

During debate over the SSC earlier this year, I was dismayed and angered to learn that the Energy Department had only received about $50 million in foreign pledges, $600 million short of what the Brown-Walker amendment required. Obviously, the international community had no interest in investing in the superconducting super collider either because they felt it was not a worthwhile venture or because they figured the United States would go ahead and build the SSC without any help. No matter what the reason, our foreign partners apparently hoped to benefit from the scientific discoveries produced by the SSC without paying for its development.

Voting against the superconducting super collider was a very difficult decision. Much of the SSC's research and development is being conducted in colleges and universities in Pennsylvania, including the Pennsylvania State University in my district. Nevertheless, I feel strongly that this is a prudent and responsible vote. Until the Energy Department gets serious about securing financial commitments from our so-called international partners, I do not think that Congress should appropriate any further money for the SSC. If other nations will benefit from discoveries and technology produced by the SSC, why shouldn't they contribute to its construction? The superconducting super collider is simply too expensive for the United States to build on our own.

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the conference report on the energy and water development appropriations bill, and in support of the superconducting super collider.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has always led the world in scientific research and technological achievement. The SSC will help physicists discover the fundamental nature of matter and energy, which will lead to major advancements in almost every field of technology. Some of the future applications of technology include: High speed magnetic levitation trains; magnetic energy storage systems for fuel conservation; magnetically propelled ships; and low-loss electric power transmission systems.

Without the SSC, U.S. industry would lose the opportunity to develop an infrastructure for superconductivity in this country, which represents a market estimated to reach $8 to $12 billion by the turn of the century.

Furthermore, a failure to follow through with the SSC will profoundly disturb the credibility of the DOE and the U.S. Government to both the world at large and to our own science community. A failure to build the SSC will disrupt the Nation's current high energy physics program. This is a balanced program and the SSC is an integral part of its focus.

Mr. Speaker, we need to cut the deficit. But we also need to secure our economic future. The investment in the superconducting super collider represents less than 1 percent of our total Federal research and development budget, yet it is an investment in an area of science that has a proven record of economic return.

I urge my colleagues to support the superconducting super collider and to support the energy and water development appropriations conference report.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report on H.R. 2445, the energy and water development appropriations bill for fiscal 1994.

I want to commend Chairman TOM BEVILL and ranking member, JOHN MYERS, as well as the rest of the subcommittee, for the outstanding job they did in fashioning a bill which addresses our country's most basic energy and water development needs, while still coming in some $25 million below last year's funding level.

I regret that the bill contains $640 million to continue construction of the superconducting super collider, and another $37 million for the advanced liquid metal reactor program, both of which the House had voted to terminate.

In these times of great budget deficits, we just cannot afford to spend money on big-ticket boondoggles such as the supercollider, which is now expected to cost in excess of $11 billion. I regret that the Senate refused to follow the House's lead in terminating this project, and that we have lost an opportunity to take another huge chunk out of the budget deficit.

Accordingly, I am reluctantly compelled to vote to recommit the bill, with instructions to the House conferees to hold the House position on the superconducting super collider. I realize this will delay passage of this bill, but it is the only option we have to stop this project before we waste any more money on it.

Aside from my concerns about the super collider and the liquid metal reactor program, I believe this is an excellent bill. It provides important funding for energy research and development, environmental restoration and waste management, and a host of reclamation projects.

The bill also provides funding for the Army Corps of Engineers to carry out public works projects across the country which create jobs, strengthen our infrastructure and economic base, and generate hundreds of millions of dollars in local tax revenues.

I know the subcommittee had many more requests to fund water development projects than it could possibly accommodate without exceeding the budget. It was a difficult task for the subcommittee to pare down the list and only fund those projects which are most important.

In my own case, I had many more federally authorized projects in my own district in southern New Jersey for which I chose not to request funding, because I feel they are not critical and can reasonably be deferred until we get our fiscal house in order in Washington.

Instead, I once again only supported those projects in my district which are directly related to our coastal economy and environment, and which cannot be deferred. I am very pleased that the full Congress has agreed to support these projects.

They include: Maintenance dredging along the New Jersey Intracoastal Waterway, which is the major north-south water route through our State; the Cold Spring Inlet, which serves the U.S. Coast Guard Training Center and base in Cape May; and the Maurice River, which supports important shipbuilding activities in Cumberland County.

The bill also continues the shore protection and water quality studies which are now underway for four important navigation and beach erosion control projects in southern New Jersey, all of which are a part of the New Jersey shore protection master plan and are consistent with the State's own priorities.

They are: Brigantine Inlet to Great Egg Harbor Inlet, Townsends Inlet to Cape May Inlet, the Delaware Bay coastline, and the Lower Cape May Meadows/Cape May Point.

These studies are aimed at developing cost-effective programs to maintain safe and navigable waterways, stabilize the shoreline, and protect shore communities from the dangers of storms and erosion.

Finally, the bill provides funding for the Army Corps of Engineers to deepen the Salem River, to help facilitate the development of the port in Salem, NJ.

I regret that this overall excellent bill is burdened by additional moneys for the superconducting super collider. It is my hope that the conferees will remove these moneys, so that we can move ahead with final passage of this important legislation.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to funding the superconducting super collider—the so-called SSC. Our Nation cannot afford it. This House has voted 2 years in a row to eliminate the funding for this program, but each year the SSC has come back to life.

Most recently, the house of Representatives voted on June 24, 1993, by a margin of 280–150, to terminate the project. Last year, the house voted on June 17, by a margin of 232–181, to end funding for the SSC.

Our country is a world leader in technology and we must continue to support our Nation's scientific research programs. The SSC, however, is a program that we simply cannot responsibly fund. If we did not currently have a deficit in excess of $4 trillion, perhaps we could look at the merits of the project through different lenses. But what I see when I look at the SSC now is a program that has grown in cost from $4.4 billion in 1987 to over $11 billion today. Furthermore, when the program was initially funded in 1987, Congress was told that its costs would be partially underwritten through foreign contributions—partially meant $1.7 billion. Yet, I understand that the Department of Energy now estimates that the foreign contribution will never total more than $400 million.

The General Accounting Office [GAO] reports to us that the SSC is behind schedule and over budget. Although proponents have argued that the potential scientific benefits outweigh the high costs and that the SSC should be an immediate priority, I note that even the administration has proposed stretching out the project.

Let's not commit ourselves to fund projects our Nation clearly cannot afford. Let us choose our priorities carefully. Let us not let this project come back to life again this year.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of H.R. 2445, the fiscal year 1994 Energy and Water appropriations bill. I would like to commend chairman BEVILL and ranking minority Member MYERS for their fine work in bringing this fiscally responsible bill to the House floor.

Although H.R. 2445 contains many worthy provisions, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention a project contained in the bill of particular importance to the people who reside in New Jersey's Middlesex, Somerset, and Union counties. The project to which I refer is called the Green Book flood control project.

As my colleagues may recall, this project was authorized by Congress under the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-662, Section 401). During the past 8 fiscal years, Congress has appropriated over $14 million for this project. In fiscal year 1986, Congress appropriated $484,000; in fiscal year 1987, $1.37 million; fiscal year 1988, $1.4 million; fiscal year 1989, $1.5 million; fiscal year 1990, $1.2 million; fiscal year 1991, $2 million; fiscal year 1992, $3.169 million; and fiscal year 1993, $3.5 million. For fiscal year 1994, Congress is providing $2.8 million to continue the following tasks: preconstruction engineering and design—including hydraulic and hydrologic analysis; environmental investigations and data collection; topographic mapping; and layout of levee alignments.

Completion of this project is vital if we are to prevent the enormous damage that another flood could bring. My colleagues may recall the great flood of 1973 that occurred in what is now largely the Seventh Congressional District of New Jersey. This flood claimed the lives of six people and caused tens of millions of dollars in damage. I would venture that if a similar floor occurred today, the damage could exceed a billion dollars.

That flood, coupled with an earlier one that occurred in 1971, provided the impetus for the Green Book flood control project. Since this project is so encompassing, we must proceed now before another devastating flood arrives. It is a little over 20 years to the day since the last great flood in this area, and it is only a matter of time before such a flood occurs again. Completion of this project ensures that this area will be adequately prepared for such an event.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I would like to thank my good friend and fellow New Jersey colleague, Congressman DEAN GALLO, for his assistance and guidance on this project. This project's success is due in large part to DEAN's tireless work as a member of the House Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee. The people of New Jersey's Seventh Congressional District certainly owe DEAN a debt of gratitude for all his efforts on their behalf.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to vote "aye" on the conference report to H.R. 2445.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. MYERS OF INDIANA

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, in its present form, I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MYERS of Indiana moves to recommit the conference report on H.R. 2445 to the committee of conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 159, nays 264, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 510]

YEAS—159

Ackerman
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Armey
Bacchus (FL)
Bachus (AL)
Baker (LA)
Barlow
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bevill
Bishop
Blackwell
Bliley
Blute
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Buyer
Callahan
Chapman
Clay
Clyburn
Coleman
Combest
Cooper
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crapo
Darden
de la Garza
DeLay
Derrick
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dixon
Dooley
Dornan
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards (TX)
Everett
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Foglietta
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Gallo
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gingrich
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Grams
Green
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings
Hayes
Hilliard
Hochbrueckner
Horn
Hoyer
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Klink
Kolbe
Kopetski
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lewis (CA)
Lightfoot
Livingston
Lloyd
Lowey
Manton
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McNulty
Meek
Mica
Michel
Mineta
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Natcher
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pastor
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pickle
Quillen
Rahall
Reynolds
Richardson
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rose
Santorum
Sarpalius
Scott
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (IA)
Smith (TX)
Spence
Stenholm
Stokes
Stump
Swift
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thompson
Thornton
Torres
Torricelli
Traficant
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Whitten
Wilson
Wise
Yates
Young (AK)

NAYS—264

Abercrombie
Allard
Andrews (ME)
Applegate
Archer
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Ballenger
Barca
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bereuter
Berman
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Boehlert
Brewster
Brown (OH)
Bunning
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Coppersmith
Costello
Crane
Cunningham
Danner
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dickey
Dingell
Doolittle
Duncan
Durbin
Emerson
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Ford (MI)
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gillmor
Gilman
Glickman
Goodling
Goss
Grandy
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hancock
Harman
Hastert
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Houghton
Huffington
Hughes
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Inslee
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Klug
Knollenberg
Kreidler
Kyl
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
Lazio
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Levy
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
Long
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McKinney
McMillan
Meehan
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Molinari
Moran
Morella
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Orton
Pallone
Parker
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Ridge
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenk
Schroeder
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Snowe
Solomon
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Sundquist
Swett
Synar
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Thomas (WY)
Thurman
Torkildsen
Towns
Tucker
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walker
Walsh
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weldon
Wheat
Williams
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—10

Bryant
Burton
Edwards (CA)
Engel
Ford (TN)
McCurdy
Moakley
Murphy
Schiff
Smith (MI)

□ 1357

Mr. MCKEON, Ms. SCHENK, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. GEJDENSON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. LAFALCE, Mrs. CLAYTON, and Messrs. CUNNINGHAM, ARCHER, and GEKAS changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. FOGLIETTA, SKELTON, CLYBURN, and RAHALL changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question on the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1400

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SLATTERY TO THE MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. MYERS OF INDIANA

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SLATTERY to the motion to recommit offered by Mr. MYERS of Indiana: Insert before the period at the end the following: "with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist on disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33".

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

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will not object, but I would ask my colleague from Kansas to explain the motion to recommit, because there is some question as to whether or not this motion would affect projects other than the SSC.

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

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

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, first I want to commend my colleagues for the last vote. This is a very important vote for this institution and the taxpayers. Now we must add an instruction to the motion to recommit to the conferees directing them to maintain the House position on the question of the super collider. So for those who want to kill the super collider, the next vote is a "yes" vote. Let me say it again, for those who want to kill the super collider, the next vote is a "yes" vote.

It is a motion to instruct the conferees to stick to the House position.

Let me also point out that this motion that we are about to vote on does not affect any other issue in this conference report. And I think that point needs to be made clear.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there has been a misstatement made, a statement that is not true, that it does not open up the conference for everything. If we go back to conference with the Senate, everything is open again. It has been represented that this does not have an effect on anything else, but if you look and if you read the order, if we go back to work with the Senate, everything is open again.

Mr. SLATTERY. If the gentleman will yield, Mr. Speaker, the vote against the super collider is now a "yes" vote on the instruction to conferees. We want to vote "yes" at this time.

Mr. MYERS o' Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY] to the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] and on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment to the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY].

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

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 282, nays 143, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 511]

YEAS—282

Abercrombie
Allard
Andrews (ME)
Applegate
Archer
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Ballenger
Barca
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bereuter
Berman
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blackwell
Bliley
Boehlert
Brewster
Brown (OH)
Bunning
Burton
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Crane
Danner
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dickey
Dingell
Dooley
Doolittle
Duncan
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gillmor
Gilman
Glickman
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Grandy
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hancock
Harman
Hastert
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Houghton
Huffington
Hughes
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Inslee
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kreidler
Kyl
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
Lazio
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Levy
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
Long
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Mazzoli
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McKinney
McMillan
Meehan
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Molinari
Moran
Morella
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Parker
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Ridge
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schroeder
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Synar
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Thomas (WY)
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Towns
Tucker
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walker
Walsh
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weldon
Wheat
Williams
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—143

Ackerman
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Armey
Bacchus (FL)
Bachus (AL)
Baker (LA)
Barlow
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bevill
Bishop
Blute
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Buyer
Callahan
Chapman
Clay
Coleman
Combest
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crapo
Cunningham
Darden
de la Garza
DeLay
Derrick
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dixon
Dornan
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Everett
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Gallo
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gingrich
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Grams
Green
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings
Hayes
Hilliard
Hochbrueckner
Horn
Hoyer
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kopetski
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lewis (CA)
Lightfoot
Livingston
Lloyd
Lowey
Manton
Matsui
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McNulty
Meek
Mica
Michel
Mineta
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Natcher
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Pastor
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pickle
Reynolds
Richardson
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rose
Santorum
Sarpalius
Schenk
Scott
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (IA)
Smith (TX)
Stenholm
Stokes
Stump
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thompson
Torres
Torricelli
Traficant
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Whitten
Wilson
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—8

Bryant
Engel
Ford (TN)
McCurdy
Moakley
Murphy
Schiff
Smith (MI)

□ 1421

Miss COLLINS of Michigan changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the amendment to the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit, as amended.

The motion to recommit, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2491, DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the de novo vote on House Resolution 275.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 273, noes 151, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 512]

AYES—273

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Becerra
Beilenson
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)

Brown (OH)
Bryant
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Ewing
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Grandy
Green
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Hoke
Holden
Houghton
Hoyer
Hughes
Hutto
Inslee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Klug
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Ridge
Roemer
Rogers
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Schenk
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shays
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Washington
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)

NOES—151

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Bentley
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Byrne
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Conyers
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Emerson
Everett
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fish
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goss
Grams
Greenwood
Hancock
Hastert
Hefley
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
King
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lazio
Leach
Levy
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Machtley
Manzullo
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Penny
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Roberts
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shuster
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Talent
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Wolf
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—9

Bateman
Engel
Ford (TN)
McCloskey
McCurdy
Moakley
Murphy
Smith (MI)
Waters

□ 1440

Mr. KOPETSKI changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2491) making appropriations for the Department of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUGHES). Pursuant to House Resolution 275, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of Monday, October 4, 1993, at page 23343.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] in favor of the conference report?

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, if I may be recognized, let me say that in its present form I am in support of the conference report.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the conference report. Pursuant to the rule, I request that one-third of the time be allocated to me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rules of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER] will be recognized for 20 minutes, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report on H.R. 2491, as well as on the Senate amendments reported in disagreement, and that I may include tables, charts, and other extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, at the outset I want to take a moment to recognize the members of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies, who have done an outstanding job in terms of bringing this conference report and, prior to that, the bill, to the House floor. It has been a real pleasure for me to work with the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN], the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR], the gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES], and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. THORNTON].

Mr. Speaker, on the minority side, it has been a real honor to work with the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], the ranking minority member. We have had an excellent working relationship throughout this entire period. It has also been an honor to work with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLO]. Each of them has been hard-working subcommittee members, and it has been a real pleasure to work with them in bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to take a moment to pay tribute to a hard-working and very talented and skilled staff, particularly Dick Malow, the staff director, along with Paul Thomson, Michelle Burkett, Dan Cantu, and Ms. Shirley Day, who is on detail from the National Science Foundation.

These people often work many long hours at night and work weekends to help prepare and bring these bills to

the floor, and I want to acknowledge the great service they render for the House.

Mr. Speaker, we bring back to the House today the conference report on the fiscal year 1994 VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Appropriations bill. As always, this is a very difficult bill to reach agreement with the Senate—because it is a bill that demands some very difficult choices.

But, Mr. Speaker, I believe we have brought back a fair conference agreement—a balanced conference agreement—and, above all, an agreement that parts from the usual way of doing business.

I want to take just a minute to expand a little bit on what I mean by that last comment.

When I came before the House this past June, I explained that Senator MIKULSKI and I had hammered out an agreement which tried to address the concern that the appropriations committees had increasingly included numerous unauthorized projects and legislation in our annual bills.

This agreement was not easy to implement. We had to say no to many of our colleagues. But the Senator and I felt it was the right thing to do.

In capsule form, what we agreed to do was this.

The 1994 VA-HUD bill would include no legislation—including language requested by the President.

The only exceptions we made to that policy were the following:

Limitations in order under the House rules,

Technical legislation that had been carried previously in the bill—or needed some adjustment,

And, of course, any major program activities lacking general funding authorization, such as EPA, NASA, and NSF.

Also, the agreement provided that we would include no unauthorized site-specific projects in either the bill or the report.

We also agreed that we would not include any HUD special projects.

It has been very tough to maintain that agreement. But, Senator MIKULSKI and I made an agreement and both of us kept our word.

It is our belief that the bill before you includes no legislation that does not meet the test we set for ourselves—and I believe we have not included any site-specific projects for Members that are not authorized.

The bottom line is that we have made a good faith effort to meet the commitment that we discussed this past June. And I would hope that our friends from the legislative committees recognize that we have kept our commitment.

Now let me point out why it was so tough to put this conference agreement together. The fact is that we were working under a number of constraints this year that we would not normally have to deal with.

To begin with, because we proposed no legislation in this bill—we were not able to use any outlay-enhancing gimmicks.

Second, after the bill left the House, the White House informed the committees that an additional $100 million was required in the NASA account as a payment to Russia. Having to shoehorn in an additional $100 million at that point was almost impossible.

So we had to make some tough choices.

We have effectively killed the AXAF-S Program—although we are providing sufficient money to look at the possibility of flying the key instrument on a Japanese satellite.

We have reduced the President's $20,000,000 new technology initiative science data purchase to zero. We effectively killed the President's new small satellite technology program.

And, we have killed the so-called search for extraterrestrial intelligence program.

Also in NASA, we could not fully fund either the comet or spacehab programs—and we are terminating the advanced solid rocket motor program.

At the appropriate time I will offer a motion implementing the termination and transferring any ASRM funds above what the House agreed to into NSF programs, NASA's national aerospace plane, and EPA's Superfund.

I also think it's important to point out that this agreement does not include $204 million for the so-called locality pay.

Under the recently passed Treasury Appropriations Act, these moneys must be paid in 1994—the bottom line is that all agencies in the bill, including VA hospitals, will have to eat this substantial amount of money. Combined with the cuts carried in the conference agreement for a number of salaries and expense accounts, this could cause furloughs or RIF's later in fiscal year 1994.

Mr. Speaker, this bill received a section 602(b) allocation that was $900 million in outlays and $1.3 billion in budget authority below the President's request. When we consider the constraints I just talked about and the wishes and wants of all the Members on both sides of this building—I believe we bring back to the House today a reasonable and balanced bill.

I want to highlight a few of the items in this bill.

We are providing $15,622,000,000 for veterans' medical care. That is nearly a $1 billion increase above 1993.

We are providing $252 million for VA medical and prosthetic research—a $20 million increase above last year.

Under Housing, we are providing $9,313,000,000 for assisted housing. That is roughly a $500 million increase above 1993.

We are also providing $778 million for the new HOPE VI program to address some of the most difficult problems in public housing.

We are providing $4,400,000,000 for the community development block grant program—an increase of $160 million above 1993.

And under the homeless programs we are providing $723 million—an increase of almost $150 million above 1993.

For the programs of the Environmental Protection Agency, we are providing $6,659,000,000—an increase of almost $300 million above the budget request.

For NASA, we are appropriating $14,551,500,000—a reduction of more than $710 million below the budget request—but an increase of almost $250 million above 1993.

And, for the National Science Foundation, we are appropriating more than $3 billion—which is an increase of $294 million above 1993.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we have brought back the Selective Service issue for another vote in the House and Senate.

We could not reach agreement on Selective Service. I believe that the time has come to save this money—and as we used to do with an old car—put the Selective Service System up on blocks.

We can come back and get that system up and running in plenty of time. But given the current world conditions today—the American All-Volunteer Army is working fine—and I believe this is $20 million which we can save and use on other higher priority programs or on deficit reduction.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill and I hope that the Members will support this conference agreement, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would include a table on the conference agreement and the resolution of the amendments in disagreement.

H.R. 2491 - Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies, 1994

	FY 1993 Enacted	FY 1994 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
TITLE I						
DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS						
Veterans Benefits Administration						
Compensation and pensions	16,969,239,000	16,828,446,000	16,828,446,000	16,828,446,000	16,828,446,000	-140,793,000
Readjustment benefits	814,010,000	947,400,000	947,400,000	947,400,000	947,400,000	+133,390,000
Veterans insurance and indemnities	22,730,000	15,370,000	15,370,000	15,370,000	15,370,000	-7,360,000
Guaranty and indemnity program account (indefinite)	495,766,000	462,119,000	462,119,000	462,119,000	462,119,000	-33,647,000
Administrative expenses	40,524,000	56,231,000	56,231,000	56,231,000	56,231,000	+15,707,000
Loan guaranty program account (indefinite)	49,275,000	27,647,000	27,647,000	27,647,000	27,647,000	-21,628,000
Administrative expenses	87,869,000	70,716,000	70,716,000	70,716,000	70,716,000	-17,153,000
Direct loan program account (indefinite)	97,000	69,000	69,000	69,000	69,000	-28,000
(Limitation on direct loans)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	.....
Administrative expenses	1,393,000	2,863,000	2,863,000	2,863,000	2,863,000	+1,470,000
(Loan level)	(147,000)	(798,000)	(798,000)	(798,000)	(798,000)	(+651,000)
Education loan fund program account	1,000	1,032	1,032	1,032	1,032	+32
(Limitation on direct loans)	(11,000)	(3,571)	(3,571)	(3,571)	(3,571)	(-7,429)
Administrative expenses	305,000	186,000	186,000	186,000	186,000	-119,000
Vocational rehabilitation loans program account	51,000	53,000	53,000	53,000	53,000	+2,000
(Limitation on direct loans)	(1,760,000)	(2,387,000)	(2,387,000)	(2,387,000)	(2,387,000)	(+627,000)
Administrative expenses	962,000	751,000	751,000	751,000	751,000	-211,000
Native American Veteran Housing Loan Program	4,500,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-4,500,000
(Limitation on direct loans)	(58,400,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-58,400,000)
Administrative expenses	500,000	156,000	156,000	156,000	156,000	-344,000
Total, Veterans Benefits Administration	18,487,222,000	18,412,008,032	18,412,008,032	18,412,008,032	18,412,008,032	-75,213,968
Veterans Health Administration						
Medical care	14,645,723,000	15,642,452,000	15,522,452,000	15,637,452,000	15,622,452,000	+976,729,000
Health care reform contingency fund (emergency)	.....	.....	.....	500,000,000	.....	.....
Total	14,645,723,000	15,642,452,000	15,522,452,000	16,137,452,000	15,622,452,000	+976,729,000
Medical and prosthetic research	232,000,000	206,000,000	252,000,000	252,000,000	252,000,000	+20,000,000
Health professional scholarship program	10,113,000	10,386,000	10,386,000	10,386,000	10,386,000	+273,000
Health professionals education loan repayment program	5,000,000	.....	.....	10,000,000	.....	-5,000,000
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses	68,954,000	68,500,000	68,500,000	73,500,000	68,500,000	-454,000
Grants to the Republic of the Philippines	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	.....
Transitional housing loan program:						
Loan program account (by transfer)	(7,000)	(7,000)	(7,000)	(7,000)	(7,000)	.....
Administrative expenses (by transfer)	(50,000)	(52,000)	(52,000)	(52,000)	(52,000)	(+2,000)
(Limitation on direct loans)	(70,000)	(70,000)	(70,000)	(70,000)	(70,000)	.....
Total, Veterans Health Administration	14,962,290,000	15,927,838,000	15,853,838,000	16,483,838,000	15,953,838,000	+991,548,000
Departmental Administration						
General operating expenses	811,919,000	823,249,000	823,249,000	828,249,000	826,749,000	+14,830,000
National Cemetery System	70,668,000	70,507,000	70,507,000	70,507,000	70,507,000	-161,000
Office of Inspector General	31,182,000	31,520,000	31,436,000	31,436,000	31,436,000	+254,000
Construction, major projects	492,674,000	362,293,000	322,793,000	369,000,000	369,000,000	-123,674,000
(By transfer)	.....	(14,000,000)	(14,000,000)	(14,000,000)	(14,000,000)	(+14,000,000)
Construction, minor projects	149,525,000	153,540,000	153,540,000	153,540,000	153,540,000	+4,015,000
Parking revolving fund	1,317,000	1,353,000	1,353,000	1,353,000	1,353,000	+36,000
Grants for construction of state extended care facilities	40,000,000	41,080,000	41,080,000	41,080,000	41,080,000	+1,080,000
Grants for the construction of state veterans cemeteries	5,104,000	5,242,000	5,242,000	5,242,000	5,242,000	+138,000
Total, Departmental Administration	1,602,389,000	1,488,784,000	1,449,200,000	1,500,407,000	1,498,907,000	-103,482,000
Total, title I, Department of Veterans Affairs	35,051,901,000	35,828,630,032	35,715,046,032	36,396,253,032	35,864,753,032	+812,852,032
(By transfer)	(57,000)	(14,059,000)	(14,059,000)	(14,059,000)	(14,059,000)	(+14,002,000)
(Limitation on direct loans)	(61,388,000)	(4,258,571)	(4,258,571)	(4,258,571)	(4,258,571)	(-57,129,429)
Consisting of:						
Mandatory	(18,351,117,000)	(18,281,051,000)	(18,281,051,000)	(18,281,051,000)	(18,281,051,000)	(-70,066,000)
Discretionary	(16,700,784,000)	(17,547,579,032)	(17,433,995,032)	(18,115,202,032)	(17,583,702,032)	(+882,918,032)
TITLE II						
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT						
Housing Programs						
Homeownership and opportunity for people everywhere grants (HOPE grants)	271,000,000	109,190,000	119,190,000	109,190,000	109,190,000	-161,810,000
Rescission of FY 1992 and FY 1993 HOPE funds	.....	.....	-250,000,000	-250,000,000	-250,000,000	-250,000,000
HOME investment partnerships program	1,172,500,000	1,600,000,000	1,325,000,000	1,275,000,000	1,275,000,000	+102,500,000

H.R. 2491 - Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies, 1994

	FY 1993 Enacted	FY 1994 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Annual contributions for assisted housing	8,836,731,000	8,423,000,000	9,192,900,000	9,334,900,000	9,312,900,000	+476,169,000
Public housing bond refinancing	-10,000,000					+10,000,000
Transfer from flexible subsidy and Nehemiah fund	42,934,000					-42,934,000
Rescission of assisted housing deobligations (budget authority, indefinite)	-8,000,000					+8,000,000
Total, annual contributions (net)	8,861,665,000	8,423,000,000	9,192,900,000	9,334,900,000	9,312,900,000	+451,235,000
Assistance for the renewal of expiring section 8 subsidy contracts	6,076,135,000	5,558,106,000	5,558,106,000	4,558,106,000	4,558,106,000	-1,518,029,000
Advance appropriation for next fiscal year	720,000,000	800,000,000	800,000,000		800,000,000	+80,000,000
Rental housing assistance:						
Rescission of budget authority, indefinite	-42,000,000	-40,000,000	-40,000,000	-40,000,000	-40,000,000	+2,000,000
(Limitation on annual contract authority, indefinite)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	
Rescission of prepayment recaptures	-283,000,000	-45,515,000	-45,515,000	-45,515,000	-45,515,000	+237,485,000
Rent supplement program:						
Rescission of budget authority, indefinite		-32,438,000	-32,438,000	-32,438,000	-32,438,000	-32,438,000
(Limitation on annual contract authority, indefinite)		(-1,544,646)	(-1,544,646)	(-1,544,646)	(-1,544,646)	(-1,544,646)
Congregate services	21,000,000	6,267,000	6,267,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	+4,000,000
Payments for operation of low-income housing projects	2,282,436,000	2,520,808,000	2,620,808,000	2,620,808,000	2,620,808,000	+338,372,000
Severely distressed public housing	300,000,000	483,240,000	483,240,000	803,240,000	778,240,000	+478,240,000
Drug elimination grants for low-income housing	175,000,000		265,000,000	265,000,000	265,000,000	+90,000,000
Community partnerships against crime		265,000,000				
Youthbuild program	40,000,000	48,000,000	48,000,000			-40,000,000
National cities in schools community development program			10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	+10,000,000
Housing counseling assistance	6,025,000		12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	+5,975,000
Flexible subsidy fund		65,747,000	35,747,000	41,000,000	35,747,000	+35,747,000
Rescission	-10,800,000					+10,800,000
Flexible subsidy fund (transfer to annual contributions)	-55,500,000					+55,500,000
Nehemiah housing opportunity fund (transfer to annual contributions)	-18,934,000					+18,934,000
Federal Housing Administration:						
FHA - Mutual mortgage insurance program account:						
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(100,000,000,000)	(64,564,645,000)	(64,564,645,000)	(64,564,645,000)	(64,564,645,000)	(-35,435,355,000)
Administrative expenses	255,645,000	262,810,000	262,810,000	262,810,000	262,810,000	+7,165,000
Offsetting receipts	-261,148,000	-267,021,000	-267,021,000	-267,021,000	-267,021,000	-5,873,000
FHA - General and special risk program account:						
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(10,664,230,000)	(13,436,205,000)	(13,436,205,000)	(13,436,205,000)	(13,436,205,000)	(+2,771,975,000)
Administrative expenses	187,000,000	192,252,000	192,252,000	192,252,000	192,252,000	+5,252,000
Program costs	145,823,000	147,371,000	147,371,000	147,371,000	147,371,000	+1,548,000
Subsidy - multifamily		-41,957,000	-41,957,000	-41,957,000	-41,957,000	-41,957,000
Subsidy - single family		-45,172,000	-45,172,000	-45,172,000	-45,172,000	-45,172,000
Subsidy - Title I		-16,293,000	-16,293,000	-16,293,000	-16,293,000	-16,293,000
Offsetting receipts	-22,171,000					+22,171,000
Raise FHA mortgage limitation	-44,000,000					+44,000,000
Eliminate 57% closing cost limitation	1,000,000					-1,000,000
Total, Federal Housing Administration	262,149,000	231,990,000	231,990,000	231,990,000	231,990,000	-30,159,000
Government National Mortgage Association						
Guarantees of mortgage-backed securities loan guarantee program account:						
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(107,700,000,000)	(85,000,000,000)	(85,000,000,000)	(130,000,000,000)	(130,000,000,000)	(+22,300,000,000)
Administrative expenses	6,936,000	8,038,000	8,038,000	8,038,000	8,038,000	+1,102,000
Offsetting receipts	-322,500,000	-269,300,000	-269,300,000	-269,300,000	-269,300,000	+53,200,000
Total, Housing Programs (net)	19,462,112,000	19,732,133,000	20,079,033,000	18,657,019,000	19,404,766,000	-57,346,000
Homeless Assistance						
Emergency shelter grants program	50,000,000	51,350,000	151,350,000	55,000,000	115,000,000	+65,000,000
Supportive housing program	150,000,000	319,968,000	319,968,000	400,000,000	334,000,000	+184,000,000
Section 8 moderate rehabilitation, single room occupancy	105,000,000	107,835,000	107,835,000	150,000,000	150,000,000	+45,000,000
Shelter plus care	266,550,000	273,747,000	123,747,000	123,747,000	123,747,000	-142,803,000
Innovative homeless initiatives demonstrations program					100,000,000	+100,000,000
Total	571,550,000	752,900,000	702,900,000	728,747,000	822,747,000	+251,197,000
Community Planning and Development						
Community development grants	4,240,000,000	4,223,675,000	4,273,675,000	4,400,000,000	4,400,000,000	+160,000,000
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(2,000,000,000)	(2,054,000,000)	(2,054,000,000)	(2,054,000,000)	(2,054,000,000)	(+54,000,000)
Capacity building for community development and affordable housing					20,000,000	+20,000,000
Total	4,240,000,000	4,223,675,000	4,273,675,000	4,400,000,000	4,420,000,000	+180,000,000
Policy Development and Research						
Research and technology	25,000,000	35,000,000	73,000,000	35,000,000	35,000,000	+10,000,000

H.R. 2491 - Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies, 1994

	FY 1993 Enacted	FY 1994 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Indian Housing						
Indian housing loan guarantee program			2,000,000		1,000,000	+1,000,000
(Limitation on direct loans)			(50,000,000)		(25,000,000)	(+25,000,000)
Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity						
Fair housing activities	15,000,000	21,419,000	25,000,000	21,419,000	25,000,000	+10,000,000
Management and Administration						
Salaries and expenses (multiple accounts)	452,567,000	465,553,000	465,553,000	458,000,000	464,053,000	+11,486,000
(By transfer, limitation on FHA corporate funds)	(432,497,000)	(444,872,000)	(444,872,000)	(444,872,000)	(444,872,000)	(+12,375,000)
(By transfer, GNMA)	(6,936,000)	(8,038,000)	(8,038,000)	(8,038,000)	(8,038,000)	(+1,102,000)
Office of Inspector General	36,012,000	36,149,000	36,115,000	36,115,000	36,115,000	+103,000
(By transfer, limitation on FHA corporate funds)	(10,148,000)	(10,190,000)	(10,190,000)	(10,190,000)	(10,190,000)	(+42,000)
Office of federal housing enterprise oversight		5,742,000	5,742,000	10,700,000	10,700,000	+10,700,000
Offsetting receipts		-5,742,000	-5,742,000	-10,700,000	-10,700,000	-10,700,000
Administrative provisions	3,579,000					-3,579,000
Total, title II, Dept of Housing and Urban Development (net)	24,805,820,000	25,266,829,000	25,857,276,000	24,336,300,000	25,208,681,000	+402,861,000
Appropriations, fiscal year 1994	(24,429,620,000)	(24,584,782,000)	(25,225,229,000)	(24,704,253,000)	(24,776,634,000)	(+347,014,000)
Advance appropriations for next year	(720,000,000)	(800,000,000)	(800,000,000)		(800,000,000)	(+80,000,000)
Rescissions	(-343,800,000)	(-117,953,000)	(-367,953,000)	(-367,953,000)	(-367,953,000)	(-24,153,000)
(Limitation on annual contract authority, indefinite)	(-2,000,000)	(-3,544,646)	(-3,544,646)	(-3,544,646)	(-3,544,646)	(-1,544,646)
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(220,364,230,000)	(165,054,850,000)	(165,054,850,000)	(210,054,850,000)	(210,054,850,000)	(-10,309,380,000)
(Limitation on corporate funds to be expended)	(449,581,000)	(463,100,000)	(463,100,000)	(463,100,000)	(463,100,000)	(+13,519,000)
Consisting of:						
Advance appropriation available	850,000,000	720,000,000	720,000,000	720,000,000	720,000,000	-130,000,000
Appropriations available from this bill	24,085,820,000	24,466,829,000	24,857,276,000	24,336,300,000	24,408,681,000	+322,861,000
Total, title II, fiscal year 1994	24,935,820,000	25,186,829,000	25,577,276,000	25,056,300,000	25,128,681,000	+192,861,000
TITLE III						
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
American Battle Monuments Commission						
Salaries and expenses	19,318,000	19,961,000	19,961,000	20,461,000	20,211,000	+893,000
Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board						
Salaries and expenses		5,000,000	5,000,000		2,500,000	+2,500,000
Commission on National and Community Service						
Salaries and expenses	2,500,000	2,519,000	2,519,000			-2,500,000
Programs and activities	77,000,000	74,971,000	105,000,000			-77,000,000
Total	79,500,000	77,490,000	107,519,000			-79,500,000
Department of the Treasury						
Financial Management Service: Community development banks		60,000,000				
Community Investment Program						
Community investment program		513,500,000				
Consumer Product Safety Commission						
Salaries and expenses	48,400,000	42,286,000	42,286,000	42,286,000	42,286,000	-6,114,000
Court of Veterans Appeals						
Salaries and expenses	8,480,000	9,278,000	9,040,000	9,278,000	9,159,000	+679,000
Department of Defense - Civil						
Cemeterial Expenses, Army						
Salaries and expenses	13,033,000	12,738,000	12,738,000	12,738,000	12,738,000	-295,000
Environmental Protection Agency						
Research and development	323,000,000	353,565,000	353,565,000	328,565,000	338,701,000	+15,701,000
Abatement, control, and compliance	1,337,215,000	1,367,535,000	1,367,535,000	1,352,535,000	1,352,535,000	+15,320,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(274,000,000)		(283,000,000)	(280,000,000)	(283,000,000)	(+9,000,000)
Abatement, control, and compliance loan account	30,225,000					-30,225,000
(By transfer)				(29,000,000)		
(Limitation on direct loans)	(70,500,000)					(-70,500,000)
Administrative expenses	1,000,000					-1,000,000
(By transfer)				(1,000,000)		
Program and research operations	827,607,000	859,170,000	859,170,000	841,000,000	850,625,000	+23,018,000
(Transfer to CEQ)				(-375,000)		
Office of Inspector General	42,799,000	45,194,000	44,595,000	44,595,000	44,595,000	+1,796,000
Buildings and facilities	134,300,000	18,000,000	18,000,000	12,000,000	18,000,000	-116,300,000
Hazardous substance superfund	1,573,528,000	1,496,400,000	1,416,100,000	1,496,400,000	1,480,853,000	-92,675,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(260,000,000)		(280,000,000)	(240,000,000)	(280,000,000)	(+20,000,000)
Leaking underground storage tank trust fund	83,000,000	75,379,000	75,379,000	75,379,000	75,379,000	-7,621,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(7,200,000)		(7,400,000)	(7,400,000)	(7,400,000)	(+200,000)

H.R. 2491 - Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies, 1994

	FY 1993 Enacted	FY 1994 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Oil spill response	20,700,000	21,239,000	21,239,000	21,239,000	21,239,000	+539,000
Water infrastructure / State revolving fund	2,550,000,000	1,528,000,000	2,477,000,000	2,500,000,000	2,477,000,000	-73,000,000
Drinking water capitalization grants		599,000,000				
Total, EPA	6,923,374,000	6,363,482,000	6,632,583,000	6,671,713,000	6,658,927,000	-264,447,000
Executive Office of the President						
National Space Council	941,000					-941,000
Office of Science and Technology Policy	6,225,000	5,170,000	4,200,000	4,700,000	4,450,000	-1,775,000
Points of Light Foundation	5,000,000					-5,000,000
Office of National Service				160,000	160,000	+160,000
Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality	2,560,000				375,000	-2,185,000
(By transfer)				(375,000)		
Total	14,726,000	5,170,000	4,200,000	4,860,000	4,985,000	-9,741,000
Federal Emergency Management Agency						
Disaster relief	2,292,000,000	292,000,000	292,000,000	292,000,000	292,000,000	-2,000,000,000
Disaster relief contingency fund (emergency)				400,000,000		
Disaster assistance direct loan program account	95,000	95,000	95,000	95,000	95,000	
(Limitation on direct loans)	(40,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(-15,000,000)
Salaries and expenses	160,409,000	165,516,000	164,239,000	160,409,000	160,409,000	
Office of Inspector General	3,000,000	4,800,000	4,350,000	4,350,000	4,350,000	+1,350,000
Emergency management planning and assistance	253,243,000	222,960,000	212,960,000	215,000,000	212,960,000	-40,283,000
Emergency food and shelter program	129,000,000	123,000,000	130,000,000	130,000,000	130,000,000	+1,000,000
Administrative provision REP savings	-10,477,000	-11,525,000	-11,525,000	-11,525,000	-11,525,000	-1,048,000
Total, Federal Emergency Management Agency	2,827,270,000	796,846,000	792,119,000	1,190,329,000	788,289,000	-2,038,981,000
General Services Administration						
Consumer Information Center	2,026,000	2,074,000	2,074,000	2,074,000	2,074,000	+48,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(2,367,000)	(2,415,000)	(2,415,000)	(2,415,000)	(2,415,000)	(+48,000)
Department of Health and Human Services						
Office of Consumer Affairs	2,159,000	2,159,000	2,159,000	2,159,000	2,159,000	
Interagency Council on the Homeless						
Salaries and expenses	900,000	910,000	910,000			-900,000
National Aeronautics and Space Administration						
Research and development	7,094,300,000	7,690,400,000	7,475,400,000	7,544,400,000	7,529,300,000	+435,000,000
Rescission	-14,300,000					+14,300,000
Total (net)	7,080,000,000	7,690,400,000	7,475,400,000	7,544,400,000	7,529,300,000	+449,300,000
Space flight, control and data communications	5,058,800,000	5,333,800,000	4,878,400,000	4,892,900,000	4,853,500,000	-205,300,000
Construction of facilities	520,000,000	550,300,000	512,700,000	550,300,000	517,700,000	-2,300,000
Rescission				-10,000,000		
Research and program management	1,635,014,000	1,675,000,000	1,637,500,000	1,635,508,000	1,635,508,000	+494,000
Office of Inspector General	15,062,000	15,500,000	15,391,000	15,391,000	15,391,000	+329,000
Total, NASA	14,308,876,000	15,265,000,000	14,519,391,000	14,628,499,000	14,551,399,000	+242,523,000
National Commission on American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian Housing						
Salaries and expenses	500,000					-500,000
National Credit Union Administration						
Central liquidity facility:						
(Limitation on direct loans)	(600,000,000)	(600,000,000)	(600,000,000)	(600,000,000)	(600,000,000)	
(Limitation on administrative expenses, corporate funds)	(964,000)	(945,000)	(945,000)	(945,000)	(945,000)	(-19,000)
National Science Foundation						
Research and related activities	1,859,000,000	2,204,800,000	2,045,000,000	1,940,000,000	1,998,500,000	+139,500,000
Academic research infrastructure	50,000,000	55,000,000	55,000,000	125,000,000	110,000,000	+60,000,000
United States polar research programs	158,000,000	163,100,000	158,100,000	158,100,000	158,100,000	+100,000
United States Antarctic logistical support activities	63,360,000	65,100,000	62,600,000	62,600,000	62,600,000	-760,000
Education and human resources	487,500,000	556,100,000	569,600,000	569,600,000	569,600,000	+82,100,000
Critical technologies institute	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	2,000,000	1,500,000	+500,000
Salaries and expenses	111,000,000	125,800,000	120,800,000	115,500,000	118,300,000	+7,300,000
Office of Inspector General	3,688,000	4,100,000	3,997,000	3,997,000	3,997,000	+309,000
National Science Foundation headquarters relocation		5,200,000	5,200,000	5,200,000	5,200,000	+5,200,000
Total, NSF	2,733,548,000	3,180,200,000	3,021,297,000	2,981,997,000	3,027,797,000	+294,249,000
National Service Initiative						
Corporation for National and Community Service		394,000,000		370,000,000	370,000,000	+370,000,000

H.R. 2491 - Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies, 1994

	FY 1993 Enacted	FY 1994 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation						
Payment to the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation	27,976,000	27,976,000	30,476,000	32,000,000	32,000,000	+4,024,000
Selective Service System						
Salaries and expenses	28,616,000	29,012,000	5,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	-3,616,000
Total, title III, independent agencies (net)	27,038,702,000	26,807,082,000	25,206,753,000	25,993,394,000	25,549,524,000	-1,489,178,000
Appropriations	(27,053,002,000)	(26,807,082,000)	(25,206,753,000)	(26,003,394,000)	(25,549,524,000)	(-1,503,478,000)
Rescissions	(-14,300,000)	.....	.....	(-10,000,000)	.....	(+14,300,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(543,567,000)	(2,415,000)	(572,815,000)	(529,815,000)	(572,815,000)	(+29,248,000)
(Limitation on direct loans)	(710,500,000)	(625,000,000)	(625,000,000)	(625,000,000)	(625,000,000)	(-85,500,000)
(Limitation on corporate funds to be expended)	(964,000)	(945,000)	(945,000)	(945,000)	(945,000)	(-19,000)
TITLE IV						
CORPORATIONS						
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation:						
FSLIC Resolution Fund	2,622,000,000	1,326,000,000	1,326,000,000	1,171,000,000	1,171,000,000	-1,451,000,000
FDIC affordable housing program	5,000,000	5,260,000	7,000,000	.....	7,000,000	+2,000,000
Bank enterprise program	1,000,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-1,000,000
Total	2,628,000,000	1,331,260,000	1,333,000,000	1,171,000,000	1,178,000,000	-1,450,000,000
Resolution Trust Corporation: Office of Inspector General	33,510,000	34,582,000	34,046,000	34,582,000	34,314,000	+804,000
Total, title IV, Corporations	2,661,510,000	1,365,842,000	1,367,046,000	1,205,582,000	1,212,314,000	-1,449,196,000
Grand total (net)	89,557,933,000	89,268,383,032	87,946,121,032	87,931,529,032	87,835,272,032	-1,722,660,968
Appropriations, fiscal year 1994	(89,196,033,000)	(88,586,336,032)	(87,514,074,032)	(88,309,482,032)	(87,403,225,032)	(-1,792,807,968)
Advance appropriations for next year	(720,000,000)	(800,000,000)	(800,000,000)	.....	(800,000,000)	(+80,000,000)
Rescissions	(-358,100,000)	(-117,953,000)	(-367,953,000)	(-377,953,000)	(-367,953,000)	(-9,853,000)
(By transfer)	(57,000)	(14,059,000)	(14,059,000)	(44,434,000)	(14,059,000)	(+14,002,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(543,567,000)	(2,415,000)	(572,815,000)	(529,815,000)	(572,815,000)	(+29,248,000)
(Limitation on annual contract authority, indefinite)	(-2,000,000)	(-3,544,646)	(-3,544,646)	(-3,544,646)	(-3,544,646)	(-1,544,646)
(Limitation on direct loans)	(771,888,000)	(629,258,571)	(679,258,571)	(629,258,571)	(654,258,571)	(-117,629,429)
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(220,364,230,000)	(165,054,850,000)	(165,054,850,000)	(210,054,850,000)	(210,054,850,000)	(-10,309,380,000)
(Limitation on corporate funds to be expended)	(450,545,000)	(464,045,000)	(464,045,000)	(464,045,000)	(464,045,000)	(+13,500,000)

□ 1450

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to express my appreciation to my chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], for his very, very fine and professional working relationship which he has developed among the entire staff as well as the members of our subcommittee.

I further would like to express my own appreciation for the fine work of Bill Warfield, who is with the office of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE], and who has been of great assistance to me and my staff in our work throughout this year. Finally I'd like to recognize the work of Doc Syers, and Darin Latteed of my personal staff, who have done so much in helping us work our way through this new responsibility in this subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, we bring to you today a conference report which allocates $87.7 billion in new budget authority among two Cabinet agencies and 19 other Federal agencies and commissions.

Within these accounts we are allocating $68.2 billion in discretionary domestic budget authority for programs as diverse as America's Space Program, the consumer information catalog, enforcement of the Clean Air Act, America's research stations on the continent of Antarctica, and efforts to address our obligation to America's veterans.

In light of your strong and overwhelming vote on last week's rule, we have revised the agreement to clearly and unambiguously terminate the Advanced Solid Rocket Motor Program. We have adopted the reduced ASRM funding level that was contained in the bill upon original House passage in late June.

This conference report is also unambiguous in its effort to provide new leadership to address long-simmering controversies. My chairman, Mr. STOKES, has worked long and hard to minimize the kinds of communication difficulties with the various authorizing committees which also have jurisdiction and oversight over the many agencies and programs that are covered within this bill.

This conference agreement is distinctive for what it does not do.

It does not fund HUD special purpose grants which have totalled as much as $250 million in recent years.

It does not earmark funds for unauthorized site specific Member initiated EPA water projects.

It does not contain more overall spending than last year's bill. We are $1.8 billion below the bill as enacted last year. We are also nearly $1.6 billion below what the President requested.

We have taken a firm step toward ending any debates about the search for extra terrestrial intelligence. This report phases out that research.

Let me return now to highlighting some of what we have been able to do.

VETERANS

Whatever else you may hear during the next year regarding veterans and where they will fit into comprehensive health care reform, your approval of this conference report means that the VA's system of 171 hospitals, 131 nursing homes and 371 outpatient clinics will receive a 7-percent increase or almost $977 million most to operate with than last year. Just as critical, we have provided $252 million—an increase of nearly 9 percent—for the high quality medical research that attracts and retains professionals and practitioners to the VA's health care delivery system.

HOUSING

We have provided $20.1 billion to HUD for housing programs. You may hear more later regarding the shift in emphasis from promoting ownership in public housing by the residents to the programs that Secretary Cisneros and the new administration hopes will lead to reinventing HUD. Major innovations in housing policy are largely in the future but this report reserves its most substantial increases to reconstruction and job training in severely distressed public housing—plus $478 million or plus 159 percent versus fiscal year 1993—drug elimination grants—less $90 million or plus 51 percent—and programs to assist the homeless—plus $151.2 million or plus 26.4 percent. We have also provided funds to begin implementing the new Secretary's top two initiatives—innovative homeless demonstrations and capacity building in community development. These two programs were authorized in final form by this House less than 1 week ago.

SPACE

Your support for this conference agreement means that America has a future in space and that NASA will live within the President's cap of $2.1 billion to continue the Space Station Program. You cannot tie a better square knot than we did in this report. Let me state it to you in the exact way our report does. "The Conferees believe that any Russian participation should enhance and not enable station." We have an agreement with the Administrator that over 50 percent of the station funds can not be spent until the Russian role as a potential international partner is negotiated and finalized

EPA

We have provided $6.6 billion for environmental protection. This actually reflects a reduction of 3.6 percent for this agency compared to last year. We have provided $500 million to support water infrastructure financing in hardship communities. Not one dime of that money is committed to a site specific Member requested project. That is a departure from past practice in this Appropriations Subcommittee. We strongly urge the authorizers to help us make use of these funds and to take timely action to prioritize the multiple requests that we received.

I urge your strong support for both the programmatic directions we have achieved and for the direction that the subcommittee is taking under the leadership of the gentleman from Ohio. We very much want a bill signed that reflects the will of this body.

□ 1500

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today not so much to oppose the conference committee report but to urge the membership to support the motion that will be offered later on today by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] to finally terminate the advanced solid rocket motor.

The ASRM was funded in the conference report at $157 million. The language of the Stokes motion will be to provide $100 million of expressly stated termination costs. If the Stokes motion is passed by the House, which I hope it will be, that will put the Congress in an appropriation bill firmly on record for terminating this boondoggle that has increased in cost almost exponentially from the time it was originally authorized, dividing up the other $57 million as follows: to fund research on the national aerospace plane, $20 million, and a transfer to the accounts National Science Foundation and the Environmental Protection Agency, $37 million.

By terminating the ASRM, NASA, the National Science Foundation, and the EPA will be better off and will be able to use the money that is transferred away from the ASRM to do what in my opinion is probably a better public good.

Mr. Speaker, the question has been asked by many of my fellow fiscal conservatives: Why not just reduce the total appropriation by $57 million, and let this money go?

Unfortunately, the way our Budget Act works is that since this is included under a section 602(b) allocation, we just cannot have money lying around. However, that is not a reason to defeat the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES]. The reason to pass that motion is, by terminating the ASRM, the $2.6 billion that is necessary to complete this project between now and the year 2002 will not have to be appropriated in future years. By spending the $57 million in programs in NASA, the National Science Foundation, and the EPA today, we will be able to save many times that in future appropriation bills for the next seven to eight years.

The Advanced solid rocket motor needs to be terminated because it is 100 percent over budget. It now bears a $2.6 billion cost to complete, after we have spent $2 billion over the past 5 years. The cost to finish this program is more than the original cost estimates that were given to the Congress when the program was initially authorized and appropriated, and it is very similar to the superconducting super collider in terms of lowball estimates that Congress is being asked to agree to.

The advanced solid rocket motor will not fly even its first flight until the year 2002, after 80 percent of the space station has been completed. The proponents of the ASRM, when the program was originally authorized, said, "We need this rocket in order to reduce the number of shuttle flights necessary to assemble the station." Because this rocket is not going to be ready until most of the station is already up, it has become a rocket without a mission. That is why its funding ought to be terminated.

There were and there still are alternative programs that NASA can afford to do the job of the ASRM. That is something that is funded in this current budget, and which will be considered in future authorizations and appropriation bills.

Finally, the facilities at Yellow Creek, MS; can and should be used for a worthy public purpose, since the taxpayers have already invested $1.5 billion in constructing them, but that worthy public purpose is not the advanced solid rocket motor, nor is it some kind of resurrection or job transfer program.

The President, in his fiscal year 1995 budget submission, ought to tell Congress and the country for what purpose he intends to use that facility. If it is reasonable and does not attempt to resurrect the ASRM out of the ashes, I am certain that it will achieve support, both in the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, in the Committee on Appropriations, and by the House of Representatives as a whole.

Again, I would urge strong support for the motion terminating the ASRM that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] will offer later on today.

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

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished ranking majority member of this subcommittee, the very able and hard-working gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN].

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report to H.R. 2491, the VA-HUD fiscal year 1994 appropriations bill. The chairman has done an outstanding job throughout the appropriations process this year, and he has enjoyed the cooperation of the ranking minority member. I am very proud of the product that we bring to the floor for the Members' consideration.

In light of the current budget environment, we were unable to fund many worthy projects, and others we funded at lower levels than we would have hoped. But in this fiscal situation, the operative word is fair, and this is a fair bill.

The programs in this bill have been authorized. The initiatives reflect the administration's priorities for the diverse agencies under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.

To address the critical needs of our Nation's veterans, I am pleased to tell my colleagues that we increased funding for veterans medical care by almost $1 billion over fiscal year 1993 amounts. This was not easy because our 602b allocation provided a funding level 2 percent less than comparable fiscal year 1993 levels.

By providing increases in Housing and Urban Development accounts the bill renews our commitment to public housing programs. I am particularly pleased that we keep in mind the special needs of rural areas. Through the increase to the Section 8 Program we improve the availability of affordable housing for the many low-income individuals waiting for assistance.

In NASA, we have successfully achieved funding for a balanced Space Program. We have included the requested amount for the redesigned space station *Alpha*, which now includes Russian participation; we have provided increases for aeronautics research and development, a key component of President Clinton's competitiveness agenda; further, we have maintained the Nation's commitment to the space shuttle, mission to planet Earth, and space science programs.

The committee appreciates the importance of basic research, so we have provided increases for the National Science Foundation's research and related activities account. And we again increase funding for NSF's K through 12 education activities.

And we provide levels for EPA above the President's request, including funds for water treatment, Superfund, leaking underground storage tank fund, and oilspill response programs.

Overall, I am pleased with our work, but I would like to take this opportunity to mention something that concerns me deeply. The Congress is responding to the current fiscal environment with a shifting mood about discretionary spending, but in our frenzy to appear fiscally responsible, we must refrain from superficial tactics to achieve our goals.

The high-resolution microwave survey is a NASA Program caught in this web. As a result, the program is being terminated in this bill. If this termination had been based on substantive issues, I would be comfortable with our actions. But unfortunately, this is not the case. HRMS has been peer reviewed; it has been authorized; it pushes state of the art technology in signal processing techniques and in radio receiver technology; and it has met its budget and its schedule for the 5 years it has been funded.

Yet in an attempt to attract attention as stewards of good government, Members of Congress have attacked the program with shallow references to little green men and ET. In my judgment, the termination of this program is a mistake. The program is being used as a scapegoat, and I want to express my sincere regret to the outstanding scientists who have dedicated their careers to the program.

Overall, however, we bring to you a responsible bill. The subcommittee has been responsive to the will of the majority of the Members of the body. I urge my colleagues to support this conference agreement.

□ 1510

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN].

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the chairman and the ranking member of the subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, within the funds for NASA, the conference report directs a reduction from the NASA ground terminal facility which lies within my district. Is this correct?

Mr. STOKES. If the gentleman will yield, that is correct. The conference report reflects the sentiment of the conferees that we are not proceeding with the TDRSS replenishment new start at this time. The conference agreement reflects a specific reduction in the operating costs at both headquarters and the ground terminal.

Mr. SKEEN. Owing to my concern with the intent of the conferees, I wrote NASA Administrator Goldin asking for an agency assessment of the technical feasibility of operating cuts such as those which the conferees have reached. His response raises possible concerns and I insert Mr. Goldin's letter into the RECORD at this point.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION, OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR,
Washington, DC, October 15, 1993.

Hon. JOE SKEEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SKEEN: Thank you for your letter of October 7, signed jointly with Senators Domenici, Gramm and Bingaman and Congressmen McDade and Lewis, regarding direction concerning NASA's Space Communications activities included in the Conference Report (House Report 103-273) accompanying H.R. 2491, the VA-HUD-Independent Agencies appropriations bill. The Report directs that "$11 million [be taken] as a general reduction from space communications, including a reduction of $8.6 million from

space communications operations activities at headquarters and at the NASA ground terminal."

We are currently assessing the impacts of an $8.6 million reduction directed at Headquarters support activities for Space Communications and Ground Terminal operations. As you may know, NASA is already actively endeavoring to reduce costs of Headquarters support activities in general, and we expect to absorb reductions in Headquarters support for Space Communications, among other areas. Clearly, however, a directed appropriations reduction of $8.6 million would require a decrease in activities at the NASA Ground Terminal in White Sands, New Mexico, as well. We recognize the important role of the White Sands Ground Terminal in the operation and maintenance of the Tracking and Data Relay Satellite (TDRS) system, and hope to avoid undue impacts of reductions in Ground Terminal funding. We are evaluating how NASA might absorb a portion of the reduction specified in the Conference Report in other elements of the Space Communications program, if necessary. If it is determined that an alternative distribution of the reductions is preferable for the most effective conduct of Space Communications activities, NASA will propose such an approach in the FY 1994 operating plan.

With respect to the TDRS Replenishment program, I note that the Conference Report deletes requested FY 1994 funding "without prejudice." We are actively studying the cost, schedule, and capability requirements to ensure continuity of vital U.S. on-orbit space communications availability through the TDRS replenishment program. As the Conference Report suggests, NASA will address the results of our studies in this regard and timing of procurement activities in the forthcoming FY 1994 operating plan.

NASA is committed to maintaining the viability of TDRSS. I appreciate your support of NASA's space communications activities and would be pleased to discuss this matter in greater detail.

Sincerely,

DANIEL S. GOLDIN,
Administrator.

Mr. Goldin's letter states that NASA recognizes the importance of the White Sands ground terminal in the operation and maintenance of the Tracking and Data Relay Satellite System [TDRSS] and stresses the agency hopes to avoid undue impacts of reductions in ground terminal funding.

I would like to ask the conferees an important question on this matter. Is it the subcommittee's intent to eliminate any flexibility by the Administrator of NASA with regard to the operating budget at the White Sands location?

Mr. LEWIS of California. If the gentleman will yield, Mr. Speaker, the potential technical problems which the Administrator mentions creates a very limited opportunity for us to assess whether the agency could faithfully implement the clear direction of the conferees. That would come at a later date in the form of a reprogramming or when the agency's operating plan is forwarded to us in the next few months.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, that is correct.

Mr. SKEEN. I thank both the chairman and the ranking member for their responses.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the short-winded gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the compliment of my colleague from Wisconsin. I guess that was a compliment.

Mr. Speaker, you know this conference committee report is 2.1 percent below fiscal year 1993, and that is good. It is 1.8 percent below the President's request for 1994, and that is good. It is 1 percent below the House-passed bill, and that is good. It is 1 percent below the Senate-passed bill. All of those things are good.

Unfortunately, it is $400 million higher than fiscal year 1993's spending for community development block grants, $400 million higher. We tried when this bill came before the House on June 28 to take community development block grants back to the level of last year and we were unsuccessful.

Now the conference committee has raised it $400 million to $4.4 billion, and it is higher by 10 percent than last year.

At a time when we are suffering huge budget deficits, it seems to me inconceivable that we would be increasing any part of our spending, even in this bill, by 10 percent or $400 million.

Earlier this year when President Clinton first took office he proposed what was called his economic stimulus package. That was a $16.5 billion package that was supposed to create jobs for this country. And in that package we found all kinds of pork barrel projects.

We found, for instance, $1.8 million for a Desert West Park in Phoenix, AZ, the Orpheum Theater in Phoenix, AZ, where the renovation of that movie theater would cost $3.5 million of taxpayers' money. In Berkeley, CA, there was the downtown YMCA that was going to cost $300,000 to renovate, and the Civic Center in Burbank was going to cost $400 million to renovate, and it goes on and on. I brought to the floor this litany of pork barrel projects at that time. And we sent this to the Senate, and that was the thing that defeated that bill.

Unfortunately, we cannot get to a lot of these that are in this bill today, but many of these projects I believe are the same projects that were in the so-called economic stimulus package, and they are simply nothing more than pork barrel projects.

So I say to my colleagues that I cannot support this because there is $400 million more in this bill than was spent last year for community development block grants. And I believe many of these projects are simply pork barrel projects for incumbent Congressmen so that they can go back home and say to their constituents that they have done a good job by bringing home the bacon, and thus getting reelected. This is the wrong thing to do during these fiscal problems. We face fiscal collapse in this country if we do not get control of our appetite for spending. This is a perfect example of that.

Ten years ago we had a $1 trillion debt. Now it is $4.35 trillion, and projections are that it will be close to $7 trillion in the next 4 or 5 years, and the interest on that debt alone is going to be one of the largest items in the Federal budget. We cannot afford it. We have to get control of spending. This is an example of waste we should not be voting for, and I urge my colleagues to defeat this conference report, send it back, and take $400 million out.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS].

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report's allocation for the Environmental Protection Agency's research and development activities contains a specific allocation for high-altitude engine research and testing. Is it the intention of the committee that these funds are to be used only for statutorily authorized high-altitude engine research and testing?

Mr. STOKES. If the gentleman will yield, Mr. Speaker, that is the committee's intention.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman. I just wanted to get that clarified for the RECORD, and I appreciate the work of the gentleman and his committee on this bill.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA].

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant opposition to the fiscal year 1994 VA, HUD, independent agencies appropriation bill. I do so in large part due to the continued funding for the space station.

However, I want to take this opportunity to personally commend Chairman NATCHER and ranking member MCDADE as well as Chairman STOKES and ranking member LEWIS of the VA-HUD Subcommittee for their efforts with respect to our Nation's housing programs.

With respect to this bill, I appreciate the difficult job the members of the Appropriations Committee face in trying to provide a fair distribution of very limited funds.

I want to especially commend the committee for the increased funding for the HOME Investment Partnership Program, the 202 elderly, and section 811 disabled program, the public housing development and modernization programs.

I also want to thank the committee for providing $150 million for the much

needed lead paint abatement program and the $700 million for the distressed public housing effort.

I also appreciate the fact that the committee recognized the great needs in the HUD–FHA multifamily property disposition program by providing $500 million for the sale of these properties. The authorization committees of both Houses will be making substantial changes to that program over the next few months in order to help HUD expedite the sale of these properties.

Finally, to Chairman STOKES and ranking member LEWIS, I want to again thank you for taking the authorization committee's wishes into consideration with respect to several housing initiatives presented by HUD earlier this spring. These include the pension fund housing demonstration and the innovative homeless initiative.

The spirit of cooperation between authorizers and appropriators is very much appreciated. Last week, the House did pass the necessary authorization legislation and HUD can now go forward with their programs.

Unfortunately, and despite the good work of the committee in addressing our housing needs, I must vote against this conference report because we continue to skew our priorities toward outer space rather than toward deficit reduction and our domestic needs.

□ 1520

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

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

First of all I would just like to say to the chairman of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies, as well as to my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], the ranking member, that I again want to commend them for the work that they and their staff do along with the other committee members.

Theirs is one of the most difficult jobs in the entire Congress. When you have the Veterans Department and all of the veterans programs lumped under that subcommittee, along with Housing and Urban Development, which is a huge department in itself, and the myriad other independent agencies, their job in distributing the limited pie of funds available is very, very difficult.

I, for one, deeply appreciate what they have done over the years for our veterans. I really wish that the subcommittee could be divided in half and that we would have a separate subcommittee on veterans' affairs so that the veterans programs would not have to compete with all of the other agencies.

Be that as it may, you folks do a great job. Unfortunately, I had to vote against this bill back on June 28 because it abolished the Selective Service System, which I feel so strongly about. Now here we are back again, with an amendment in disagreement on the Selective Service System. At the appropriate time I will be offering a preferential motion to recede to the Senate position. However, due to the strange parliamentary situation we have here, we will have to vote on the conference report itself prior to taking up the amendments in disagreement. So I am put again in the uncomfortable position of having to vote against the conference report, which I strongly support. A great job is done for our veterans in this legislation. But I cannot contribute to abolishing the Selective Service System.

I just wanted to explain that. I hope that the House is going to use the wisdom of Solomon and reverse its earlier decision and restore the funds for Selective Service that were deleted some weeks ago. Perhaps today, we will change that around and we will be successful.

Mr. Speaker, again I commend the gentleman from California for yielding this time and congratulate him and the subcommittee chairman for the great work their subcommittee does.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES], a very important member of the subcommittee.

Mr. TORRES. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I note the conference agreement earmarks $28 million of funds provided under HOPE I, II, and III for YouthBuild Programs authorized under title I, subtitle D of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992. Are these funds subject to any restriction, or can they be used to implement any of the activities contained in the authorizing statute, including the funding of new programs?

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

Mr. TORRES. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. STOKES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the funds appropriated to YouthBuild under HOPE I, II, III may be used to implement any activity authorized under title I, subtitle D of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992, including, but not limited to, the funding of new programs.

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for that clarification.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLO], a member of the subcommittee.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 2491, the VA, HUD appropriations bill.

As a new member of this subcommittee, I want to congratulate our new chairman LOUIS STOKES, and our new ranking member JERRY LEWIS, on a job well done.

There are many important priorities in this bill—veterans health care, housing assistance, environmental protections, and space programs. And, as always, there never seems to be enough money to meet all the needs. But, I believe this conference report made the tough choices and found the appropriate balance of funding for all these needs.

In particular, I am very pleased that under the Department of Housing and Urban Development, we provided the higher figure of $1.567 billion and 12,000 units for section 202/811 senior citizen and disabled housing. I remain concerned, however, about the need to address the problem of mixed populations—nonsenior disabled people living in elderly housing—in HUD-assisted housing. It is my understanding that this is an issue for consideration in the authorization committees, and I hope that other members of the subcommittee will work with me to encourage the authorizing committee to find a long-term solution to preserving senior housing projects for their intended use—low-income seniors.

I also remain concerned about a provision in the conference agreement that requires HUD to set aside no less than 75 percent of the drug elimination grants for housing authorities with over 1,240 units. While I appreciate the needs of the larger housing authorities, I know of no geographic boundaries for this Nation's drug and crime problems and smaller housing authorities are often in even greater need of this assistance. In fact, those housing authorities with less than 1,240 units actually represent 43 percent of all public housing units. It seems unfair to me that these housing authorities would be limited to only 20 percent of these critical funds. Once again, I encourage the authorizing committee to move forward on a long-term solution to address the needs of all public housing authorities when it comes to keeping these homes free and clear of drugs and crime.

Under the Veterans' Administration, I am pleased that the conference agreement provides funding for all major construction projects requested by the administration and authorized by Congress this year.

Finally, I support the conference level of funding for Superfund. As a Member who represents a district that includes 12 civilian and 1 military Superfund site, I am extremely concerned that the funding is available to keep these cleanups on schedule and to protect the health and environment of our citizens and our communities.

Mr. Speaker, again, I support this conference agreement and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of its passage.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. RAMSTAD].

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, today we have the opportunity to put the final nail in the coffin of the ASRM by voting for the Stokes motion.

I would like to thank the Committee on Appropriations for agreeing to follow the will of the House to end this program that resembles the celebrated cat with nine lives.

It is hard to believe that the ASRM, which had virtually no support in the Congress or even at NASA and is clearly one of the most blatant examples of pork-barrel spending, too so long to kill.

After the House voted overwhelmingly to terminate the ASRM earlier this summer, the other body and the conference committee unfortunately tried to restore enough funding to keep the program alive. But it is gratifying that the House finally said enough is enough and refused to allow its will to be steamrollered.

But I must say I am disappointed that the money for the ASRM has been placed in other space and science programs. It is my judgment and the judgment of many, many Americans that these savings should have been placed directly in deficit reduction, which is certainly a greater need than the national aerospace plane. But that is a fight for another day.

Mr. Speaker, today's action is the first step on the long road of eliminating wasteful spending, and I only hope my colleagues will cut more pork to eliminate the deficit and to address the national debt before it is too late.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

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

Mr. Speaker, at the outset I want to congratulate both the chairman and the ranking member for the work they have done on this bill, a very difficult, contentious bill, as I know it always is because of the multiplicity of the programs involved.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to protest the death blow dealt the Homeownership and Opportunity for People Everywhere [HOPE] Program by the VA-HUD conference report.

On June 29, the House voted in favor of a bipartisan Kolbe-Andrews-Blackwell amendment which restored $10 million to HOPE for a total funding level of $119 million. Regrettably, the Senate deleted this restored funding and voted to fund the HOPE Program at $109 million.

However, the conference report contains a provision to rip yet another $12 million from the HOPE Program and transfer it into the Youthbuild Program.

This leaves the HOPE Program with a measly $97 million.

This provision to transfer $12 million from HOPE to Youthbuild was not contained in either the House or Senate version of the VA-HUD appropriations bill. It is a Senate subcommittee amendment which was put in the conference report without debate or votes by Members in the House and Senate.

Neither the House nor Senate have adequately funded HOPE, but at least procedure was followed in getting these figures. Unfortunately, that was not the case when this provision to slash an additional $12 million from HOPE was surreptitiously inserted into the VA-HUD conference report.

The HOPE Program has been decimated by cuts and rescissions. If we fund the HOPE Program at the Senate level of $109 million, HOPE will be 90 percent below the fiscal year 1994 authorization level.

This means 45,000 low-income residents participating in HOPE will be forced to forgo dreams of homeownership. Imagine how many more residents will be left holding the bag with this additional $12 million cut from HOPE.

Congress has done a great disservice to low-income residents who want to pursue the American dream of homeownership—and we have effectively provided people with yet another reason to distrust lawmakers.

To further cut the HOPE Program is disheartening and it is wrong to put a provision into the VA-HUD conference report to further slash HOPE without allowing Members to debate the merits of this provision.

□ 1530

That means 45,000 low-income residents participating in HOPE will be forced to forego their dreams of home ownership.

I am very disappointed with the decision that has been taken here, and I hope the House will reject this conference report.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN].

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the committee chairman has yielded time to me so that I might enter into a colloquy with him regarding the language in the statement of the managers' accompanying the conference report concerning the requirements of the Clean Air Act for use of oxygenated fuels as applied in Alaska.

The report language states that "The limitation precludes enforcement of section 211(m)(2) of the Clean Air Act against marketers, refiners, or distributors of gasoline to require use of oxygenated substances."

The limitation in this bill, however, does not apply to all oxygenates—as the report language I have just read states. Instead, it applies only to a single statutorily specified oxygenate, methyl tertiary butyl ether or MTBE. No limitation applies to other fuel oxygenates.

May I ask the gentleman, am I correct?

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

Mr. WAXMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct. The limitation applies only to a single statutorily specified oxygenated for Alaska. This entire provision concerns the unique conditions in Alaska only.

Mr. WAXMAN. I thank the chairman for helping to clarify that important point. Finally, I would also like to address the issue of further research on oxygenates. I wish to put into the RECORD, an October 8, 1993, letter I received from the acting head of the Office of Research and Development at EPA, Dr. Gary Foley, on this matter.

I thank the subcommittee chairman for his cooperation on this issue, and I include with my remarks the following correspondence:

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT,

Washington, DC, October 8, 1993.

Hon. HENRY A. WAXMAN,

Chairman, Subcommittee on Health and the Environment, Committee on Energy and Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter is in response to your inquiry to Dr. Peter Preuss, Director of the Office of Science, Planning and Regulatory Evaluation in the Office of Research and Development at EPA, regarding language that accompanies the FY 1994 Appropriations Bill.

Currently, the language reads:

"The Office of Research and Development at the EPA believes that additional research on oxygenates would be useful and oxygenate fuels should be investigated before being introduced into commercial application."

We believe that the following sentence would accurately reflect the analyses of the Office of Research and Development to this point.

"The Office of Research and Development at the EPA believes that additional research on oxygenated would be useful and other oxygenates fuels should be investigated."

We hope that this provides the clarification that you requested.

Sincerely yours,

GARY J. FOLEY,

Acting Assistant Administrator for Research and Development.

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

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the VA-HUD conference report. This is a tough bill working under a tight budget allocation. Balancing the diverse priorities contained in this funding bill from Veterans and Housing needs to EPA, NASA, and Selective Service to name a few, is a very difficult and challenging task.

I am pleased that the total budget authority level in this year's bill is lower than last year. Last years' bill in budget authority amounted to just over $89.5 billion—$89,557,933,000—while this years' fiscal year 1994 bill is just under $87.7 billion—$87,695,272,032.

I would like to commend the chairman of the subcommittee and our ranking member, the gentleman from California, for the impressive manner in which they have guided this bill through the appropriations process. They have been fair and accommodating and I have thoroughly enjoyed working with both of them.

I very much appreciate the chairman's candor and openness in dealing with funding for NASA and the space station in particular as well as the ranking member's continued strong support. This has been a challenging year for the space station in terms of the redesign, management restructuring, and the question of Russian involvement.

I must admit, I was skeptical at first, but I am confident that we now, under the conception of space station *Alpha,* have the plan for a better, cheaper streamlined version of space station *Freedom* with the option of entering into some form of a partnership with the Russians yet to be decided.

While total funding for the space station amounts to $2.1 billion, the subcommittee has included a provision which caps the amount available to NASA at $1.1 billion through March 31, 1994. At that point, the subcommittee can give NASA approval to spend the balance pending final approval of the plan for Russian involvement.

I believe this is a very important restriction. While the prospect of major cooperation with the Russians seems to be around the corner, entering into such a partnership brings with it many concerns. The provision included by the subcommittee gives members the opportunity to ensure that any joint United States-Russian space station option conforms to the established goals of our current space program as well as ensuring that the plan is supported by the American public.

The redesigned space station *Alpha* will cost less to build but will be comparable in terms of scientific capability. As a result of the redesign, we will save more than $4 billion over the next 5 years and $19 billion over the life of the program.

By approving the funding for the space station program, we have recognized the importance of investing in our technological future as well as the hopes and dreams of our children. As I've argued before, and I think most Americans would agree, America's space program is one of the activities we undertake which falls unquestionably into the legitimate purview of our Federal Government.

Forget the unparalleled knowledge about space itself, forget even the new heights of international cooperation and the building of inhabitable structures in space. What you're left with are medical advances, new techniques in air and water purification, improved crystals for electronics, new energy production research, better insight into global ecology, and more than 30,000 other basic applications of science that will improve our productivity, our global competitiveness, our environment, and our everyday lives. Unarguably, these are objectives not only worth achieving, but achievable only through dedicated initiatives at a Federal level.

I support this conference report and I would urge my colleagues to approve it.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me say, it has been expressed a number of times today that this is a very complex bill. It is one that involves funding for programs that range from our efforts in space to the responsibilities of the EPA in terms of the environment. It is a very difficult bill that contains a good deal of discretionary spending.

The work that has been done by the chairman and our staff this year in helping us put together this very carefully balanced bill is very much appreciated by this Member.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members to give support to this conference committee report.

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

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

I would just concur in the statement just made by the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], the ranking member of the subcommittee, that this is a good bill. It has been a very difficult bill for us to put together. It is one which we worked on assiduously in order to try to bring back to the House not only a good bill, but a bill that conforms with the rules of the House. I urge all Members to support this bill.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support but with concerns on this conference report which will provide $87.7 billion for veterans, housing, emergency management, environmental, basic science and NASA programs, and independent agencies for fiscal year 1994. The conferees are bringing to us a bill that is $1.9 billion less than 1993 funding levels and $1.6 billion less than requested by the administration for fiscal year 1994. This figure could have been even further reduced had Congress not continued to fund the space station program at $2.1 billion this year alone, incidently at the expense of folks back here on the Earth. I'm hopeful that the House position on the Advance Solid Rocket Motor [ASRM] Program will now finally prevail so that we can terminate the program along with the funding for the Selective Service Program.

I support the inclusion of $379 million in funding for the National Service Initiative, funding for the FDIC Affordable Housing Program, continued funding for veterans benefits and ongoing programs at HUD, the EPA and elsewhere that I think are significant in their contributions.

So many of the programs funded by this legislation are vital to our Nation and its citizens, especially the ongoing housing programs that we are funding at $19.4 billion in HUD along with the roughly half a million dollars in VA housing programs. We hear frequently cited the reports of people without health insurance. We do not hear as often about the millions who live in substandard housing, paying more than one-half of their income each month for rent, or both. We do not hear as often about the homeless. This bill will help meet some of the housing needs of the people we represent.

The agreement provides higher funding for important housing programs like public housing, including severely distressed public housing, and the CDBG Program. The conference agreement also recognizes the strengths of congregate housing services, providing $25 million for this program that I am interested in and strongly support. I am pleased at the provision of over $9 billion for assisted housing, $265 million for the successful public housing drug elimination grants program and $32 million for the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation.

In general, this measure takes a good direction in the funding of homeless assistance programs under this bill. I strongly support the reprogramming of funds from shelter plus care [SPC] to the Emergency Shelter Grants [ESG] Program for a conference level of $115 million. I also support supportive housing and funding dedicated for the program in the House-passed bill increased from $150 million last year to $334 million for fiscal year 1994. The agreement also provides $130 million for the essential FEMA Emergency Food and Shelter Program.

I am also pleased that we have found a way to fund a deserving program for community-based organizations serving homeless veterans as authorized under sections 3 and 4 of the Homeless Veterans Comprehensive Service Programs Act of 1992.

I am concerned, however about the de-funding the Interagency Council on the Homeless. Eliminating funds for the Interagency Council on the Homeless could cripple efforts to bring and keep all agencies into the circle of responsibility for addressing homelessness. While the Department of Housing and Urban Development has done a good job with their programs, the crisis of homelessness for people is so often not just a housing problem.

The funding for the interagency council cannot be restored here today. Notwithstanding that, we must look to reinstate as soon as possible a true interagency effort to ensure continued accountability and better services for homeless persons from the array of national departments and agencies who have primary on-going responsibility to outreach to the homeless population. Indeed, despite the specific rationale of the Senate report language to which the House is yielding, I must point out to my colleagues that the Gore Report on Reinventing Government actually identifies cross-department initiatives addressing the problems of the homeless as one of its strong organizational recommendations.

Mr. Speaker, I support this conference agreement with some reservations. I continue to question the science fiction-like programs and qualities of programs such as the space station program which is being generously maintained through this appropriation legislation and the ASRM program which shouldn't survive. In such lean budget years, I am really hard pressed to support legislation that provides for the continued cannibalization of our critically important domestic programs on earth for questionable and imagined space science research benefits and programs.

I remain hopeful that our future appropriations measures will see additional funding for assisted housing, section 8 assistance, and public housing as that funding is key to moving beyond the McKinney homeless programs to permanent housing for our citizens. That will only be possible if we can continue to redirect our priorities to address the human deficit which has grown so dramatically over the last decade. To achieve such change we must cut the excess of the space station, the ASRM and other questionable programs, and truly reorder our national priorities.

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in reluctant opposition to H.R. 2491, the fiscal year 1994 VA, HUD and independent agencies appropriations bill.

Although I realize the constraints under which the committee finds itself, I believe one serious mistake has been made. The national aerospace plane [NASP] has been canceled.

As my colleagues know, I have been involved in NASP since its days as a top secret program known as Copper Canyon. I strongly believe that this program is absolutely essential for our future aerospace industry and America's aerospace trade surplus. In addition, it is necessary to expand and continue our exploration of the last human frontier—space.

Although I commend the committee for their support for the high speed civil transport. It is a different program than NASP, with different, shorter term goals.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this is a tragic mistake for America and for mankind. It signals to me that we cannot make even the slightest investment in anything that does not have immediate benefits. Therefore, I must oppose this conference agreement.

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, facing a tight budget and a slim 602(b) allocation for over 25 different Federal agencies, the VA–HUD subcommittee has probably done as well as one might expect for veterans programs. However, when considering the inadequate numbers they started with, it is difficult for veterans to be pleased.

The bottom line, Mr. Speaker, is that Federal spending for veterans' programs in inflation adjusted dollars has not increased in more than a decade and its overall share of the Federal budget has been steadily eroding. Since 1965, spending for veterans programs increased by a mere 36 percent, while at the same time social welfare spending increased by an astounding 361 percent.

Mr. Speaker, veterans are willing to shoulder their share of deficit reduction. But, I am concerned that we are asking them to shoulder an ever increasing percentage every year.

When measured by 1988 dollars, veterans' programs, are taking a dive. They are not keeping pace with what is required. And the results are becoming ever more obvious in the services provided to our veterans—backlogs are rising and delays are commonplace. The backlog of VA compensation claims is approaching 900,000. By this time next year, it could be well over 1 million. The equipment backlog in VA hospitals is approaching $1 billion. We can do better for those who sacrificed to preserve America's freedom.

Mr. Speaker, it's a matter of priorities. I have very real concerns about the way taxpayer dollars are being spent. Tens of billions are going to fund mega science projects, public housing, housing research, education grants, and so-called volunteer programs. All in direct competition against veterans' programs.

I credit the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Stokes] chairman of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and independent agencies and the gentleman from California, JERRY LEWIS, the subcommittee's ranking member for all they were able to do for veterans under difficult circumstances.

However, I stand in opposition to the legislation. I am seriously concerned that this conference report, though written within the budget Congress adopted, is misdirected in its priorities and overspent in too many of its accounts. I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member rises to express his thanks to the distinguished chairman of the VA/HUD/Independent Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee, Mr. STOKES, the distinguished gentleman from California, the ranking Republican member of the subcommittee, Mr. LEWIS, and all of the House conferees on this measure for their efforts to include funding for an Indian Housing Loan Guarantee Program. While the conference report includes only $1 million for this program—as opposed to the House-passed level of $2 million—this modest amount will provide an opportunity to start the Indian Housing Loan Guarantee Program so as to prove its benefits to our native American populations who live on Indian reservations and its savings to the American taxpayer.

Because of the efforts of the conferees and their able staff to include funding for this program, Indian families living on tribal trust land, for the first time ever will have an opportunity for home ownership through private home loans.

Mr. Speaker, this Member would again express his gratitude for the efforts of the conferees because of the opportunity those efforts will provide to many native American families across our country.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 2491, the Veterans Affairs [VA] and Housing and Urban Development [HUD], and independent agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1994.

Agencies that H.R. 2491 funds, in addition to the VA and HUD, include the Environmental Protection Agency [EPA], the National Aeronautics and Space Administration [NASA], the National Science Foundation [NSF], the Federal Emergency Management Agency [FEMA], the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation [FDIC], the Resolution Trust Corporation [RTC], and the new Corporation for National and Community Service, which was established earlier this year. These various agencies support everything from community and neighborhood development to programs for the homeless, to disaster assistance, to pollution control, to medical care and treatment for veterans and their eligible beneficiaries.

The major EPA programs which are funded by this bill include pollution abatement, control, and compliance; wastewater treatment facilities; and oilspill prevention and response activities. The EPA also subsidizes the costs of loans made to needy local education agencies to remove hazardous asbestos in school buildings. It additionally operates the hazardous substance Superfund Program, which was established to clean up emergency hazardous materials and spills and dangerous, uncontrolled, and abandoned hazardous waste sites.

This bill also funds FEMA, the agency that is charged with coordinating the entire Federal disaster assistance response by providing support and relief to public entities, individuals, and families. This includes protective measures, debris clearance, the repair and restoration of damaged facilities, and temporary housing.

The funds provided in this bill enable the VA to administer benefits for veterans, family members of living veterans, and survivors of deceased veterans—28.7 percent of our total population. These benefits include pension payments; disability compensation payments; educational training and vocational assistance; guaranteed loans for housing assistance; life insurance policies; and inpatient care and treatment in hospitals, nursing homes, and clinics. The bill also provides for the major construction, modernization, alteration, and improvement of VA facilities, and supplies matching grants to assist States in the construction and establishment of State veterans' homes and nursing care facilities.

Through HUD, the bill funds programs that support our housing needs and the development and preservation of our communities. These include mortgage insurance programs that help families become homeowners and facilitate the construction and rehabilitation of rental units; rental assistance programs for lower income families who otherwise could not afford decent housing; programs that aid community and neighborhood development and preservation; and programs that help protect the home buyer in the marketplace.

One of HUD's most effective programs is the Community Development Block Grant, or CDBG, Program, which supports grants to State and local governments for local community development initiatives, such as decent, affordable housing, suitable living environments, and expansion of economic opportunity. These CDBG funds are often the only sources of revenue for new or previously unfunded public services, particularly in rural areas. These funds also generate local employment opportunities.

For example, CDBG loans to small businesses enable them to hire local workers, both temporarily and permanently. Colusa County, in my district, has participated in the CDBG Program for over 10 years now, and uses much of its CDBG funds for economic development. Its revolving loan fund for small businesses has enabled many of them to stay afloat and support the surrounding area. In Yolo County, CDBG funds are used primarily for housing rehabilitation; over 100 units have been rehabilitated since 1987. However, the county also lent CDBG economic development funds to a small firm for job creation. The firm has since then totally repaid the loan, and the county can now recycle the funds into a revolving loan fund for job generation in other small businesses.

This bill also provides funding for the new Corporation for National and Community Service, the President's National Service Program.

National Service will enable participants to work in programs that address unmet human, educational, environmental, and public safety needs. It will involve the most diverse range of Americans, from high school students to our oldest citizens, and will serve populations as diverse. And in exchange for their service, participants will receive financial assistance for their education.

These service programs will be defined and driven by the needs of States and local communities. Program participants will teach, tutor, and care for small children; run recycling programs; aid homebound individuals; provide home care for senior citizens; and clean up our parks and playgrounds. Communities will be served through Head Start centers, family support programs, community health centers, police departments, schools, conservation organizations, and in many other ways that work to meet the needs of that community in that community.

The conferees have set funding priorities for the wide variety of agencies and programs that this bill supports. Yet the total funding level in the bill that they have produced is within the subcommittee's funding target and below the President's budget request.

The conferees have managed to achieve a balance—between meeting the needs of the many Americans who depend on the programs and services that this bill funds and being fiscally responsible. This conference report will ensure that millions of Americans have access to decent housing and neighborhoods, quality medical care, and a clean environment. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support its passage.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). 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. SENSENBRENNER. 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 341, nays 89 not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 513]

YEAS—341

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Bateman
Becerra
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blackwell
Bliley
Boehlert
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cunningham
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Ewing
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Grandy
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Herger
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hoke
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hughes
Hutto
Hyde
Inslee
Istook
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
Kyl
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Lehman
Levin
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McKeon
McKinney
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Michel
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pickle
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Ridge
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Synar
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walsh
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—89

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Beilenson
Blute
Boehner
Bunning
Burton
Byrne
Callahan
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Coppersmith
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Everett
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Franks (NJ)
Gekas
Goodlatte
Goss
Grams
Hancock
Hefley
Hoagland
Hoekstra
Holden
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Inglis
Inhofe
Jacobs
Johnson, Sam
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Leach
Lewis (FL)
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
McInnis
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Moorhead
Nussle
Orton
Pallone
Paxon
Penny
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Portman
Ramstad
Roberts
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Schaefer
Sensenbrenner
Shuster
Smith (MI)
Smith (OR)
Solomon
Spence
Stump
Torkildsen
Walker
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—3

Engel
Ford (TN)
Pelosi

□ 1556

Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY and Messrs. HEFLEY, BAKER of Louisiana, GOODLATTE, and MINGE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. RAVENEL, MCHUGH, and KYL and Mrs. SCHROEDER 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.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Pursuant to House Resolution 275, the amendments in disagreement and the motions printed in the joint statement are considered as read.

The Clerk will designate the first amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 18: Page 18, line 17, after "1994" insert "; and up to $203,000,000 of amounts of budget authority for rental assistance under section 8 of the Act and section 162(h) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1987 recaptured during fiscal year 1992 as a result of the conversion of section 202 direct loans to capital grants".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STOKES

Mr. STOKES. 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. STOKES moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and concur therein.

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

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. 38: Page 24, strike out lines 20 to 23, and insert:

For the urban revitalization demonstration program under the third paragraph under the head "Homeownership and Opportunity for People Everywhere grants (HOPE grants)" in the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1993, Public Law 102-389, 106 Stat. 1571, 1579, $803,240,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the first proviso of such third paragraph, the Secretary shall have discretion to approve funding for more than fifteen applicants: *Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing amount that is used for the urban revitalization demonstration program shall be made available for an application that was not submitted to the Secretary by May 26, 1993: *Provided further*, That of the foregoing $803,240,000, the Secretary may use up to $2,500,000 for technical assistance under such urban revitalization demonstration, to be made available directly, or indirectly under contracts or grants, as appropriate: *Provided further*, That nothing in this paragraph shall prohibit the Secretary from conforming the program standards and criteria set forth herein, with subsequent authorization legislation that may be enacted into law: *Provided further*, That of the $803,240,000 made available under this heading, $20,000,000 shall be made to eligible grantees under the urban revitalization demonstration program, to implement programs authorized under subtitle D of title IV, and of which, $10,000,000 shall be made for youth apprenticeship training activities for joint labor-management organizations pursuant to section 3(c)(2)(B) of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, as amended.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STOKES

Mr. STOKES. 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. STOKES moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

For the urban revitalization demonstration program under the third paragraph under the head "Homeownership and Opportunity for People Everywhere grants (HOPE grants)" in the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1993, Public Law 102-389, 106 Stat. 1571, 1579, $778,240,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the first proviso in such third paragraph, the Secretary shall have discretion to approve funding for more than fifteen applicants: *Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing amount this is used for the urban revitalization demonstration program shall be made available for an application that was not submitted to the Secretary by May 26, 1993: *Provided further*, That of the foregoing $778,240,000, the Secretary may use up to $2,500,000 for technical assistance under such urban revitalization demonstration, to be made available directly, or indirectly, under contracts or grants, as appropriate: *Provided further*, That nothing in this paragraph shall prohibit the Secretary from conforming the program's standards and criteria set forth herein, with subsequent authorization legislation that may be enacted into law: *Provided further*, That of the $778,240,000 made available under this heading, $20,000,000 shall be made to eligible grantees under the urban revitalization demonstration program, to implement programs authorized under subtitle D of title IV, and of which, $10,000,000 shall be made for youth apprenticeship training activities for joint labor-management organizations pursuant to section 3(c)(2)(B) of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, as amended.

INNOVATIVE HOMELESS INITIATIVES DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

For the innovative homeless initiatives demonstration program as authorized by section 2 of the HUD Demonstration Act of 1993, $100,000,000, to remain available until expended.

CAPACITY BUILDING FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING

For the capacity building for community development and affordable housing program as authorized by section 4 of the HUD Demonstration Act of 1993, $20,000,000.

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

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 34, line 9, strike out "(b)(2)" and insert "(b)".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STOKES

Mr. STOKES. 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. STOKES moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and concur therein.

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

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. 113: Page 52, line 21, after "activities" insert": *Provided further*, That, pursuant to Public Law 102-486, an amount equal to not more than 50 percent of all utility energy efficiency and water conservation cash rebates received by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration may be made available for additional energy efficiency and water conservation measures, including facility surveys".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STOKES

Mr. STOKES. 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. STOKES moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 113, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert "*Provided further*, That, pursuant to Public Law 102-486, an amount equal to not more than 50 percent of all utility energy efficiency and water conservation cash rebates received by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration may be made available for additional energy efficiency and water conservation measures, including facility surveys".

"*Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this Act to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall be available for other than termination costs of the advanced solid rocket motor program."

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the amounts appropriated in this Act for fiscal year 1994 shall be: $4,853,500,000 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration "Space flight, control and data communications", $517,700,000 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration "Construction of facilities", $7,529,300,000 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration "Research and development", $1,480,853,000 for the Environmental Protection Agency "Hazardous substance superfund", $1,998,500,000 for the National Science Foundation "Research and related activities", and $110,000,000 for the National Science Foundation "Academic research infrastructure"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 275, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 30 minutes.

Is the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] opposed to the motion?

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

□ 1600

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the amendment to terminate the advanced solid rocket motor.

The fact is that we have a $1 billion state-of-the-art facility, owned by NASA, in Mississippi. It is 90 percent complete. The earlier conference agreement killed funding for the program unless a stringent set of circumstances is met, but did allow for completion of the facility. The gentleman from Wisconsin mentioned the $1 billion in the facility owned by NASA.

By doing so, we would be taking the most cost-effective approach in the long-run because it would provide NASA with the flexibility it needs to meet the challenges of manned space flight in the future. If the decision is made to go to a significantly higher orbit in future flights, we will need the ASRM, as attested to by NASA administrator Dan Goldin. And we would

need the capabilities offered at the Yellow Creek site in Mississippi.

Knocking out all funding and stopping completion of the work at Yellow Creek would greatly limit NASA's ability to respond to changes in the space program in the future. It also would preclude NASA from exploring other options at this modern, government-owned facility.

With this action, we are jeopardizing a solid and substantial investment in money, as well as putting severe limits on NASA's ability to plan for the future. I ask my colleagues to consider these points and to oppose the amendment to terminate ASRM.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I would like now to offer an amendment restoring the June House position on ASRM.

This amendment provides that no funds, except for termination costs, may be used for the Advanced Solid Rocket Motor Program.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, to be sure that there is no doubt about the issue, the amendment will transfer $57,500,000 from the NASA space flight, control and data communications account and the NASA construction of facilities account to the following accounts and programs: $20 million for NASA's national aerospace plane—NASP, in the research and development account; $12,500,000 to support scientists in a variety of strategic research endeavors as part of the research and related activities of the National Science Foundation; $10 million for the construction and procurement of research facilities and instruments within the National Science Foundation's infrastructure account; and $15 million for EPA's Hazardous Substance Superfund. I urge the Administrator to use some of these funds for an emerging area in environmental cleanup—the restoration of contaminated lands—brownfields—in urban areas to productive use.

Mr. Speaker, these activities will promote investments in high technology, scientific research, and environmental cleanup, and will restore the NASA ASRM funding to the level carried in the bill as it left the House last June.

This action will leave $100,000,000 in the NASA space flight account for termination costs only.

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

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

Mr. STOKES. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] for this amendment and urge my colleagues in the House to support it.

As one who has been a principal opponent of continued funding for the ASRM, let me say that I believe that the Stokes motion does what those of us that have wanted to defund the ASRM will do. That is, to provide money for termination costs only.

I do wish to advise the Chair that I intend to ask for a rollcall vote on adoption of the Stokes motion so that perhaps those in the other body will get the message that the time has come to terminate the ASRM. I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Ohio is overwhelmingly supported.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG].

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] and the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] and echo what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER], my colleague from Wisconsin, said just a minute ago, which is that I and most of the folks originally opposed to the ASRM fully endorse this amendment today to terminate the program and to essentially only spend the money we are obligated to spend to terminate the program as it now exists.

There is really no reason to beat up on ASRM any longer, but I think it is clear to a number of us who fought this issue over the last several years that the project has been wildly over budget and that it is a program now essentially designed and fully funded without a mission.

In fact, the most recent testimony indicates that the ASRM will finally be ready to go at about the same time the space shuttle missions are coming to an end.

This is a vote today that will save us, over the long run, about $2.6 billion in funding for the Advanced Solid Rocket Motor Program. I and a number of my colleagues, given the choice in the best of all worlds, would like to see the money banked and used to reduce the deficit. That is not an option, unfortunately, under the rules of the House.

I think it is still appropriate, however, that all of us who fought against ASRM so hard in the past today support the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] and terminate the program and finally at least put one notch on our belts for eliminating a wasteful, inefficient, and overbloated Government program.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, first let me thank the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] for yielding me this time. I want to rise in strong support of his motion with regard to the ASRM. I think that that is the best that can be done under the circumstances, and it comes close to the proposal that originally we had endorsed in the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. Mr. Speaker, I would like to engage the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for a brief colloquy relative to amendment 101 of the conference report.

The statement of managers explaining amendment 101 indicates that, in addition to placing a calendar date limitation on the availability of about half of the funds for the space station, that a cap will be in effect for the remainder of the funds. Further, the statement of managers indicates that a procedure has been agreed to governing the release of the remainder of that money.

While I recognize the expediency of the arrangement that the parties to this agreement were seeking to achieve, I want to state my strong belief that the issue of how the United States structures a cooperative arrangement with Russia on the space station will have far reaching effects—not only on space policy but also on foreign policy. This is a manner on which the entire House should have a say.

I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman three relevant questions about the procedure for the release of the money that is capped.

First, can the gentleman explain for the Members precisely what this procedure will be?

Second, can the gentleman explain how this agreement was reached?

Third, can the gentleman state precisely what criteria he will use to judge the acceptability of the administration's proposal for the space station in order to release the remainder of the appropriated funds?

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

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

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentleman's questions, let me say first that I cannot give the precise details on what procedure we would use.

But I can give him some idea of our thoughts at this time.

As I think the gentleman may be aware, both he and I and Mr. WALKER and Mr. LEWIS have expressed serious reservations concerning the so-called Russian option for the United States space station. We put those reservations in a letter to the Vice President.

□ 1610

Following that Senator MIKULSKI and I met with the Vice President and his National Security staff to discuss what options we could pursue to ensure that the House and the Senate had an opportunity to take a closer look at the effects of any further agreements reached between the United States and Russia concerning our space station.

I want the gentleman to know that I felt strongly that the Appropriations Committee had a special responsibility to the House in this case. I felt we should not simply appropriate $2.1 billion without having some idea about what space station we are buying.

I also think that if the gentleman looks at the language in the statement of the managers—he will see that concern expressed again—including the fact that we are spending $8 million a day on a space station that is, more or less, in limbo awaiting a decision on Russian participation.

Let me say further to the gentleman that my first choice in dealing with this issue was to have a second vote in the House either this fall or next spring.

In the first case, the Appropriations Committee would have meted out about $500 million and looked for a second vote at roughly the end of November. At that time, after consulting with the gentleman's committee, we would have determined whether we wanted to release the balance of the $1.6 billion for space station, dependent on what final arrangements had been reached with Russia.

In the second case, we would have meted out $1.1 billion and taken a second vote some time next March.

I think it is fair to suggest that the administration strongly urged that we not take station up for a second vote either this fall or next spring. To be fair, I believe they are fully aware of our concerns and will actively try to ensure that those concerns are carefully considered in any discussions with the Russian Government.

So the compromise that we came up with makes use of a longstanding arrangement with NASA which permits the Committees on Appropriations to cap programs and subsequently release money, providing that the use of the money meets the satisfaction of the committee and of other Members of the House.

While I would agree with the gentleman from California that this procedure is certainly not the best available and was not the preferred procedure—I think it is only fair to point out that since the responsibility for appropriating the money in the first place rests with the Appropriations Committee—it seems reasonable that we should have some control and responsibility for how it is spent.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the gentleman that as we see events unfold over the coming month or two concerning what impact the Russian option will have on our space station, we will fully involve both the gentleman from California, [Mr. BROWN] and other members of his committee including, of course, the minority.

And, finally, Mr. Speaker, in terms of what criteria we would use to judge the acceptability of the administration's proposal for space station in order to release the remainder of the appropriated funds, I think it would be fair to suggest that the basis of that criteria will be the concerns expressed in the joint letter that we sent to the Vice President on September 21.

At the core of those concerns is our view that whatever Russian contributions are agreed upon for station, and I believe the gentleman from California shares that view, that that contribution be enhancing rather than enabling.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that my response is satisfactory, and we will discuss these issues more in the coming weeks.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to state my belief that the distinguished gentleman and I are in full agreement on the substance of this issue, and I look forward to continuing the consultative relationship we have had at the time that the administration submits a request to release the remainder of the appropriated funding next year.

However, I would also like to make the point that this procedure by which funds appropriated by Congress are further withheld, controlled, or directed by nonlegislative correspondence would be unconstitutional if it were included in the legislation itself. Furthermore, it denies the whole House a fundamental right. As my colleagues may know, I am firmly opposed to actions taken in report language that would be illegal or contradict the rules of the House if it were bill language. I hope that my colleagues will join me in taking a serious look at this issue in the future.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the House has spoken very clearly on the issue of the ASRM. I think it should be said for the RECORD, however, that it was the intent of the subcommittee to move in the direction of closing down ASRM. We simply felt early on that there was a need to keep at least a crack open in case we do formulate an agreement with the Russians that leads to the requirement for a booster that will enable us to fulfill that agreement with the Russians.

The House has given very clear directions to us at this moment. Should we find ourselves in the circumstance, however, that we have an agreement somewhere down the line with the Russians, we may have to revisit the subject. The House should be on notice of that fact.

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

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would rise in support of the motion of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], and commend both the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] and the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] for their cooperation on this issue.

I would also like to say that as somebody who has been fighting ASRM, the advanced solid rocket motor, since the committee offering an amendment to kill this, there have been so many Members of the body that have worked hard in doing this. The gentlewoman from Utah [Ms. SHEPHERD], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG], and a host of people are trying to do what is in the merits of good science and what is going to be in the taxpayers' interests as well, too.

Without going too much into the copious history of this particular project, I will reiterate that this particular project was 100 percent, or was going to be 100 percent, over budget. It was not going to be completed until its mission of putting a space station up was already done, so we would have this done in the year 2001, and the space station, if we continued to fund that, would need to be up way before that. I think just on the merits of this project, this was not one that was in the best interests of science.

Second, an issue of the integrity of the House was at stake. We had spoken very strongly on this issue, not once but twice. We hope it will not need a third or fourth or fifth time to kill this.

Third, the budget deficit is a very important issue in consideration of this project. We complain that it will take $100 million to close down and terminate this project, but on the side, we would have spent $3 billion to complete this project that would not have been in the best interests of the NASA budget.

Finally, in conclusion, I would just like to say that we have put nails in the coffin of ASRM before. We were hoping that the rule that we passed with 305 votes was going to be a stake in the heart, and we hope now the motion of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] will be a silver bullet to kill this particular project.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

Mr. Speaker, I am in full support of H.R. 2591, the funding bill for the veterans affairs and housing and urban development agencies.

The funding provided in this bill is critical to families across America, and we need to assure that this most necessary funding gets out to those who need it.

There are many veterans in my district who rely on health services from their VA hospital. The programs funded through this bill are essential to them, and we need to assure them

that the programs they have come to rely upon will be there when they need it.

I am grateful to Chairman STOKES for crafting this legislation. I appreciate his leadership on the issues of veterans affairs, housing, and space science.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment that terminates the advanced solid rocket motor. While a great deal of misinformation has been provided by opponents, these facts remain:

Following the *Challenger* tragedy, the Presidential commission which studied the accident called for the creation of the ASRM program to provide for greater safety, reliability, boost capability and management control for our manned-space effort. Thus the competition for a government owned, contractor operated facility went forward. Yellow Creek, MI, was chosen because its preexisting infrastructure saved time and money in the construction process and it had the best transportation system.

Today, $1.9 billion has been invested in the program and the facilities that would build a motor providing for at least an additional 12,000 pounds of payload are 90 percent complete. This would allow NASA to meet international commitments of a space station design to go to 51.6 degrees or more. NASA Administrator Dan Goldin has said that in order to get to the higher inclination, which was endorsed by the space station *Freedom* redesign panel, "We have got to have the ASRM."

Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal invested in this program not only in money, but also in the dreams of our manned space program. We must not waste this solid investment and I urge defeat of the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I have pointed out these facts in earlier consideration of this issue and we are meeting with other Members to see what can be done to best use this asset if the amendment is accepted.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The question is, will the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 113 and concur with an amendment?

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. 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 401, nays 30, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 514]

YEAS—401

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blackwell
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings
Hayes
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Huffington
Hughes
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Inslee
Istook
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kreidler
Kyl
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McKinney
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Myers
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Ridge
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Synar
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Towns
Tucker
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weldon
Wheat
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—30

Bacchus (FL)
Bachus (AL)
Bevill
Browder
Callahan
Cramer
Derrick
Everett
Gekas
Geren
Hall (TX)
Hochbrueckner
Lightfoot
Livingston
McCloskey
Mica
Mineta
Montgomery
Murtha
Parker
Pickett
Pickle
Quillen
Sundquist
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Thompson
Torricelli
Traficant
Whitten

NOT VOTING—2

Engel
Ford (TN)

□ 1639

Messrs. PICKETT, HOCHBRUECKNER, GEKAS, DERRICK, and TANNER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. ZIMMER, KNOLLENBERG, and WELDON changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the House receded from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 113 and concurred with an amendment.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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 58, line 16, strike out "$5,000,000" and insert: "$25,000,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STOKES

Mr. STOKES. 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. STOKES moves that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 129.

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SOLOMON

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SOLOMON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 129 and concur therein.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of determining the appropriate allocation of time for debate on my motion, I would, after consultation with the committee chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] and the ranking member, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], ask unanimous consent that the 1 hour of debate time be equally divided between the two of them and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] on that side and myself on this side, each with 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Accordingly, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] will be recognized for 15 minutes; the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] will be recognized for 15 minutes; the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] will be recognized for 15 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] will be recognized for 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, I have some good news for Members. If we pass the Solomon-Montgomery motion to save the Selective Service System, this good conference report, and it is a good bill, bypasses the Senate. It goes directly to the President for his signature and it helps guarantee that we are going to adjourn before Thanksgiving. So let us all support the Solomon-Montgomery motion.

Mr. Speaker, the opponents of Selective Service claim that the mission of the agency is no longer necessary because the cold war is over, but the ability to mobilize and draft people quickly is not entirely about the cold war.

The United States needed to draft people during the Korean war.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] be able to go home for Thanksgiving, regardless of how the vote turns out.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, back to serious business. The United States needed to draft people during the Korean war and the Vietnam war, and those were not wars with the former Soviet Union. Most recently, events in Russia, in Somalia, in Bosnia and other flashpoints around the world showed the wisdom of staying prepared for unpredictable emergencies.

Mr. Speaker, God forbid if nuclear controls in Russia or one of the former Soviet Republics ever fall into the wrong hands. The strategic situation in Europe and across the Atlantic would be transformed in a split second; we all know that.

What if the worst were to happen in Korea, another unstable region of the world, and we did not have the backup to reinforce our active duty troops? North Korea is only 1 year away at most from having a nuclear weapon. It already has the missile capability of hitting South Korea and hitting Japan.

Mr. Speaker, the top military people in this country believe we must maintain the capability to mobilize quickly, especially at a time of dramatic reductions in the size of our active-duty military forces.

We heard a dramatic speech on this floor by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] about this very subject the other day.

Senator SAM NUNN believes it would be a serious mistake to terminate the Selective Service System, and he said so during the debate in the other body.

But listen to who else is opposed to abolishing Selective Service. Senator JOHN GLENN, Senators BARBARA MIKULSKI, TOM DASCHLE, SIMON, and DODD, Senator BYRD, and a majority of the Senate agree with Senator SAM NUNN.

Since the vote in the House, each of the Armed Services chiefs has come out in strong support of retaining Selective Service.

I would also point out that Gen. Colin Powell, as recently as the other day when many of us had lunch with him, stated that the earlier House vote was a serious mistake. Here is what General Powell said about Selective Service:

America needs to keep the option of rapidly reconstituting its forces, and I urge that we maintain the Selective Service System.

Even more importantly, Mr. Speaker, ever since draft registration was reinstated, millions of young Americans have lived up to their obligations as U.S. citizens. They have obeyed the law of the land and they have registered for the draft. Ninety-seven percent of them have obeyed that law, while the other 3 percent got off scot free. To now say we are going to pardon them, and that is exactly what we are doing if we abolish this agency, to say we are going to pardon them and make them eligible for all Federal benefits and all the grants is a slap in the face to every patriotic American, particularly those who went to serve in the Armed Services.

I do not have to tell you about this list of 19 veterans' organizations who feel very strongly about this.

Mr. Speaker, let me just give one last reason. In my State of New York and in the State of California and a number of other States, military recruiters for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force are not allowed on high school campuses. They are not allowed to come there and offer young men, 17 and 18 years of age, and young women, too, an honorable career in our military. They are prohibited from going on campus. Many times the only place we can make these names available to the recruiters is from Selective Service lists. That is one of the reasons why we desperately need to maintain the Selective Service System; otherwise we are going to go back to 1979 when all we were attracting into the military were people who were just looking for jobs. They were desperate. We were not getting a cross-section of America.

We need to maintain an all-volunteer military to deal with these critical issues that will be coming before our country. One of the ways we can do that is simply by restoring 80 percent of the recommended funding for the Selective Service System, $25 million. This is an amount which has not gone up in over 10 years. They have been tightening their belts for 10 years. They will continue to do so, but let us stay prepared.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the Solomon-Montgomery amendment when it comes to a vote in a few minutes.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion of the gentleman from New York to recede and concur to the Senate amendment that restores funding for the Selective Service System.

I urge Members to vote down the motion of the gentleman from New York. After it is defeated, I will offer a motion to insist on the House position to appropriate $5 million to terminate the Selective Service System.

On June 29, the House voted to terminate funding for Selective Service. On October 1, during the VA–HUD conference, the Senate declined to agree to the House position. My counterpart, Senator MIKULSKI, and I could not compromise because there is no middle ground on this issue—Selective Service is either necessary or it is not. For that reason, the Senator and I agreed to bring the issue back to both Houses, and follow the will of the Congress.

I ask you today to reaffirm the House position and vote to terminate Selective Service. I urge this for three reasons:

First, Selective Service is not a military necessity;

Second, it harms inner-city youth; and

Third, and it takes money away from important programs.

Selective Service is not a military necessity because the volunteer army has succeeded in dealing with every crisis for 20 years, including Desert Storm. DOD planning projections show no need for a draft unless Russia rebuilds as a superpower. If a military need were to arise, Selective Service would be superfluous because the military has insufficient training facilities for inductees.

Selective Service harms inner-city youth because young men failing to register cannot receive student loans or Government jobs. Selective Service has proven incapable of reaching these youths and encouraging them to register. Once they have not registered, they can never obtain student loans, or Federal jobs, or often State student loans, or jobs in State governments.

Selective Service takes money away from other high priority programs. Funding for Selective Service can be used to help veterans, aid the homeless, produce affordable housing, protect the environment, and support scientific research. The need for money to address problems in these areas is unquestioned, yet the Congress is often forced to reduce these expenditures because of the need to reduce the deficit. If deficit reduction is going to be accomplished, it should begin here.

If we ever again need general conscription, we should follow the examples of World War II and the cold war. The United States initiated registration in 1940, a year before the World War II draft became necessary. After World War II, the United States disbanded Selective Service, reconstituted it in 1948 as the dangers of the cold war became manifest. If a global challenge were to arise again that would require conscription, we could do as we did in the past, and simply reconstitute Selective Service. In the meantime, while we have no need, we should take resources from Selective Service and apply them to worthy and necessary programs or to reduce the deficit.

I urge Members to vote down the motion of the gentleman from New York.

□ 1650

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great reservation that I rise to speak on this matter at all. As a matter of fact, I think the House is perfectly capable of quickly working its will on this matter. Nonetheless, my chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], has indicated rather clearly that, if Selective Service once again is a need of the country, we can recreate that system. The people have demonstrated more than once that they are extremely responsive in times of crisis. In the meantime, there is approximately $25 million a year, moneys that are expended year in and year out, where the need is in question.

Because of my reservations about this yearly spending for the sake of local bureaucracies, I recommend the House terminate the Selective Service.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] a perfect gentleman. He has yielded us 15 minutes of his 30 minutes of time because he knows of our interest in this important matter, and I certainly rise, in strong support, to accept the Senate amendment that was made by the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON]. I strongly believe it is in the national security interest to continue funding for the Selective Service System.

As my colleagues know, Mr. Speaker, the selective service has always been there to provide an inexpensive insurance policy in the event of major crises. I am not sure that really this is a proper way to eliminate a Government agency, by cutting off the money without other committees having some input, especially on an issue that affects the military security of this country. If we kill selective service today, I do not care what my colleagues say. It would take a year or longer to implement or call up a national emergency. That might be too late.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly believe that if the Persian Gulf war had lasted another 6 months and we had suffered a large number of casualties, volunteers for the services would have fallen off, and the draft would have had to have been implemented. Thank God this did not happen. I totally support the all volunteer system, but at certain times we may again need the draft and need it quickly.

Can we really, Mr. Speaker, take the chance to not fund this insurance policy for another year at really the cost of less than one F–16 fighter aircraft? We have eliminated the funding for the ASRM, so the subcommittee would have no problem finding the $25 million for Selective Service for next year.

Mr. Speaker, the 18-year-olds in our country are not clamoring to do away with the registration. Over 97 percent, and I got these figures from the Director of Selective Service, over 97 percent of those 18-year-olds have gone to the post office, and they have signed up. I think they are proud to be a part of this program that adds to the security of our Nation. After reaching the age of 26, Mr. Speaker, they are dropped from the rolls.

It seems that the House of Representatives is really the only group that wants to eliminate the Selective Service System. The earlier vote on this amendment was very close, 207 to 202 in the Committee of the Whole, and I really think we have the opportunity today to turn it around.

Of course we all hope that, even if the System is saved, we will never have to go back to the draft. But, as we know, the world is really a dangerous place out there with flames burning in Bosnia, Russia, Somalia, the Middle East, and any of these places could explode into a major crisis and spread into other countries very quickly. A major use of our forces could call for a draft, and the Selective Service System is in place to implement that mobilization.

Mr. Speaker, this is a strong point that I would like to stress to my colleagues today:

The Director of the Selective Service System tells me they are prepared with the equipment and personnel in an emergency to quickly call up doctors, nurses, medical technicians, and other key personnel in a short time. Even if we might not need draftees in the first months of a war, we need all the medical personnel we can find to treat the wounded. We have a terrible shortage in the military of plastic surgeons and orthopedic surgeons. This is a quick way to call up these health care professionals. We can do it, the Director tells me, within 42 days.

The Selective Service System has a good reputation across the country. The leading citizens in our communities serve on selective service boards without pay. In fact, there are 11,000 unpaid community volunteers who are willing to serve in this capacity, and my colleagues in Congress know of these distinguished citizens in our communities back home. There are only 230 civilian paid jobs in the Selective Service and about 650 part-time military reservists and national guardsmen to work with this volunteer network across the country.

Mr. Speaker, why destroy the Selective Service System when we have no idea what the future holds for the United States in this troubled world? The Director of the Selective Service told me that, if it is not funded today, he is closing down the Selective Service System on December 1. What a tragedy that could be to our country.

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support the motion and accept the Senate amendment.

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I could not agree with the gentleman more. I wish I had given as clear and as well thought out a set of comments as the gentleman just did.

I might say that the Selective Service System, as well as the entire national security system that we have in our country, is an insurance policy. This is a part of it. We in this Congress are the bottom line for the national defense, and the national security and national interests of our country. The Constitution so states we should live up to that responsibility.

This is a very unsettled world, an uncertain world. Who could have predicted, whether it be Pearl Harbor or Saddam Hussein, their actions lo those many 50-plus years ago or just a few years ago?

□ 1700

This is an insurance policy which we cannot let lapse. That is what we are voting on, an insurance policy for the future. Let us vote today to keep it. I support the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], and I support the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] in his motion. I certainly hope it will prevail.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER] a veteran, a new Member of this House, and a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON], and also the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], on this issue. I join all my colleagues to maintain the Selective Service.

Mr. Speaker, the Selective Service is not a dinosaur of the cold war, but is truly, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] has said, a viable insurance policy for this Nation during a time of peace.

Mr. Speaker, in issues of statecraft, we must decide with our heads, not the emotion of the moment, on whether there is the emotion to cut spending in certain areas. There is a tremendous tone in that, but we have to think with our head. There is greater instability in the world now then ever before. As we debate issues on the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs, as we look out there at the hot spots around the world, right now, as we downsize the military, we like to talk about what is facing us up to year 1997 with defense cuts, and go to what is called the win-hold-win strategy.

The win-hold-win strategy basically says you can go out there and fight a Desert Storm conflict. And if the recalcitrant commander of North Korea pours across the line, they are supposed to hold until we win the Desert Storm, and then we can go finish out the Korea.

Well, I would hate to be the soldiers in the hold category, especially when we need the rapid response.

So I disagree with my colleagues who say that we can have an immediate rapid response and call up the Selective Service, because it will take up to a year to bring them there.

We talk about a viable insurance policy. This is really a pool. And this pool also sends a message to our youth of greater responsibility. So I disagree with my colleague from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] when he talked about that this really harms the inner-city youth.

No, it does not harm the inner-city youth. It injects greater responsibility and empowers the inner-city youth. The inner-city youth, if we tap into those and they come forward and they serve the U.S. military, they learn things about discipline and courtesy and respect and reverence and honor. And when you empower the inner city, you bring them to higher levels.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all my colleagues to maintain the Selective Service and vote "yes."

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. CLEMENT].

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we are all looking for ways to cut costs, and I surely have deliberated about cutting the Selective Service. Why do we need it? But I have had firsthand experience with the Selective Service, because I have had to serve in one of those units in previous years.

The Selective Service System is an inexpensive insurance policy in the event of a national emergency. We know of all of the regional and ethnic conflicts in the world that we know will continue. But we also need to know what our manpower is and what our resources are, in a moment's notice, in case of real emergencies.

Ninety-nine percent of all young men turning 18 have no problem with registering and are proud to carry their registration card in their wallets.

Mr. Speaker, these organizations totally support keeping the Selective Service System: American Legion, Non Commissioned Officers Association, Am Vets, Marine Corps League, National Guard Association, Military Order of the Purple Heart, Air Force Sergeants Association, Association of the U.S. Army, Jewish War Veterans, Reserve Officers Association, The Retired Officers Association, Fleet Reserve Association, and Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. Speaker, all of these organizations which represent over 10 million Americans, support the continuation of the Selective Service. Vote "yes" to save the Selective Service.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to associate myself with the comments of my friend, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON]. They are patriots and have supported defense and the military and Selective Service in the past.

Mr. Speaker, this is an issue of national security. We have a strange dichotomy in this country. We fight our wars, like Vietnam, Desert Storm, Somalia, and hopefully not Haiti. But then we scale down our military after that. And what I would like to address is the policy that some Members in the House are directing, which I feel will hurt us in the military.

Mr. Speaker, if we followed the policies of these same individuals that are trying to cut Selective Service in Desert Storm, we would still be there, at a great loss of life. If we followed the policies that we have followed in Somalia, we will lose more lives, and it will not be effective. The policy of putting our troops under U.N. control, this is a policy which is bad. And the same Members are trying to effect the elimination of the Selective Service.

Mr. Speaker, in that dichotomy, where we cut down the troops, in the Clinton package we cut defense $127 billion, this same group is attacking defense, where 80 percent of the cuts, come after 1996. Where do they want to make all of the cuts? They want to make it in the national security of this country. Even impacted aid in education for students of military families is being cut under the package. Every item under defense, these same people are cutting.

Mr. Speaker, we need to reinstate and keep viable the Selective Service Program. In 1948, when they reinstituted the Selective Service Program, it was because they made a mistake.

Mr. Speaker, to the chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], whom I have great respect for, in the inner cities, I think the gentleman would find that every boy and girl, every man and woman, who has entered the service, and even has to sign up and take that responsibility, that is one of the things we try to teach our children, responsibility. Every man and woman that enters the service and accepts that responsibility, and, according to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] 97 percent of them do that, I think they benefit from this program.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that we adhere to and maintain the Selective Service System.

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to respond to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] for a moment. The gentleman mentioned inner-city youth. I, of course, raised that in my statement. That is one of the basic problems that confront us.

I just want to say that we learned from our hearings that Selective Service did not have any meaningful, effective way of being able to have an outreach program for these inner-city youth. These youth are not particularly attracted to the full service, or at

least not to registering for Selective Service. If, as we found, they do not register, they find themselves penalized by not being able to get loans to go to college, or by not being able to get jobs and things of that sort.

That is one of the basic problems. We do not want to hurt youth. But let me tell you—these young people are very patriotic. But the problem is that the selective service program is not set up effectively to reach them. Yet they wind up being penalized.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, under the program 97 percent of our youth do sign up for this. We are talking about 3 percent that turn out to be mavericks. Those that do, we use this as a tool for our recruiting, which is a benefit to our national security.

So I disagree with the gentleman and say it is a benefit to the inner cities and outer cities as well.

□ 1710

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TANNER].

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, this issue, as surely as any issue we debate, is one of national security policy. It should not be debated, in my opinion, in this context of whether to fund this program or not fund. it should be made in consultation with the Pentagon, with the Committee on Armed Services and with others who are charged, legally, with the responsibility of focusing and fashioning a national security policy for this country.

To terminate the funding, in my judgment, bypasses all of the safeguards that we have in the Congress as we try to cooperate with the executive branch and make a meaningful national security policy.

May I further say that to terminate right now would send a chilling signal, in my opinion, to the rest of the world as it relates to our resolve to exercise our responsibility in the world as the world's foremost source for peace. To terminate this program now, to eradicate the database that exists therein, would take, as some have said, a year to reconstruct. We may not have a year because, my colleagues, as certain as I am standing here, the only certainty in this uncertain world is further uncertainty. That has been said again and again by people who are far more learned than I am.

I would just say in this day when we are trying to fashion MediGuard to utilize our Reserve Forces so that when we have that national emergency in the future, God forbid it should ever come, we have the ability to respond and to protect our troops.

As the chairman said earlier, this program should be sustained now.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I do not believe there is any Member of the House speaking to this issue who does not want to play a role to make certain that America is ready, should we need to exercise quickly men and women serving their country at a time of crisis. Five hundred thousand well-trained and equipped American fighting men and women were deployed to the Persian Gulf theater, halfway around the world, without a mandatory draft. That deployment did not come near to exhausting our Reserve capabilities, and the operation's success speaks volumes about what we can accomplish with All-Volunteer Forces.

We stopped drafting people in 1973 and did not reestablish the Selective Service System until 1979, precisely when the Soviets invaded Afghanistan. That means we did without a draft for 6 years during the very height of the cold war.

The draft is currently capable of delivering 100,000 inductees within 28 days of mobilization. Current DOD war fighting doctrine would utilize untrained draftees only in the event of a global war. If we have a national security need, it is to maintain a trained force structure that is made up of volunteers rather than mobilizing inductees.

The system is working at this point, and there is little question that the American people will respond should we face a time of crisis.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the very distinguished ranking Republican on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, one of the most respected Members of this House.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in strong support of preserving our Nation's Selective Service System.

Regretably, and I believe that all of our colleagues recognize it, we are living in troubled times, when our Nation is being called upon to provide peacemakers and peacekeepers in hot spots throughout the world: in Somalia, in Haiti, and the possibility at a later date in Bosnia.

What are the underlying costs of this issue before us and what are we complaining about? We are complaining about a possible $25 million expenditure compared to a total budget, a defense budget of over a quarter of a trillion dollars. It seems to me that $25 million is an inexpensive insurance policy to make certain that we will be prepared to meet any future emergency—dollars well spent to assure our preparedness in the event of any major emergency. To rebuild this system that we are about to tear apart, if we do not approve this proposal, it is estimated it would take over a year to put our Selective Service System back in place, not to mention regathering all the volunteers who are involved in this system.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to recede to the Senate's position, partially restoring funding for our Nation's Selective Service System.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO].

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Here we are again. This House has already spoken on this issue. This House has already determined that the cold war is over, that the Soviets are out of Afghanistan, and we no longer need to make a political statement in the face of that Soviet invasion, which is what Jimmy Carter did when he reinstated the draft, despite the fact that his own director of the Selective Service Bernard Rotzger, had already developed a comprehensive report that said that draft registration was unneeded and draft registration would do nothing, draft registration would do nothing to enhance the readiness of this country.

Mr. Speaker, mostly on the other side of the aisle and some on this aisle, seem to underestimate the willingness of the American people to regard serious threats to the United States and to live up to their patriotic duty. In every major American conflict around the world, every war that we have entered into, the volunteers exceeded the capacity of our training facilities for months until that war. In the case of the gulf war, 6 months after mobilization began, we still had Reservists queued up and waiting for training.

There is not the training capacity to bring the raw recruits forward, unless Members are anticipating casualties on the sort of scenario of 500,000 or 600,000 in a very short period of time. There is no threat that the Department of Defense can anticipate that would bring that about, absent a reintegrated and mobilized Soviet Union invading Europe. Of course, they have to fight their way through Eastern Europe first, so I think we would have quite a bit of notice and quite a bit of time to get our forces, again, get them mobilized and get them trained.

There is no realistic threat under which we are going to use these lists of 18- to 26-year-old Americans. There is no need for this. It is a cold war relic.

Colleagues, let us not just say, "Oh, it is just $29 million. We can't be bothered with cutting that out of the budget." Cutting the budget has to start somewhere. If Members are unwilling to cut the super collider at a billion, they are unwilling to cut the space station, they are unwilling to cut the solid fuel rocket motors, let us start here, $29 million for an outmoded cold war relic.

□ 1720

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HUTTO].

Mr. HUTTO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I applaud the eloquent statement that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] as well as others have made on the importance of Selective Service.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs made one excellent point that I would like for him to amplify on. He mentioned that in the gulf war, if the situation had arisen and we needed more, I know the Active Forces, the Reserves, do a tremendous job, but we do not know what emergencies may come up. We did not know we were going to have the gulf war.

I would ask the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], how long would it take if we had to draw on this reservoir of registrants.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUTTO. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, it would take at least a year or longer. We have the statistics to prove that. The gentleman makes a great point about the Persian Gulf war.

On the Persian Gulf war, we were on the edge of having to implement the draft. If we would have had more casualties in the Persian Gulf war, the volunteers would have fallen off tremendously and we would have gone to the draft. We are only talking about 2 years ago that we nearly went to the draft, anyway.

Certainly, let us not throw out the whole system today. I hope our colleagues would vote "aye."

Mr. HUTTO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. We have talked about the readiness of our forces, and again, the Active Reserve and the Guard do a great service, but we have heard a lot about insurance today. I think for the security of our Nation we should retain the Selective Service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The Chair would observe that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] has the right to close debate.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let me just briefly respond to my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], because he brought up the young people in our inner cities, about whom we are all so concerned. When I look at our military today, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER] talked about this a little bit, they are the best-trained, they are the best-equipped, the most highly motivated young men and women, I think, ever to serve in our military. I was over in the Persian Gulf and I have been with our NATO troops in Europe, they are truly outstanding.

The big thing is that they are a real cross-section of America. They come from all walks of life. That is what is so necessary. I look at some of the kids I have talked with who served in the military after coming from the inner city. They served for 2 years, 3 years, 4 years.

I was talking to one the other day who had been in the military for 20 years, a career officer. He is a black man. He is so proud of his service. When he got out, he did like all the rest, he went back to the inner city. He went back to where he grew up and became a citizen. He told me, "You know, I learned respect. I learned the meaning of the words 'patriotism, voluntarism, pride'. I learned how not to use drugs. I even got a little religion."

That is what he took back to his community. That is how important this is.

Mr. STOKES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I am glad to yield to my best friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me. I can appreciate very much what the gentleman is saying. I have no doubt that this young man feels exactly that way.

The point is that the gentleman did that, that the young man did that without the Selective Service requiring him to do that. He did that as a volunteer youth. He went into the service, and there is no problem with that. We are getting plenty of inner-city youth who volunteer. Some people are claiming there are too many inner-city youth in the military.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, can I reclaim my time? The gentleman has time of his own.

Mr. STOKES. I would yield the gentleman additional time, if he wants.

If the gentleman will continue to yield, I just want to say to the gentleman that he is making an effective argument, I think, for the fact that we do not need selective service. These young men will volunteer as patriots.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman just made my point. The whole point is that in so many of the big cities, in particular, the school boards do not want to let our military recruiters come onto these campuses and explain to students that there is a career there where they can better themselves and come home later on and make their communities a better place to live. That is why we need this enrollment list, so we can reach out and get those young people. Otherwise, nobody tells them. The guidance counselors will not tell them.

Mr. Speaker, let me just sum up by saying that back on June 28, this House rejected this same amendment to restore 80 percent of the recommended funds, tightening the belt of the Selective Service System but keeping it going. We lost by one vote.

Mr. Speaker, since that time, when this amendment lost by one vote, there has been a near revolution in Russia. Members do not realize how close that attempted coup came to putting hardline Communists back in power, with their fingers on the triggers of nuclear weapons. Mr. Speaker, we have just had some tragic losses in Somalia. And now there is even talk of putting 25,000 troops into a place called Bosnia, into an internal dispute that Hitler could not solve with 42 divisions and 200,000 men. We need to be prepared. That is all this amendment does.

Mr. Speaker, I ask every Member of this House to please vote "yes" on this motion to recede to the Senate position. We will then send this legislation directly to the President. He will sign it, and we will be on our way home, eating turkey on Thanksgiving at home instead of being here on this floor arguing. I urge support of the amendment.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I think we can see from the debate that has taken place on this floor this afternoon why we brought this matter back in true disagreement from the Senate. There obviously is a very genuine, philosophical difference on this issue on both sides. I think it is an important debate. I also think it is important for us to realize that the Committee on Appropriations, the committee that has to fund this program, has a responsibility to report to the House when we have a situation of this sort.

We made inquiry into this program. We did not just suddenly say, "Take $25 million out of a program," just picking it out of the air. We held hearings on this matter. We talked with Selective Service. We had input from the Department of Defense. So this matter was fairly gone into in order to try and bring to the House what we felt would be a responsible recommendation.

One of the things I would like to clear up is the fact that the period of a year to reconstitute Selective Service has been mentioned several times here today. In the testimony that came before our subcommittee we were told that it would take 6 months to reconstitute Selective Service.

What we are talking about here today, however, is not any lack of patriotism on the part of American youth. There has never been a lack of patriotism on the part of any of America's youth. They have responded to

every war, every national emergency this country has ever had. In fact, part of the problem is that we get too many. We cannot even utilize all of them. It is not a question of patriotism, it is a question of whether we continue to put $25 million a year into an archaic system.

Mr. Speaker, we have not used this system now in 20 years. We did not use it for Grenada, we did not use it for Desert Storm—we have not needed it for any of the skirmishes we have been involved in around the world. This is $25 million a year that we are putting into an archaic system.

Mr. Speaker, the Selective Service had said to us that they could deliver 100,000 inductees 28 days after mobilization. When we asked some questions, the Department of Defense stated, and I am going to quote from the testimony before our subcommittee, that they did not intend "* * * to utilize draftees unless it becomes necessary to reconstitute our forces to a level sufficient to deal with a global war. Under these circumstances, new or expanded training bases would be constituted prior to mobilization."

In other words, DOD does not have the facilities to train and house the draftees once they are inducted.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, one of the points is that I was a volunteer myself. I was not inducted under the Selective Service. I also know that during Vietnam we had many volunteers. I would like to think that those volunteers that are patriotic, that serve their country, also be supported by those that do not want to volunteer. Selective service provides that those Americans that choose to avoid the draft are also held responsible and support their country.

Mr. STOKES. In that vein, Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the gentleman, I think, is forgetting about a very real problem we have with inner-city youth. We have the same problem that relates to the census, the reason there is an undercount, because many of them do not want to be on registration, and they are not told to register and things of that sort.

□ 1730

In this case they are penalized if they do not register. But in the same category you have many young men who go into the service simply because they cannot even find a job out here in our society. So they go in there to be able to get a job, to get a chance to go to college and get an education, and things of this sort.

So the basic problem is not the one the gentleman mentions. The basic problem is the fact that we do not want to penalize young men for not registering for an arcane system.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STOKES. I would just say, Mr. Speaker, in closing, I hope that the House today will realize that once before we did take the money out of Selective Service. When we went to the Senate we maintained the House position, and that is why we brought it back, that all this money should be taken out of Selective Service. I urge my colleagues to vote down the Solomon-Montgomery motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, will the House recede from its disagreement with the Senate to Senate amendment No. 129 and concur therein?

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

Mr. SOLOMON. 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 236, nays 194, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 515]

YEAS—236

Abercrombie
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Canady
Castle
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crapo
Cunningham
Darden
Deal
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
English (OK)
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Fingerhut
Fish
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Frost
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Geren
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hayes
Hefley
Herger
Hilliard
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Hoekstra
Holden
Houghton
Hoyer
Hughes
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kim
King
Kingston
Klink
Kolbe
Kyl
Lancaster
Lantos
Laughlin
Lazio
Levy
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Machtley
Manzullo
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
McNulty
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Ridge
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Rowland
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Shaw
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Stupak
Sundquist
Swett
Talent
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thompson
Thurman
Torkildsen
Valentine
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walsh
Weldon
Whitten
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff

NAYS—194

Ackerman
Allard
Andrews (ME)
Applegate
Archer
Bacchus (FL)
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Blackwell
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Byrne
Camp
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Coppersmith
Cox
Coyne
Crane
Danner
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
English (AZ)
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Glickman
Gonzalez
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hastings
Hefner
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoke
Horn
Huffington
Inslee
Istook
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Klug
Knollenberg
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
LaRocco
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McDermott
McKinney
Meehan
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Murphy
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rangel
Reynolds
Rohrabacher
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Santorum
Sawyer
Schenk
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Shays
Shuster
Skaggs
Slattery
Slaughter
Stark
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Swift

Synar	Upton	Waxman
Thornton	Velazquez	Wheat
Torres	Vento	Williams
Torricelli	Visclosky	Woolsey
Towns	Walker	Wyden
Traficant	Washington	Wynn
Tucker	Waters	Yates
Unsoeld	Watt	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—3

Engel	Johnson (SD)	Tauzin

□ 1751

Ms. SCHENK, Mrs. MALONEY, and Messrs. LEHMAN, TORRES, LEWIS of California, BONIOR, and PAYNE of New Jersey changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. BARLOW and Mr. SPRATT changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the House receded from its disagreement with the Senate to Senate amendment No. 129 and concurred therein.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Speaker, on October 19, I missed rollcall vote 512 due to my participation in meetings on the Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1994. For the record, had I been present I would have voted:

Rollcall 512, "no."

WITHDRAWAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2380

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my name as a cosponsor of the bill, H.R. 2380.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION RELATING TO CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENTS REPORTED FROM CONFERENCE IN DISAGREEMENT ON H.R. 2520, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103-301) on the resolution (H. Res. 279) relating to the consideration of amendments reported from conference in disagreement on the bill (H.R. 2520) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2401, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1994

Mr. DELLUMS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2401) 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, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. SPENCE

Mr. SPENCE. Madam Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SPENCE moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendments to the bill H.R. 2401 be instructed to insist upon the provisions contained in section 1051 of the House bill (relating to involvement of United States Armed Forces in Somalia).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Madam Speaker, a few weeks ago, during consideration of the Defense authorization bill, we adopted the Gephardt-Gilman amendment which provided for, among other things, that we would have a vote on continuing our operations in Somalia before November 15.

Since we completed work on the Defense authorization bill, the situation in Somalia has changed. Since that time, the administration, pursuant to our request, has issued a report on our involvement in that country, and the bottom line is this: We went to Somalia for humanitarian reasons and humanitarian purposes; we have successfully completed that mission, and we started withdrawing our troops from Somalia.

After that time, the United Nations passed a resolution changing our mission from that of a humanitarian effort to that of using military force against one of the political factions in Somalia. Our country supported that resolution in the United Nations. We bought into this new mission.

Our U.S. military was used to enforce the hunt for General Aideed. Our military thereafter in that pursuit lost lives, had people captured. We call them detainees. We had people wounded and we saw on national television the bodies of some of our service people being dragged through the streets of that city.

□ 1800

After an outcry from the citizens of this country, the administration has now changed the policy we have been pursuing, and the President has set a deadline for withdrawal from Somalia of March 31, 1994. There are added questions which remain:

Why March 31, 1994? Why not 1 month earlier or 1 month after that? Why are we still there? Why is there a time definite with such importance attached to it? Why not leave Somalia as soon as possible?

In any event, the only occasion this body will have to express ourselves in this matter is right now. The other body has had ample time to fully debate the new developments; we have not; and so this is the reason for my motion to instruct, to give this body time to debate these new events.

Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

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

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise to support the motion to instruct House conferees to the conference on H.R. 2401, the fiscal year 1994 Defense authorization bill, to insist on the Gilman-Gephardt amendment.

This amendments call on the President to report to Congress by October 15 on the administration's policy in Somalia, and to seek, and receive, by November 15, congressional authorization for continued deployment of United States military forces in Somalia.

It is gratifying to note that the President has already complied with the language calling for a report. However, the President has not requested authorization for continued operations in Somalia as contemplated by the Gilman-Gephardt amendment. Nor has the Congress, in particular the House, debated such basic issues as the terms, conditions, and termination of the Somalia operation in light of the President's report.

The President has said that it would be disastrous for us to cut and run in Somalia right now. Instead, the President promises that we will cut and run on March 31, 1994, even if the political situation in Somalia has not improved by then.

As the New York Times observed about this policy in its editorial of October 8 entitled "Somalia: Time to Get Out,"—and I quote—"The Administration could easily find itself spilling

considerably more blood, both American and Somali, for the next six months without accomplishing much in a cause unrelated to any direct American interest."

Many of us agree with the New York Times editorial that the United States has done its job of providing humanitarian relief in Somalia, and that our troops should be withdrawn sooner than March 31. Accordingly, I have introduced legislation—H.R. 3292—along with the ranking member of our Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], designed to ensure that our troops are out by January 31.

Madam Speaker, after reading the President's Report on Somalia that was submitted to the Congress last week, I am more concerned than ever that this administration is digging us even deeper into the sand trap that Somalia has become. Rather than clarifying its policy there, the report spells out confusing and often conflicting objectives.

In particular, I am dismayed that after stating our Nation's intention to be out by next March 31, the President goes on to report that he is now sending a total of 3,000 additional ground troops to Somalia.

That is some 1,300 troops above the 1,700 he announced last week—and separate from the 3,600 troops that will be part of the offshore rapid deployment unit.

All together, when this new deployment is completed, we will have more than doubled the number of American troops committed to the U.N. mission in Somalia—from less than 5,000 to more than 11,000.

All of us applaud the cease-fire that seems to be in place there now—and the shift in focus from going after the warlord Mohammed Aideed to seeking a political solution. But there are no guarantees that this will continue. We may well be in the eye of a hurricane that could engulf us at any time through a poorly planned activity or a misjudgment of intent.

Madam Speaker, the issue of terminating our military involvement in Somalia is too important a matter to be addressed through an amendment to another piece of legislation—with all of the time and other limits that approach entails.

This issue is so important that the Congress—in particular this body—must address it on its own terms by debating and discussing a free standing measure.

That is why I have introduced legislation to require the withdrawal of all U.S. troops by January 31.

This date gives the administration and the Pentagon enough time to plan for an orderly withdrawal of our forces—and at the same time, Congress will be in session and able to address any circumstances that might call for a reexamination of that date.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and I hope that hearings will be speedily scheduled on this so that the House can fulfill its responsibilities to the American people on this very important matter as soon as possible.

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

Madam Speaker and Members of the House, from a parliamentary perspective what is before us at this time is a motion to instruct conferees on the part of the House to maintain the House position on Somalia. I can submit to my colleagues to a moral certainty that the House will maintain the House position on policy toward Somalia for a very practical reason:

The House passed the Gephardt-Gilman amendment that is the exact same language contained in the counterpart legislation in the other body. So, as a practical matter, Madam Speaker, the motion to instruct is simply an opportunity on the part of my distinguished colleagues on the other side of the aisle to debate Somalia, and I think that that is wholly appropriate. They are not asking us to maintain the House position because they know that the House position will be maintained. But I think that my colleagues do a service to this body anytime we assume the responsibility to engage in an important debate on a matter of this significance that is timely, important and relevant to the American people, to the Somali people, to the United Nations, indeed to the world.

Having made those comments, Madam Speaker, let me now make a few remarks regarding the debate on Somalia.

Madam Speaker, Members of the House, the decisions, the changes in the world, that bring us to this moment have been breathtaking both in their speed and in their impact. Just a short time ago none of us believed that the Berlin Wall would come tumbling down, that the Warsaw Pact would evaporate and that the Soviet Union would dissipate. But the fact of the matter is these are the realities. The cold war is now over.

For the past 40-plus years many became experts in the politics of the cold war. But I would submit, Madam Speaker, that there are no experts in this post-cold war environment. Ph.D's, brilliant scholars, learned and distinguished colleagues notwithstanding, there are no experts in the post-cold war.

I would submit, Madam Speaker, that each step that we take away from the Berlin Wall, each step that we take away from the end of the cold war, is a step into uncharted waters.

□ 1810

It is a step into the unknown, a step into the future, a step into transition. It is a step fraught with risk, potential dangers, the ability to make mistakes, but also great opportunities for us in this country and for people around the world. Great possibilities.

In this post-cold war environment, as we evolve what America's role in this new world order is to be, as we evolve what the new role of the United States shall be, we will embrace a whole new lexicon that did not exist in our minds just a short period ago.

Madam Speaker, we are now talking about peacekeeping, peacekeeping-plus, peacemaking, and peace enforcement. These were terms not in our lexicon in the context of the cold war.

So we are now groping. America is groping. The world is groping toward a new reality. How do we engage the world in a post-cold war environment?

Madam Speaker, we are going to make mistakes. We are going to experience difficulties. We are going to see weaknesses.

But the mistakes we make need to be corrected, the difficulties we experience need to be overcome, and the weaknesses that we see need to be strengthened; not simply used as platforms for shallow criticism, but problems out there that must be solved.

Madam Speaker, I might be wrong, but I believe that the Somalias of the world, the Bosnias of the world, the Haitis of the world, are the new realities. We are no longer in a bipolar us-versus-them world where we could study the politics of war. We are now about the business of learning the difficult and arduous task of trying to figure out how to wage the peace. It is very difficult in a nation that has studied war for well over four decades.

So we look at Somalia. Tens of thousands of Somali people were falling dead, Madam Speaker. Many of us saw this as an incredible thing that was happening when thousands of people, thousands of miles away, were falling dead for the simple reality that they lacked food. But, more often than not, they did not lack food because it was not available, but the situation was hostile, the environment was hostile.

The United States decided to play a role in the context of Somalia. We took the moral high ground. We said that in the new world, thousands of people should not fall over dead simply because they do not have enough to eat. And, as a great Nation, we decided to do something. We took the moral high ground. For the most part, we were successful beyond our wildest imaginations throughout most of Somalia.

But then we got caught up in Mogadishu. I would submit, Madam Speaker, that at the point where our mission shifted from a humanitarian mission, shifted from focusing on a political track and began to engage in military missions, is at the point

where our moral high ground was eroded, a point where our policy of humanitarian assistance and political endeavor was seriously compromised.

Madam Speaker, I believe we made a mistake, that we never should have been pursuing a military operation in Somalia. We never went to Somalia to wage war.

It staggers the imagination to consider that the same hands that just a few months ago handed out food to dying people could end up being the hands dispensing death. We did not go to Somalia to kill; we went to Somalia to help and assist.

So we got caught up in mistakes. But I am pleased, Madam Speaker, that this President saw the need to identify the mistake.

We are a great Nation, and greatness is not simply one's capacity to destroy and be the bully on the block, as we have been referred to now that we have won the cold war. Greatness in a nation is the ability to recognize a mistake has been made, to rectify the mistake, and to make mid-course change.

If this country saw that we made a mistake in pursuing military options in Somalia and perverted and distorted what we were doing there, it took greatness to then say this was a mistake, let us turn it around.

How many times have we slipped down the slippery slope toward violence and retaliation and more retaliation and more violence, and, suddenly, there we are, with 10,000, 20,000, 50,000, 100,000 troops, a full-blown war, death, and destruction?

I was excited about the fact that this President was willing to say this was a mistake. We cannot continue to go down this road of retaliation and violence and war, and must turn it around.

Madam Speaker, the President has done that. The President, as requested by the Congress, has submitted his mission report on Somalia, and, as understood by those of us who are committed to saving lives in Somalia, the President has reaffirmed the humanitarian role of our soldiers there and has stated categorically that the problems of Somalia and our response to these problems will be political and not military.

The impact of this simple shift in U.S. policy was both swift and dramatic. Attacks on peacekeepers ceased. General Aideed issued a unilateral ceasefire. The release of CWO Michael Durant became imminent, and is now a reality.

The United States of America has successfully navigated an important turn in this, our first real post-cold war challenge. We must resist again being sidetracked by the doomsdayers, the naysayers, and those committed to snatching failure from the jaws of victory. We have regained the moral and practical high ground in Somalia, and indeed we must keep it, Madam Speaker, because for so many decades flexing of our military muscle was an important part of our relationship with the rest of the world. Some of us now are having great difficulty accepting the legitimacy of negotiation and reconciliation as guiding principles in relations between nations and peoples.

Madam Speaker, this is a new day, a new opportunity, a new set of challenges. Diplomacy has worked, is working, and will continue to work in Somalia, if only we stay the course and complete the positive and welcome task originally begun as Operation Restore Hope.

Madam Speaker, we must not withdraw prior to the President's March 31 deadline. We must not revert to the militaristic posture that cost so many lives on all sides and so sidetracked our basic mission. We must build on the dramatic progress that our renewed emphasis on diplomacy has brought.

Madam Speaker, my final comment is that I said earlier we now are thrust into a position where we must now learn how to wage peace, and I accept the responsibility of governance here. We are the only superpower on the planet.

Madam Speaker, we won the cold war. It is over. We do not have to prove our prowess on a street in Mogadishu or in a seaport town in Haiti. We are, without challenge, the most powerful military force on the face of the Earth. We could make holes in the ground where these two nations exist.

That is not the question. The question is, Should we be about that? Madam Speaker, I am saying in a post-cold war world, we should not be about that. We, as the only superpower on the face of this Earth, must show restraint. Because when you are the toughest person on the block, you have to show restraint.

Strength brings responsibility, and we must show restraint. But beyond that, we must show the world that there are alternative ways of solving international disputes and problems in nation states. Not simply deploying troops and gunboat diplomacy or engaging in military tactics. That is our challenge.

Madam Speaker, I have waited 23 years for this moment to come. We are now in a post-cold war era. Now the battle is being waged on our turf. And I stand here saying that our challenge today and our challenge tomorrow is to learn how to wage the peace, to figure out what role we are going to use our military forces in.

□ 1820

There are those who believe that the only purpose for our military forces is to prepare to fight world war IV and that we should withdraw from any responsibility, and any other nations in the world, except build a mighty military machine, withdraw from any other involvement in the planet and prepare to wage world war IV. That is a point of view. I accept that as a point of view that can legitimately be held by people. I simply dissent from it.

I believe that there is an alternate view. The alternative view is, since we have won the cold war, is to learn how to win peace, learn how to show the world by example that we do not need more weapons and proliferation and more capacity to destroy, that negotiation, diplomacy, and political solution at the end of the day is the greatest thing that can happen to us.

Our children, Madam Speaker, demand it. Their parents want it. The future dictates it.

Madam Speaker, with those remarks, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPENCE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

The gentleman from California makes a very good point. I think this debate we are having today evidently does not come down to partisanship. It seems that we agree on the very important point of our involvement in foreign affairs in other countries.

When it is not in our vital interest to do it, not in our national interest to do it and they are trying to solve these questions for themselves, we should not be involved in those militarily.

Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Madam Speaker, it is always fascinating to hear the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. He has much to say and well worth listening to. I would only say, in addition to my agreeing with much that he did say, that we did not start the killing in Somalia, that General Aideed killed 24 Pakistanis who were engaged, possibly, on a fool's errand to disarm General Aideed.

I think the notion was there were too many warlords over there with too many weapons, which resulted in the maldistribution of food. But nonetheless, I agree with the basic thrust of what the gentleman said, that the mission changed, that our national interest had a moral component that was fulfilled in feeding starving people. But then, when we moved the mission into nation-building, trying to impose a democracy or some form of viable government on a country that had not had one for many, many, many generations, we lost that humanitarian sense of mission and the mission was distorted into nation building.

We need a full debate here on the rapid changes that are going on in foreign policy in this country and under this administration. In the last several weeks, 18 Americans have died in Somalia. And yet, our continued presence there is without a coherent policy to justify it.

In remarks about Somalia 2 weeks ago, President Clinton said, "Let us

finish the work we set out to do. Let us demonstrate to the world that when Americans take on a challenge, they do the job right." But 5 months before, on May 5, President Clinton welcomed home the men and women who had participated in the humanitarian mission started by President Bush in December. That day on the White House lawn the President said:

> Welcome home, and thank you for a job very well done. You have proved again that our involvement in multilateral efforts need not be open-ended nor ill-defined, that we can go abroad and accomplish some distinct objectives and then come home again, when the mission is accomplished.

Well, we did and he did not. We accomplished the Bush mission, as the President acknowledged, but we did not bring our troops home. Instead, President Clinton reduced our troop levels there and turned over command to the United Nations to achieve a new mission of nation building and political reconciliation.

The failure of this mission is now obvious. We need an exit strategy. Our purpose for remaining there is hopelessly confused.

The administration says we are no longer pursuing Aideed but, instead, are trying to marginalize him. But then our Army Rangers are ordered to raid a hotel where it is hoped to capture him or senior advisers, and the result is 18 dead Americans, 75 wounded, 3 missing, and 1 released captive of a force of about 100. Again, to what purpose?

Following the mauling of our Rangers in Mogadishu, Secretary of Defense Aspin has been mildly contrite about his unfortunate decision to deny tanks and armored vehicles to support our soldiers in Somalia. I am not aware that he has even addressed the catastrophic decision to withdraw from the region several AC-130 aircraft whose absence inexcusably left our Rangers and other forces without air support.

The administration obviously believes that staying in Somalia another 6 months is necessary to keep alive the esoteric policy of assertive multilateralism. Is this what propels the administration to send young men and women on ill-conceived missions that have nothing to do with protecting vital American interests? Is this what drives the President to send a shipload of soldiers, some of whom have sidearms, to Haiti with the understanding that they will be protected by the Haitian military, the very people most likely to harm them?

Is this what recently inspired administration support for expansive United Nation missions to Rwanda, Georgia, Liberia, all internal conflicts that do not threaten vital United States interests and do not threaten international peace and security?

The U.S. forces should not be squandered in this administration's experiments to cast the United Nation as miracle worker. We cannot expect every warload and terrorist thug to get religion at the sight of a blue beret.

We need to withdraw our men and women from Somalia long before March 31. This is not cutting and running. It is about competence and making the tough decisions.

We need hearings. We need debate on just where our foreign policy is heading and leave the nation building in Somalia to those countries with cultural, political, historical, and geographic ties to the region.

Mr. DELLUMS. Madam Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MCCURDY].

Mr. MCCURDY. Madam Speaker, it is a shame that we are having this debate today. We should have had it a month ago. At that time, actually, when we had a previous vote, this Congress overwhelmingly supported the Bush initiative moving into Somalia. And I think it would be wrong for us to say today that the policy in Somalia has been a failure.

We overlook the fact that throughout the country of Somalia we see the many good works of United States involvement there. The country is on its way to being self-sufficient and being able to feed itself. The feeding stations have been closed throughout the country, and it is clear that those Americans who were tragically killed in Somalia have not died in vain. I think it would be irresponsible for anyone to say that that was the case.

It is also clear that in this day and age of the post cold war that there may not be anything described as a purely humanitarian mission. In Somalia, food was used as a weapon, chaos was a tool of some of the clan members, and we did not fully understand the willingness of some to use violence to achieve their end. And I think it is obvious that the West and the industrialized world did not have a clear appreciation of the dangers that awaited them in that country.

□ 1830

Madam Speaker, the United Nations is not properly organized today for the task of nation-building. They are just now learning how to do that. I believe there have been some tragic mistakes. What I am concerned about, however, is the standing of the United States by a hasty retreat from Somalia. I believe that arbitrary deadlines by this Congress could work against our best interest in the long term.

I say that not as one who is up here defending this administration. I have been in this Congress 13 years. I have served under three Presidents, two Republicans and one Democrat. I made the same comments when Ronald Reagan was President, that Congress should not be tying the administrations hands. I made the same argument when George Bush was President, and supported the use of force in the gulf war. I will make the same argument here today.

As a matter of fact, Senator DOLE in December of 1990, in a speech regarding U.S. involvement in the Persian Gulf, said that "there are those in Congress who want to tie the President's hands behind his back." Someone asked him the other day about that statement. He said, "That was then and this is now."

I do not believe that is the case. I would appeal to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to work together to develop policies that make sense, that use common sense as a guide. My chairman talks about the need to wage peace. How do we wage peace in this new day and age? There are some who describe it as the new world order. George Bush actually helped coin the term. I would disagree somewhat. I do not believe there is a lot of new order. I believe there is a lot of disorder. The world is not that peaceful. Just ask the Moslems in Bosnia or the Serbs or the Croats, the Georgians, the Abkhazians, the Azeris or the Armenians. We can go around the world and see those who believe that "just negotiation" is not going to resolve their conflicts.

We have, Madam Speaker, interests both national and international to see that those conflicts are resolved, and at times there will be a call for the use of force. The question is, how do we develop a foreign policy that makes sense?

My personal opinion is that it may be premature to expect a fully articulated foreign policy to replace the foreign policy that guided this country for over 50 years, one of containment.

If the Members read the "X article" by George Kennan years ago, it took time to develop the policy of containment. I believe we are going to go through a similar process. There are, however, some principles that we should keep in mind. National interest is one of those. National interest should guide much of our actions, especially when it is resorting to the use of force.

Mr. Speaker, we should, and we have learned through the decade of the 1980's and now through the 1990's that it is better to work in coalitions, to work with our allies wherever possible. Multilateralism, however, is not the goal of a foreign policy. It is not a substitute for a foreign policy. It is a tool. Working in coalitions is desirable whenever possible, but it is not the objective.

Those of us who consider ourselves internationalists cannot even argue that avoidance of isolationism is a foreign policy, either. We need to look at those areas that are in our national interest, and at the same time, there are threats to our security and threats to the stability of the world that are important.

Madam Speaker, it appears to me that the most important foreign policy issue facing the United States today is that of Russia, seeing that a stable, democratic society emerges from the current conflict and instability there. The other component has to be expanding the open global trading system, which is an economic component. I believe the President has done an excellent job articulating the connectedness of international economics and our own national interest.

Beyond that, Mr. Speaker, we have second tier problems. We have North Korea that will emerge as a potential crisis in just a matter of weeks. The Bosnias and the Somalias will be there as well, but those should not be guiding the rest of our foreign policy or capturing the entire interest of this administration.

Madam Speaker, the appeal that I would make today, is for both sides to avoid the partisanship, the cheap shots and second-guessing. It is now time for the United States to develop a foreign policy, one based on what is best in our own national interests, but also that recognizes the changing, evolving nature of the world. In our effort to achieve a coherent foreign policy, we should keep in mind the old axiom that in foreign policy partisanship should end at the water's edge.

Mr. SPENCE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON].

Mr. DELLUMS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. WELDON. Madam Speaker, let us cut through all the rhetoric and get to the real issue of why we are here today. I think the chairman hit it. The issue here today is that we need to debate this policy, this foreign policy issue of Somalia, and Madam Speaker, we need a vote on this issue. We have spent over $2 billion in the Somalia operation since we first committed our troops last year. We have seen 29 young Americans who have come home in body bags because of our policy there, and the changing of the mission, which has not been fully supported by this Congress and the American people.

The idea that somehow we can gag Members and not give them an opportunity to vote on this issue, which our constituents are clamoring for us to have a vote on, is outrageous. We tried to offer an amendment to the defense authorization bill just last month. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], our ranking Member, tried to have an up-or-down vote on whether or not to pull our troops out of Somalia and cut off the funds. We were denied that opportunity. Instead, we were given a sham resolution, and 26 of us on this floor voted against that sham resolution, because we said it was nothing more than a CYA effort to give us cover in case something tragic happened.

That following weekend 18 young Americans were killed when their helicopters were attacked in the fighting in Mogadishu. Madam Speaker, we need to debate this issue. The administration cannot keep having us run away from it. We have to debate it up front and the American people need to see us talking about what our policy should be and how long we should be deployed.

Madam Speaker, we do not even know now whether or not that sham resolution, which said we should have a vote by November 15, is going to give us a vote. No one will say that on the record, whether or not we are going to have a vote, so in fact that resolution we passed in September was exactly what we called it, it was a sham. It was just designed to give us some cover.

Madam Speaker, we had a hearing today with Secretary Aspin. The chairman of our committee asked for it to be an open hearing. The chairman said he would only come before us in a closed session, yet there was not one piece on information in that hearing that was classified. He just did not want to answer the tough questions that we were asking him and the parents of our young kids are asking us. These questions are being asked all across America.

Madam Speaker, I include for the RECORD two letters of the parents of young people in my district and in my area, Michael Carroll and William Willoughby, who have questions they have raised about their children's involvement in Somalia.

The letters referred to are as follows:

DREXEL HILL, PA,
October 5, 1993.

DEAR PRESIDENT CLINTON: This letter to you is one small voice that hopes to be heard.

On Sunday, October 3, 1993, at approximately 4 pm we received a call from Staff Sgt. Mackey from the Department of Casualty in Alexandria, VA. At that time, the details were given as follows:

". . . Specialist Michael K. Carroll and his unit were on foot attempting to secure a helicopter crash site when he and his unit came under heavy gunfire. Spc. Carroll has received gunshot wounds to his shoulder and is currently at the 507th CFG in Mogadishu. It is not known at this time the severity of his injuries . . ."

These words echoed in our minds and hearts for the next longest 30 hours of our lives.

During that time, we received a subsequent call from the rear detachment commander, Cpt. Castel from Michael's base in Ft Drum. The only additional information we received was that Michael was in very serious condition and that the wound was to his right shoulder. Additionally, he was awaiting evacuation to Germany for medical treatment once he was stabilized.

As the sun changed Sunday night into Monday morning, we sat awaiting additional updates. At that point we began our own investigation in search of updates. We were able to contact a military-based hospital in Germany and on parental instinct made the call to the hospital and found that we had reached the correct facility and that the wounded were expected to arrive within the hour. Our next telephone call was made a few hours later and we were advised that Michael had in fact arrived, but they were unable to give us detailed information because they could not properly identify us as next-to-kin. We understood their position and completed the call with respect.

As we began to wait again, you can imagine our surprise and relief, Mr. President when we received a call from Michael personally! Our prays have been partially answered. We are now anticipating his return to the states for proper medical attention as well as answers to our questions regarding his prognosis.

Experiencing this anguish first hand has pressed our "emotional buttons" to write to you concerning our non-biological sons still remaining in Somalia.

We supported the successful humanitarian relief efforts provided by maybe ten times the American troop strength in December than by what are currently in Mogadishu. As a proud father and former serviceman with the 82nd Airborne, I can say with much pride how much I appreciate the efforts and courage of the American troops in Somalia today. However, it is my feeling after speaking with Michael, and I stress this is my personal feeling, that the military of the United States should do one of two things . . . withdraw all American troops from Somalia or supply adequate reinforcements to complete the mission so the American troops and people can continue to hold their heads high with pride and respect.

We find it disheartening to hear that when U.S. forces reach out to aid other UN nations in need and require our support, that we get little, if anything, in return from them.

As that former serviceman and proud father, I urge you to either define the mission, complete the mission with adequate troop strength or send our sons home.

Respectfully,

MICHAEL and STEPHANIE CARROLL.

CLEVELAND TRACK MATERIAL, INC.,
Cleveland, OH, September 24, 1993.

Congressman MARTIN HOKE,
Fairview Park, OH.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOKE: This is to inform you about the situation in Somalia. My son John is a platoon leader in the 568th Engineer Company (Combat Support), in Mogadishu and has informed me about his unit involvement. I am disturbed by what appears to be a deteriorating situation in spite of claims to the contrary by U.S. Special Envoy Admiral Jonathan Howe.

My understanding of the situation is from two tours in Vietnam in Special Forces and U.S. combat units, and over a year as an instructor on counterguerrilla operations at the U.S. Army Infantry School, Fort Benning, GA. I was a professional Army officer until medical retirement in 1971.

In Somalia, there are several key indicators of heightened risk and even impending disaster.

1. Popular support is on the side of Aidid. The Pakistanis have particularly earned the emnity of the populace, and the polyglot U.N. forces are regarded as foreigners. The average Somali has to side with his countrymen if he expects to be alive the day after the U.N. forces depart.

2. The gangs have sanctuaries that the U.N. forces do not have the power to control. There are entire sections of Mogadishu that are still under gang dominance.

3. The gangs have freedom of movement to attack U.N. forces at will because of the characteristics of the city and help from the populace. Additionally, practically every street is an ambush site resulting from the narrowness of most streets and walls next to the streets. Conventional forces are exceedingly vulnerable in these circumstances even if they are armed. My son and four of his soldiers luckily survived an ambush on June 5th that was set up in similar conditions. Four U.S. soldiers have been wounded since June 5th and we are very lucky that the casualty numbers are not significantly greater. All of the U.S. casualties are support, not combat troops, by the way.

4. The gangs are better armed. They are using rocket propelled grenades (RPG's) with impunity to attack the U.S. compounds and even holed a U.S. tanker in the harbor on Saturday. They are also improving their military skills such as markmanship, tactics, and coordination.

The situation is rapidly developing into urban guerrilla warfare against U.N. forces. U.S. forces in this situation are increasingly vulnerable.

1. The combat support and service units (transportation, engineers, medical, etc.) are thin-skinned and not really trained for this type of activity. Fifteen percent of the troops are female, and one trucking company commander is female. The engineer company is equipped with the same machinery as your average county road maintenance crew—bulldozers, loaders, scrapers, and the like—only the operators are U.S. Army soldiers and carry M-16's. They have *no* heavy weapons—mortars, .50 Cal. machine guns, night vision devices, TOW missiles, and, of course, no Combat Engineer vehicle (CEV's) for the combat engineer missions which they now perform exclusively. In any engagement with the gangs, they are outgunned at the onset.

2. U.N. security is unreliable. One unit was on a large search mission in support of the Pakistanis. In the afternoon, the Pakistanis disappeared—leaving the engineers naked—without security. This is not a confidence builder. Army doctrine and practice until now have proscribed operations combining multi-lingual units below battalion level because of operating difficulties.

3. There are increasing rocket and sniper attacks on the compounds. The rockets (RPG's) are very effective anti-personnel weapons and act like mortars in this application. Our units are especially vulnerable to this type of attack. Car bomb and ground assaults may follow.

4. The U.S. combat unit in the area is a brigade from the 10th Mountain Division which is the U.N. quick reaction force. It is not used to secure any missions by the engineers or transportation units. Please note that it is light infantry also—no tanks or armored personnel carriers.

It is clear that the current forces on the ground are increasingly losing control. It is an obvious lack of combat power defined by quality of forces, communications, mobility, and firepower. A combat power ratio of 3 to 1 is usually required for a conventional force to defeat another conventional force. A combat power ratio of at least 10 to 1 is needed for a conventional force to defeat a guerrilla force. We are not close to that.

The threat of another Beirut-type disaster is real. We must decide to control the situation by re-inserting significant numbers of U.S. forces. In order to maintain control, those forces may be required to stay there for years. Overwhelming force was a key to success in desert Storm.

The other alternative is to leave. We must decide to do one or the other. We should not leave any of our forces out on a limb with inadequate security. Casualties will continue to mount. Not one single American soldier's life should be wasted on a situation that has no real mission or any linkage to our national interest.

I look forward to your response.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM H. WILLOUGHBY,
President.

Madam Speaker, I will read part of a letter I got over the fax today from the father of a young man who was in the Somalia operation:

I ask this Congress to put as much effort into investigating this foreign policy disaster, as they put into investigating Watergate, and Iran-Contra. Now if I am not mistaken, neither Watergate nor Iran-Contra caused the loss of American soldiers' lives.

My son Dominick was killed October 3, 1993. He was buried October 11, 1993. He died in Somalia defending his fellow Rangers and fighting for his country's policies. He believed in the Ranger creed, which says: "Never shall I fail my comrades * * * embarrass my country."

Madam Speaker, we cannot embarrass this country, either. This issue needs to be debated.

Madam Speaker, our mission is complete. I was just in Somalia in January. I am convinced we did our job well. I am proud of our troops. We cannot bring home part of them or most of them and leave 4,500 troops there as sitting ducks. It is time to bring them all back home.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues today, this is the first day that we can file a discharge petition that forces a vote on bringing the troops home. I ask my colleagues to sign House Resolution 227 offered by the gentleman from Ohio, SHERROD BROWN. Members can sign it in the well today, which would force an immediate vote on the issue on this House floor of bringing our troops home.

□ 1840

If you are really committed to ending our involvement, you have that opportunity. So I would ask my colleagues on both the Republican side and the Democratic side to support the discharge petition requesting that House Resolution 227 be brought up for immediate consideration. Let us bring our troops home now.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate has spoken on the continued deployment of American troops in Somalia. After 2 days of intense pressure by the Senate leadership, Senator BYRD backed off his original amendment to an early withdrawal, and the Senate agreed to authorize United States troops in Somalia until the March 31 deadline requested by the President. But our troops remain under fire, and the House has an equal responsibility to address this issue. I am outraged that we are being denied that opportunity. Months after our troops have completed their mission, there is no legitimate reason to postpone this debate one more day. Michael Durant has been returned to the United States, and we have accounted for those who were killed. It is time to bring the troops home.

Many months ago, U.S. troops achieved their objectives as outlined by President Bush. Key transportation routes were secured and the food was flowing to the Somalian people. By February, we put an end to the mass starvation in that nation. Under the plan put forward by the Bush administration, our troops were to leave once those objectives were achieved and control of the operation was to be transferred to a U.N. peacekeeping force.

In March, however, the U.N. Security Council expanded the size and mandate of the original mission. The new administration allowed them to remain involved under the guise of a nation-building effort. What started out as a rapid intervention mission has been stretched into a protracted crisis. And, my colleagues, I regret to say that it got our stamp of approval. On May 25, over the objections of many in this body including myself, the House authorized the continued deployment of U.S. troops for the U.N.'s peacekeeping mission.

We had no business authorizing an open-ended deployment for troops in Somalia before the President even explained the mission and asked the American people and Congress to support it. Yet, that is exactly what the House did. When our worst fears were realized, the House called for a vote by November 15 on the continued deployment of troops in Somalia. So far, that has not been forthcoming. It now appears we will simply be asked to consider the language the Senate approved when we debate the Defense appropriations conference report.

Many of us argued in May that we should bring the troops home no later than June 30. That was not unreasonable, our mission had long been completed and the transfer to U.N. command had occurred on May 1. But that measure was defeated. So we supported a substitute which would have allowed 6 months to bring the troops home. And that was defeated. Five months later, our troops remain, and as many of us predicted in May, we have become mired in this civil conflict and suffered needless casualties.

We said in May that it was time to bring United States military involvement in Somalia to an end, and we are saying it even more emphatically today. Every day our troops remain in Somalia, they are becoming more deeply entrenched in this civil war and needlessly risking their lives. According to a New York Times reporter in Mogadishu last week, "The Sprawling, sandy compound that houses thousands of United States forces is still a base besieged, with all but a few troops forbidden to leave the shelter of sandbags and coiled concertina wire to patrol Somali streets * * * snipers opened fire overnight Monday on two strongpoints held by Pakistani peacekeeping troops."

How much more carnage do we need to witness before we come to our senses? What is it going to take to force us into action? The President has called for a March 31 deadline in Somalia, but we have yet to hear the details of the mission and what will be accomplished.

From every direction in Washington, there are powerful forces at work trying to stall congressional action on this critical matter. Secretary Aspin refuses to appear in a public hearing to explain how the troops were denied equipment, much less to explain our military objectives over the next 6 months. Nobody benefits if we find ourselves back here in a few months saying that we were right once again, and we have lost more lives.

We are ignoring our responsibility to the American people if we let this military mission continue without a full debate and a vote in the House of Representatives. I am frustrated by the leadership's complacency on this issue and am becoming convinced that there is an effort to sweep this issue under the rug. So I am initiating a discharge petition today on House Resolution 227, the resolution urging the President to return troops from Somalia as expeditiously as possible. I urge those who share my concerns to sign on to this petition immediately. With American lives on the line, we cannot afford to be talked into delay. Now is the time for Congress to act and bring the troops home.

Mr. DELLUMS. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Madam Speaker, I would appreciate it if the gentleman would state for the RECORD, because the gentleman and I serve together on the Armed Services Committee, that it certainly was not this gentleman, nor my colleagues on the Armed Services Committee, who in any way attempted to limit the debate on the options on the issue of Somalia.

Mr. WELDON. No. I said in my comment it was this chairman who requested a full and open hearing today with the Secretary of Defense, and if anything, I applaud the chairman for his willingness to have an open discussion on this issue.

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SPENCE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Madam Speaker, our President desperately needs to articulate to the American people our policy in this foreign country.

I attended a briefing this morning, a classified briefing, although there was nothing classified in the briefing, that certainly did not answer my questions nor the questions of the American people, nor did it allay my fears nor their fears.

We are in a no-win situation. This is assured by the March 31, 1994, deadline for pulling out. This is the equivalent of telling your chess opponent what your next move is going to be.

Aideed's route to victory is peace. He can now vacation for 6 months, come back and pick up all of the marbles, or worse yet, he can acutely embarrass us just days before the March 31 pullout. It will cost millions, perhaps billions of dollars more to keep our troops there this long. And who knows how many American lives will be lost.

The generally good advice to not tie the President's hands in foreign policy implies a level of confidence in our leadership which I do not think now exists. This Congress and the American people really need the debate that is now going on. I am very appreciative of the debate from both sides of the aisle.

Mr. DELLUMS. Madam Speaker, I recognize that my colleagues on the other side have used up all of their time, and in the spirit of comity, although there are a couple of my colleagues who do not agree with us on this side, I am feeling generous, and I, therefore, yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH].

Mr. ROTH. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for graciously allowing me this time. This is almost unprecedented, and I want him to know that I appreciate it very much.

Madam Speaker, I was interested in Somalia from the very beginning because I did go to the White House and ask the people when are we going to be out of Somalia when we first went in in December, and they told me well, we are going to try to be out by Inauguration Day, January 20. Well, January 20 came and went and we were still there, and we are still there now.

The reason I asked for this time is because one of the young people that was involved in this firefight was from my congressional district, and his mother called our office. I think it is important for the House to know what transpired, because I had mentioned that I will do everything I can for her, like any other Congressman here would. But I said, "Well, why don't you call the White House?"

When she called the White House she was most irate when she got back to me, because the White House talked to her. First of all, they had her on the phone for 4 minutes waiting. When they got on the line, they had a recorded message on health care. And then when they finally talked to her, she told them of her concerns, and why she was calling, and they at the White House said, "Well, we'll make sure the President hears of your comments." She said, "Well, do you want my name or my son's name or background?" And they said no, "We're not interested in that. We'll just add you to the list of people who are opposed to our policy in Somalia."

I do not think that that is a way that our Government should treat the parents of the sons that we have overseas. So not only do we have an obligation here in this body to make sure that our people in uniform are protected, but we have got to, I think, have some sensitivity and some feeling for the people who have their sons and daughters in the service. And that is not always being exemplified. And that is why people are so negative and turned off on this Government.

Again I appreciate the gentleman from California giving me these 2 minutes. It was very generous, and I want him to know I appreciate it.

Mr. SPENCE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] for supporting the fundamental issue of the right to debate this issue. And I know he has always done that.

But the important thing is that the House be allowed to debate it just like in the Byrd-Dole debate, because if this thing comes to conference, and we have not debated the issue, then I think it is a shirking of our responsibility.

But I believe we need to pull out of Somalia now. In this Member's opinion, the Gephardt amendment for sanctions during Desert Storm was in poor judgment. I think the Gephardt amendment to stay in Somalia is also in poor judgment.

Aideed, whether he fires a shot or not, or another bandit takes his place, or they take out Aideed, he is still going to be there 6 months from now. We are going to risk lives, and it is going to continue to cost American dollars.

Let me tell Members the way in which I think we are irresponsible. One Member said cheap shots.

On August 8 we lost a light armored vehicle, destroyed lives. The military commanders on the line, seeing they could not get to our troops, requested that they have heavy armor.

On 25 September we lost a helicopter, not talked about much. Two people escaped. One torso was cut in half by the Somalians. They tore apart the arms and legs and paraded through the streets. They are not the Aideed supporters. These are civilians. And again we asked for armor. The Secretary of Defense turned down that request for that armor.

On October 3 we lost 2 helicopters, 18 killed, we had 72 wounded. Why? It took 7 hours for U.N. forces to get to them. That is our policy of putting our troops under U.N. control. The Pakistanis, the Malaysians did not speak English. They had to use night goggles. In the first intersection they were hit.

We got our donkeys kicked there and they were hit. If we would have had that armor, we could have rolled right through those barricades, got to our helicopters, and maybe not lost as many people.

Let us get out of Somalia.

Mr. DELLUMS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

Mr. KASICH. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Madam Speaker, let me say that the debate on Somalia will come in November, and we are going to hear it all of the time in 1-minute speeches. But I will tell you, this afternoon I was talking to a friend back in Columbus, an associate with the Mershon Center, a think tank, and we both began to think about the talk that Cap Weinberger made in 1984 to the National Press Club. Cap Weinberger said there are six conditions that ought to be met before we decide whether we are going to commit U.S. forces.

Condition No. 1, our vital interests must be at stake. Condition No. 2, the issues involved are so important for the future of the United States and our allies that we are prepared to commit enough forces to win. No. 3, we have clearly defined the political and military objective which we must secure. Four, we have sized our forces to achieve our objectives. Five, we have some reasonable assurance of the support of the American people, including the People's House. And six, U.S. forces are committed to combat only as a last resort.

What I maintain has been happening in this country, and it happened when Ronald Reagan put us in Lebanon, and I feel compelled today to say that when that vote came up to keep our forces in Lebanon, I voted against the administration, against Ronald Reagan, because I thought our mission in Lebanon did not make a lot of sense.

□ 1850

I also sent a letter to President Clinton earlier this year when he struggled with the decision on Bosnia and I said in that letter:

> Mr. President, I want to be constructive. If you have a clear plan for going to Bosnia, if it makes sense I want to be bipartisan.

My statement today is designed to say that in foreign policy we have to be bipartisan but it is also designed to say that I think Cap Weinberger really hit on something in these six principles that we ought to dig out again. And when we look at Lebanon or when we look at Somalia or when we look at Haiti we begin to find that those particular circumstances do not really get answered in the six precepts that Cap Weinberger laid out. That is why we have been losing our way in terms of defining foreign policy. And we had better learn from these cases as we begin to look at places like Bosnia. We have got to be able to decide "Are our vital interests at stake? Are we prepared to commit enough forces? Do we have clearly defined political and military objectives? Have we sized our force right? Do we have the support of the American people and the Members of this body? And are U.S. forces committed to combat only as a last resort?" And I believe that if the circumstances that we are looking at around the world cannot be answered by looking at these vital precepts that Cap Weinberger laid down for us then I think we draw the conclusion that we ought not to go.

I think that is what happened in this administration. We have not been able to clearly define these objectives.

Mr. Chairman, I think what I am going to do is make sure we send out a "Dear Colleague" on this issue of what Weinberger raised for all of us to think about because the debate on Somalia is going to continue here but it is really a much larger debate about the future of the American forces in the post cold war.

Mr. SPENCE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

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

My colleagues, I am going to do a special order tonight for an hour because I was in Somalia yesterday, flew all last night and got home at about 4 o'clock in the morning and flew over and back on the air bridge, four C–5 flights, two of them for 12 hours and 13 hours each, two for 5 hours each from West Cairo down to Mogadishu.

When I arrived at the airport there was an H–60 waiting for me with General Thomas Montgomery at the airplane. He put me on the H–60 and within 5 minutes I am looking down at 10 Soviet-built T–72 tanks, painted white, and an Indian flag flying over their detachment area.

I said, "General, tell me these just got here. They weren't here October 3." He said, "I know what you are saying, Congressman, but they were here. I called the Indians; I asked them for help. It was the dead of night and they had to call Delhi.

"I called the Italians and I asked them for help. They had to call Rome. And the result was," and all these are allies and they wanted to help—"it was a political breakdown." The rescue mission was 9 hours getting to site 2 where five Americans were probably taken alive and beaten to death by the crowd. One of them did have white plastic handcuffs that had been cut. As I said on this floor several times last week no one puts handcuffs on a dead body.

So where do we go from here? I am looking at Clinton's press statements out of Dee Dee Myers, that he is pulling out the Rangers.

I ask my colleagues, I ask America, I ask a million people watching this House floor right now: Why are we announcing that the Rangers are leaving? If they want to bring them home, bring them home, but do not announce it. As we speak Aideed is having a press conference and pointing out that he killed five men from the 160th Special Ops Aviation Regiment, that he killed six men from Benning, one of them with that mortar fire. If we are out of time that is all right. I will continue with a full hour this afternoon. There is a lot my colleagues have to know about the Somalia operation implications on Haiti and Bosnia.

Mr. SPENCE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COLLINS].

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Madam Speaker, I spent last weekend in Fort Benning, GA. On Friday night I read reports in the Bayonet paper, which is the post paper, about the memorial service for six Rangers who were killed in Somalia, reports of those who were wounded in Somalia, and a blow-by-blow article from a troop engaged in hand-to-hand combat, fighting for 16 hours he was pinned down.

Then on Saturday morning I visited Michael Collins, sergeant, Birmingham, AL, wounded in the gunfight in Somalia, is going to be laid up for over a year trying to recuperate.

Then I had lunch with young recruits going through basic training. We talked about Somalia, the possibility of them going to Somalia in a very short period after finishing their basic training. They are prepared to go; if called they will go.

They are concerned, though, which was: Will Congress support us if we go? They did not ask, "Will the President support us?" They asked, "Will Congress support us?"

I talked with career soldiers, soldiers who had been in and remember Vietnam. The morale of those soldiers is low. They are concerned.

I spent time with retirees, with generals, colonels, and they all say we do not need to be in Somalia. Somalia has the makings of another Vietnam. Bring our troops home. But on the way out kick Mr. Aideed right square in the rump.

Mr. DELLUMS. Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of our time to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WASHINGTON].

Mr. WASHINGTON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] for yielding this time to me and especially for giving me the honor of closing debate on what is an important subject and will become an even more important subject in the days and weeks ahead.

Madam Speaker, I come to the well this evening to set the record straight, however, because I have heard over and over again from some of our friends who wish to quarrel with the President's policy but do not have the courage to run for President in order to hold that office, that we have no legitimate interest in Somalia.

I have searched the RECORD and many of these same Members were Members of Congress during the period of time when they thought that they had some significant military interest in Somalia, because between 1980 and

1988 this country appropriated and gave $140 million in military aid to Somalia. We had a military interest then, we had a significant interest then; but the only difference is that the Soviet Union does not exist anymore.

Some of you people act like you just heard of Somalia when you saw the dying people on television back in November and December last year. You know better than that. You have known where Somalia was all along. You participated and propped up the Marxist regime because you wanted to do something to try to fight the Soviets being in Ethiopia. So you used the puppet of Somalia to try to balance off what you thought was happening in the Soviet Union and now you want to come with clean hands and say you do not know where Somalia is?

Pontius Pilate was not guilty of the death of Jesus Christ, but he was not innocent. And we are not guilty of what is going on in Somalia but we damned sure as hell are not innocent. We participated by sending money and military aid and propping up the Government in Somalia. Now my colleagues, both Democrat and Republican, want to say we have no legitimate interest in Somalia? We are responsible because every colonialist is responsible for neo-colonialism. This is the same kind of colonialism that the British and the Italians practiced up until 1960 when they supposedly set Somalia free.

From 1960 until now our hands are dirty, and if our children die over there, it is the fault of people who appropriated the money to prop up the regime with $140 million lo those many years, and that is the truth.

□ 1900

Mr. SPENCE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAM JOHNSON].

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I do not think colonialism is the issue, in deference to my friend. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. WASHINGTON] is a good guy, and I appreciate that he is from a good State; but colonialism just is not the issue.

The issue here is, can we take care of our guys? The mission keeps changing on us. It started off as humanitarian and then it changed to combat. We would not call it that. It was not called combat. It was called a peace action.

When our POW got shot down and caught and when those other guys got dragged through the streets and killed by those Somalis, we did not want to call them POW's. We did not call them missing-in-action. We did not call them killed in action.

Do you know what that POW was called? He was called a detainee. That is because some general counsel in the Department of Defense said that is what he would be called.

Secretary Aspin said, "Let's try to figure out what kind of rules we are going to follow."

Let me tell you, there are the rules of combat, which is the Geneva Convention on POW care, that can be followed and should have been followed and were not followed.

So what is the issue here? Our administration cannot take care of our people in Somalia. They do not know what the mission is. They do not know how to conduct the mission, the mission being nonexistent with no goal and no opportunity to retrieve our people in good health.

Therefore, what is the answer? The obvious answer is let us get ourselves out of there.

What in the world are we protecting, the United States or the United Nations? I do not think our job is to protect the United Nations. It is to protect the United States of America, and that means withdrawal from Somalia.

Mr. SPENCE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time.

Madam Speaker, as evidenced by the remarks on the floor this afternoon, for the most part I do not think this has been a partisan debate, nor should it be. We find ourselves in this place today because as some have expressed it, we have been through a learning experience.

Our chairman suggested that we are in a post-cold-war environment. The same old rules do not apply. We are feeling our way. We are groping. That may be so, and to some extent that is so; but if nothing else comes out of this debate, and I hope we will have more debate before the time is over this year, before November 15. The other body, as I said, has already debated this issue more in depth than we have. If we have learned nothing else, we have learned that we have made a mistake in Somalia.

The U.N. policy was wrong. We supported that policy and we have now admitted it, in due deference to our President, as expressed by the chairman of our committee today.

He has admitted that mistake, and we are now on the right track, it seems to me. We have at least admitted our mistake. We are in the process of pulling out militarily from Somalia.

Maybe with all the bad things we have gone through, and yes, even though we have lost lives in the process, maybe we have learned something for the future, that will serve us well when we consider these kinds of problems in the future, and we will be considering these kinds of problems in the future.

We have learned that we should not be involved, I repeat, in the internal affairs of other people. We have enough to do right here at home.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. KENNELLY). 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 South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE].

The motion to instruct was agreed to.

MOTION TO CLOSE CONFERENCE COMMITTEE MEETINGS ON H.R. 2401

Mr. DELLUMS. Madam Speaker, pursuant to rule XXVIII, clause 6(a), I move that conference committee meetings on the bill (H.R. 2401) 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, be closed to the public at such times as classified national security information is under consideration, provided, however, that any sitting Member of Congress shall have the right to attend any closed or open meeting.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6, rule XXVIII, the vote on this motion will be taken by the yeas and nays.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 422, nays 2, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 516]

YEAS—422

Abercrombie	Byrne	Dreier
Ackerman	Callahan	Duncan
Allard	Calvert	Dunn
Andrews (ME)	Camp	Durbin
Andrews (TX)	Canady	Edwards (CA)
Applegate	Cantwell	Edwards (TX)
Archer	Cardin	Emerson
Armey	Carr	English (AZ)
Bacchus (FL)	Castle	English (OK)
Bachus (AL)	Clay	Eshoo
Baesler	Clayton	Evans
Baker (CA)	Clement	Everett
Baker (LA)	Clinger	Ewing
Ballenger	Clyburn	Farr
Barca	Coble	Fawell
Barcia	Coleman	Fazio
Barlow	Collins (GA)	Fields (LA)
Barrett (NE)	Collins (IL)	Fields (TX)
Barrett (WI)	Collins (MI)	Filner
Bartlett	Combest	Fingerhut
Barton	Condit	Fish
Bateman	Conyers	Flake
Becerra	Cooper	Foglietta
Beilenson	Coppersmith	Ford (MI)
Bentley	Costello	Ford (TN)
Bereuter	Cox	Fowler
Berman	Coyne	Frank (MA)
Bevill	Cramer	Franks (CT)
Bilbray	Crane	Franks (NJ)
Bilirakis	Crapo	Frost
Bishop	Cunningham	Furse
Blackwell	Danner	Gallegly
Blute	Darden	Gallo
Boehlert	de la Garza	Gejdenson
Boehner	Deal	Gekas
Bonilla	DeLauro	Gephardt
Bonior	DeLay	Geren
Boucher	Dellums	Gibbons
Brewster	Derrick	Gilchrest
Brooks	Deutsch	Gillmor
Browder	Diaz-Balart	Gilman
Brown (CA)	Dickey	Gingrich
Brown (FL)	Dicks	Glickman
Brown (OH)	Dingell	Gonzalez
Bryant	Dixon	Goodlatte
Bunning	Dooley	Goodling
Burton	Doolittle	Gordon
Buyer	Dornan	Goss

Grams
Grandy
Green
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hancock
Harman
Hastert
Hastings
Hayes
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Huffington
Hughes
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Inslee
Istook
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kreidler
Kyl
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McKinney
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Ridge
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Synar
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—2

DeFazio
Washington

NOT VOTING—9

Andrews (NJ)
Bliley
Borski
Chapman
Engel
Greenwood
Hansen
Neal (NC)
Santorum

□ 1927

Mr. WASHINGTON changed his vote from "present" to "nay."

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and include therein extraneous material, on H.R. 2401.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees to the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994:

From the Committee on Armed Services, for consideration of the entire House bill and the entire Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Messrs. HUTTO, SKELTON, and MCCURDY, Mrs. LLOYD, Messrs. SISISKY, SPRATT, MCCLOSKEY, ORTIZ, HOCHBRUECKNER, TAYLOR of Mississippi, ABERCROMBIE, ANDREWS of Maine, EDWARDS of Texas, and UNDERWOOD, Ms. HARMAN, and Messrs. SPENCE, STUMP, HUNTER, KASICH, BATEMAN, HANSEN, WELDON, KYL, RAVENEL, DORNAN, HEFLEY, and MACHTLEY.

As additional conferees from the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, for consideration of matters within the jurisdiction of that committee under clause 2 of rule XLVIII: Messrs. GLICKMAN, RICHARDSON, and COMBEST.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, for consideration of sections 812, and 1316 of the House bill and sections 1087, 2854, and 2908 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. GONZALEZ, NEAL of North Carolina, and KANJORSKI, Mrs. ROUKEMA, and Mr. RIDGE.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Education and Labor, for consideration of sections 373, 1303, 1331, 1333–1337, 1343, 1344, and 3103 of the House bill and sections 338, 532, 1088, and 2853 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. FORD of Michigan, CLAY, WILLIAMS, PETRI, and GOODLING.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for consideration of sections 267, 382, 601, 1109, 1314, 2816, 2822, 2829, 2830, 2839, 3105(b) and (c), 3132, 3137, 3140, and 3201 of the House bill and sections 322, 325, 327, 705, 822, 1088, 2802, 2803, 2833, 2842, 2844, 2913, 3106(c), (d), (j), (l), 3131, 3132, 3133, 3136–3147, 3149, 3150, 3201, and 3202 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. DINGELL, SHARP, SWIFT, MOORHEAD, and OXLEY.

Provided, Mr. BLILEY is appointed in lieu of Mr. OXLEY solely for the consideration of sections 267, 601, and 1109 of the House bill, and sections 705 and 3106 of the Senate amendment.

Provided, Mr. BILIRAKIS is appointed in lieu of Mr. OXLEY solely for the consideration of sections 1314, 3137, 3140, and 3201 of the House bill, and sections 322, 2802, 2803, 3132, 3136, 3139–3147, 3149, 3150, 3201, and 3202 of the Senate amendment.

Provided, Mr. STEARNS is appointed in lieu of Mr. OXLEY and Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois is appointed in lieu of Mr. SWIFT solely for the consideration of section 822 of the Senate amendment.

Provided, Mr. SCHAEFER is appointed in lieu of Mr. OXLEY solely for the consideration of section 3138 of the Senate amendment.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for consideration of sections 234, 237, 241, 1005, 1008 (relating to funding structure for contingency operations), 1009 (relating to report on humanitarian assistance activities), 1021, 1022, 1034, 1038, 1041, 1043–1045, 1048, 1051–1055, 1105, 1107, 1108, 1201–1203, 1205–1208, 1360, 1501–1510, and 3136 of the House bill and sections 216, 221, 223, 224, 241–245, 547, 1041, 1042, 1051–1054, 1061, 1067, 1077, 1078, 1083–1085, 1087, 1093, 1094, 1101–1103 and 1105–1107 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. HAMILTON, GEJDENSON, LANTOS, GILMAN, and GOODLING.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Government Operations, for consideration of sections 818, 829, 1023, 1050, 2816, 2821, 2823, 2839, and 3140 of the House bill and sections 825, 2843, 2844, and 2902–2908 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, and Messrs. ENGLISH of Oklahoma, CLINGER, and MCCANDLESS.

As additional conferees from the Committee on the Judiciary, for consideration of section 262 of the House bill, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. BROOKS, SYNAR, BERMAN, FISH, and MOORHEAD.

As additional conferees from the Committee on the Judiciary, for consideration of section 1022 of the House bill and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. BROOKS, SCHUMER, CONYERS, SENSENBRENNER, and FISH.

As additional conferees from the Committee on the Judiciary, for consideration of section 1082 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. BROOKS,

MAZZOLI, BRYANT, FISH, and MCCOLLUM.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, for the consideration of sections 1351, 1352, and 1354–1359 of the House bill and sections 654 and 3501–3506 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. STUDDS, TAUZIN, LIPINSKI, FIELDS of Texas, and BATEMAN.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, for consideration of sections 265, 1314, and 3137 of the House bill and sections 328, 2841, 2851, 2915, 3103, and 3135 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. STUDDS, Mrs. UNSOELD, and Messrs. REED, FIELDS of Texas, and BATEMAN.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Natural Resources, for consideration of section 2818 of the House bill and sections 2855, 3132, 3139, and 3147 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. MILLER of California, VENTO, LEHMAN, and YOUNG of Alaska, and Mrs. VUCANOVICH.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, for consideration of sections 364, 901, 934, 943, and 1408 of the House bill and sections 523, 1064, and 3504 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. CLAY, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, and Mrs. MORELLA.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, for consideration of sections 2816 and 2841 of the House bill and sections 1063, 1087, 2833, 2842, and 2917 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. MINETA, APPLEGATE, WISE, SHUSTER, and CLINGER.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Rules, for consideration of section 1008 (relating to funding structure for contingency operations) of the House bill, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. DERRICK, BEILENSON, FROST, SOLOMON, and QUILLEN.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for consideration of sections 215, 262, 265, 1303, 1304, 1312–1318, and 3105 of the House bill and sections 203, 233, 235, 803, and 3141–3148 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. VALENTINE, Ms. E.B. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. WALKER, and Mr. FAWELL.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Small Business, for consideration of section 829 of the House bill, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, and Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for consideration of sections 1071 and 1079 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. MONTGOMERY, SANGMEISTER, and STUMP. Provided, Mr. SLATTERY is appointed in lieu of Mr. SANGMEISTER solely for the consideration of section 1079.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Ways and Means, for consideration of sections 653, 705, and 1087 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. ROSTENKOWSKI, GIBBONS, PICKLE, ARCHER, and CRANE.

There was no objection.

□ 1930

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2519, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2519) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MFUME). Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of Thursday, October 14, 1993, at page H7968.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. 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 and the amendments in disagreement on H.R. 2519, the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 1994, and that I be permitted to insert a table and extraneous matter following my remarks on the conference report.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1940

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I will only take about 1 minute. This conference report has been available for the Members for 5 days. I think most everybody knows what is in the report. I will just summarize very briefly.

The total amount of money for budget authority is $23,396,781,000. Of that, $3.8 billion is to continue various programs for technology enhancement, economic development incentives, scientific research, fisheries development, weather forecasting services, international trade and tourism promotion, and for small business development.

There is $10.1 billion in discretionary appropriations for the Department of Justice and the law enforcement agencies. The conference report also includes $2.7 plus billion for the judiciary. The conference agreement also includes funding for related agencies such as, $374.4 million for the Maritime Administration, $400 million for the Legal Services Corporation, $657 million for the Small Business Administration, and $1.142 billion for the U.S. Information Agency.

Mr. Speaker, 178 amendments were added to the bill when it went to the Senate. We have been able to resolve all of these. I think there is only one upon which we will probably have a vote. It is my hope that that is the case.

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

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 17 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I hope not to take that entire time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the conference report to accompany H.R. 2519, the fiscal year 1994 Departments of Commerce, Justice, State, the judiciary, and related agencies appropriations bill.

Mr. Speaker, the chairmen of the House-Senate conference committee, and all the members of the conference committee, are to be commended for their diligence in crafting a conference report which I believe all Members should support.

Under the leadership of the chairmen of the conference committee—the gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from South Carolina—and with the help of a revised 602(b) allocation, the conferees were able to make some important improvements over the House-passed bill, particularly in high priority areas such as law enforcement, and immigration controls. In addition, the conferees have placed controls on U.N. peacekeeping.

For the Department of Justice, an area of particular concern to many Members of this body, the conference agreement provides a $130 million increase over the House-passed bill. A sizable portion of this increase finances a comprehensive immigration initiative which will allow us not only to detect and apprehend, but also to detain and deport, illegal aliens. The conference report provides a $90 million increase over the House-passed bill for

immigration control initiatives, a $129 million increase over fiscal year 1993. Not only does the agreement put 600 additional border patrol agents in the field as provided in the House bill, it also funds construction and expansion of four INS detention facilities, and increased detention and deportation facilities at airports and seaports. items which were not included in the House-passed bill.

To fight the war on crime and drugs, the conference agreement provides funds above the House level for the FBI, the DEA, and for assistance grants for State and local law enforcement.

For the Commerce Department, the conference report provides increases above the House for the administration's technology initiatives. We increase funding by 16 percent above the House to continue National Weather Service modernization efforts. Funds are also provided for the Economic Development Administration to help assist communities impacted by defense and timber industry cutbacks, as well as other economically depressed communities.

Like the House-passed bill, the judiciary is given a significant increase, 11 percent, over fiscal year 1993, including full funding for the 35 new bankruptcy judgeships the Congress approved last year.

Reflecting the need to put our own domestic needs first, we have cut spending for the Department of State and international programs 8 percent below the fiscal 1993 level, a $349 million cut.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report the conferees were able to reach a compromise once and for all on the issue of funding Radio and TV Marti. Under the conference agreement, Radio and TV Marti have one last chance to prove their effectiveness—if it cannot be proven, they will be terminated.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the conference agreement sends a strong signal to the administration and to the American public on what I believe to be one of the most important issues facing our nation today—the role of the United Nations in our national security policy.

When we brought this bill to the House 4 months ago, we had a record high of 13 peacekeeping operations. Now, we have 18 missions, with 3 new missions having been approved in the last 2 months. And the U.S. bill for these operations now totals $1.3 billion for fiscal 1994 alone.

More importantly, in the last 4 months too many brave American soldiers are being placed in harm's way, too many are paying with their lives. The United States now has almost 50,000 Americans soldiers supporting U.N. missions around the globe. And, the President wants to send as many as 25,000 more to Bosnia.

Why are they there? What vital U.S. interests are at stake? When are they coming home? And, what is the cost to the American taxpayer?

Unbelievably, not even the administration has answered these questions.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is time for Congress to step up to the plate. It is high time the administration told the American people what our role is in the morass of U.N. nation building.

And, the Congress must demand answers.

This conference report is a step in the right direction. It includes strong language putting the administration on notice that the American public has not bought into this notion of global peacekeeping. The conference report tells the administration that we expect:

The Secretary of State to notify the Congress at least 15 days in advance before our U.S. Representative votes at the United Nations for any new peacekeeping missions. The President must tell us the cost, the mission, the U.S. interests served, the duration and the termination date, and the source of funding.

We recommend the administration not agree to any new missions until both the administration and the United Nations clean up their act.

We expect the administration to notify the United Nations that the United States will not pay more than a 25 percent assessment for peacekeeping.

The conferees are putting the United Nations on notice that we are tired of no one minding the store, and it is high time for a strong, independent inspector general who will put an end to the endless reports of waste, fraud, and abuse at the United Nations. The conference report puts into law a requirement that the United States withhold 10 percent of all regular United Nations budget contributions until the Secretary of State can certify to the Congress that the United Nations has a strong inspector general.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report puts the administration on notice that the Congress, and the American people, are watching, and expect to be consulted on these gravely important matters.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I believe the conferees have done a tremendous job balancing pressing domestic priorities with the fiscal constraints we are operating under.

Mr. Speaker, I have placed on the platform here a map showing the 18 so-called peacekeeping missions in which the United Nations is now involved around the world. As I said, just a few months ago there were only 13 of these. In the last 2 months we have become engaged in two or three more by the vote of our delegate to the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, it is time we brought some order, brought some discipline into the decision of when we go into a peacekeeping operation, how we pay for it, how the mission is defined, when we get out, and under what conditions.

I believe this procedure, that is in this conference report, does just that. It does not, in my judgment, violate any of the separation of powers clauses, nor the War Powers Act, because these are United Nations proceedings, not otherwise.

□ 1950

And I hope and trust that the conference report will be accepted.

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

Mr. ROGERS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and more important, I want to thank the gentleman for his real leadership in addressing some very, very crucial issues in regard to our Nation's relationship with the United Nations today, and the related concern that he has talked about that I think all of us have in the Congress in regards to the need for a rational foreign policy.

I was with the gentleman during the now, I guess, maybe, infamous so-called briefing on Somalia where more questions were raised than answered, and now we have very similar concerns in regard to Bosnia and Haiti. And I want to thank the gentleman for what he is trying to accomplish within this bill. It is most important, and I urge all of the Members to pay attention.

I think the gentleman has said, if I am correct, that the United Nations is currently involved in 18 peacekeeping missions, with 8 more being proposed, and that some 50,000 American troops are directly or indirectly involved. Is this the case?

Mr. ROGERS. That is exactly correct.

Mr. ROBERTS. I must tell the gentleman even with the press attention to this matter I do not think the American people are aware of the extent of that involvement.

The gentleman addressed this problem, if I heard him correctly, by requiring the United Nations to give 15 days' notice before any peacekeeping involvement, including cost, including the purpose of the mission and some kind of date or some kind of time equation so we know where we are, is this the case?

Mr. ROGERS. That is correct. The procedure now is, there is no congressional deliberation of a decision that our U.N. representative makes at the Security Council in New York about a possible mission that they would like to get involved with. The Security Council votes to go into that mission, wherever it may be, and we are bound by it. Then the United Nations sends us a bill, sends the Congress a bill for almost one-third of the total cost of that peacekeeping operation.

Mr. ROBERTS. Let me ask a question about that, because as the gentleman indicated, I understand the

United Nations assesses the United States about 32 percent, I think it is about 31.9 percent of the total cost of each of the peacekeeping missions. Now am I to understand that assessment has been raised or increased, and that, according to my figures here, and we talked about this, that estimated requirement in 1994 comes to $1.4 billion, and that involves a shortfall of $855 million. Is that correct?

Mr. ROGERS. That is correct. The total cost of the requirements in 1994 for peacekeeping missions by the United Nations, our share of that, is $1.3 billion, and we were unable to pay it. We simply cannot pay that figure, and we are not paying it in this bill.

Meanwhile, they are voting more missions that we cannot pay for, and we have to get a handle on the fiscal end of this problem, if nothing more. And that is what this conference report attempts to do.

Mr. ROBERTS. If the gentleman will continue to yield, to address the problem in this bill the gentleman is saying to our State Department, in keeping with the President's desire, I might add, for more involvement by other countries, that the State Department tell the United Nations that our cost share of the bill would be 25 percent in the future, is that correct?

Mr. ROGERS. That is correct. The conferees expect the administration to notify the United Nations that the United States will not accept an assessment greater than 25 percent. Currently, the United Nations charges the United States 31.7 percent. We are saying that is unacceptable. We expect our assessment to be no more than 25 percent, the same percentage we contribute to the general budget of the United Nations. I believe it is too much as it is at 25 percent. But at least we ought to hold the peacekeeping assessment to 25 percent as well.

Mr. ROBERTS. Finally, I believe you said that the United States would withdraw 10 percent of its funding if the United Nations does not appoint a long-needed inspector general to conduct an investigation with regards to fraud, and waste, and abuse, is that correct?

Mr. ROBERTS. That is exactly right. For years the United States under different administrations has been pressuring the United Nations to appoint some sort of independent auditor to root out waste, fraud, and abuse. They have refused any meaningful attempts at reform.

Now we are saying in this conference report OK, if that is the way you want it, we are going to withhold a portion of our annual dues to the United Nations. We are going to withhold 10 percent until the Secretary of State certifies to the Congress that the U.N. has a strong, independent inspector general, with independent investigatory powers that can report to the Secretary General and the General Assembly of the United Nations, and to us that the monies are not being wasted, and that fraud is not occurring. That is a very important provision in this conference report.

Mr. ROBERTS. I want to thank the gentleman, and I want to really underscore again the importance of what he has done.

From the information I have, I note with interest from your map and from your statement that our U.N. representative voted to approve another three missions, one in Haiti, Liberia, and Rwanda. Wait a minute, make that four missions. There is another one in the Republic of Georgia I think.

Mr. ROGERS. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTS. All without consultation and notification, is that correct?

Mr. ROGERS. That is exactly correct. She voted in the U.N. Security Council a peacekeeping mission for the Republic of Georgia in the former Soviet Union in August of this year, in September the mission to Haiti, in September the mission to Liberia, and just a couple of weeks ago, October 5, Rwanda, none of which was the Congress consulted about, none of which did we receive notice about so that we could plan fiscally for it. I think it has just gotten out of hand.

Mr. ROBERTS. One final thing, and I said finally before, but is it true that the administration used the 21-day continuing resolution, and now wake up to this, is it true the administration used the 21-day continuing resolution to pay approximately $321 million in U.N. bills before this Congress even passed the appropriation bill? Is that correct?

Mr. ROGERS. That is correct. Using the continuing resolution passed by this body, the State Department or the OMB used a 21-day CR to pay all of the peacekeeping arrearages for fiscal 1994. In addition, they also have already spent 76 percent of all the funds they expect us to appropriate in this bill, using a 21-day CR. This is highly unusual. It is not right. So, therefore, the gentleman is correct in his statement.

Mr. ROBERTS. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I am not on the committee, and I am not on the Armed Services Committee or on the Foreign Affairs Committee, but I can tell you as a Member, like many Members in this body, I have a very keen and strong interest in this Nation's foreign policy. I do not want the Congress to intervene and trample on the rights of the Executive. My goodness, we cannot even get a majority around here to decide when to adjourn, let alone try to conduct any foreign policy.

But it is no wonder, with the record that the gentleman has demonstrated, and the kinds of things he has endeavored to put in this bill, that we are getting back into the business of considering the War Powers Act and requiring congressional approval of American involvement in the so-called peacekeeping operations. We have risked and lost American lives in Somalia. I think the gentleman's efforts go a long ways toward making sure that does not happen again in other U.N. missions, and I thank him for his efforts and thank him for yielding.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN.]

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report to H.R. 2519, the Commerce-Justice-State fiscal year 1994 appropriations bill. As a member of the subcommittee, I would like to compliment Chairman SMITH and Ranking Member ROGERS for their hard work on this important legislation. They led the subcommittee through the difficult task of cutting $1.5 billion from the President's request in order to meet our 602(b) allocation.

Upon review of this bill some of you may note that we have changed funding priorities for certain law enforcement programs. It became clear during the course of our hearings that Attorney General Reno had some new ideas on crime control initiatives. We have supported the new direction she is charting for the Justice Department to combat the alarming rise in crime in our Nation. For example, I am pleased to report to my colleagues that during conference we added 48 million dollars for State and local law enforcement assistance grants. In addition, we added 30 million dollars above the President's request for juvenile justice programs.

President Clinton is committed to addressing our Nation's competitiveness problems during his term. He has targeted programs in the National Institute of Standards and Technology in this regard. The goal is to enable Government and industry to team together as partners to improve manufacturing processes and perform cutting edge research and development on tomorrow's products. The subcommittee provided a 35 percent increase over fiscal year 1993 funds to allow NIST to fulfill President Clinton's initiative.

We have provided an 18 percent increase for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. These funds are critical to maintain our national ocean service programs, our national marine fisheries programs, and our satellite and environmental programs. I am particularly pleased that we have been able to provide desperately needed funds to modernize the National Weather Service.

This conference report allows us to maintain our commitment to public broadcasting through the Public Telecommunications and Facilities Program. And we provide funds to initiate

President Clinton's Information Highway Grant Program.

In this bill the committee is showing strong support for the Economic Development Administration. EDA serves an extremely important function in our Government—it is the only agency with an exclusive mandate to provide technical and financial assistance to economically distressed areas. Now, more than ever, EDA funds are needed by communities in every congressional district to overcome the effects of a slowly recovering economy.

This bill provides funds for small business administration programs. As we all know, the growth of small business is essential to the health of our Nation's economy. The SBA is the central Government agency responsible for encouraging and nurturing that growth. I am pleased to say that, through the funding levels in this bill, we are continuing our commitment to small business development centers, the Guaranteed Business Loan Program and the 8(A) Program that benefits disadvantaged businesses.

Finally, I am pleased to report to my colleagues that we have reached a reasonable compromise on the controversial radio and TV Marti. I am hopeful that the three-member advisory panel established by this legislation will help resolve the long-standing concerns on both sides associated with radio and TV Marti.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this conference report.

□ 2000

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS].

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

Mr. Speaker, the House and Senate conferees have reached agreement on the Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary appropriations bill for this new fiscal year, and I think we have produced a bipartisan, balanced bill. I want to thank and congratulate chairman SMITH, our distinguished ranking member Mr. ROGERS, my colleagues on the subcommittee, and our terrific staff for a job well done.

The bill finances a wide range of governmental activities, from scientific research to law enforcement to immigration control to diplomatic activities to international peacekeeping. We tried to satisfy the diverse needs of these programs while keeping in mind our need to keep spending down.

In this bill, we have managed to do both.

Let us keep one key fact in mind as we vote on this bill. It appropriates $200 million less than these programs spent last year. That's not a decrease in the rate of increase, and it's not a decrease below the 1994 base. It is a $200 million cut in spending, and, in addition, $1.5 billion less than the administration's budget request.

While achieving significant savings, this bill still provides increased funding for essential Government activities. Among those are the scientific research and technology transfer programs of the Commerce Department. NOAA, NIST, and NTIA programs can play a major role in revitalizing our economy; they are absolutely essential to our effort to prepare our businesses and our workers for the globalized economy of the 21st century. These three Commerce Department agencies represent precisely the type of research and applied technology efforts the Federal Government needs to encourage to make our economy thrive.

Within these programs, I am particularly pleased that we were able to honor the request for almost $62 million to help renovate the laboratory facilities of the National Institute of Standards and Technology. We have more than 2 billion dollars' worth of NIST facilities—built between 25 and 40 years ago, that are deteriorating at an alarming rate. These renovation funds are a prudent investment and will help NIST continue to play its vital role in promoting our country's long-term economic health.

I would like to point out that the bill provides $2.156 billion for the courts of appeals, district courts, and other judicial services—including $16 million to meet the highest priority needs of the Federal courts. This is an important reference that should not go unnoticed by states still struggling to recover from the economic downturn the country experienced in the last few years. It is my hope, and I believe the intention of the members of the conference committee, that this money will be used to add all of the 35 new bankruptcy judges we authorized during the 102d Congress.

The conference report states that the judicial conference is to "examine carefully the pending bankruptcy caseload of each of the districts with newly authorized judgeships and fill those with the greatest backlog and complexity of cases first." Certainly, the most needy of those districts deserve priority attention, but all 35 judges should be appointed as soon as possible.

We are making great strides in improving the economic fortune of the country, and these judges will help further that effort. The backlog of cases in bankruptcy courts only slows our recovery as debtors, creditors, and others with some relation to these cases sit and wait for resolution. These delays not only cost time, but money as well. It is important that these cases move as swiftly as possible to their conclusion, and the bill provides the funding to break the existing logjam.

I'm also pleased that we were able to maintain the House Appropriations Committee's funding level for the Legal Services Corporation [LSC]. The $400 million in this bill is less than the LSC requested, and far less than it needs. One of the basic principles of our system of justice is that any party to a legal dispute is due a fair hearing in a court of law. To meet that standard, we have to provide competent legal representation for those who cannot afford it, in both civil and criminal cases. The LSC is an essential part of the efforts to provide justice to all Americans. I support its efforts, and hope that we will be able to provide more resources for this valuable program in the future.

Finally, the conferees approved a reasonable, constructive compromise on the issue of funding our Government's broadcasts to Cuba. I anticipate that the process set in motion by the bill will lead to real reforms and cost savings at Radio Marti and the orderly termination of TV Marti.

The agreement cuts 25 percent of the budget for these programs and establishes a short-term, independent advisory panel to investigate and make recommendations regarding Radio Marti's policies and standards, and TV Marti's technical viability. In the case of Radio Marti, I have been concerned by evidence of bloated budgets, conflict of interest, and inappropriate programming. The independent review panel this bill creates is specifically required to address these concerns. And to ensure that the panel's work is not just left to gather dust on a shelf, over one-third of the funding for Radio Marti is tied to the implementation of the panel's recommendation by the Director of the U.S. Information Agency.

With respect to TV Marti, the issue of program quality is secondary to the threshold question of whether the Cuban people can see it. The evidence, both anecdotal and official, concludes that jamming continues to effectively prevent TV Marti's signal from reaching its intended audience—and from fulfilling its mission. I fully anticipate that the panel will reach the same conclusion, and that the USIA Director will pull the plug on TV Marti.

I include in the RECORD at this point the declassified text of recent official reports on the reception of TV Marti in Cuba—reports which underscore the extensive technical problems that exist in this program:

(Declassified by DRHamilton on 6 Oct 93 following consultations with USINT HAVANA. The following texts have been slightly altered to permit declassification. Deletions are marked ——— and insertions are indicated by italic.)

REPORT ONE, DATED SEPTEMBER 3, 1993

Para. 3. TV Marti found a crack in Cuban Electronic Curtain: ——— monitoring of TV Marti Broadcasts to Cuba has repeatedly (one line garbled, text probably not lost) demonstrated points for a minute or two before the jamming starts. Once the jammers come on, however, the TV becomes hash and noise. ——— monitoring of the TV Marti broadcast on September 1 detected a small difference for the first time ——— in a small

area, perhaps a window between jammers, just after 5 a.m., in which —— the sound *could be heard* and —— the color broadcast of the TV Marti program *viewed* for a few minutes. The area is near Playa Solada between Mariel and Havana, does not appear to be more than a few square miles in size and is lightly populated region, but this area will be explored further —— and reported fully to TV Marti.

REPORT TWO, DATED SEPTEMBER 10, 1993

Para. 3. Window for TV Marti broadcasts is tiny: —— the TV Marti program *was received* on three occasions in a small area about 35 kilometers west of Havana. It appears as though a small gap of from five to ten kilometers in length exists between Cuban jamming west of Havana and just to the east of the Port Town of Mariel. Depending on atmospheric conditions, the TV Marti signal has been picked up about five miles east of Mariel (just beyond the Pan American Polytechnic School) and in an area of from five to ten kilometers further east toward Havana (always terminating before Playa Solada). Sound is always audible first as the high pitched tone of the jammers fades, and then the video becomes clearer toward the center of the area but is never good. One morning, September 3, the TV Marti signal was completely overshadowed by Channel 13, TVT, the CBS affiliate station in Tampa, Florida. On each of the occasions that TV Marti was observed on a handheld battery-powered (Sony-Watchman) receiver, electricity was on in the area. However, the region is very sparsely populated and the reception that is possible along the cost fades out before reaching the central highway about six to eight kilometers further inland.

REPORT THREE, DATED SEPTEMBER 14, 1993

1. Summary: As requested, —— the Mariel/Pinar Del Rio area west of Havana *has been monitored* eleven times since new TV Marti broadcast protocol was initiated August 31 to determine whether TV Marti signal could be received. On three occasions TV Marti programs were received at least faintly in a small area about 35 KMS west of Havana, a few kilometers east of Mariel. This reception area is very sparsely populated and extends no more than a few kilometers south of the coast road and for about ten kilometers from east to west, although variations were noted due to atmospheric conditions. Electricity appeared to be available during each monitoring excursion, and jamming was detected about half the time. End summary.

2. —— routes and times *were varied* to maximize the range of observations possible. The total distance covered on round trips —— varied from 169 KMS to 72 KMS and start times were from 2:45 a.m. to 3:30 a.m. The average trip was about 100 KMS with stops every few KMS to extend the antenna outside the car and check for reception during a one- to two-minute interval. Monitoring was always concluded in the Mariel area when TV Marti programming concluded at 6:00 a.m., ——. Reception was tested on a Sony Watchman hand-held receiver which was thoroughly checked —— before project began and again after one week. Electricity appeared to be available throughout the monitoring area each morning, but very few lights showed in residences. Routes covered inhabited areas more intensively, and then concentrated on the area east of Mariel where reception was detected repeatedly. No TV Marti signal was ever observed at any point in either Pinar Del Rio Province of the Havana suburbs.

3. Here are the detailed results for each date:

August 31: Observed heavy static and snow only. Took coast road to Mariel; made multiple observations around La Puntilla and in town suburbs. 96 KMS.

September 1: Took central highway to Guanajuay, west of Mariel, and started monitoring there at about 3:30 a.m. Observed heavy jamming until reaching an area about five kilometers east of Mariel (just beyond the Politecnica Panamericana). Detected first sound of TV Marti program and then picture just after 5:20 a.m. and at next two stops. All reception faded well before Playa Saldado. Width of reception area was about eight to ten kilometers, and very few homes were noticed. 108 KMS.

September 2: Took Autopista to Artemisa (west of Guanajuay) and returned by coast road. Concluded monitoring near the Politechnica at 6:00 a.m. Observed only noise and snow. 124 KMS.

September 3: Took coast road and started careful monitoring near the coast guard school just beyond the Marina Hemingway in the extreme western suburbs of Havana. Detected heavy jamming until a few kilometers beyond Playa Saldado. When jamming faded completely, —— *got excellent* reception of TVT-channel 13, the CBS affiliate station from Tampa, Florida. The TVT program was visible right up to the cement plant on the outskirts of Mariel. 97 KMS.

September 4 and 5: No observations.

September 6: Took the central highway deep into Pinar del Rio Province (reached KM 70 on the highway at 3:30 a.m.) where monitoring was started well east of Candelaria. Detected fairly strong jamming as side roads meandered through the countryside. Reached area of previous TV Marti reception, but detected only jamming until a little closer to the firing range (half way from Mariel to Playa Salado). Finally detected clear audio with poor picture at 5:45 a.m. to hear an excellent report on the commemoration of Martin Luther King's "I Have a Dream" speech. Reception window was very narrow. 169 KMS.

September 7: Took central highway to Mariel and monitored in Mariel area and side roads. Observed only noise and snow. 72 KMS.

September 8: Took coast highway to Mariel and east almost to Artemisa. On return TV Marti was detected from just opposite the Politecnica almost to Playa Salado, a window of about 12 KMS in length. Reception was quite clear. 98 KMS.

September 9: No observation.

September 10: Very strong jamming was observed everywhere. Took central highway to the exit for Playa Salado and concentrated route in small towns and villages (Banes, Agnacate, Caimito, etc.) that are a few kilometers inland from the areas in which TV Marti had been received. 96 KMS.

September 11: No observation.

September 12: Repeated successful September 8 route but received only noise and snow. 98 KMS.

September 13: Concentrated on coastal road routes during very bad atmospheric conditions (some lightning and thunder in distance). Received only noise and snow. Conditions were so bad that even Radio Marti could not be received at all on shortwave until after 7:00 a.m. 78 KMS.

September 14: Poor atmospheric conditions again. Observed only noise and snow on TV, while Radio Marti faded in and out on shortwave. Repeated observations in central highway area to coast road as on September 10. 101 KMS.

REPORT FOUR, DATED SEPTEMBER 29, 1993

1. Summary: —— additional monitoring *was conducted* to detect visibility of TV Marti signal in the beach cities area, east of Havana, on September 28, and 29. A very poor signal was detected briefly on September 28. But much better reception was detected over a broad area on September 29. —— End summary.

2. Here are the details of the Broadcast reception:

During poor atmospheric conditions of September 28, the TV Marti audio signal was first received in the Guanabo area and was clearly audible for about ten minutes while driving east about 0420 hours. No picture, however, was ever detected very clearly. Boomerang car antenna with video walkman recently supplied by TV Marti used to monitor signal. A total of 144 KMS from residence to an area about 15 KMS east of Santa Cruz Del Norte was covered during the entire TV Marti Broadcast period.

TV Marti program was heard fairly clearly throughout most of the beach city area east of Havana on September 29. Starting a few miles east of Cojimar (at 0355 Hours) and running through the fairly populous area up to Guanabo and the less populated areas up to el Abra—70 KMS east of Havana——most of the broadcast *could be understood* on the way out and back (until 0550 hours), a total of 149 KMS. A clear video signal was received only intermittently, probably due to poor atmospheric conditions. Electricity appeared to be available throughout the monitoring area. Equipment was same as on September 28.

I wish to stress that TV Marti's fate has, I believe correctly, been tied to specific questions about its reception and effectiveness, not broader considerations of our policy toward Cuba. In reaching this agreement, all of us involved have restated our strong support for democracy in Cuba. Fidel Castro's dictatorship should find no solace in this decision.

The conference agreement requires that the Director reach a decision on TV Marti's efficacy by July 1, 1993, and fences $2.5 million of the budget to cover close-out costs, but I'd note that the Director has the authority to make a decision on termination before then, and I encourage him not to wait until the last minute.

To summarize, Mr. Speaker, this is a good, taut bill. It finances the necessary functions of government, and it takes into account the need to put our Federal financial house in order. I urge its passage.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the conference report on the Commerce, Justice, State, Judiciary appropriations bill, and I urge my colleagues to support this well-crafted agreement.

As a new member of this Appropriations subcommittee, I want to thank Chairman SMITH and the ranking member, Mr. ROGERS, and our other colleagues and our fine staff for the hard work and cooperative spirit which have led to this conference agreement.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill of amazingly broad scope. It includes: international trade, advanced technology, law enforcement, peacekeeping, foreign affairs, the entire judicial branch of Government, important independent agencies such as the Small Business Administration, Federal Communications Commission, Federal Trade Commission, and yet to merely list these worthy agencies and programs in one bill points up some of the severest choices and tradeoffs of any appropriations bill that we consider in this House.

So we did have tough choices, but we brought in this conference report $219 million below the fiscal 1993 funding level, and we reduced the President's budget request by $1.5 billion. Let me detail some of those specific cuts: We have $84 million less for the Justice Department than we had last year and $260 million less than the President's request. We have $343 million less for the State Department than we had last year, $589 million less than the President's request. We have $52 million less than we had last year for payments to international organizations. We are appropriating $21 million less than in 1993 for the USIA, $189 million less for the Maritime Administration, $93 million less than fiscal 1993 for the Economic Development Administration, and on and on.

We have made the tough spending cuts. The cuts are real. They are significant. Many agencies have been affected.

At the same time, this cutting has permitted some additional flexibility in funding some of the most promising initiatives of the Clinton administration.

For example, we have been able to increase the commitment to the National Institute of Standards and Technology by 35 percent. That is $136 million more than last year.

That is money well spent.

It includes $199 million for the advanced technology program to support industry-led research efforts to develop new technologies that increase our country's competitiveness.

We have two important examples of that commitment in North Carolina, working with the national textile and apparel industry.

The National Textile Center, a consortium of four southeastern universities based at North Carolina State University, is conducting core research for the textile industry. The so-called T.C. Squared consortium is also provided matching funds in this bill. It is a nonprofit, member-driven Government-industry partnership that serves as a vehicle for the development and the transfer of manufacturing technology in the apparel industry.

This is just one example of how these advanced technology funds are well spent. I am pleased that this subcommittee has been able to provide additional resources for this and other advanced technology programs to enhance our country's competitive edge.

We were also able to provide $26 million for new information infrastructure grants. Again, North Carolina has made great strides in this area. Our State has its own information highway in place, and we will be submitting an application under the new competitive grants process to demonstrate the applications of tele-medicine by linking the four medical schools and teaching hospitals in our State with the Army hospital at Fort Bragg to support teleconferencing, the high-speed exchange of data and high-resolution radiological images, and the linking of remote rural and military sites.

In short, Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill, an excellent conference report. It demonstrates our commitment both to reduce spending and to redirect spending to the areas of maximum economic payoff. We have made the tough choices while providing the flexibility for new and promising initiatives, and I urge my colleagues to support this conference report.

□ 2010

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the chairman yielding this time to me. I would ask the distinguished chairman to enter into a colloquy with me.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I would be glad to.

Mr. HOYER. Is it the chairman's understanding that the Census Bureau's funding level under the conference agreement will not result in any reductions in force beyond those envisioned in the administration's own budget request?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Maryland, is correct. The administration's budget request assumed that temporary employees winding up their work on the 1990 census would be leaving Government employment, but the conference agreement funding level should not require any reduction in force at the Census Bureau beyond that.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the distinguished gentleman for clarifying this point. As I am sure the gentleman can understand, Census Bureau employees in the metropolitan area have been very concerned about the workforce implications of the Bureau's budget under the conference agreement, and the gentleman's clarifying comments should go a long way toward calming those waters.

In thanking my colleague, I would like to acknowledge the excellent work of the subcommittee staff and thank them, too, for their assistance.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN].

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to commend the gentleman and the members of the conference committee for their hard work on the conference report on State, Commerce and Justice. They have done an excellent job with this bill; however, I rise to take some exception to specific cuts with respect to the Census Bureau, which is located in my district. It is my understanding that the conference committee report contains a budget cut of $54 million below that which was requested by the President.

Now, I understand that the chairman has some concerns about the performance of the Census Bureau, and I certainly believe they have merit. At the same time, as a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Subcommittee on Census, I have heard numerous hours of testimony about changes that are being made at the Census Bureau to improve our performance over the year 2000 census and that it will be an improvement over 1990. I am encouraged by these reports. I would just like to say that while I am concerned about these cuts, I would like to work with the gentleman in the future and perhaps revisit this issue for next year's budget to insure that these cuts do not result in a less accurate census, but rather that we have the necessary manpower and necessary personnel to achieve an even more accurate census in the year 2000; but again, I want to commend the committee for its hard work in this issue.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], a member of the full committee.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding this time to me. I want to compliment him and the chairman of the subcommittee for coming to some very successful conclusions with the Senate on this conference.

They have come up with some good ideas. Unfortunately, they are in report language. I wish they were in bill language.

I hope that this body starts to take note of what they have accomplished, because frankly, it goes a long way toward where we should be going, but it does not get over the goal.

They call for a peacekeeping consultation between the White House and the Congress, asking the White House to let us know 15 days in advance before they detail our troops all over the world.

They call for a reduction of the 31.7 percent—and by the way, only 6 months ago it was 30.4 percent. The Clinton administration boosted the allotment to a 31.7 cost share by the United States for peacekeeping missions under the United Nations all

around the world. They called for that to be reduced to 25 percent.

They called for the United Nations to give us credit for such expenditures like the billion dollars that we spent on our Defense Department moving our troops into Somalia before the United Nations starts picking up the bill. We ought to get credit for that against anything that we owed the United Nations.

Frankly, I am concerned about the totality of the situation. We are using our military. They are not the exclusive military in the U.N. peacekeeping mission, but our soldiers, our Marines, their lives, our airmen, their lives are on the line in Somalia, and soon to be Haiti and all these other places in the world. We are going to put them on the line. We are going to risk their lives, and then we are going to pay 31 percent of the U.N. peacekeeping costs? Give me a break.

The fact is that only a few months ago, as the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] pointed out, we were involved in peacekeeping missions in 13 countries. Now it is 18. There are some 74,000 U.S. troops involved in these peacekeeping missions.

They are contemplating in the White House sending United States troops to Sudan, Zaire, South Africa, Togo, Bosnia, Papua, New Guinea, the Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan; the list is endless.

Why? Because Morton Halperin, the Assistant Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State and various other gurus have decided it is important to take U.S. troops and put them under the auspices and direction of the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, they should not be under the direction of the United Nations. They should be under our leadership. They should be going to places of United States interest and they should not be deployed all over the world to be sniped at by people like what happened in Somalia just a few days back.

There was a Presidential Directive No. 18 that says that U.S. troops will be used under the United Nations direction. That needs to be repealed.

Morton Halperin, the Assistant Secretary of Defense, needs to be canned, needs to be fired.

We need to bring our troops back and we need to forget this misbegotten policy.

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

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

It is my understanding that the conferees on H.R. 2519, in providing funding above last year's appropriation level for the National Sea Grant College Program, intend that this new funding supplement Sea Grant's current level of expenditure for marine biotechnology, not act as a replacement for those expenditures. Is my understanding of the conferees' intent correct?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is correct. The amounts provided to Sea Grant for marine biotechnology are not intended to supplant the program's current expenditures on these activities.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. That is an important distinction, though a subtle one.

May I just also say that the gentleman and his subcommittee have my great appreciation and that of our authorizing committee, under extraordinarily difficult circumstances.

I think the chairman and the members of his subcommittee have done remarkably well providing particularly for those programs in NOAA and the ocean and coastal fisheries. We appreciate the constraints under which the gentleman is operating, and we appreciate what he has been able to come up with.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. I want to say that we try to work with the full committee chairman of the Merchant Marine Committee and the gentleman's committee has been very good to work with.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. VALENTINE].

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 2519.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will allow the President to implement important elements of his technology policy. It provides appropriations for the technology programs of the Department of Commerce close to the level requested by the administration and authorized in H.R. 820. That bill passed the House overwhelmingly in May.

These programs include the inhouse research and the extramural programs of the National Institute of Standards and Technology [NIST], as well as the activities of the Technology Administration.

Our committee carefully reviewed and strongly endorses the Department of Commerce technology programs slated for funding in this bill.

Strengthening the technology programs of the Commerce Department is essential for the President's technology policy to succeed. The need is clear. The administration's approach is sound.

I want to commend the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH], and the conferees for bringing this conference report to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the measure.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

I rise in support of the conference report and to commend the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH], and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] for their work in bringing this conference report to the floor. This bill always presents difficult funding decisions, and I want to compliment them on the final product.

The Committee on Science, Space, and Technology authorizes two of the important programs for which funds are appropriated in this act: the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and technology programs at the Department of Commerce, including the National Institute of Standards and Technology. The chairman has consulted with me on these programs, and I am pleased that for the most part the bill comes very close to funding the programs and priorities which the authorizing committee has reported.

With respect to NOAA, the bill almost fully funds the critical operations of the National Weather Service. As we've seen from the spate of natural weather disasters in this country over the last few years, the warnings provided by the National Weather Service have saved countless lives and reduced property losses. As many Members know, our weather offices are in dire need of modernization, and I am pleased that the Weather Service Modernization Program is nearly fully funded. In addition, the conference report includes much needed funds for a new NOAA hurricane research and reconnaissance aircraft to supplement the aging fleet. These funds should enable the Weather Service to continue to supply us with the accurate and dependable weather warnings and services upon which we have come to rely.

The bill also recognizes the growing importance of the Department of Commerce's Technology Administration and the National Institute of Standards and Technology in maintaining our economic competitiveness. The Clinton administration had requested a major increase for NIST to fund the President's technology policy. While the bill does not provide all of the funding requested by the President, it appropriates $525.9 million, an increase of $137.2 million, or nearly 35 percent, over last year's appropriations. The bill also provides an important increase in NIST's in-house research budget to provide an enhanced in-house capability to provide technical and scientific support to these endeavors. These funding levels are comparable to those provided in H.R. 820, the National Competitiveness Act, which passed the House earlier this year.

Mr. Chairman, I again want to commend the conferees on their excellent work, and I urge my colleagues to support the conference report.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], a member of the committee.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to express particular support for the funding of this conference report for the USIA and the Board for International Broadcasting which I believe continue to perform very valuable services for our country as we struggle to define our role in the post-cold-war era.

I believe that the BIB is one of the very best programs we fund. Through its oversight of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, the BIB has played an essential role in bringing freedom to the people of Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union.

□ 2020

Although the cold war is over, the need for surrogate broadcasting is not. Neither communism, nor fascism, are dead, either within the fragile democracies of Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union or within the authoritarian societies of Asia. It takes time for a country and its citizens to develop the institutions of freedom. It takes a commitment by countries with a strong history of democratic principles to help these peoples adapt to the institutions of freedom.

This report also provides funding for the USIA, which administers the Voice of America. I strongly support the ongoing efforts of VOA to broadcast news and the message of our country to the world, and I will continue to support providing funds to VOA so that they may carry out their important mission.

While I also strongly support the committee's efforts to provide funding for the BIB and USIA, I believe administration plans underway to reorganize our broadcasting services are poorly conceived and could result in undermining the nature and progress of the surrogate radios.

As coauthor of legislation to create Radio Free Asia, I believe that the BIB should have authority over the newly proposed Asian surrogate service. Given its track record of success, BIB is a logical home for an Asian surrogate service. Most importantly, BIB has the independence needed to make the Radio Free Asia broadcasts credible and effective.

Funding surrogate radio in Asia is one of the smartest initiatives we can pursue to advance our national interest and values. I sincerely hope that, when the reorganization of our broadcasting services occurs, Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty and Radio Free Asia are under a board which enjoys the same independence as the BIB has always had. This independence is vitally important to their success.

Finally, I strongly support funding for the National Endowment for Democracy in this conference report. I plan to speak on this issue later, but briefly, I believe that our Nation should be looking outward and using this incredible opportunity to promote our values overseas. NED is one of our best tools to achieve that end, and I believe we should continue to utilize NED's great expertise.

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

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report for H.R. 2519.

I appreciate the hard work and the difficult choices that the conferees had to make.

In these times of limited budgetary options, I am pleased that the conferees gave special consideration to the ocean and coastal programs of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

As the chairman of the subcommittee with jurisdiction over NOAA's ocean and coastal programs, I am very familiar with the importance and value of supporting these efforts.

I am particularly encouraged with the appropriation levels which have been provided in the conference report for the Coastal Zone Management Program, the National Undersea Research Program, the National Sea Grant College Program, and the National Marine Sanctuary Program.

The list of problems which face our coastal areas is astonishing. Loss of fisheries, coastal pollution, red tides, non-indigenous species, habitat loss * * * the list goes on and on.

Each of these programs provide unique services in addressing these problems by helping to understand, manage, and protect our coastal resources.

It is imperative that we support these programs and others which are the front line for coastal research and management.

I think that it is also important to note that these are programs which have traditionally been congressional priorities.

There has been a lot of progress made in the past few years in reconciling the differences of opinion with the administration in regard to funding requests for these programs.

I urge Members to continue working with the administration to achieve adequate funding requests for each of them.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Appropriation Subcommittee chairman, Mr. SMITH, for his continued hard work and leadership, and I urge the Members to support this conference report.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PETE GEREN].

Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report, and I would like to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH]. I ask the gentleman, "Is it your understanding that this conference report does not intend, imply, or require that the southern region headquarters of the National Weather Service be closed or consolidated?"

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is our understanding. In fact, they have told us they do not intend to.

Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas. Furthermore, is it the gentleman's understanding that NOAA will use funds from the $319 million appropriated for local warnings and forecasts in this conference report to fully fund and staff the southern region headquarters of the National Weather Service?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Yes; we understand that NOAA will use a portion of these funds to maintain the southern region headquarters.

Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MFUME). The Chair would advise Members controlling the debate time that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] has 7 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] has 8 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the very distinguished ranking Republican on the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 2519 making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice and State.

In general this bill has provided funding for the foreign affairs agencies within the House passed authorization levels. The bill also provides a waiver of the statutory requirement for an authorization of the State Department and USIA, of 6 months. Regrettably this is necessary because of a holdup of consideration of the State Department and USIA authorization bill in the Senate.

The House responsibly passed the authorization bill in June, and I hope that the Senate will resolve to quickly consider the bill so we can complete action on the measure.

Briefly, I want to commend the appropriations managers for the conference report language that addresses the egregious problems that persist with U.N. peacekeeping, and secondly, for recognizing the urgent need for the

State Department to upgrade the consular visa and passport systems.

We included an important amendment in the authorization bill directing the State Department to upgrade its visa control system, and allowing them to collect and retain fees for this purpose.

Specifically, with regard to title V, of the conference report, I would like to commend the authors of this legislation regarding their provisions designed to increase the role of Congress in supporting U.S. contributions to U.N. peacekeeping activities.

As ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I fully support the efforts of my Appropriations Committee colleagues to rein in the runaway U.S. peacekeeping costs. Requiring that our future assessment be limited to no more than 25 percent of the total cost for each peacekeeping mission is an important step toward this goal.

Equally important is the provision mandating improved congressional notification for all future decisions to create new peacekeeping missions or to expand any ongoing missions. Without congressional notification, the administration has recently approved our participation in three new and expanded missions in Haiti, Liberia, and Rwanda. Adoption of the provisions in this conference report should enable Congress to play a greater more informed role in formulating our overall policy toward these and other U.N. peacekeeping operations.

I would like also to address the issue of visa processing and the antiquated, unreliable and user intensive, microfiche systems that the State Department uses in over 100 overseas posts to maintain the list of aliens ineligible for entry.

This list includes names of terrorists, and those with criminal histories. The embarrassing case of radical sheik Omar Abdul Rahman getting a United States travel visa, despite being on a microfiche lookout list in Khartoum, Sudan, should be all the evidence we need that the system is broken and badly needs repair.

Not only must we modernize the outdated equipment, but we must have the State Department resume checking the FBI criminal record histories of those who seek to immigrate to the United States and have lived in the United States previously.

Not only should the State Department find moneys to modernize its equipment as the conferees recommend but it needs to resume these FBI criminal record checks promptly before we have another possible even more embarrassing visa case, as we did with Sheik Rahman with his tourist visa in 1990.

Lastly, at the appropriate time, I will rise to support the chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary, the gentleman from Iowa's [Mr. SMITH] motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment to fund the National Endowment for Democracy.

Democracy building is a central theme of our foreign policy, and the endowment was designed and created and proven to be an effective tool to serve this vital U.S. interest.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MANTON].

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, the House Appropriations Committee report on H.R. 2519 stated that:

> The Committee intends that recreational fishing harvest monitoring data collection be expanded to include the Northeast.

However, the conference report does not contain this language.

Both the House and Senate included $195,000 above the administration's request for recreational fishery harvest monitoring. Is it the chairman's understanding that the conferees still intend that these moneys can be used to expand recreational harvest monitoring data to the northeast?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr.Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANTON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Yes, it is still the intention of the conferees that those funds be used for that purpose.

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] for his answer and for his willingness to work with me in my new position as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries Management. I commend him and his staff for their fine work on this matter.

□ 2030

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT], a very distinguished member of the committee.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report, and particularly would like to commend the conferees for taking strong action on downsizing the funding for the United Nations regular and peacekeeping operations.

Mr. Speaker, I wish I had the oratory skills of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] or the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS]. But I would like to speak for a moment as a father, and from the heart, for something I think needs to be said about this whole U.N. peacekeeping fiasco we are into.

As a father of a son who is 16 years of age and a junior in one of our Nation's leading military academies at Northwestern, Lake Geneva, I remember back to when I was his age in high school, filled with idealism, and decided to volunteer for the military. In doing so I took an oath to serve my Commander in Chief. Mr. Speaker, today we have heard the discussion here of what has happened in Somalia and what is probably going to happen in Bosnia and other countries that we have never heard of around the world. And we look at the Commander in Chief, who at the time when SAM JOHNSON, one of our colleagues, was a prisoner of war in a Vietnam prison camp, when other mothers and fathers were sending their sons off to battle, Walter Cronkite was on CBS every night telling us what a lousy bunch of people our troops were and how wrong the United States was. And as we lost confidence in our military, that is like mom and dad losing confidence in their kids, because people in the military need the support of the country behind them.

While this was going on, there was another young man who decided to go to the Soviet Union and protest against America's policies. Today that young man is now the Commander in Chief. He now is sending our young men off in harm's way. And when people who are wise in the ways of the military ask for simple military measures to protect our own troops, he denies that protection, and 18 young men are killed in Somalia.

Mr. Speaker, I think that it is long overdue that we as a nation and those of us here in Congress, who have a responsibility to those moms and dads, two in my district who lost their sons in Somalia, for no reason, that we have a right to question that policy and we have a responsibility as Members of this organization to shut off their lifeblood, that is, the money of the taxpayers of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that the United Nations be reformed. It is not part of the United States. It is not our role to fund it. It is not our role to put our young men and women in harm's way to satisfy a very corrupt group that is full of cronyism. And the one thing that they can claim as a success, in Cambodia, which was riddled with tens of millions of dollars of graft and corruption, bids that were given to cronies, supplies that were never unpacked, and then we are asked to take the young men and women of this country and put them in harm's way to satisfy the policy and the fascination of a young man who shirked his responsibility and never served his country in harm's way?

Mr. Speaker, over my dead body will there be another young man go and be killed because of that.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report.

I particularly want to commend the conferees for taking strong action on downsizing funding U.N. regular and peacekeeping operations.

The conferees included statutory language requiring the United Nations to set up and operate an inspector general system before we fully fund that organization. I do not consider this Congress micromanaging foreign policy. It is an expression of our frustration with a once

well-intended organization which has fallen prey to corruption and cronyism of the worst sort.

I also strongly endorse the conferee's report language requiring the administration to report to Congress in advance of security council votes on new peacekeeping operations and the desire of the conferees to reduce U.S. peacekeeping assessments from 32 to 25 percent. Frankly, I wish these requirements were also statutory requirements, not report language.

If the United Nations does not make substantial progress toward reform then I believe the administration should consider calling together the other major U.N. contributors and take more direct action.

To quote a member of the U.S. Commission on improving the Effectiveness of the U.N., Gray MacDougal:

If the organization did not already exist, no rational human being would recommend that anything resembling the present structure be created. This unfortunate starting point is compounded by a U.N. secretariat leadership that readily takes on additional responsibilities and shows every indication of being a bottomless financial pit.

Even so-called success stories like the peacekeeping operation in Cambodia has documented tens of millions of dollars in waste and fraud including equipment never needed or unpacked and millions in contracts given to preferred contractors even though their bids were far higher than other companies. The United Nations refuses to give the United States copies of the internal audits documenting the widespread fraud.

At the end of my statement I will submit for the RECORD a recent article I authored on this subject which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor. But I want to briefly touch on one final point.

Although President Clinton publicly seems to distance himself from the United Nations, the President's actions do not match his words. Presidential decision directive 13 has sketched out an ambitious, dangerous and expensive administration policy of increased involvement with the U.N. It included putting U.S. soldiers under foreign commanders, sharing intelligence with U.N. members and increased so-called peacekeeping with U.S. troops. Although the President has refused to provide this document to Congress, bits and pieces of this decision directive have turned up in several authorization and appropriation bills.

In every case Congress has refused to endorse or fund his plans. Given the recent foreign policy fiascos in Somalia and Haiti, I think it's time for President Clinton to formally repudiate the contents of Presidential decision directive 13 and shift our United Nations policy to one of institutional reform.

I have lost two constituents in Somalia because this President feels it is more important to work with the United Nations than to protect the lives of troops abroad. Instead he congratulates himself on his Russia and Middle East policy.

The fact is his Russia policy is nothing more than a continuation of George Bush's work. And President Clinton's Middle East policy consists of setting up a card table in his front yard for a signing ceremony and taking credit for the fruits of George Bush's labor.

In closing, I again commend the conferees on a job well done and urge support of this conference report.

[From The Christian Science Monitor, Oct. 15, 1993]

U.N. NEEDS REFORM, NOT AN EXPANDED ROLE

(By Jim Lightfoot)

President Clinton went to the UN recently and said things Americans want to hear. Mr. Clinton warned the UN not to become engaged in every one of the world conflicts. He expressed America's desire to reduce its assessed costs for peacekeeping operations and encouraged the UN to make serious efforts to reduce wasteful spending.

Unfortunately, the President's actions do not match his speech. For months, his team has been preparing Presidential Decision Directive (PDD)-13 and its annex Presidential Review Document (PRD)-13. These two documents are the heart of a dangerous, expensive administration plan to strengthen the UN.

Among the many proposals included in PDD-13 placing United States troops under UN command; sharing classified intelligence with the UN; repealing the law that limits the amount of troops the US can commit to peacekeeping operations without congressional approval; and bypassing congressional approval for UN operations by establishing an account for peacekeeping and peacemaking operations.

Depsite Clinton's admonition that the UN must learn to say no to new peacekeeping operations, the US voted for the promoted questionable new operations over the last three months in Liberia, Rwanda, and Haiti. In August, the US voted to send an 88-man UN observer force to a war-torn area of the former Soviet Georgia. In fact, the administration is now working with the French on a possible second UN peacekeeping operation in Rwanda.

So far the administration has refused to provide PDD-13 or PRD-13 to Congress, although they have been leaked to the press. Clinton has sent bits and pieces of his proposals to Congress without disclosing his full intentions. In every case Congress has refused to fund his plan. In fact the House Appropriations Committee took even stronger action. The defense appropriation bill for fiscal year 1994 included language requiring 15-day notification to Congress before any new humanitarian operations can take place. The bill also includes language that directs the administration to report to Congress on its proposals to strengthen the UN and forbids the administration from renovating and donating to the UN a defense facility for use as a UN peacekeeping headquarters.

Unfortunately, the Democrat leadership, probably acting at the request of the Clinton administration, stripped on procedural grounds the 15-day notification period from the appropriations bill.

The dismal performance of the United Nations in Somalia should make anyone nervous about giving the UN a blank check to commit American forces or funds to any peacekeeping operation it sees fit to create. Even the "success" story of the UN peacekeeping operation in Cambodia has documented tens of millions of dollars in waste and fraud, including equipment never needed or unpacked and millions in contracts given to preferred contractors even though their bids were far higher than those of other companies. The UN refuses to officially provide the US copies of the internal audits documenting the widespread fraud.

The UN's problems go deeper than its overreach on peacekeeping. As one member of the US Commission on Improving the Effectiveness of the UN, Gary MacDougal, notes: "If the organization did not already exist no rational human being would recommend that anything resembling the present structure be created. This unfortunate starting point is compounded by a UN Secretariat leadership that readily takes on additional responsibilities and shows every indication of being a bottomless financial pit."

In one respect, Clinton is right: Putting our economic house in order cannot mean we shut our windows to the world. But the solution to the UN problems is not more American money or troops. The US must use its influence and our allies must use their influence to reform UN operations.

We don't have to write a big check to expand UN peacekeeping operations. According to some estimates, reforms within current peacekeeping operations alone would save $100 million a year. By insisting that the UN grows and reforms like the world around it, we can help achieve the noble goals of its founders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MFUME). The Chair would advise that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] has 7 minutes remaining and reserves the right to close debate, and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself one minute to engage the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] in a colloquy.

Mr. Speaker, due to a drafting error in the conference report, language was inadvertently omitted from the statement of managers concerning the relocation of the Pan American Health Organization.

Mr. Speaker, the Pan American Health Organization has approved a site in Montgomery County, MD, to locate its new headquarters. I wish to clarify the conferees' intention with respect to the use of funds provided to the organization in this conference report.

I would ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH], is it the conferees' understanding that no funds provided in this bill shall be used directly or indirectly for the construction of the new headquarters.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Yes, it is the conferees' intention that none of the assessed U.S. contribution provided in this bill be used to fund the construction of a new headquarters for the Pan American World Health Organization.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to alert my colleagues that the conference committee's recommendations include 30 unauthorized line items totaling $35,844,000 in 4 accounts: 1 totaling $576,000 in the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration [NOAA] operations, research, and facilities account; 10 totaling $18,578,000 in the NOAA construction account; 4 totaling $3,590,000 in the International Trade Administration [ITA] operations and administration account; and 15 totaling $13,100,000 in the Small Business Administration [SBA] salaries and expenses account. Note that six NOAA construction unauthorized line items totaling $6,078,000, and

the ITA and SBA unauthorized line items had not been included in either the House-approved or Senate-approved versions of H.R. 2519.

A list of these unauthorized line items follows.

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION [NOAA] UNAUTHORIZED LINE ITEMS: 11 TOTALING $19,154,000

NOAA OPERATIONS, RESEARCH, AND FACILITIES UNAUTHORIZED LINE ITEMS: 1 TOTALING $576,000

1. $576,000 for the Fish Farming Experimental Station at Stuttgart, Arkansas (Amendment No. 81, bill language).

Not authorized by House or Senate; $600,000 appropriated by Senate only.

NOAA Construction Unauthorized Line Items: 10 totaling $18,578,000

1. $2,000,000 for the construction of the National Marine Fisheries Service Estuarine and Habitat Research Laboratory in Lafayette, Louisiana (Amendment No. 82, bill language).

Not authorized by House or Senate; $6,250,000 appropriated by Senate only.

2. $1,000,000 for a grant for the purchase of equipment for the Ruth Patrick Science Education Center in Aiken, South Carolina (Amendment No. 82, bill language).

Not authorized by House or Senate; not appropriated by House or Senate.

3. $1,000,000 for construction and related expenses for a Multi-Species Aquaculture Facility to be located in the State of New Jersey (Amendment No. 82, bill language).

Not authorized by House or Senate; not appropriated by House or Senate.

4. $1,000,000 for a grant to the Mystic Seaport, Mystic, Connecticut, for a maritime education center (Amendment No. 82, bill language).

Unauthorized by House or Senate; not appropriated by House or Senate.

5. $1,395,000 for a grant to the Indiana State University Center for Interdisciplinary Science Research and Education (funded under the Small Business Administration in previous fiscal years) (Amendment No. 82, bill language).

Unauthorized by House or Senate; not appropriated by House or Senate.

$1,000,000 for a grant for the Boston Biotechnology Innovation Center. (Amendment No. 82, bill language).

Unauthorized by House or Senate; not appropriated by House or Senate.

$683,000 for planning and design of a joint Federal and State Marine Laboratory to be located at the marine resources center at Fort Johnson, South Carolina (Amendment No. 82, report language).

Unauthorized by House or Senate; not appropriated by House or Senate.

$1,800,000 for the Newport, Oregon, Marine Science Center (Amendment No. 82, report language).

Not authorized by House or Senate; appropriated by Senate only.

$500,000 for the Kodiak, Alaska, Fisheries Center (Amendment No. 82, report language).

Not authorized by House or Senate; appropriated by Senate only.

$8,200,000 for Columbia River facilities (Amendment No. 82, report language).

Not authorized by House or Senate; appropriated by Senate only.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE ADMINISTRATION [ITA]—OPERATIONS AND ADMINISTRATION UNAUTHORIZED LINE ITEMS:—4 TOTALING $3,590,000

1. $800,000 for the Center for Global Competitiveness at Saint Francis and Saint Vincent Colleges in Pennsylvania (Amendment No. 89, bill language).

Unauthorized by House or Senate; not appropriated by House or Senate.

2. $465,000 for the Center for Manufacturing Productivity at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst (Amendment No. 89, bill language).

Unauthorized by House or Senate; not appropriated by House or Senate.

3. $1,395,000 for the Massachusetts Biotechnology Research Institute (Amendment No. 89, bill language).

Unauthorized by House or Senate; not appropriated by House or Senate.

4. $930,000 for the Michigan Biotechnology Institute (Amendment No. 89, bill language).

Unauthorized by House or Senate; not appropriated by House or Senate.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION [SBA]—SALARIES AND EXPENSES UNAUTHORIZED LINE ITEMS: 15 totaling $13,100,000

1. $175,000 for a grant to the Ben Franklin Center in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, to assist small business to qualify for and participate in the Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) program (Amendment No. 128, bill language).

Not authorized by House or Senate; not appropriated by House or Senate.

2. $750,000 for a grant to the North Carolina Rural Economic Development Center for the North Carolina Small Business Capital Access Program to provide financial development assistance to small business (Amendment No. bill language).

Not authorized by House or Senate; not appropriated by House or Senate.

3. $500,000 for a grant to the Van Emmons Population, Marketing Analysis Center in Towanda, Pennsylvania, for continuation of an integrated small business data base to aid Appalachian Region small businesses (Amendment No. 128, bill language).

Not authorized by House or Senate; not appropriated by House or Senate.

4. $1,000,000 for a grant to the City of Prestonsburg, Kentucky, for small business development assistance (Amendment No. 128, bill language).

Not authorized by House or Senate, not appropriated by House or Senate.

5. $680,000 for a grant to the State of Nebraska for a statewide small business data base to facilitate the development of small businesses in rural communities (Amendment No. 128, bill language).

Not authorized by House or Senate, not appropriated by House or Senate.

6. $100,000 for a grant to the Institute of Economic Development, Western Kentucky University to provide small business consulting services for senior citizens (Amendment No. 128, bill language).

Not authorized by House or Senate, not appropriated by House or Senate.

7. $5,000,000 for a grant for a National Center for Genome Resources in New Mexico to provide consulting assistance, information and related activities to small businesses (Amendment No. 128, bill language).

Not authorized by House or Senate, appropriated by Senate only.

8. $1,000,000 for a grant to the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Arkansas, for the Genesis small business incubator facility (Amendment No. 128, bill language).

Not authorized by House or Senate, not appropriated by House or Senate.

9. $1,000,000 for a grant to the WVHTC Foundation in West Virginia for build out, equipment and operations costs for a small business incubator facility (Amendment No. 128, bill language).

Not authorized by House or Senate, not appropriated by House or Senate.

10. $300,000 for a grant to the Economic Development Council of Paducah, Kentucky, to assist in the development of a small business incubator facility (Amendment No. 128, bill language).

Not authorized by House or Senate, not appropriated by House or Senate.

11. $250,000 for a grant to Grant County, West Virginia, to establish a small business development fund to provide financial assistance to small businesses and grants (Amendment No. 128, bill language).

Not authorized by House or Senate, not appropriated by House or Senate.

12. $750,000 for a grant to Hazard Community College in Hazard, Kentucky, to assist in the devleopment of a small business consulting, information and assistance facility (Amendment No. 128, bill language).

Not authorized by House or Senate, not appropriated by House or Senate.

13. $930,000 for a grant to Seton Hill College in Greensburg, Pennsylvania, to provide for a small business consulting and assistance center for entrepreneurial opportunity (Amendment No. 128, bill language).

Not authorized by House or Senate, not appropriated by House or Senate.

14. $200,000 for a grant to the University of Central Arkansas to assist the Small Business Institute Program of the Small Business Administration to establish and operate a National Data Center (Amendment No. 128, bill language).

Not authorized by House or Senate, not appropriated by House or Senate.

15. $465,000 for a grant to the Iowa Waste Reduction Center, University of Northern Iowa for a demonstration program to assist small business in complying with Federal regulatory requirements (Amendment No. 128, bill language).

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report on H.R. 2519, the bill that funds the Commerce, Justice and State Departments, the Federal judiciary, and related agencies for fiscal year 1994.

First, I would like to commend Chairman NEAL SMITH and the conferees for meeting the challenge that was before them. The conferees were able to set priorities in determining the funding levels for the various agencies and programs that this conference report supports, given the fiscal restraints they faced. But, the funding level in the resulting conference report is not only below the subcommittee's target, as set by the Appropriations Committee based on this year's budget resolution. It is also less than the amount requested by the President, and below last year's funding level.

The Commerce-Justice-State conference report supports a diverse number of agencies and programs. They include community policing efforts, law enforcement against organized crime, the Federal Bureau of Investigation [FBI], and our Federal prisons; the operation of our national fisheries and our marine, weather, environmental and satellite programs; the Immigration and Naturalization Service; the National Weather Service; and the Small Business Administration.

The conference report's support of the President's new immigration initiative is of tremendous importance to California, given the serious problems that we are having with illegal immigration. It targets funds for additional

land border inspectors, additional Border Patrol agents, increased pre-inspection at airports, and more asylum officers. The conference report also increases immigration inspection fees on foreigners entering the country by plane or boat from $5 to $6—an increase that is expected to raise $50 million.

The conference report provides grants to State and local law enforcement agencies to assist them in safeguarding our neighborhoods and communities. It also supports juvenile justice programs, FBI start-up costs for creating a national background check system, and a new community policing effort so that State and local governments can put more officers on the street and employ innovative techniques to prevent crime.

The Small Business Administration—known for its direct and guaranteed loan assistance to small businesses—is funded by this conference report, as is the Economic Development Administration [EDA]. The EDA, in turn, supports the efforts of my district's Tri-County Economic Development Corp. [TCEDC], which was formed in 1985 to serve as the economic development planning and coordinating agency for Butte, Glenn, and Tehama Counties. Over the past 8 years, TCEDC has financed a revolving loan fund that has worked in partnership with private lenders to provide loans to small businesses, creating over 250 jobs. Without the financial support provided in this conference report, economic development programs in these three counties would be seriously jeopardized.

Also important to my constituents is the conference report's support of SEARCH, The National Consortium for Justice Information and Statistics. SEARCH is comprised of Governors' appointees from all States. These appointees are dedicated to assisting State and local criminal justice agencies in building, operating, and improving their computer systems to combat crime, all at no cost. In the past, SEARCH has assisted the Sacramento County Sheriff's Department Crime Analysis Unit in mapping a series of car-jackings that took place at gunpoint in the Sacramento area; this mapped information was then distributed to patrol forces. SEARCH also helped the Sutter County Sheriff's Department examine two computer disks that were suspected of containing evidence in a homicide case.

The programs funded in this conference report safeguard our children, neighborhoods, and communities, and preserve our resources. They protect our industries, both locally and globally, and help us maintain our position as an international leader—economically, socially, and politically. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote for maintaining our quality of life to and support final passage of this conference report.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of funding for the National Endowment for Democracy. Some of our colleagues have argued that NED is not necessary. I disagree. While many of NED's supporters are focusing in this debate on the importance of a strong NED presence in the republics of the former Soviet Union, and such a presence is vitally important, I would like to speak briefly about NED's significance to the Chinese prodemocracy movement.

In fiscal year 1993, NED is spending under $1 million for all of China. The funds support a range of initiatives by exile groups and are helping to keep the light of democracy burning bright as these exile groups educate the public in China and in the United States about China's reality today. NED funds help to document human rights abuses, to provide legal support for political prisoners inside China, and to publish magazines promoting the evolution of China toward a more open and democratic society.

I submit for the RECORD a letter to Members of Congress by Fang Lizhi, a prominent Chinese dissident, in support of the National Endowment for Democracy. I would also like to include in the RECORD a letter from Liu Binyan and Su Xiaokang, directors of the Princeton China Initiative in support of NED. These letters all attest to the importance of NED funding for the China democracy movement.

Through NED, small human rights organizations in China and in other places around the world are able to carry on their courageous and important work. By supporting human rights organizations around the world, NED helps to give voice to the voiceless. The road chosen by human rights activists is often a lonely and difficult one. It is also an essential one. Human rights activists promote respect for human rights and the rule of law in fledgling democracies. They provide hope for victims of oppression and political violence and help to pave the way to a more just and peaceful world.

More than 50 small human rights groups receive assistance from the National Endowment for Democracy. They work in China, Burma, Indonesia, Vietnam and Cambodia, Ethiopia, Eritrea, Zaire, Liberia, Nigeria and Uganda, Russia, Ukraine, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, and Cuba. Their work is important and the contributions they receive from NED are critical to their survival. I urge my colleagues not to forsake these brave people who look to the United States for guidance. Support the funding for the National Endowment for Democracy.

The letters follow:

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA,
Tucson, AZ, June 29, 1993.

HONORABLE MEMBER: I recently heard that the National Endowment Democracy (NED) will face a close down due to the current budget cut. As a person who has been and are pursuing Chinese democracy, I would like to take this opportunity to express my opinion about this matter.

As I understand it, NED has played an important in supporting the democratic cause all over the world. The pro-democracy movements of many countries, including China, are directly encouraged by NED's efforts. It is true that the Cold War is over, but it does not mean that democracy has achieved. In fact, many countries in today's world still is ruled by an oligarchic dictatorship, still lacks freedom of speech, still has not meaningful elections, and still holds political prisoners. Therefore, NED's functions are still absolutely necessary for the leadership of the U.S. in the international affair.

I would also like to mention here a misleading, which has been circulating recently. It says that economic development will automatically lead to a democratic society. Especially, when the world economy now is sluggish, democracy and human rights as a basic principle in international affairs if frequently downplayed. For instance, considering the high economic growth in China in last few years, some people even argue that China now needs only economic development, because more economic growth will lead inevitably to democracy. It would be wonderful if democracy did indeed grow automatically out of economic development, but history gives us, unfortunately, no such guarantees. In the actuality of China today, the economic growth that we see has not in the slightest moved the current leaders in China to alter their autocratic rule.

I feel the need to stress this point because a world in which the principles of democracy and human rights are downplayed is a world that lengthens the time during which autocracy can survive. On the other hand, history has shown many times that a dictator who relies on massacre and suppression to maintain his rule at home is frequently untrustworthy in international affairs as well. In this area the problem of democracy is one of the world-wide problems, like that of environment. Without step-by-step improvement in the world-wide environment for human rights and democracy, one can not expect a complete solution of many international problems. Therefore, I would like to strongly recommend you, member of the legislators of the U.S., to approve the NED and its functions to work continually and effectively.

Sincerely,

FANG LIZHI,
Professor of Physics.

PRINCETON CHINA INITIATIVE,
Princeton, NJ, June 29, 1993.

The House of the Representatives and the Senate,
Washington, DC.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: We are exiled Chinese writers who have not been able to return to China after the June massacre in 1989. We have heard that the Congress is considering the possibility of abolishing the national endowment for Democracy. We are very surprised and deeply worried.

Since the 1989 Tiananmen massacre, the exile Chinese intellectual communities and democratic movements in exile abroad have been graciously supported by the U.S. government and the Congress, and the main channel for this support has been the National Endowment for Democracy. As far as he know, from the end of 1990, through the Foundation for Democracy and Human Rights in China (of which Fang Lizhi, Chia Ling and other prominent Chinese dissidents are Board members), NED has given grants to at least eight organizations to do various projects, with grants from NED, these organizations have been able to exert significant impact on Chinese politics.

For instance, Human Rights in China, which is located in New York, has been able to provide first-hand, accurate information about human rights records and cases of human rights abuse in China by using the funds provided by NED to investigate and follow up on the developments in China. This organization invited well known dissidents inside China to join its Board of Directors,

thus making a major breakthrough in the prohibition of human rights activities in China.

The Independent Federation of Chinese Students and Scholars, with ten of thousands of members in the U.S., and also supported by NED, has been vary active in protecting the rights of Chinese students and scholars. They have also played an important role in providing information and testimony during the Congressional hearings on the issue of Most Favored Nation trading status for China.

With the financial help from NED, the bimonthly magazine "Democratic China" has published regularly, furnishing information and analysis on recent developments in China to overseas Chinese readers, to the western media and to people in China through radio broadcasts in the Chinese language. "China Focus", a monthly newsletter in English published by the Princeton China Initiative, provides insiders' information and views on current events in China in a voice that is unavailable anywhere else.

Without the help from NED, the impact of these organizations and publications will be greatly diminished, and some will even cease to exist. To the exiled Chinese democracy movement which has been growing steadily since the 1989 Tiananman Movement, the abolition of NED would be a great setback. It would have a negative impact on the whole process of China's demoncratization and stability.

We urgently appeal to you to continue your support of NED so that it can play an even more important role in promoting democracy in the world. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

LIU BINYAN,
Chairman, Executive Committee.
SU XIAOKANG,
Executive Director.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. BURTON of Indiana. 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 303, nays 100, answered "present" 1, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 517]

YEAS—303

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blackwell
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Bonilla
Bonior
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Calvert
Canady
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cunningham
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dixon
Durbin
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Evans
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Grandy
Green
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hughes
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inslee
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
Kleczka
Klein
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kreidler
Kyl
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Schenk
Schiff
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walsh
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—100

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Ballenger
Bartlett
Barton
Bentley
Boehner
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Camp
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cox
Crane
Crapo
DeLay
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Franks (NJ)
Gekas
Gingrich
Goss
Grams
Hancock
Hefley
Herger
Hoke
Huffington
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson, Sam
King
Kingston
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Manzullo
McCandless
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Orton
Paxon
Penny
Petri
Pombo
Portman
Ramstad
Ridge
Roberts
Rohrabacher
Roth
Royce
Saxton
Schaefer
Schroeder
Sensenbrenner
Shays
Shuster
Slattery
Smith (MI)
Smith (OR)
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sundquist
Talent
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (WY)
Upton
Walker
Weldon
Wolf
Zeliff
Zimmer

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Spratt

NOT VOTING—29

Bishop
Borski
Dingell
Dooley
Edwards (CA)
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Ford (MI)
Gephardt
Greenwood
Hansen
Hastert
Hayes
Hefner
Hochbrueckner
Johnson (CT)
McDade
McMillan
Meyers
Michel
Miller (CA)
Moran
Murphy
Neal (NC)
Richardson
Rostenkowski
Roukema
Santorum

□ 2056

Ms. MOLINARI changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. LINDER, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, and Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi 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

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 517 on H.R. 2519 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present I would have voted "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote 517, on H.R. 2519 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER. Mr. Speaker, due to my being unavoidably detained on Tuesday, October 19, I was unable to record my vote on one bill. Therefore, I would like to take this opportunity to submit for the RECORD

how I would have voted had I been present: rollcall No. 517, "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on rollcall votes 510 through 517 due to the hospitalization of my wife. Had I been present, I would have voted:

On Rollcall 510, "nay."
On Rollcall 511, "yea."
On Rollcall 512, "yea."
On Rollcall 513, "yea."
On Rollcall 514, "yea."
On Rollcall 515, "nay."
On Rollcall 516, "yea."
On Rollcall 517, "yea."

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2519, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MFUME). Pursuant to House Resolution 267 the motions printed in the joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference to dispose of amendments in disagreement are considered as read.

The Clerk will designate the first amendment is disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 3: Page 2, line 25, strike out "$427,000,000" and insert "$493,750,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. 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. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "notwithstanding the provisions of section 511 of said Act, $474,500,000".

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

The motion was agreed to.

□ 2100

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 5: Page 3, line 5, strike out "and chapter A of subpart 2" and insert "and an additional $50,000,000 shall be available to carry out the provisions of chapter A of subpart 2".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. 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. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "of part E of title I of said Act and $50,000,000 shall be available to carry out the provisions of chapter A of subpart 2".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the motion is agreed to.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not want to take a lot of time, but I would just like to know what is in his motion briefly. You are receding and you are accepting the Senate's position?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, in some of the amendments the Senate is receding to the House and on some of the other amendments the House is receding to the Senate. There are no surprises.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. On the motions where we are receding and taking the Senate amendment, I would just like to know what is in them. Can you tell me what they are?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. They are printed in the RECORD and have been available to the Members for 5 calendar days.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Well, I do not have that in front of me. Is it costing more money? How much more is it? What is the number on this, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is amendment No. 5.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I would say that these motions were printed in the RECORD. We filed them Thursday night. They have been available for several days.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

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

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate amendments numbered 7, 11, 62, 79, 80, 99, 120, 137, and 145 be considered en bloc and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The texts of the various Senate amendments referred to in the unanimous consent request are as follows:

Senate amendment No. 7: Page 3, line 10, after "(c)" insert "an additional".

Senate amendment No. 11: Page 4, line 4, after "petitions" insert ": *Provided further*, That funds made available in fiscal year 1994 under subpart 1 of part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, may be obligated for programs for the prosecution of driving while intoxicated charges and the enforcement of other laws relating to alcohol use and the operation of motor vehicles

Senate amendment No. 62: Page 26, after line 15, insert:

SEC. 109. Section 524(c)(9) of title 28, United States Code, as amended, is further amended by deleting subsection (E).

Senate amendment No. 79: Page 32, after line 14, insert:

INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY SERVICES

For necessary expenses of the Manufacturing Extension Partnership, the Advanced Technology Program and the Quality Outreach Program of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, $232,524,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed $1,290,000 may be transferred to the "Working Capital Fund".

Senate amendment No. 80: Page 32, after line 14, insert:

CONSTRUCTION OF RESEARCH FACILITIES

For construction of new research facilities, including architectural and engineering design, not otherwise provided for the National Institute of Standards and Technology, as authorized by 15 U.S.C. 278c–278e, $61,686,000, to remain available until expended.

Senate amendment No. 99: Page 40, line 15, after "works" insert "for the provision of educational, cultural, health care, public information, public safety or other social services".

Senate amendment No. 120: Page 49, line 17, after "expended" insert ", of which $28,877,000 shall be available for the United States Merchant Marine Academy and $10,344,000 shall be available for State maritime academy programs".

Senate amendment No. 137: Page 56, line 19, after "Service" insert "not otherwise provided for".

Senate amendment No. 145: Page 59, line 17, after "1974." insert "In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct loan program, $183,000, which may be transferred to and merged with the Salaries and Expenses account under Administration of Foreign Affairs.".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 7, 11, 62, 79, 80, 99, 120, 137, and 145, and concur therein.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the motion is agreed to.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Amendment No. 7 says:

Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which adds the words "an additional," which were not in the House bill. This language clarifies the intent of the conferees that the $25 million in discretionary grants designated for Community Policing is in addition to the $50 million provided for the Byrne discretionary program.

Am I to understand that is $25 million more?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. That makes the $25 million for the Community Policing Program in addition to the $50 million available in the Byrne program for discretionary grants.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. It is not additional money?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. It is in addition to the amount of money for the Byrne discretionary grant program.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. So that is $25 million more?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Yes. But we took that into consideration when we set the other figure too. We looked at the total for the Byrne program and added $25 million for community policing.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. You are saying that the $25 million came from some other source within the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Within the total amount for the bill, that is right.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. So it is not $25 million additional to what was already appropriated for that?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. No.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

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. 10: Page 3, line 16, strike out all after "4824);" down to and including "agencies" in line 24, and insert "and (e) an additional $25,000,000 shall be available pursuant to the provisions of chapter A of subpart 2 of part E of title I of said Act, for criminal records upgrade projects, including $10,000,000 for reimbursement to the Federal Bureau of Investigation".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. 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. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

(e) $16,000,000 shall be available to reimburse any appropriation account, as designated by the Attorney General, for selected costs incurred by State and local law enforcement agencies which enter into cooperative agreements to conduct joint law enforcement operations with Federal agencies; (f) $500,000 shall be available to carry out the provisions of subtitle B of title I of the Anti Car Theft Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-519), notwithstanding the provisions of section 131(b)(2) of said Act, for grants to be used in combating motor vehicle theft: *Provided*, That not to exceed $12,500,000 of the funds made available in fiscal year 1994 under chapter A of subpart 2 of part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, shall be available as follows: (a) $2,000,000 shall be available for the activities of the District of Columbia Metropolitan Area Drug Enforcement Task Force; (b) not to exceed $10,000,000 shall be available to the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for start-up costs associated with coordinating the national background check system; and (c) $500,000 shall be transferred to the National Commission to Support Law Enforcement for the necessary expenses of the Commission as authorized by section 211(B) of Public Law 101-515.

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

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. 21: Page 5, line 17, strike out "(f) $600,000" and insert "(d) $5,000,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. 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. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following: (f) $500,000.

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

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. 22: Page 6, line 6, strike out "$117,196,000" and insert "$115,000,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. 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. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment, insert: $119,000,000.

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

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 6, line 12, strike out "$30,898,000" and insert "$30,723,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. 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. SMITH of Iowa 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 sum proposed in said amendment, insert "$30,000,000".

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

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. 27: Page 8, line 5, strike out $400,968,000 and insert "$400,086,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. 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. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert "$403,968,000".

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

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. 30: Page 9, line 17, strike out "$63,817,000" and insert "$62,092,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. 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. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert "$66,817,000".

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

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. 31: Page 10, line 2, strike out "$44,817,000" and insert "$43,092,000".

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

The motion was agreed to.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. 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. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment, insert "$45,997,000", and on page 9 line 19 of the House engrossed bill, H.R. 2519, strike "$19,000,000", and insert in lieu thereof "$20,820,000", and on page 10 line 3 of the House engrossed bill, H.R. 2519, strike "$19,000,000", and insert in lieu thereof "$20,820,000".

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 11, line 10, strike out "$56,521,000" and insert "$46,150,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. 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. SMITH of Iowa 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 proposed in said amendment, insert "$61,513,000".

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

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. 37: Page 11, line 23, strike out "$56,521,000" and insert "$46,150,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. 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. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment, insert "$61,513,000".

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

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. 44: Page 15, line 4, strike out "$60,275,000" and insert "$58,000,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. 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. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment, insert "$55,000,000".

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

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. 52: Page 19, line 16, after "1996" insert "for projects on the northern border of the United States only".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. 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. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert the following:

for projects on the northern border of the United States only.

In addition, section 286 of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U.S.C. 1356), as amended, is further amended—

(1) in subsection (d), by striking "$5", and inserting "$6"; and

(2) in subsection (h)(2)(A), by deleting subsection (v), and inserting the following:

"(v) providing detention and deportation services for: excludable aliens arriving on commercial aircraft and vessels; and any alien who is excludable under section 212(a) who has attempted illegal entry into the United States through avoidance of immigration inspection at air or sea ports-of-entry.

"(vi) providing exclusion and asylum proceedings at air or sea ports-of-entry for: excludable aliens arriving on commercial aircraft and vessels including immigration exclusion proceedings resulting from presentation of fraudulent documents and failure to present documentation; and any alien who is excludable under section 212(a) who has attempted illegal entry into the United States through avoidance of immigration inspection at air or sea ports-of-entry.".

IMMIGRATION EMERGENCY FUND

For the Immigration Emergency Fund, as authorized by section 404(b)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U.S.C. 1101), $6,000,000 to remain available until expended

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

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. 63: Page 26, after line 15, insert:

SEC. 110. During fiscal year 1994, from funds appropriated to the Department of Justice, the Attorney General may enter into reimbursable agreements with the Federal Judicial Branch, or reimburse a State or local government, if applicable, for the cost of managing prisoners or detainees, who are in the custody of the Attorney General, in a home confinement, electronic monitoring, or other such less costly alternative to incarceration when a Federal judicial official has determined this course of confinement to be viable and practicable: *Provided*, That this section shall not be applied in any way which is inconsistent with Federal law under titles 18 and 21, United States Code, including Federal sentencing guidelines and law related to minimum mandatory sentences.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. 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. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed in said amendment, insert the following:

SEC. 110. Technical Amendments to the Victims of Crime Act.—

(a) Section 1402 of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10601), is amended—

(1) In subsection (d)(2)—

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

(B) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(C) 1 percent shall be available for grants under section 1404(c); and

"(D) 4.5 percent shall be available for grants as provided in section 1404A.".

(2) In subsection (d)(3), by striking "1404(a)" and inserting "1404A".

(3) In subsection (g)(1), by striking "(d)(2)(A)(iv)" and inserting "(d)(2)(D)".

(b) Section 1404A of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10603(a)), is amended by striking "1402(d)(2)" and inserting "1402(d)(2)(D) and (d)(3).".

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

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. 64: Page 26, after line 15, insert:

SEC. 111. (a) 28 United States Code 1930(a)(1) is amended by striking "$120" and inserting in lieu thereof "$135"; and

(b) 28 United States Code 589 is amended in subsection (b), subparagraph (1) by striking "one-fourth" and inserting in lieu thereof "22.2 per centum", and in subsection (f), paragraph (2) by inserting after the word "title" the following:

"; and

"(3) 11.1 per centum of the fees collected under section 1930(a)(1) of this title".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. 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. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In

lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

SEC. 111. Bankruptcy Fees.—

(a) Chapters 7 and 13 Filing Fees.—Effective 30 days after enactment of this Act—

(1) Section 1930(a)(1) of title 28 of the United States Code is amended by striking "$120" and inserting "$130".

(2) Section 589a of title 28 of the United States Code is amended in subsection (b)(1), by striking "one-fourth" and inserting "23.08 percentum".

(3) SEC. 406. (b) of Public Law 101-162 (103 Stat. 1016) is amended by striking "25 percent", and inserting "30.76 percentum".

(b) Chapter 11 Filing Fee.—Effective 30 days after enactment of this Act—

(1) Section 1930(a)(3) of title 28 of the United States Code is amended by striking "$600" and inserting in lieu thereof "$800".

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

The motion was agreed to.

(2) Section 589a of title 28 of the United States Code is amended in subsection (b)(2), by striking "50 percentum" and inserting "37.5 percentum".

(3) Section 589a of title 28 of the United States Code is amended in subsection (f)(1), by striking "16.7 percentum" and inserting "12.5 percentum".

(4) Sec. 406.(b) of Public Law 101-162 (103 Stat. 1016) is amended by adding "and 25 percent of the fees hereafter collected under 28 U.S.C. section 1930(a)(3)" immediately after "28 U.S.C. section 1930(a)(1)".

(c) No funds provided by this Act shall be expended to fill any bankruptcy judgeship unless such appointee was on a merit selection list or report submitted to the court of appeals by either the judicial council or a subcommittee of the members of the council, in accordance with section 120 of the Bankruptcy Amendments and Federal Judgeship Act of 1984 (Public Law 98-353; 98 Stat. 344), section 152 of title 28 of the United States Code, and the Judicial Conference of the United States' Procedures for the Selection and Appointment of Bankruptcy Judges.

(d) Report on Bankruptcy Fees.—

(1) Report Required.—Not later than March 31, 1998, the Judicial Conference of the United States shall submit to the Committees on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Senate, a report relating to the bankruptcy fee system and the impact of such system on various participants in bankruptcy cases.

(2) Contents of Report.—Such report shall include—

(A)(i) an estimate of the costs and benefits that would result from waiving bankruptcy fees payable by debtors who are individuals, and

(ii) recommendations regarding various revenue sources to offset the net cost of waiving such fees.

(B)(i) an evaluation of the effects that would result in cases under chapters 11 and 13 of title 11, United States Code, from using a graduated bankruptcy fee system based on assets, liabilities, or both of the debtor, and

(ii) recommendations regarding various methods to implement such a graduated bankruptcy fee system.

(3) Waiver of Fees in Selected Districts.—For purposes of carrying out paragraphs (1) and (2), the Judicial Conference of the United States shall carry out in not more than six judicial districts, throughout the 3-year period beginning on October 1, 1994, a program under which fees payable under section 1930 of title 28, United States Code, may be waived in cases under chapter 7 of title 11, United States Code, for debtors who are individuals unable to pay such fees in installments.

(4) Study of Graduated Fee System.—For purposes of carrying out paragraphs (1) and (2), the Judicial Conference of the United States shall carry out, in not fewer than six judicial districts, a study to estimate the results that would occur in cases under chapters 11 and 13 of title 11, United States Code, if filing fees payable under section 1930 of title 28, United States Code, were paid on a graduated scale based on assets, liabilities, or both of the debtor.

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 67: Page 26, after line 15, insert:

SEC. 114. Section 504(f) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, is amended by inserting the following after "task forces,": "gang task forces, and for programs or projects to abate drug activity in residential and commercial buildings through community participation,".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. 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. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

SEC. 112. For fiscal year 1994 only, grants awarded to State and local governments for the purpose of participating in gang task forces and for programs or projects to abate drug activity in residential and commercial buildings through community participation, shall be exempt from the provisions of section 504(f) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended.

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

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. 71: Page 28, line 16, after "studies" insert": *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used to repeal, to retroactively apply changes in, or to continue a reexamination of, the policies of the Federal Communications Commission with respect to comparative licensing, distress sales and tax certificates granted under 26 U.S.C. 1071, to expand minority ownership of broadcasting licensees, including those established in the Statement of Policy on Minority Ownership of Broadcasting Facilities, 68 F.C.C. 2d 979 and 60 F.C.C. 2d 1591, as amended 52 R.R. 2d 1313 (1982) and Mid-Florida Television Corp., 69 F.C.C. 2d 607 (Rev. Bd. 1978), which were effective prior to September 12, 1986, other than to close MM Docket No. 86-484 with a reinstatement of prior policy and a lifting of suspension of any sales, licenses, applications, or proceedings, which were suspended pending the conclusion of the inquiry: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated to the Federal Communications Commission by this Act may be used to diminish the number of VHF channel assignments reserved for noncommercial educational television stations in the Television Table of Assignments (section 73.606 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations): *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated by this Act be used to repeal, to retroactively apply changes in, or to begin or continue a reexamination of the rules and the policies established to administer such rules of the Federal Communications Commission as set forth at section 73.3555(c) of title 47 of the Code of Federal Regulations".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. Smith of Iowa. 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. Smith of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

: *Provided*, That $60,400,000 of offsetting collections shall be assessed and collected pursuant to section 9 of title I of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and shall be retained and used for necessary expenses in this appropriation, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 1994, so as to result in a final fiscal year 1994 appropriation estimated at not more than $99,900,000: *Provided further*, That any offsetting collections received in excess of $60,400,000 in fiscal year 1994 shall remain available until expended, but shall not be available for obligation until October 1, 1994: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used to repeal, to retroactively apply changes in, or to continue a reexamination of, the policies of the Federal Communications Commission with respect to comparative licensing, distress sales and tax certificates granted under 26 U.S.C. 1071, to expand minority ownership of broadcasting licenses, including those established in the Statement of Policy on Minority Ownership of Broadcasting Facilities, 68 F.C.C. 2d 979 and 69 F.C.C. 2d 1591, as amended 52 R.R. 2d 1313 (1982) and Mid-Florida Television Corp., 69 F.C.C. 2d 607 (Rev. Bd. 1978), which were effective prior to September 12, 1986, other than to close MM Docket No. 86-484 with a reinstatement of prior policy and a lifting of suspension of any sales, licenses, applications, or proceedings, which were suspended pending the conclusion of the inquiry: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated to the Federal Communications Commission by this Act may be used to diminish the number of VHF channel assignments reserved for noncommercial educational television stations in the Televisions Table of Assignments (section 73.606 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations): *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to repeal, to retroactively apply changes in, or to begin or continue a reexamination of the rules and the policies established to administer such rules of the Federal Communications Commission as set forth at section 73.3555(d) of title 47 of the Code of Federal Regulations, other than to amend policies

with respect to waivers of the portion of section 73.3555(d) that concerns cross-ownership of a daily newspaper and an AM or FM radio broadcast station.

In addition, section 9(a) of Title I of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is further amended as follows:

(a) by striking "(a) General Authority.—" and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) General Authority.—

"(1) Recovery of Costs.—"; and

(b) By adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(2) Fees Contingent on Appropriations.—The fees described in paragraph (1) of this subsection shall be collected only if, and only in the total amounts, required in Appropriations Acts."

and on page 28, line 14 of the House engrossed bill, H.R. 2519, strike "$129,889,000", and insert in lieu thereof "$160,300,000".

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

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. 73: Page 30, line 4, after "2282–2285)" insert ": *Provided further*, That the funds appropriated in this paragraph are subject to the limitations and provisions of sections 10(a) and 10(c) (notwithstanding section 10(e)), 11(b), 18, and 20 of the Federal Trade Commission Improvements Act of 1980 (Public Law 96–252; 94 Stat. 374)".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. 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. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

: *Provided further*, That the funds appropriated in this paragraph are subject to the limitations and provisions of sections 10(a) and 10(c) (notwithstanding section 10(e)), 11(b), 18, and 20 of the Federal Trade Commission Improvements Act of 1980 (Public Law 96–252; 94 Stat. 374), except that this proviso shall cease to be effective upon enactment of an Act authorizing appropriations for the Federal Trade Commission for fiscal year 1994

And on page 29, line 11 of the House engrossed bill, H.R. 2519, strike "$19,000,000", and insert in lieu thereof "$20,820,000",

And on page 29, line 21 of the House engrossed bill, H.R. 2519, strike "$69,740,000", and insert in lieu thereof "$67,920,000",

And on page 29, line 22 of the House engrossed bill, H.R. 2519, strike "$19,000,000", and insert in lieu thereof "$20,820,000".

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

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. 75: Page 31, line 12, after "subsistence" insert ": *Provided*, That immediately upon enactment of this Act, the rate of fees under section 6(b) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77f(b)) shall increase from one-fiftieth of 1 per centum to one twenty-ninth of 1 per centum and such increase shall be deposited as an offsetting collection to this appropriation to recover costs of services of the securities registration process: *Provided further*, That such fees shall remain available until expended".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. 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. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

: *Provided*, That immediately upon enactment of this Act, the rate of fees under section 6(b) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77f(b)) shall increase from one-fiftieth of 1 per centum to one-twenty-ninth of 1 percentum and such increase shall be deposited as an offsetting collection to this appropriation, to remain available until expended, to recover costs of services of the securities registration process: *Provided further*, That such fee increase shall be repealed upon enactment of legislation amending the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to establish a new fee system in fiscal year 1994 for full cost recovery of Commission expenses.

In addition, and subject to enactment of legislation amending the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to establish a new fee system in fiscal year 1994 to require the Commission to collect $171,621,000 in fees to be deposited to this appropriation as an offsetting collection; $171,621,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That subject to the fee provisions contained in said legislation, $171,621,000 of fees shall be assessed and deposited as an offsetting collection to this appropriation to recover the costs of services of the securities registration process: *Provided further*, That the $171,621,000 herein appropriated shall be reduced as the aforementioned fees are collected during fiscal year 1994, so as to result in a final fiscal year 1994 appropriation estimated at not more than $0.

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

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. 78: Page 32, line 14, after "Fund" insert "and $3,000,000 may be transferred to the Department of Commerce 'Working Capital Fund'".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. 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. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "$1,500,000".

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

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. 81: Page 33, line 3, strike out all after "883i;" down to and including "Fisheries" in line 7 and insert "$1,685,000,000, to remain available until expended; of which $600,000 shall be available for operational expenses and cooperative agreements at the Fish Farming Experimental Laboratory at Stuttgart, Arkansas, and of which $10,000,000 shall be available for NOAA-wide efforts to conduct research on coastal development and population growth-associated problems, seafood safety, and remediation of environmental contamination and habitat restoration, including joint pilot projects between the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the National Institute of Standards and Technology to apply advanced sensor and environmental technologies for such purposes, particularly at military installations slated for closure; and in addition, $54,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the fund entitled "Promote and Develop Fishery Products and Research Pertaining to American Fisheries": *Provided*, That grants to States pursuant to section 306 and 306(a) of the Coastal Zone Management Act, as amended, shall not exceed $2,000,000 and shall not be less than $500,000: *Provided further*, That in applying provisions of section 606 of this Act to the programs, projects, and activities of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the notification requirements of section 606 shall apply to the proposed reprogramming of funds in excess of $250,000 or 5 per centum, whichever is less, for each program, project, or activity: *Provided further*, That hereafter all receipts received from the sale of aeronautical charts that result from an increase in the price of individual charts above the level in effect for such charts on September 30, 1993, shall be deposited in this account as an offsetting collection and shall be available for obligation".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. 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. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert:

$1,694,753,000 to remain available until expended; of which $576,000 shall be available for operational expenses and cooperative agreements at the Fish Farming Experimental Laboratory at Stuttgart, Arkansas; and in addition, $54,800,000 shall be derived by transfer from the fund entitled "Promote and Develop Fishery Products and Research Pertaining to American Fisheries": *Provided*, That grants to States pursuant to section 306 and 306(a) of the Coastal Zone Management Act, as amended, shall not exceed $2,000,000 and shall not be less than $500,000: *Provided further*, That hereafter all receipts received from the sale of aeronautical charts that result from an increase in the price of individual charts above the level in effect for such

charts on September 30, 1993, shall be deposited in this account as an offsetting collection and shall be available for obligation

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

The motion was agreed to.

□ 2110

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 84: Page 33, after line 26, insert:

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT AND MODERNIZATION

For construction, procurement and modification of aircraft, including research equipment and spare parts, necessary to acquire the next generation aircraft reconnaissance system for hurricane and severe storm forecasting and atmospheric research, $46,000,000, to remain available until expended.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. 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. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "$43,000,000".

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is $43 million more than the House, for this section? This was zero when it left the House was it not?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, these funds are for the NOAA hurricane plane. They have had a great need for some time for a plane that would fly higher and faster to locate these hurricanes farther out and to provide better data to forecast the hurricanes' landfall.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Further reserving the right to object, could the gentleman tell me why there was no money in this in the House version when it went to the Senate?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. It was not specifically authorized, it was not in the President's budget request, and we became aware of the need for the plane after the House considered this bill.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. It was not authorized?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. That is right, not specifically authorized.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] objects. The Chair will have to put the question on the motion as a result of the objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Is the Chair talking about putting the question and either having a rollcall vote tonight——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will repeat the question.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, if the Chair puts the question, then he is saying that there probably would have to be a vote either verbal or rollcall tonight?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, let me reserve the right to object.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Many of our colleagues are very interested in this provision. In fact, on the House side, several Members talked to me about this need of an airplane for hurricane spotting.

So I would hope the gentleman would not object to this.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Well, the only problem that I have is it is $43 million that was not authorized. It went to the Senate and was put in. And we had zeroed it. There was zero for it, as I understand.

Mr. ROGERS. If the gentleman would further yield, unfortunately, the need for this plane was not identified until after the House passed their bill, and well after the administration had submitted their budget request.

I would point out to the gentleman, that much of this bill is not authorized, including many important programs. Yet we still provide funding because of the importance of these programs.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Further reserving the right to object, I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. As a matter of fact, two-thirds of this bill is not authorized. So when Mr. ROGERS and I came to the floor, previously, we came without a rule. Anybody could object to anything they wanted to at the time. But we did not include many unauthorized matters, and where we did, any one Member could have knocked them out on a point of order. But we purposely did not include a lot of unauthorized items. The Senate provided the funding after hearing testimony on the need for this plane.

Mr. ROGERS. If the gentleman would yield further——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will advise Members that the ongoing colloquy is considered a continuation of the gentleman from Indiana's reservation of the right to object.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman further yield briefly?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, what the chairman has said is that some important programs in NOAA were not yet authorized when our appropriations bill came to the floor of the House.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. But it had been authorized in the Senate.

Mr. ROGERS. The funding was not specifically authorized in the Senate, but it was the Senate that added the funding.

When we go to conference then, we try to accommodate the House and the Senate. This add was for the airplane that many House Members supported. So it is not unusual for you to find items in this conference report that were not authorized by the House.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I understand. But the authorizing committee in the House, what the gentleman is saying, never got their authorizing bill completed before the appropriations process took place.

Mr. ROGERS. Exactly.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. So it should be brought to the attention of the House that the authorizing committee did not do its job in a timely fashion.

Mr. ROGERS. The gentleman can say that.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

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. 93: Page 38, after line 19, insert:

United States Travel and Tourism Administration

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the United States Travel and Tourism Administration including travel and tourism promotional activities abroad for travel to the United States and its possessions without regard to 44 U.S.C. 501, 3702 and 3703, including employment of American citizens and aliens by contract for services abroad; rental of space abroad for periods not exceeding five years, and expenses of alteration, repair, or improvement; purchase or construction of temporary demountable exhibition structures for use abroad; advance of funds under contracts abroad; payment of tort claims in the manner authorized in the first paragraph of 28 U.S.C. 2672, when such claims arise in foreign countries; and not to exceed $15,000 for official representation expenses abroad;

$20,298,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed $2,500,000 is to provide financial assistance under section 203(a) of the International Travel Act of 1961, as amended, notwithstanding the provisions of section 203(f)(1) of such Act: *Provided further*, That in addition to fees currently being assessed and collected, the Administration shall charge users of its services, products, and information, fees sufficient to result in an additional $3,000,000, to be deposited in the General Fund of the Treasury.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. 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. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert:

UNITED STATES TRAVEL AND TOURISM ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the United States Travel and Tourism Administration including travel and tourism promotional activities abroad for travel to the United States and its possessions without regard to 44 U.S.C. 501, 3702 and 3703, including employment of American citizens and aliens by contract for services abroad; rental of space abroad for periods not exceeding five years, and expenses of alteration, repair, or improvement; purchase or construction of temporary demountable exhibition structures for use abroad; advance of funds under contracts abroad; payment of tort claims in the manner authorized in the first paragraph of 28 U.S.C. 2672, when such claims arise in foreign countries; and not to exceed $15,000 for official representation expenses abroad; $17,120,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated by this paragraph shall be available to carry out the provisions of section 203(a) of the International Travel Act of 1961, as amended: *Provided further*, That in addition to fees currently being assessed and collected, the Administration shall charge users of its services, products, and information, fees sufficient to result in an additional $3,000,000, to be deposited in the General Fund of the Treasury.

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

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. 97: Page 40, line 4, after "year" insert ": *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of sections 391 and 392 of the Communications Act, as amended, not to exceed $1,000,000 appropriated in this paragraph shall be available for the Pan-Pacific Educational and Cultural Experiments by Satellite program (PEACESAT): *Provided further*, That $500,000 shall be available for the American Indian Higher Education Consortium for utilization of telecommunications technologies".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. 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. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 97, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert ": *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of sections 391 and 392 of the Communications Act, as amended, not to exceed $700,000 appropriated in this paragraph shall be available for the Pan-Pacific Education and Cultural Experiments by Satellite program (PEACESAT)".

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

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. 101: Page 40, after line 22, insert:

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

For grants for economic development assistance as provided by the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended, Public Law 91-304, and such laws that were in effect immediately before September 30, 1982, $242,642,000, of which $13,720,000 shall be for Trade Adjustment Assistance: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this heading may be used directly or indirectly for attorneys' or consultants' fees in connection with securing grants and contracts made by the Economic Development Administration.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. 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. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 101, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert:

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

For grants for economic development assistance as provided by the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended, Public Law 91-304, and such laws that were in effect immediately before September 30, 1982, and for trade adjustment assistance, $322,642,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this heading may be used directly or indirectly for attorneys' or consultants' fees in connection with securing grants and contracts made by the Economic Development Administration: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Commerce may provide financial assistance for projects to be located on military installations closed or scheduled for closure or realignment to grantees eligible for assistance under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended, without it being required that the grantee have title or ability to obtain a lease for the property, for the useful life of the project, when, in the opinion of the Secretary of Commerce, such financial assistance is necessary for the economic development of the area: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of commerce may, as the Secretary considers appropriate, consult with the Secretary of Defense regarding the title to land on military installations closed or scheduled for closure or realignment.

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

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. 110: Page 44, line 16, strike out "$2,063,000" and insert "$2,075,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. 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. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 110, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "$2,160,000".

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

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 13, strike our "$297,252,000" and insert "$286,170,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. 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. SMITH of Iowa 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 sum proposed by said amendment, insert "280,000,000".

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

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. 113: Page 45, line 14, after "3006A(i)" insert ": *Provided further*, That not to exceed $11,524,000 shall be available for Death Penalty Resource Centers".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. 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. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 113, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum named by said amendment, insert "$19,800,000".

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

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. 114: Page 46, line 10, strike out "$84,500,000" and insert "$80,952,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. 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. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 114, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "$86,000,000".

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

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. 115: Page 46, line 24, strike out "$44,612,000" and insert "$43,358,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. 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. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 115, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "$44,900,000".

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

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. 122: Page 51, line 12, strike out "$900,000" and insert "$500,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. 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. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 122, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: $1,118,000, of which $500,000 shall be available by transfer from unobligated balances remaining from the appropriation entitled "Commission on Agricultural Workers, Salaries and expenses".

And on page 51 of the House engrossed bill, H.R. 2519, after the heading "Salaries and Expenses" on line 9, insert the following new heading "(including transfer of funds)".

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

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 18, strike out all after "Act." down to and including line 22.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. 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. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 129, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by said amendment amended to read as follows:

None of the funds appropriated for the Small Business Administration under this Act may be used to impose any new or increased loan guaranty fee or debenture guaranty fee, or any new or increased user fee or management assistance fee, except as otherwise provided in this Act: *Provided*, That none of the funds provided in this or any other Act may be used for the cost of direct loans to any borrower under section 7(b) of the Small Business Act to relocate voluntarily outside the business area in which the disaster has occurred.

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

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. 130: Page 54, line 4, strike out "$22,994,000" and insert "$21,032,000, of which $5,135,000 shall be available until expended for the Microloan program".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. 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. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 130, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "$16,946,000".

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

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. 132: Page 54, line 15, strike out "$75,000,000" and insert "$65,000,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. 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. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 132, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

Delete the matter stricken and delete the matter inserted and strike all on line 14, page 54 of the House engrossed bill, H.R. 2519, and all that follows through "In addition," on line 24, page 54, and on page 53, line 12 of the House engrossed bill, H.R. 2519, strike "this amount" and insert in lieu thereof "the total amount in this paragraph".

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

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. 133: Page 55, after line 2, insert:

In addition, for the cost of emergency disaster loans and associated administrative expenses, $75,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That these funds, or any portion thereof, shall be available beginning in fiscal year 1994 to the extent that the President notifies the Congress of his designation of any or all of these amounts as emergency requirements under the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990: *Provided further*, That Congress hereby designates these amounts as emergency requirements pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D).

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. 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. SMITH of Iowa 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 sum named in said amendment insert "$140,000,000", and on page 55, line 6 of the House engrossed bill, H.R. 2519, strike "12,369,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$7,000,000".

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

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. 135: Page 56, after line 2, insert:

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

PAYMENT TO THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

For payment to the Legal Services Corporation to carry out the purposes of the

Legal Services Corporation Act of 1974, as amended, $349,000,000; of which $298,904,000 is for basic field programs; $7,826,000 is for Native American programs; $10,808,000 is for migrant programs; $1,226,000 is for law school clinics; $1,113,000 is for supplemental field programs; $695,000 is for regional training centers; $8,056,000 is for national support; $9,236,000 is for State support; $963,000 is for the Clearinghouse; $569,000 is for computer assisted legal research regional centers; $9,555,000 is for Corporation management and administration; and $49,000 is for board initiatives.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. 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. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 135, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

For payment to the Legal Services Corporation to carry out the purposes of the Legal Services Corporation Act of 1974, as amended, $400,000,000; of which $341,865,000 is for basic field programs; $8,950,000 is for Native American programs; $12,759,000 is for migrant programs; $1,402,000 is for law school clinics; $1,274,000 is for supplemental field programs; $795,000 is for regional training centers; $9,611,000 is for national support; $10,564,000 is for State support; $1,101,000 is for the Clearinghouse; $651,000 is for computer assisted legal research regional centers; $10,928,000 is for Corporation management and administration; and $100,000 is for board initiatives.

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

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. 138: Page 57, line 2, strike out "$1,612,206,000" and insert "$1,653,184,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. 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. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 138, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,704,589,000".

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

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. 139: Page 57, line 16, after "2718(a))" insert "and for expenses of general administration."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. 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. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 139, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "and for expenses of general administration: *Provided*, That notwithstanding section 502 of this Act, not to exceed 20 percent of the amounts made available in this Act in the appropriation accounts, "Diplomatic and Consular Programs" and "Salaries and Expenses" under the heading "Administration of Foreign Affairs" may be transferred between such appropriation accounts: *Provided further*, That any transfer pursuant to this section shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 605 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section".

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

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. 140: Page 57, line 23, strike out "$481,416,000" and insert "$455,816,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. 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. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 140, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$396,722,000".

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

The motion was agreed to.

□ 2120

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 141: Page 58, line 3, strike out "$3,800,000" and insert "$3,000,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. 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. SMITH moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 141, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

Delete the matter stricken and delete the matter inserted, and strike all on line 24, page 57 of the House engrossed bill, H.R. 2519, and all that follows through line 3, page 58.

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

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. 142: Page 58, line 25, strike out "$381,481,000" and insert "$410,000,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. 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. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 142, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "$410,000,000, of which $10,000,000 is for relocation and renovation costs necessary to facilitate the consolidation of overseas financial and administrative activities in the United States".

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

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that amendments numbered 147 and 148 be passed over this evening and that they be considered tomorrow, Wednesday, October 20, 1993, immediately prior to the consideration of amendment No. 171.

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

There was no objection.

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 149: Page 60, line 6, strike out "$20,892,000" and insert "$21,992,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. 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. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 149, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

Delete the matter stricken and delete the matter inserted, and on line 5, page 60 of the House engrossed bill, H.R. 2519, strike ", of" and all that follows through "arrearages" on line 7.

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

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. 150: Page 60, line 7, after "arrearages" insert :*Provided*, That

funds shall be available for peacekeeping expenses only upon a certification by the Secretary of State to the appropriate committees of the Congress that American manufacturers and suppliers are being given opportunities to provide equipment, services and material for United Nations peacekeeping activities equal to those being given to foreign manufacturers and suppliers, and that the United States Mission to the United Nations has established procedures to provide information on all United Nations procurement regulations and solicitations to American manufacturers and suppliers".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. 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. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 150, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert ": *Provided*, That funds shall be available for peacekeeping expenses only upon a certification by the Secretary of State to the appropriate committees of the Congress that American manufacturers and suppliers are being given opportunities to provide equipment, services and material for United Nations peacekeeping activities equal to those being given to foreign manufacturers and suppliers".

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

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. 159: Page 63, after line 12, insert:

SEC. 503. No funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act or any other Act may be expended for the salary of the United States Commissioner of the International Boundary Commission, United States and Canada.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. 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. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 159, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

SEC. 503. Funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act or any other Act may be expended for compensation of the United States Commissioner of the International Boundary Commission, United States and Canada, only for actual hours worked by such Commissioner.

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

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. 161: Page 63, line 20, strike out "$47,279,000" and insert "$58,000,000, of which $14,000,000 is available only for payment of United States contributions to the Preparatory Commission for the Organization on the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. 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. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 161, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "$53,500,000, of which not less than $9,500,000 is available until expended only for payment of United States contributions to the Preparatory Commission for the Organization on the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons".

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

The motion was agreed to.

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

The text of the amendment is a follows:

Senate amendment No. 162: Page 63, after line 20, insert:

BOARD FOR INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING

GRANTS AND EXPENSES

For expenses of the Board for International Broadcasting, including grants to Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, Incorporated, as authorized by the Board for International Broadcasting Act of 1973, as amended (22 U.S.C. 2871-2883), $206,000,000, of which not to exceed $52,000 may be made available for official reception and representation expenses.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. 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. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 162, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum "$206,000,000" named in said amendment, insert "$210,000,000".

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

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. 166: Page 67, line 1, strike out "$217,650,000" and insert "$250,702,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. 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. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 166, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "to include other educational and cultural exchange programs, $242,000,000".

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

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. 169: Page 68, after line 19, insert:

BROADCASTING TO CUBA

For expenses necessary to enable the United States Information Agency to carry out the Radio Broadcasting to Cuba Act, as amended (22 U.S.C. 1465 et seq.) (providing for the Radio Marti Program or Cuba Service of the Voice of America), and the Television Broadcasting to Cuba Act (22 U.S.C. 1465aa et seq.) including the purchase, rent, construction, and improvement of facilities for radio and television transmission and reception, and purchase and installation of necessary equipment for radio and television transmission and reception as authorized by 22 U.S.C. 1471, $28,351,000, to remain available until expended as authorized by 22 U.S.C. 1477b(a): *Provided*, That such funds for television broadcasting to Cuba may be used to purchase or lease, maintain, and operate such aircraft (including aerostats) as may be required to house and operate necessary television broadcasting equipment.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. 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. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 169, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

BROADCASTING TO CUBA

RADIO BROADCASTING TO CUBA

For expenses necessary to enable the United States Information Agency to carry out the Radio Broadcasting to Cuba Act, as amended (22 U.S.C. 1465 et seq.) (providing for the Radio Marti Program or Cuba Service of the Voice of America), including the purchase, rent, construction, and improvement of facilities for radio transmission and reception and purchase and installation of necessary equipment for radio transmission and reception as authorized by 22 U.S.C. 1471, $14,000,000, to remain available until expended as authorized by 22 U.S.C. 1477b(a), of which $5,000,000 shall be withheld from obligation until 30 days after the Director of the United States Information Agency submits a report to Congress which certifies receipt of the report of the Advisory Panel on Radio Marti and TV Marti and specifies the measures the United States Information Agency is taking with respect to the recommendations of the panel.

TELEVISION BROADCASTING TO CUBA

For expenses necessary to enable the United States Information Agency to carry out the Television Broadcasting to Cuba Act (22 U.S.C. 1465aa et seq.), including the purchase, rent, construction, and improvement

of facilities for television transmission and reception, and purchase and installation of necessary equipment for television transmission and reception, $7,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not later than July 1, 1994, the Director of the United States Information Agency shall submit to Congress, after consulting with the Board for International Broadcasting and after taking into account any relevant recommendations of the Advisory Panel on Radio Marti and TV Marti, his recommendations as to whether TV Marti broadcasting is technically sound and effective and is consistently being received by a sufficient Cuban audience to warrant its continuation and whether the interests of the United States are better served by maintaining television broadcasting to Cuba, by terminating television broadcasting to Cuba and strengthening radio broadcasting to Cuba, or by funding other activities related to promoting democracy in Cuba authorized by law: *Provided further*, That of the amount appropriated in this paragraph, $2,500,000 shall be withheld from obligation until after July 1, 1994, and, after that date, funds shall be available only for the orderly termination of television broadcasting to Cuba unless the Director of the United States Information Agency determines, in the report to Congress called for in the Administrative Provision Establishing the Advisory Panel on Radio Marti and TV Marti, that maintaining television broadcasting to Cuba is technically sound and effective, is consistently being received by a sufficient Cuban audience to warrant its continuation, and is in the best interests of the United States.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION ESTABLISHING THE ADVISORY PANEL ON RADIO MARTI AND TV MARTI

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established an advisory panel to be known as the Advisory Panel on Radio Marti and TV Marti (in this section referred to as the "Panel").

(b) FUNCTIONS.—The Panel shall study the purposes, policies, and practices of radio and television broadcasting to Cuba (commonly referred to as "Radio Marti" and "TV Marti") by the Cuba Service of the Voice of America.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date on which the members of the Panel have been appointed pursuant to subsection (d), the Panel shall submit to the Congress and the United States Information Agency (USIA) a report which shall contain—

(1) a statement of the findings and conclusions of the Panel on the matters described in subsection (b); and

(2) specific findings and recommendations with respect to whether—

(A) such broadcasting consistently meets the standards for quality and objectivity established by law or by the United States Information Agency;

(B) such broadcasting is cost-effective;

(C) the extent to which such broadcasting is already being received by the Cuban people on a daily basis from credible sources;

(D) TV Marti broadcasting is technically sound and effective and is consistently being received by a sufficient Cuban audience to warrant its continuation;

(d) COMPOSITION.—(1) Panel shall be composed of three members, who shall among them have expertise in government information and broadcasting programs, broadcast journalism, journalistic ethics, and the technical aspects of radio and television broadcasting.

(2) The Director of the United States Information Agency shall appoint the members of the Panel not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act. Individuals appointed to the Panel shall be noted for their integrity, expertise, and independence of judgment consistent with the purposes of the Panel.

(3) Each member of the Panel shall be appointed for the life of the Panel. A vacancy in the Panel shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

(4) Each member of the Panel shall serve without pay, except that such member shall receive travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in accordance with Sections 5702 and 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

(e) TEMPORARY PERSONNEL.—(1) The Panel may procure temporary and intermittent services under Section 3109 (b) of title 5, United States Code (relating to employment of experts and consultants), at rates for individuals not to exceed the maximum rate of basic pay payable for GS-15 of the General Schedule.

(2) Upon request of the Panel, the head of any Federal agency may detail, on a reimbursable basis, any of the personnel of the agency to the Panel to assist it in carrying out its duties under this section.

(3) Support Services.—The United States Information Agency shall provide facilities, supplies, and support services to the Panel upon request.

(f) TERMINATION.—The Panel shall terminate immediately upon submitting its report pursuant to subsection (c).

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

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. 170: Page 68, strike out lines 20 to 26.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. 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. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 170, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

NORTH/SOUTH CENTER

To enable the Director of the United States Information Agency to provide for carrying out the provisions of the North/South Center Act of 1991, (22 U.S.C. 2075), by grant to an educational institution in Florida known as the North/South Center, $8,700,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That funds appropriated by this Act for the United States Information Agency and the Department of State may be obligated and expended at the rate of operations and under the terms and conditions provided by H.R. 2519 as enacted into law, notwithstanding section 701 of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 and section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 except that this proviso shall cease to be effective after April 30, 1994 or upon enactment into law of H.R. 2333, the State Department, USIA, and Related Agencies Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 or similar legislation, whichever first occurs.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair rules that further consideration of this bill will continue tomorrow.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 18, 1993.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5 of Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on Monday, October 18, 1993 at 4:30 p.m. and said to contain a message from the President wherein he transmits a report on additional measures with respect to the national emergency with the Republic of Haiti.

With great respect, I am

Sincerely yours,

DONNALD K. ANDERSON,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

EXECUTIVE ORDER WITH RESPECT TO NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH HAITI—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

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

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 204(b) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. section 1703(b), and section 301 of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. section 1631, I hereby report that I have again exercised my statutory authority to issue an Executive order with respect to Haiti that, effective 11:59 p.m., e.d.t., Monday, October 18, 1993, that:

(a) Blocks all property in the United States or within the possession or control of United States persons, including their overseas branches, of persons:

(1) who have contributed to the obstruction of the implementation of United Nations Security Council Resolutions 841 and 873, the Governor's Island Agreement of July 3, 1993, or the activities of the United Nations Mission in Haiti;

(2) who have perpetuated or contributed to the violence in Haiti; or

(3) who have materially or financially supported any of the foregoing; and

(b) Prohibits any transaction subject to U.S. jurisdiction that evades or avoids, or has the purpose of evading or avoiding, or attempts to violate, the prohibitions in the new order, or in Executive Orders Nos. 12775, 12779, or 12853, except to the extent now authorized pursuant to the relevant Executive order.

I am enclosing a copy of the Executive order that I have issued.

The new Executive order is necessary to further the implementation of the Governors Island Agreement by reaching persons who are supporting the groups fomenting violence and opposing the restoration of constitutional government in Haiti. The new Executive order is to be implemented by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 18, 1993.*

ANNUAL REPORT OF FEDERAL PREVAILING RATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 5347(e) of title 5 of the United States Code, I transmit herewith the 1992 annual report of the Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 19, 1993.*

1992 CALENDAR YEAR REPORTS BY DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION ON ACTIVITIES UNDER HIGHWAY SAFETY ACT AND NATIONAL TRAFFIC AND MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY ACT OF 1966—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation and the Committee on Energy and Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the 1992 calendar year reports as prepared by the Department of Transportation on activities under the Highway Safety Act and the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966, as amended (23 U.S.C. 401 note and 15 U.S.C. 1408).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 19, 1993.*

IN OPPOSITION TO TAX INCREASES IN NAFTA

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 want to take this opportunity in the 5-minute section here to explain why my colleagues and I are opposed to including tax increases in the proposed North American Free-Trade Agreement.

□ 2130

First, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I am leaning strongly in favor of supporting the NAFTA, but it would be difficult to support increased taxes as part of the NAFTA agreement. Because NAFTA will reduce tariffs, it has been estimated that the Government will lose approximately $2.3 billion over the next 5 years, and this amount will need to be made up.

While I believe that NAFTA will, in fact, spur new economic growth and, thus, actually increase taxable income and tax revenues for the Government, the House budget rules require that this loss be made up. If we must find $2.3 billion in offsets because of the House rules, we have only one good alternative, and that is to cut spending. We can either raise taxes or cut spending.

Mr. Speaker, the administration has proposed a $5 per person increase in the tax assessed on international airline travel and a doubling of the fees for customs service collected on railroad cars and trucks that cross the border. Now, in the past we are going to be making up for lost tariffs which were paid by people outside of this country with fees and taxes on people within this country, not a very fair exchange.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, a group of 27 House Republicans, all supporters of or leaning strongly for the support of NAFTA, wrote to the President indicating our strong opposition to including tax increases as part of the NAFTA treaty. As we said in the letter, it would be difficult for many of us to support NAFTA if it includes a tax increase. We are willing to look at any proposal to cut spending, but I will make a suggestion or two for the White House's benefit.

When Congress passed the President's tax package earlier this year, the bill included $2.5 billion in increased programs. It expanded programs for food stamps over the next 5 years. This program; yes, this program, was expanded at a time when our Federal deficit is so deep and our debt goes up every day. We should cancel the expansion of this Federal Food Stamp Program, and that will provide enough money to offset the lost revenues under NAFTA.

The NAFTA vote is expected to be close, and the President is counting on Republican votes. The President must know though that many Republicans are very strongly opposed to tax increases, and, if he insists on including them in NAFTA, he could very well lose many Republican votes.

Mr. Speaker, there is a difference in philosophy between many Republicans and the President on raising taxes, and he needs to have and be conscious of our opinion in this matter because our votes are crucial to this matter.

Today in Congress Daily the President is quoted as saying on this issue, "We have to work through this." That is right, Mr. President, we do have to work through it, and we have to come up with a consensus, as Mr. Kantor said, on approaching how we are going to recover the lost revenues.

Many of us in this House want to see NAFTA pass because it is good for this country. We do not believe that higher and new taxes are good for this country, and in conclusion I would say that in the same publication, Congress Daily, I see where the House Committee on Ways and Means has marked up the bill with the proposed taxes in it, not a very good sign of working through it, Mr. President, not a very good sign at all.

And then, even to make matters a little more discouraging, I see where the Speaker of the House has rejected the special spending cuts section which could have given us the cuts we need to meet the lost revenues from the reduced tariffs.

I reiterate. I call again upon the White House to cooperate with us on this side of the aisle. Eliminate the taxes. Let us find an acceptable alternative. Let us reduce spending, and we can pass the NAFTA agreement.

GAMBLING WITH OUR NATIONAL MILITARY STRATEGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BROWN of Ohio). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago I spoke at this very spot about my concern that the Bottom-Up Review had not sized the Army properly. I also expressed my concern that peacekeeping commitments might so degrade the Army as to render it incapable of carrying out the national military strategy to fight two major regional conflicts almost simultaneously. In summary, I noted that it is increasingly difficult for the military, especially the Army, to accommodate new peacekeeping missions with fewer forces and reduced budgets.

Tonight, I want to discuss a problem intimately related to the first, the lack

of budgetary support for the Army. While I have concerns about the sizing of the Army, I also have similar concerns about the funding of it. Simply put, the funding of the Army is insufficient, even for the smaller 10 division force described in the Bottom-Up Review, which I disagree with. We need 12 divisions.

First, allow me to discuss a little bit of recent history. The Army came out of Vietnam a demoralized, if not broken, institution. Twenty years ago, in the waning years of that bitter conflict, the Army instituted a number of far-reaching changes. Some of those changes it was forced to accept; others it initiated. Those changes included the end of the draft and beginning of the All-Volunteer Force; the creation of the total force concept, and the establishment of the training and doctrine command [TRADOC] at Fort Monroe, VA. These decisions affected the Army profoundly.

Though many military leaders expressed great misgivings about the AVF, by the early 1980's the services had finally learned how to make it work. Recruiting high school graduates and paying them well helped create an Army of quality people.

The total force concept proved itself in the Persian Gulf war just as Army Chief of Staff Creighton Abrams had designed it back in the early 1970's. Since much of the Active Army's combat support and combat service support was found in the Guard and Reserve, the requirement to activate those forces helped bring along the support of the American public.

And the third decision, the creation of the training and doctrine command, paid great dividends. First rate training programs, as symbolized by the establishment of the national training center at Fort Irwin in the deserts of California, and the renewed emphasis on professional military education helped produce Army combat leaders who had studied war and were well prepared when called to action. Those officers responded to that call in magnificent fashion in Panama and the Persian Gulf war with campaign plans that produced quick victories and few American casualties.

The investments of the 1980's produced an American Army that was able to combine excellent people, first-rate equipment, and top notch military thinking to win decisively on the field of battle. Today, those hard-won gains secured over the past 20 years are at risk.

The balance that needs to be sustained among competing demands—procuring modern equipment, attracting quality people, maintaining adequate numbers of trained forces, and attending to infrastructure needs—has been lost. We are addressing today's needs at the expense of tomorrow's investments; today's current operations and readiness at the expense of tomorrow's modernization. Unless that balance can be restored among the competing demands we will have an Army that will have good people, but with old equipment and not enough forces to do the job if we hope to win the next war with few casualties.

Even at the 10 Active Army division level, to which I disagree as we need 12, the programmed budget to accomplish modernization of weapons, adequate personnel and unit training, and infrastructure upkeep is not enough. Readiness of deployed forces has been maintained by underfunding investment. The backlog of major Army items needing maintenance and repair has increased dramatically. Some $400 million of that money has been diverted to fund operations in Somalia and Southwest Asia. On the procurement front the Army budget is 60 percent less than where it was expected to be 3 years ago—$18.7 billion versus $6.8 billion.

Modernization provides major leverage in achieving a decisive warfighting capability—the smaller the force, the more modern it must be. The Army needs about $15 billion per year to modernize in an adequate manner. It is falling at least $2 billion and maybe as much as $5 billion short in the area of research, development, and acquisition. In this week's issue of Defense News a front page article emphasizes the point by revealing that nearly half of all Army procurement programs are in danger of either being reduced or eliminated over the next 5 years.

Force reductions to date have been substantial—the inactivation of four divisions and one corps. Two other divisions are to be deactivated by the end of fiscal year 1994. And if current plans found in the Bottom-Up Review are carried out, two more Army divisions will be deactivated sometime over the next few years.

The Army is undergoing fundamental changes as it shapes itself as "a strategic force for the 21st century." The Army is coming home. It will be primarily an America-based force rather than the forward deployed force it was during the cold war. We are making the investments in Airlift and Sealift to help give the Army a substantial projection capability. We need an Army of 12 active divisions with 555,000 active duty soldiers. The Army also needs approximately $64 billion per year. The fiscal year 1994 budget request is $60.7 billion.

Unless such readjustments are taken in the fiscal year 1995 Defense budget, we will be gambling in a fashion that undermines our stated national military strategy. The price will be paid, as it has always been paid in the past, by American soldiers who were not given adequate support in peacetime.

□ 2140

LEGISLATION NEEDED TO PROTECT LESBIANS AND GAY MEN AGAINST JOB DISCRIMINATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that I feel compelled to take this time. I have been asked from time to time by some of my colleagues why I think there is a need for legislation which would protect lesbians and gay men against job discrimination. People have said, "After all, there is no problem. People are not discriminated against in hiring in this country based on their sexual orientation. So why press for legislation? Is this some effort to get some special rights?"

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that people ought to be getting special rights based on their sexual orientation. Indeed, while I am a supporter of affirmative action in cases of minority discrimination where there has been an obvious community impact, I do not think affirmative action is an affirmative remedy for the kind of discrimination gay men and women face. What I think we need is simply legislation that says you are entitled as an individual to win a job or lose it based on your merits.

Again, I have been asked, "Well, why is there any need for this?"

Sadly, this week's Roll Call, in yesterday's edition, gives an example of the reason. Three Members of this body, three elected officials, explicitly told a newspaper in Oklahoma that they would refuse to hire people who were honest about being gay or lesbian; without regard to their qualifications, apparently, without regard to their diligence, without regard to their ideology. The fact that these individuals would be gay or lesbian and would presumably, if asked, say so, the fact that they would not hide, apparently would result in their not being hired. Now, if that happens here in the House of Representatives, it is obvious that it is happening elsewhere in society.

Mr. Speaker, my own view is that it is time for us to clarify this with regard to the House of Representatives. I daresay that many of our colleagues were surprised to hear that. That is certainly the conversations I have had. I was particularly surprised with regard to a couple of my colleagues, by the way, because I thought some of them were those who felt that the U.S. Congress should not exempt itself from laws that apply to others.

I have heard people say that the Congress must abide by the laws that everybody else abides by. Congress must stop abrogating to itself the right to evade laws.

Well, I agree with that, and I hope that the Hamilton-Boren committee,

when it comes out, will cover us fully under all the laws.

Mr. Speaker, I have to note if we were a private corporation located here, we would be covered by the District of Columbia's law that says you cannot discriminate against people based on their sexual orientation. So apparently some of my colleagues feel, despite their rhetoric about complying with the law, that it is perfectly okay for them to ignore the law of the District of Columbia that would apply if they were a private corporation, because they feel the need to discriminate, without regard to people's qualifications, against gay men and women lesbians.

I think there is a gap between the rhetoric and the actual actions. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this is a matter we should address. What individual Members do may be wholly within the control of individual Members. I do think once this explicit announcement of people's right to discriminate has come forward, again without regard to qualifications, without regard to behavior, without regard to whatever discretion people show, but the simple fact would be enough to deny them the chance to work in these offices, I hope we will be able to make it clear through the leadership that such policies of bigotry do not cover those areas of the House in general. It would certainly not be worthy of our commitment to individual rights and individual dignity to so practice.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we will, by this unfortunate incident, not again be asked why some of us feel the need to protect people against discrimination. It would seem to me hard for Members to deny the existence of a discrimination which three of our colleagues have now announced they feel free to practice.

APPOINT SPECIAL PROSECUTOR TO INVESTIGATE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 60 minutes

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I will not take the full 60 minutes. In fact, I will just take a few minutes tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that rumors are flying around the city of Washington right now to the fact that the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Ron Brown, may be resigning in the next few days. I do not know if they are true or not, but many have asked me today, because of the investigation that we have been working on and have launched to find out whether or not Mr. Brown did take a $700,000 bribe and whether or not Mr. Brown was going to get ultimately millions, and maybe tens or hundreds of millions, of dollars in royalties and so forth from the Government of Vietnam for removing the trade barriers or helping remove the trade barriers that have been in place against that government.

We believe, those of us who have been involved in this investigation, that even if Mr. Brown does resign, that the investigation should go forward, because there is a cloud that hangs over the Clinton administration because of the allegations.

Now, there is a grand jury investigation that has been taking place down in Miami, FL. That will deal with Mr. Brown and the possibility of his illegal actions.

But we have taken two steps to remove the trade barriers against Vietnam, even though we have not had an accounting, a full accounting, of the 2,200 POW-MIA's that are missing in that country and in Southeast Asia. Because of that, that we have taken these two steps to normalize relations and remove those trade barriers, a lot of people have been asking the question, did Mr. Brown have undue influence on the administration, even the President, in getting him to remove these trade barriers or start taking those steps?

Mr. Speaker, today a letter was sent to the Attorney General asking her to appoint a special independent counsel. The reason we sent this letter to the Attorney General is because she said, I believe quoted in the October 1 Washington Post, "If I appoint the person or select a person who is going to be the counsel, you are still going to question the conflict of interest as long as I am involved in that process." Again she said, "For me to appoint somebody, you will be asking, 'Well, that person has a conflict, too, because you appointed them.'"

Mr. Speaker, she said these conflicts might arise because she is a Cabinet-appointed officer, as is Mr. Brown.

In order to work with the Attorney General in overcoming this dilemma, a letter was sent today signed by the Republican leader of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], the Republican whip of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], the chairman of the Republican Conference, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], the chairman of the Republican Policy Committee, and myself, the chairman of the Republican Study Committee, that listed not one, not two, but eight former Attorneys General or members of the Justice Department whose credentials are impeccable. They have been prosecuting attorneys, career prosecutors, and, as I said, former Attorneys General.

Mr. Speaker, they include Mike Baylson, Griffin Bell, Alan Cohen, Jim Ferguson, Mark Hellerer, Dan Reidy, David Rothenberg, and Tony Valukas, responsible people who could be appointed to conduct this investigation and to be the independent counsel in the investigation.

Mr. Speaker, we think it is absolutely essential, regardless of whether or not Mr. Brown resigns, that we have a complete investigation in the Congress, as well as have the independent counsel appointed by the Attorney General. The reason we feel that way is because this administration will continue to have a cloud hanging over it until all the questions are answered.

I have sent numerous letters to the Justice Department, letters to the National Security Council, and letters to the President himself, as well as Mr. Brown, asking for information.

In addition to that, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER], the ranking Republican on the Committee on Government Operations, has sent a letter to the President asking for additional information on these allegations.

□ 2150

We believe all of those questions should be answered to the full satisfaction of the Congress of the United States, and we believe the investigation should be absolutely complete, even if Mr. Brown resigns, so that the American people will know that they can have full confidence in President Clinton and this administration and that there have been no deals cut with the Government of Vietnam in order to normalize relations.

If that is done, then I think that the President will be able to continue being effective in his job as President of the United States. However, if this is not done, I think this cloud will continue to hang over the administration and will be a cloud that will grow and will continue to hurt the administration in the months and years to come.

We sent this letter today to Janet Reno, the Attorney General, and I hope that she will respond favorably and pick somebody to be the special prosecutor or special counsel, in this case, and we can get to the bottom of it as quickly as possible so that there will be no problems at all by pointing fingers at anybody in the administration.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the letter to which I referred.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, October 19, 1993.

Hon. JANET RENO,
Attorney General of the United States, Department of Justice, Washington, DC.

DEAR GENERAL RENO: The situation concerning Commerce Secretary Ronald Brown cries out for the appointment of a special prosecutor.

The morass of media reports and rumors about his possible actions simply must be cleared up, not only to retain the public's faith in the Administration's enforcement of the laws but also in fairness to Mr. Brown himself. He is entitled to something better than prolonged trial by press account.

You recently explained to the press your rationale for not appointing a special prosecutor in this case in the absence of a reauthorized Independent Counsel Law: "If I appoint the person or select the person, you're still going to question the conflict [of interest] as long as I am involved in that process." Again, "For me to appoint somebody, you will be asking me, 'Well, that person has a conflict, too, because you appointed them'." (Both quotes from The Washington Post October 1, 1993)

We understand your dilemma and want to help.

We have developed the enclosed list of distinguished individuals from among whom you can choose a special prosecutor to deal with the Brown case. Because the list has been compiled by persons decidedly not connected with the Administration, its independence is unimpeachable. No one can suggest any conflict of interest on your part in making the appointment from our list.

We are ready to do our part to insulate from politics the investigation of Secretary Brown. We hope to hear from you.

Bob Michel, Republican Leader; Dick Armey, Chairman, Republican Conference; Newt Gingrich, Republican Whip; Henry Hyde, Chairman, Republican Policy Committee; Dan Burton, Member of Congress.

SUGGESTED INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINTMENT AS SPECIAL PROSECUTOR

Mike Baylson, former U.S. attorney.

Griffin Bell, former Attorney General.

Alan Cohen, former Justice Department career prosecutor.

Jim Ferguson, former Justice Department career prosecutor.

Mark Hellerer, former Justice Department career prosecutor.

Dan Reidy, former Justice Department career prosecutor.

David Rothenberg, former assistant U.S. attorney.

Tony Valukas, former U.S. attorney.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. I am going to do a special order this evening on Somalia, having just been there yesterday. It seems further ago than that because of the span of time. I have been tracking this whole Commerce Secretary Ron Brown thing with you very carefully.

Are you hearing rumors from some of the networks that Mr. Brown is even indicating he might resign?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I received some calls from national television networks today and some news media saying that they had had some reports that there would be some more revelations in some of the news media in the next few days and that Ron Brown's resignation was imminent. It may be for the reasons that we have raised during the investigation, or it may be for some other reason. I simply do not know. But if it is the case, as I said before, and he does resign, we should still continue this investigation to its conclusion.

Mr. DORNAN. He was one of the first, being the head of the Democratic Party during the whole entire election year and for a long time before that in being a key part of the Clinton victory; he was one of the first appointments made, one of the first confirmed by the Senate within a week after the inauguration. He greased through the Senate. It was a virtual love fest. The Republicans were as weak as I have ever seen them. And if he were to consider resigning, it certainly would not be based on his protestations of a week ago and 2 weeks ago that he was virtually as clean as a hound's tooth.

If he were to resign, then it would be what I call the Coelho approach. Throw everything over the side and get out of town, hope that the Justice Department stops all investigations. I think that probably the least believable of all the things I have heard was that he never had any role in moves toward removing all sanctions against the Communist government of Hanoi. To have a Commerce Secretary not taking the lead in what was virtually a veiled campaign promise would be astounding to me. It just does not have the ring of truth to it

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. There are many inconsistencies, as the gentleman well knows.

First of all, he said he never met Mr. Hao, who allegedly gave him the $700,000 bribe. Then he admitted he met him not once but three times. It was said that there was never any bank account at Indosuez set up to get that money in Singapore, and then we found out, through FBI sources, that moneys were transferred electronically from the Government of Vietnam to a bank in Singapore.

It could be a coincidence, but I certainly doubt it. And then he appeared before our committee, and I asked him personally if he had any involvement in making a decision or trying to influence the decision to normalize relations with Vietnam. He answered not once but twice, "No, Congressman, I had no involvement in that and neither did I discuss it with any of my top staff persons."

Then we found out from a mole, if you will, that the NSC held a meeting in June, and one of his top lieutenants was the chief pusher, if you will, to normalize relations with Vietnam and lower those trade barriers.

It is inconceivable, as the gentleman just said, that the Secretary of the Department of Commerce would not know what one of his top deputies was doing, as far as trying to push this thing through.

Mr. DORNAN. What about the chartered jet from National Airport down to West Palm Beach? Has anybody in the media gone for their Pulitzer Prize to try and get the records at both ends to find out if that jet actually went down there, who the passengers were? What about the house he bought for someone here that closed 3 days after his, the approval of his appointment in the Senate, one of the meetings was supposedly at that house that he had purchased for a nonrelated friend?

The whole thing, it brings to mind the double standard of the media in this city and in the biggest cities of this country. If this were a Republican, that is not Mr. Sununu, our friend, going to a stamp show of philatelists. This is something they would absolutely be like sharks in the water. It would be Watergate all over again. Where are you, Woodward and Bernstein, when we need you?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Let me just say that I share the same, almost the same degree of cynicism toward the media that my colleague from California does. However, in this case I will tell you that a number of the networks and a number of the media people have been working on it. They may not have been working as hard as they have on other cases. I simply do not know. But I do know that they have been looking into it.

I think they believe that Mr. Brown misled them in the past. I think they are very concerned about that, and I think that they have been working on it.

As far as how thorough they have been working on it, I do not know. I can tell you this: The questions you just raised about the jet, about telephone logs, about Federal Express letters that went back and forth from Florida to the Commerce Department and Mr. Brown, we have asked for all of those records, as many as we can possibly get.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER] the ranking Republican on the Government Operations Committee, has written to the White House asking for phone logs and a lot of other information. I believe if we get that information, we will get to the bottom of it.

If the White House or the executive branch tries to stonewall us, then we will have a big problem. But I am hopeful that the President and his people who are advising him down there will see fit to give us the information so this cloud that I talked about that hovers over the administration will be removed and they can do their job.

Mr. DORNAN. I am looking forward to tracking this one. We have heard so many attack 1-minutes against the Bush administration over the last 4 years on absolutely no evidence in most cases. The silence is thundering here on this and several other things that have already happened in the first 9 months of the Clinton administration.

TRANSFER OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order for this evening reserved by the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI] to speak on the Free-Trade Agreement, that I be allowed to take that order at this point.

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

There was no objection.

ON NAFTA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. COPPERSMITH] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Mr. Speaker, I should not take nearly that much time. I want to take some time this evening, however, to talk a little bit about the Free-Trade Agreement but talk specifically about a small business I know in Arizona that is in Metropolitan Phoenix.

It is in a town called, a city called Glendale, AZ. It is called La Corona Foods.

I think this is an excellent example of what kind of businesses are succeeding now, what kind of businesses will succeed with the passage of the Free-Trade Agreement.

La Corona Foods, Inc., is a small business in Arizona that is owned by a man named Charles Pritchard. Three years ago Mr. Pritchard began selling his yogurt in Mexico, and over that 3 years his firm has grown to the point where now 45 percent of his sales and one-third of his staff is tied to exports to Mexico.

It turns out that in Mexico consumption of yogurt is 3½ times higher than it is in the United States. Part of that has to do with the fact that the Mexican population is somewhat younger, a better market for yogurt. Part of it has to do with yogurt is an excellent source of protein, and there is a great consumer demand for it in Mexico.

But this once small business with $15 million in annual sales, 85 employees, is now the No. 1 best selling American-made yogurt in Mexico. This is a business that is selling to Mexico right now, and it is selling and is succeeding in the international market, despite, really, an effective tariff of about a little more than 20 percent.

There is a tariff that Mexico places, plus as well as the fact that milk prices in the United States are relatively higher because of our support price system. La Corona is succeeding, despite the fact that in this case the Mexican tariff is significantly higher than the average tariff Mexico imposes on all goods.

□ 2200

We have recited time and again the fact that the average Mexican tariff is about two and one-half times the average American tariff. For most goods, across the board, it averages about 10 percent compared to the average American tariff at about 2.5 to 4 percent, so Mexico imposes a tariff in the aggregate of 2.5 percent, but that is higher in particular industries and it is higher for particular goods.

For example, in computers and semiconductors, that is something that is also important in Arizona, the effective tariff on semiconductors is 10 percent in Mexico. It is essentially 2 percent or less coming from Mexico and the United States, and the tariff on the products that semiconductors are used in, because most people do not just buy raw semiconductors, they buy computers, they buy telephone equipment, communication equipment, and that tariff can be 20 percent.

Here we have a situation where the Mexican tariff essentially makes La Corona 20 to 25 percent more expensive than the Mexican product, but they have succeeded, so now, nearly over $5 million to $6 million of their sales are sales to Mexico, and over one-third of their growth, one-third of the staff they have added, are now in the export business. They are at risk should NAFTA fail.

We have asked the question time and again: Who wins and who loses if NAFTA succeeds or if NAFTA fails. Here is a small business that fails, that hurts, that will suffer should NAFTA not succeed. They are succeeding right now, but they know that should the United States turn its back on the rapidly growing Mexican market, their sales to Mexico would plummet; that one way or another, the Mexican Government will find a way to block American goods, to find a preferential way to import products from other countries. That is really part of the message about NAFTA.

NAFTA requires so much more of the Mexican Government than it does of the United States. It requires Mexico to lower its tariffs much more.

As the gentleman from Florida, SAM GIBBONS, has said, and has been quoted on this floor a number of times, we essentially have one-way free trade. We allow goods from Mexico to come into the United States at relatively negligible tariffs. We have lowered our tariff, and we are importing a great deal from Mexico. Mexico still has relatively high tariffs, but because of the quality and because of the excellence of American goods, we are still able to export considerable amounts to Mexico. We went from running a trade deficit with Mexico in 1987 to today, where we run a large trade surplus, some $40.6 billion worth of products each year.

La Corona is important because it is a small business. Small business represents about 93 percent of the nearly 90,000 firms in Arizona. Those are the firms that really are most likely to benefit from these increases in opportunity, most likely to benefit from NAFTA giving American companies preferential access to the rapidly growing Mexican market.

What many people do not realize about NAFTA is, while Mexico will lower its tariffs with respect to the United States, it will retain those tariffs with respect to the rest of the world, so we will have a situation where it will be Japanese chip makers and Japanese computer firms and Japanese electronics firms who face that relatively high Mexican tariff of 10 percent on semiconductors or 20 percent on the finished products.

American firms will have a zero tariff, and there will be no incentive to locate in Mexico, to serve the Mexican market, because we will be able to gain tariff-free access to that market, as well as service the United States. Lower tariffs have caused trade to flourish. They have been a win-win situation in the past. They will cause small businesses to flourish under NAFTA.

Mr. Speaker, I speak of La Corona because it is an excellent example of a small business that sells a consumer good. No one can argue that yogurt is going to a maquiladora plant where it is being assembled with granola bits and then transhipped back into the United States. This is a consumer good that is made in the United States, and it is made in the United States because that is where the quality work force is, that is more productive. It is made in the United States because we have a far better supply of quality milk. It is sold to consumers in Mexico, and it is sold by the millions of dollars for this small firm.

They have no incentive to relocate, should the free-trade agreement go into place, because right now they could make that choice if they wished, but they would be moving further away from the source of their quality raw material, American milk. They would also be moving away from their skilled U.S. work force. They have economic reasons to stay. What NAFTA offers La Corona is the opportunity to expand its sales in the Mexican market.

Mr. Speaker, finally, let me just quote from Mr. Pritchard. He criticized the famous quote, I think, that many people have said about Ross Perot, "If NAFTA is passed, you will hear a giant sucking sound."

Mr. Pritchard says that is entirely wrong. What is going to be the big sucking sound is the goods and services we will sell down there, not jobs. He is productive. He is a small business that is succeeding, that benefits workers in my State from access to the American market, access that NAFTA will improve.

We need to end this system of one-way free trade and get two-way free trade. I know if we just provide a level playing field of equal tariffs going both ways, the American work force, American business, can compete. They are second to none. Their products are valued all over the world.

Let us try and lock up that access to the rapidly-growing Mexican market and approve NAFTA.

THE STATUS OF AMERICAN TROOPS IN SOMALIA

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, when I took a special order in this distinguished Chamber last Friday, I made comment that I was receiving some resistance in trying to go at no taxpayer expense, only at the expense of my own energy, to hitchhike on U.S. Air Force C–141's or the giant Galaxy, Lockheed Galaxy C–5, to Somalia to observe, myself, using my own military experience and my own world travel that has taken me, mostly at my own expense, overwhelmingly at my own expense, to more nations around the world than any Congressman or Senator who has ever drawn God's breath in 217 years, and I was not able to go last week.

I wanted to go on one of the flights from Hunter Air Base in Georgia, with one of the M–1 tanks that should have gone over there weeks before, and then, as I said Friday on the floor here, that I would fly commercial if I had to, and I started to make the reservations on United Airlines to Amsterdam, Amsterdam on KLM to Nairobi and the nation of Kenya to the south of Somalia, where I would have muscled my way onto a press pool airplane that the U.S. military is providing to try and get people up to Somalia to tell the story. As of right now, there are no American journalists or photojournalists in there that I know of.

When the Pentagon saw that I was determined to get over there, I must say they did assist me, gave me an escort officer, and the two of us hitchhiked by air starting at 5:30 Sunday morning, two days ago, to what is called Cairo West Airport, a Soviet-built field to the west, obviously, of the city of Cairo. It was over a 13-hour flight, two mid-air refuelings.

We then had a layover, where I took advantage of discussing with all of the troops coming and going from Mogadishu and Somalia through West Cairo, which is about the only spot that we are transiting troops up to Europe or straight home to the United States with some stops, sometimes air refueling, no stops. I was able to get a good opinion of what the young men and women, many women, about 14 percent of our forces there, feel coming out or going back for a second or third tour, how they feel about the dangers, about feeding starving people.

Then I picked up a flight just over 5 hours, the same C–5 that we had been with since Fort Benning, and got into Mogadishu International Airport, which is an armed camp. It is the headquarters of the 75th Ranger Regiment, 3d Battalion, out of Fort Benning. I was met on the ramp with my escorts by Maj. Gen. Thomas Montgomery. He had the blades spinning on an H–60 helicopter, and I put on a flak jacket, a helmet, jumped in, and we began to take a tour of Mogadishu.

Before I tell the 1,200,000 interested American, including the mothers, fathers, wives, and older children of many of our force over there, that is going to go back up to 10,000 before it starts to come down again, what were my written objectives that I sent to the Pentagon. Then I will come back to that helicopter ride around all of Somalia and tell the Members what I think I accomplished.

Mr. Speaker, I personally wanted to view that air bridge by the Air Force to resupply our fine, the finest, military men and women in the world. I want to study the crew stress on these long flights and the need for C–17 aircraft.

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

Mr. DORNAN. I gladly yield to the gentleman from California.

□ 2210

Mr. HUNTER. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding, because I think it is important for everybody who is listening to this to understand what my friend, the gentleman from California, [Mr. DORNAN], has done. Over the weekend while a lot of us were staying in Washington, a few of us were going back to our districts, the gentleman from California, [Mr. DORNAN], because of his concern for our Armed Forces personnel, spent about 40 hours in the air flying to Somalia and back. And I want to say to you as a member of the Armed Services Committee, who depends on you, as a lot of us do for the great expertise that you provide, that we thank you for the service that you have provided, and the background that you have established, and the facts that you have brought back to us regarding the Somali situation. And I look forward to listening to the gentleman.

Mr. DORNAN. DUNCAN, I do not want to get melodramatic here. I do not even want to get dramatic, but I know I speak for you when I say it is an honor to hang out with these people. I just love being around them. I did in Vietnam, because I could not get activated as an Air Force fighter jock, so I went over there eight times, twice literally with the very salt of this Earth, and I mean that in the Biblical sense, the wives of our missing pilots, and their mothers, into Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam. And they are identical. You cannot separate them from Vietnam, your war, from Korea, or from Desert Storm, or Panama, or Grenada, where these fine people, augmented by 14 percent females in this dangerous area of the world. They are just great to be around, from the highest general to the youngest shave-tail private first class.

Mr. HUNTER. If the gentleman will yield for one last brief statement, I just want to say to my friend that just a few minutes ago I talked on the phone in the Cloakroom with my old platoon sergeant from the 75th Rangers, Charlie Company Rangers from 1970–71 in Vietnam. I was fortunate enough when the 173d Airborne Bridgade came home to go and serve with the 75th Rangers until they stood down in II Corps, and I did not do anything special in Vietnam. But I served with a lot of great people, and Pop Carter, my platoon sergeant was one of those people. And Pop was an individual who spent 54 months in Vietnam with various units, with the 173d Airborne initially. He was in the Daktho operation, and was one of the last people ultimately out of Vietnam when we left in such a disarray in the last phase of the war.

I asked him, and he was up to speed totally on what was happening in Somalia, as always. He is in Valdosta, GA, but he is watching television, and he is reading, and he knew what was happening.

Mr. DORNAN. I met him in the House restaurant a few years ago.

Mr. HUNTER. You met Doc with his son who is in the U.S. Marines at Fort Lejeune. I asked Pop what he thought about the way the Secretary of Defense handled this. And he said very simply, he said, "He broke the contract he had with us. That was a contract to provide us the very best."

I thought that that was interesting coming from an individual who spent a lot of time, and I asked him if he thought it was reminiscent of Vietnam. And he said, "absolutely, where the politicians in Washington are overruling the ground commanders in the field," and that is what happened when the Secretary of Defense, Les Aspin, refused to send the armor that the field commander asked for

So I just let Pop know that we are going to be talking a little bit about the Rangers tonight, and those that fell in battle. And once again, I appreciate the gentleman undertaking this very arduous task for the benefit of all of the Members of the House and for the benefit of the families of those who fell.

Mr. DORNAN. I appreciate it, DUNCAN. And I got as far as getting on a helicopter with General Montgomery.

But let me tell you, the trip started at Andrews, and I missed seeing Michael Durant by three or four minutes. He arrived from Germany, from Landstuhl Army Hospital right outside the great Ramstein Air Force Base, and his wife had joined him over there, and she was on the flight coming back. And they transferred him to a Nightengale C–9 hospital plane. Warren Christopher was there. One of the best Chiefs of Staff of the Army we have ever had, Gordon Sullivan, was there to pin the Purple Heart on him.

By the time I got down to Bunning and turned on the evening news, CWO

Michael Durant had arrived in Fort Campbell, and it was a lump in the throat, a tear jerker. The whole base turned out, all of those 160 aviation, special ops aviation regiment troops were there with their Red Berets. He was there on a stretcher with his brand new Purple Heart. They said you are back with your own, we are going to take care of you, we are going to get you back on the job, and we are going to get you back in the cockpit. And Durant raised his fist in victory. And all the wives were there with signs of "Welcome home, hero." And I choked watching it, because within a day I would be talking to young Sgt. Mason Hall who was the gunner on the chopper that went down with the two men that I mentioned last week in the special order with you that I wanted to see get the Medal of Honor. I can correct some things that had been given to the press, not been given to them incorrectly, but wrong assumptions had been made.

M. Sgt. Gary Gordon of Maine did not have to rappel down to the crash site of Durant's helicopter, the second that was destroyed of three within an hour that day on October 3. This chopper went right down on the deck, four feet off the ground, and Gordon, and Randall Shughart jumped out and ran to Durant's helicopter.

This may be as close as we will ever get to a narrative or of an action battle report of what happened, because young Mason Hall told me he saw them reach the two pilots. One of them, Gary or Randy, pulled Durant out of the helicopter. The other one was pulling out a man that I surmised on this floor last week would probably have a Vietnam record. It was Ray Frank, chief warrant officer. He was 45. When I saw his age I deducted 20 years back to our pullout in 1973, and he would have been 25. And I said this may have been one of our teenaged, 19-year-old warrant officer pilots earlier, and I bet he has had a tour in Vietnam. DUNCAN, he had three tours in Vietnam, 31 combat missions. And when I come back to the floor again I will find out whether they were in Huey Hog Gunships, or Huey Slicks transporting troops around, or Cobras that were introduced in 1968, the two men, thin-bodied Cobras.

One of these Rangers pulled out Ray Frank, and I am hanging on every word. We are standing right there where one of the mortars hit and killed another soldier in front of the Ranger barracks, the outdoor living, and I will mention that more in a minute. And he said, Congressman, at that moment an RPG hit my helicopter No. 3 that Shughart and Gordon had just gone out to help the two pilots from helicopter II that was down, and helicopter I by that time had about 90 Rangers around it. The RPG hit right behind me, he said, on the door. He had traded places with the left gunner whose hand was crippled from fire, and he said when the RPG hit right next to me, it ripped through the helicopter and tore off the leg of another Ranger that was firing with a rifle from the helicopter. So they were on fire. They got the collective up, started to smoke all the way back to Newport where they crashed. They did get the trooper in the back with the leg missing to an ambulance. He is in a hospital here in the States. The one with his hand hurt is OK. It was a hard landing. That helicopter was destroyed. I did not know that on the floor here either. So that is three $13 million helicopters in an hour.

But what everybody wanted to get across, including their commanding general, Bill Garrison, was that that was a successful mission. They captured 20 of Aideed's lieutenants. Four were killed in the crossfire, mainly by their own fire at our Rangers, and the Rangers got in with armored Humvees and got out, got out with all of their prisoners arrested in the name of the United Nations resolution that Madeleine Albright put through in New York City at the United Nations because this man was killing U.N. troops left and right brutally in the daytime, in ambush, executing people like the 24 Pakistanis at food distribution points. This guy has gone absolutely wild as a killer.

And what is absolutely stunning to me, the more I research this, is that he is a former chief of police of Mogadishu. He was the chief of staff of the army under Barre. He was put in jail by Barre after bringing him to power in October 1969 for 6 years and was notorious in Somalia. This scorpion is tough. Then Barre let him out, and gives him a colonelcy, and he goes up in the Ogaden to battle 11,000 Cuban troops. And they got their clock cleaned because the Russians weighed in with commanding officers in some of the units, 11,000 battle-hardened Cubans, some of them from Angola, superior weaponry, and kicked them good, sent them back to Somalia, and eventually he chased Barre, the dictator, out into Kenya and took over.

□ 2220

The mass of killing and destruction in the streets that we witnessed on American television all these years, they brought about this horrible famine where some 350,000 people died. He did not seem to worry about that. His wife is living off the dole in Canada. One of his rejected wives, that is. He may have three. He has not only a son in this country who is, as far as I know, a fine young Marine in the service, he has three other sons going through our college system. He is a very smart man of letters, he considers himself. So I asked Admiral Howe there, our charge, McInerney, I asked what is it that started him killing? And they said, they all said, quite simply, he wants to be dictator of the country. He thinks he has earned it.

When he saw the way the United Nations was going, the direction in which it was going, the nation building, possible multiparty system, elections, he did not like it.

When the Pakistanis took the radio station away from him where he was putting out his propaganda, he started killing. He has killed seven Nigerians and wounded a dozen more, and I mean arms and legs off. He has murdered a dozen Moroccans and killed their battalion commander, who at first—a fellow from north of Morocco who would not fire on women and children—Aideed's people were setting them up as shields, and it cost him his life. What also cost him his life was staying on the radio, his heroism, helping the Moroccans fight back. He rejected medical aid.

He has killed four or five Malaysians, he has killed more, three more Pakistanis in addition to the 24 killed in that raid. He has killed four American MP's with an auto-detonated landmine. I flew over that in a H-60—it sounds funny when I say this, given the 7-hour time difference—yesterday I am looking down at the wreckage of an American MT humvee that was blown apart, killing four kids, young men, heroes, on August 8. It sits there in the street. We cannot get to it to clean it up. That is a kind of "in your face."

Mr. HUNTER. If the gentleman would yield, would the gentleman describe Mogidishu as compared to an American city?

Mr. DORNAN. Well, this is about the best thing I got out of the trip because if you travel as much as I have been fortunate to travel as a journalist, in my life, you have a great frame of reference to ask yourself, "Compared to what," the lay of the land. I do not have to do all this sequentially because I wanted to mention circling your old 75th Ranger Group at Fort Benning, all encased in a big cyclone high-wire fence with razor wire on the top. I can imagine the great 75th guys at Fort Benning when somebody says, "What do you do," he says, inside the post, "Excuse me. I am not allowed to talk about this. I am going to go into my regimental headquarters," and he punches his secret code and disappears behind this high fence. So they are a super-trained force. The gentleman has been to Benning, there is a parachute school, infantry school. The deputy commander, Colonel Camp, pointed out that the fire we saw coming in was not antiaircraft fire to stop this congressman, it was the 75th anniversary of the Benning facility. They had the Old Guard from Fort Myer down there, and the fireworks were on as we were coming into the pattern. But I drove around the 75th, and I asked them how many Rangers were wounded in the wee hours on the 24th. I asked are they

all back here; they said "yes." I said, "How are they doing in the hospitals? Are they going to get back to duty, some of them?" They said, "Congressman, one man is in the hospital, Michael Collins, with a bullet through his knee, and he is going to need some therapy, and the other 29 all are at home with their wives and families, recuperating, getting ready to go back on the job."

By the way, for the million people listening in, Mr. Speaker, the Rangers are being pulled out, being pulled out today. Clinton had a press conference this morning. They are going to be replaced with 18-year-old, 19-year-old Marines with whitewall hair, coming off of those ships. These kids are great, but they do not know the lay of the land. These are not 34-year-old sergeants like Gary Gordon, 32 years old, like Randy Shugart, who know. Besides, why are we announcing that we are pulling them out? If Les Aspin and Clinton want to pull them out, do it quietly. Whatever happened to the dictum that you never talk about troop movements? Why should we reward Aideed in a deal unless the deal was cut to get this hero pilot, Michael Durant, the Blackhawk pilot out? Why are we telling them we are taking out the one force that Aideed most feared, the United States Rangers and our Fort Bragg Special Forces guys who are trained up to and beyond the standard of the 3d Battalion of the 75th Rangers?

When I came back a day later, I was met at the airport—I do not think I will use her name, because I do not want to hold her up for any kidding at Dover Air Force Base because she is a new lieutenant—but one of my appointments to the Air Force Academy, fine young lady, Air Force officer, met me at the airplane with the deputy commander at Dover. I said, "Would you take me to the morgue?" I said, "I know it is empty now with the last body has gone out into the country to be buried, William David Cleveland, Jr., 34, five children, whose mother identified him on television on the night of October 4, his dead body being dragged through the streets, beat on with——

Mr. HUNTER. If the gentleman will yield, that is an important point to me and, I think, a lot of other people, the fact that Colonel Aideed has committed atrocities. He has committed war crimes by desecrating the bodies of these dead men and by, in some cases, mutilating the bodies.

Mr. DORNAN. They were all burned in the end, beyond recognition.

Mr. HUNTER. All done by people under his order and for a specific purpose, getting this footage for Mr. Aideed.

For us to pull out and to not punish Aideed is only going to lead, I think, in the future to every tinhorn dictator or terrorist in the world feeling that they can do the same thing to the United States.

Mr. DORNAN. I have words here from Zbigniew Brzezinski, National Security Adviser to President Carter. I will read his words here in a minute. That is exactly what he is saying: "Our credibility is being disastrously eroded." But before I started my trek home last night to get back here at 4:00, this young lieutenant, class of '92 out of the Air Force Academy, the deputy commander at the base drove me around that morgue. I just wanted to see it, building 121 at Dover, a temporary building, a huge extension, one of these air-filled, heavy-cloth buildings that they thought would be needed for Desert Storm, and thank God it was not because there were only 146, of which we got back every set of remains which passed through this almost sacred building. I said I just wanted to see where—his mom called him "David," when I was with the Rangers on the ramp yesterday, they told me they called him "Bill"—I just wanted to see where the charred, desecrated remains of Sergeant Cleveland ended up. His first stop coming home, and his last stop as he was sent to his family for a decent burial, a hero's burial.

So, back to Benning—I do want to say something about all these C-5 crews—four landings, every one of them, hardly knew when we touched the ground. The gears touched so softly we just settled down. Here we are 35 feet in the air looking at a humvee following, and I go, "What is that? A little Jeep from World War II?" The whole perspective is changed when you're so high in the air.

But on that second leg, let me advance forward from Benning to all the Rush Limbaugh fans at Cairo-West Airport, unbelievable, all the young men and women I talked to on the way to Somalia, a little nervous about the conditions there, obviously all are going to be away from their families for Christmas and Thanksgiving, of course, and come back to this 5-hour flight through the rest of the night and in the morning I am approaching Somalia.

First thing, I look out the window, and I am looking at the U.S.S. Guadalcanal. We just went through the 50th anniversary of the battle, the longest in American history, that that ship is named after. I looked down there, and one of the C-5 pilots said, "Boy, this is boring." There are already two C-5's at Mogadishu, and it cannot hold three. So we have to hover there over the water and orbit out there at 1,500 feet. I looked out here, and there is one of these big deployment ships with the ramps out, sticking out front, here is a hovercraft zipping around. I said to the pilot, "You think it is boring up here in a holding pattern? What do you think of those Marines down there, stacked seven to eight in the berths? They are going to back up this coastline for 5½ more months." I looked at him, and he said, "You are right. I will never say that again."

I looked down at the Guadalcanal, that shipload of Marines, hundreds of Marines, 3,600 of them who are going to be off the coast, and I said, "I hope we don't lose one of those kids down there the way we have lost these 10-year-older, 12-year-older, and 35-year-old Ray Frank with three combat full tours of Vietnam, 31 combat months."

Finally, we get cleared in, we land. The first thing that struck me, to come back to your question finally, was how small Mogadishu is. As you are approaching the airfield from the southwest going northeast, you look out and here is desert surrounding the city. This is the way Palm Springs, California, used to be. Here is the last tree, and that is all desert.

□ 2230

It is all desert beyond the October 21 road, and I have been getting briefed up in the Intel Committee that they had streets going out that looked like it was four times bigger than it is as a city. I should have listened to my daughter who was there in 1982 describing it to me.

We come across the Indian encampment—India. I did not know this. They had a dozen, maybe 10 Soviet-built T-72 main battle tanks, one of the best in the world.

I found out later they were there the night of October 3 and 4 when our guys were being picked off by snipers one by one, and 18 died. They were there.

General Montgomery told me they had to call Delhi in the dead of night. The Italians had to call Rome.

This chain of command with the United Nations and our guys is not going to work.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, this is an important point for the American people. The point is that it is true when President Clinton says the American Quick Reaction Force is under American command. That is true, but the backup force that may have to rescue him may be, and in this case it was the Malaysians who had the armor, because no Americans had armor, because Secretary Aspin did not want to antagonize the world audience, or whatever his political reasons for not sending that.

So the point is that you have got these other countries that are not under American command, and if they choose not to participate, you can call in and say, "I've got an American company pinned down under heavy fire," and they have to go pick up the phone and call up their home country and their government and say, "Should we risk it going in to help the Americans?"

If they do not get the OK, they are under no obligation to move and to rescue our people, so it is purely a voluntary operation. It may occur. You may be rescued. You may not be rescued when you work in a U.N. mission and you are having to depend on another country.

So is it true, and this question has been going around Capitol Hill, is it true that these countries have to call home to get permission to help the Americans?

Mr. DORNAN. That is true, but one thing I did want to straighten out, it is the advantage of a little "I was there."

I asked General Montgomery, I asked one of his top lieutenant colonels, William David of the 10th Mountain Light Division, I said, "Is there any truth to this rumor that some Americans, and you were on the scene, Colonel David, to take out a sidearm and threaten some Malaysian?"

And General Montgomery exploded and used a good barnyard expletive, "Absolutely not true," he said.

The problem was language barriers, coordination, getting permission. They were willing to fight their way in and die for us in a rescue operation, which two Malaysians and many Pakistanis were wounded.

The Pakistani commander personally came up to me, snapped to attention in the U.N. headquarters—no, Montgomery's headquarters—saluted me.

"What an honor to help you, sir. What an honor to serve with you."

So it is not a problem of personal bravery. A lot of U.N. troops there have fought well against Aideed, but it is this uncomfortable feeling when I was questioning these people about this lack of smooth coordination, and tomorrow I am maybe going to do a special order on chapters 6 and 7 of the U.N. Code under which this chain of command is supposed to take place, people whose names I will not mention, pretty much as high as you can get around there, whispered to me, "Congressman, it doesn't work."

Now, all the former flower children in the Clinton administration, if they think of any violence at all, they just shudder. They want it all to be under the United Nations because—I know this is a rough statement I am about to make, but I believe it—Bill Schlesinger once said about Governor Michael Dukakis that he felt he had a visceral—nice good strong word—a visceral dislike for the United States military, even though he had sat in the barracks in Korea right after the war ended, he got over there, but he never went out, never associated, and got out as fast as he could, a 2-year draftee; but he said, Dukakis, a bright man, showed this distaste, never visited one of the military installations, not even the head electronic base for the whole U.S. Air Force right outside of Boston, the Lincoln Laboratory there, never visited any facility or went near anybody in uniform the whole 8 years he was Governor of Massachusetts.

Well, that sentence comes back to me all the time with the Clinton folks, a visceral dislike for all things military.

That is what caused the insult to Barry McCaffrey, our 3-star hero who is the division commander of the Point of the Spear, the Stewart Army Post 24th Infantry Division in Desert Storm, a woman insulted him in the White House. She said, "We don't talk to people in uniform. Don't wear it here."

There is this whole undercurrent there, and I will tell you, it is affecting the morale of the military, not their performance. They are overlooking all this. The officers say nothing if somebody is listing from the White House.

Some of the NCO's and all of the enlisted men who feel they have not given up their first amendment rights, they have lots of observations and a lot of them are politically astute, and as I said, a third or more of them listen to Rush Limbaugh when they are home all throughout the United States. So some of them are politically charged up.

But to come back to this helicopter flight with General Montgomery—no, let me finish answering the gentleman's question about Mogadishu.

Mr. HUNTER. How big is the city?

Mr. DORNAN. I cannot believe there are 700,000 people there. I had in my mind's eye larger than it is.

When we popped up in the helicopter, I could see the October 21 road, that is named after the October 21, 1969 revolution, when Aideed as a Chief of Staff of the Army helped Ciad Beret overthrow the prior government. From that road I could see nothing but desert. I could see from the Indian encampment on the south, I could see the base named after the gentleman from California, Hunter Base, Sword Base, the university complex, the United Nations compound. I could see on the top of the hill the only place we would not fly was this swollen large hump of land covered with the better buildings, and at the very top of it three white buildings, one of them the Olympic Hotel that the Rangers hit in bright daylight about 3 o'clock in the afternoon on Sunday, October 3, and that is what I wanted to comment on.

Maybe it is because we are used to living around cities where there is so much traffic that even though we conquered most of the smog, particularly in Los Angeles, I think only 2 alert days last year, we are used to the results of light industry and lots of transportation and mobility.

We do not know what crisp air is until we get up in the mountains or go to Idaho or Wyoming or up where we sometimes go up in the Shenandoah and you say, "Look at those stars, feel this clear air," the first thing that hit me because they destroyed even the light industry, the crisp air, visibility as far as your eye is capable of seeing, and there is the whole city laid out in front of me.

Newport is tiny, one pier. Oldport is tinier, with a big rusting freighter half sinking in the water right off the coast.

I am looking down at the water and one of the crew reminds me, because I have told them about the shark dead. He said, "Lot of sharks down there. We have had two shark deaths."

General Montgomery told me his orders are that no one goes in that water, and the beaches are gorgeous. It looks like our coast from Laguna down to the district of the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], really beautiful.

So we land at this airport. Of course, it is all torn apart from years of neglect. The Rangers are off here to the side. It has been in the print that that is where the 75th, Third Battalion is at.

I get in the helicopter. We pop up. I fly over those T-72 tanks.

We curve around the south bend and we start up past Hunter Base, which I know Aideed recently was considering making a major assault on. He did not care about casualties. It is like Ho Chi Minh. He calls and whistles out to his clan in the desert, nomadic clan, "Send me some more young men to be used as cannon fodder."

We fly up the October 21 Highway and there is the famous cigarette factory where there has been much fighting.

Then a little further there is the huge pasta factory. I guess that is leftover from years of Italian colonial rule. Big tall rocket holes into the side of the building where there have been fire fights, all along the October 21 road, which I could not see on satellite imagry in past briefings, roadblocks everywhere, rusted beat up broken old vehicles, tires, rocks, bricks, everything, furniture, all along this road which they claim they are going to try to clear.

I look down and here are 200 camels.

I said, "What is that?"

He said, "It's a camel bazaar."

I said, "What, selling camels?"

And he said, "Yes, for meat."

He said, "It's kind of like a used car lot."

Here are people living in hovels with green tarpaulin covers over them. Then it must go back hundreds of years like the old Siouk area, hundreds of tiny little fortress houses all jammed together, and all of a sudden here is a residential area with gutted buildings where architects from Europe must have tried to win a war.

□ 2240

They are so stylized: triangles, trapezoids, isosceles triangles, all these strange buildings. We go around by the old port area. I wanted to see where the

helicopter had crashed, the third Special Forces H-60, and I looked out, and here is a Catholic church totally gutted. I mean a cathedral, a twin spire, massive cathedral with the roof gone like it was Coventry in bombed-out England. I looked down at a mosque. It is not much better, but it has been put back in shape, and then a guy says, "Follow me, Congressman. See that block down there? Come to this intersection, see these four big trucks? That's the wreckage of our Humvee where four American MP's were killed on August 8 still there in the street."

Then we circled around back. I said, "I want to see where the helicopter crashed on September 25 and we got no remains back from on two of the three killed." The wreckage is still there laying on the street, and they showed me the scrape marks where it hit this large building, clipped this mosque, went into the street, and that was about 2:30 in the morning that a firefight started there.

Later in the day I heard that we have a 10th Mountain soldier trying to rescue the two warrant officers, and we did rescue them, who took a bullet in his neck. He is a paraplegic.

Then they said, "Another one of my young troops in the 10th Mountain Division lost an arm and a leg." Gordon Sullivan had told me this before I left, the four-star Chief of Staff of the Army. He said, "We had a lot of men injured in that." I have not even begun to track where they are, how they are doing from the long firefight through the night and into the morning of September 25.

But I have to correct something I said earlier, and I think I steered "DUKE" wrong. The lieutenant colonel that coordinated the whole firefight, he said, "Congressman, my men went into that burning helicopter and looked for the remains of those three men. We got the remains of one soldier. They have had a funeral for him, Fernan, F-e-r-n-a-n Richardson." He said, "But we cannot find any remains of the other two, and the helicopter was burning so badly that magnesium was running down the street. However at some point during the night the crowds went in, and they must have been in a grisly, ghoulish fashion, got what was left of those soldiers from that crash," and that is what the media reported there, not U.S. media, but on-the-scene media. They were holding up in a grisly manner parts of the bodies of our two young heroes, a door gunner and a door gunner from another regiment, one from Fort Campbell and one from Fort Drum, NY.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I think one thing, BOB that you mentioned to me before you started this special order was that we might mention again and go over the names of the people who were killed in action, and one thing that I wanted to say was that I saw one of the fathers on a television show talking about his son and taking on, and I think with good cause, Secretary Aspin's refusal to send armor, and at one point he was asked, "Do you think your son died in vain," and he said, "Yes, I do," and he was angry, and he was upset, and, as my colleague knows, I have thought about that a lot because I participated in a small way in Vietnam, as the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] did in a very heroic way, and the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] did by going over to Vietnam several times, and of course in Korea we did not have a clear victory. The Korean soldiers still consider themselves the forgotten soldiers of the last 40 or 50 years——

Mr. DORNAN. It was a victory for South Korea, but not for North Korea. They are still slaves, and the South is doing very well.

Mr. HUNTER. That is right, but often people talk about those wars as being wars in which people died in vain, and I do not think that. I think that, especially in light of the end of the cold war, that if one goes down to the what we call the Retired Soldiers' and Sailors' Home, and some people call it the Old Soldiers' Home, but it is the Soldiers' and Sailors' Retirement Home down Capitol Hill——

Mr. DORNAN. Where Lincoln visited himself.

Mr. HUNTER. Yes; it was where, in fact, Lincoln wrote the Gettysburg Address. It is about 5 miles from the Capitol you will see these veterans at that home, some of them out taking exercise, taking that morning walk or down at their golf course that they have there. One gentleman who worked on the golf course had an artificial leg from wounds in Vietnam, and another one had been in Korea, Vietnam, and in World War II, and, if you talked to those people, and you listened to them, and you realized that they were engaged in these small struggles around the world that cumulatively, while what we did was in many cases bad policy, and we did it the wrong way, and we marched forward in a clumsy fashion in many cases, cumulatively those were the boys that won the cold war——

Mr. DORNAN. Oh, yes.

Mr. HUNTER. Those people at the Soldiers' and Sailors' Home or Soldiers' and Airmen's Home; excuse me, and of course the Sailors' is the same way, and I like to think of these young men who died in Somalia as contributing in some way. Everybody cannot be on the flag in the monument at Iwo Jima that we have out here next to the, adjacent to the, Arlington Cemetery where the Marines, including Ira Hayes, are raising that American flag at Mount Suribachi, but all of them contributed nonetheless, and these young men contributed too by projecting American power even though we have a very vague foreign policy right now and even though the gentleman and I take issue with the leadership that we have in the White House right now, and in the Pentagon. Nonetheless these young men contributed, and their contribution to freedom and to America is every bit as real as the heroes who come home from wars in which we have definitely achieved victory, like Desert Storm and like World War II, and come home to the ticker-tape parades, and I thought we might go over the names of these young men and read them off.

Mr. DORNAN. Tell you what to do.

Mr. HUNTER. And in some cases, as the gentleman mentioned, they are not all young men. Some are middle-aged men.

Mr. DORNAN. When the gentleman mentions the fathers, just hold that for a minute while I read a letter that was addressed to Congressman MARTIN HOKE in Ohio, and he sent it to all of us as what we call a "Dear Colleague" letter. It went to 433 others besides the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] and me and the five Delegates from our territories.

Just listen to this. I let all the crews read it on each one of the big C-5 Galaxys I was on, and every one of them was really impressed, and some of the fathers in that million audience who are out there who have lost sons have been watching these special orders, calling my office, and this will touch them because here is a father whose son is with an engineering unit, and he does not want to lose him, and I had some of the young engineers I was taking back for a second time from the 43d Engineer Group down at Fort Benning that said there was one day they were out there and the U.N. troops supporting them disappeared. I do not want to say which country because maybe they are out there with different orders, and they looked around, and all of the sudden it seems very lonely. They are open and big construction equipment. They got their M-16's over there, and suddenly they are looking around and they are all alone. This is way out on the road to Baidoa.

So here is what he says to Congressman HOKE. Now the date is significant: September 24 being the day before the first Black Hawk crash, the utility one, UH-60, where we lost three men, and the two warrant officer pilots are in the burn center down at Brooks Air Force Base down in San Antonio. Hopefully, they are going to be released soon back to Fort Campbell. This is one that went down at 1:30 in the morning where we got a paralegic guy, a hero with an arm and a leg lost. He says:

"Dear Congressman HOKE, this is to inform you about the situation in Somalia. My son," I will leave his name out, "is a platoon leader in the 568 Engineer Company, combat support in

Mogadishu and has informed me about his unit involvement. I'm disturbed about what appears to be a deteriorating situation in spite of the claims to the contrary by U.S. Special Envoy Adm. Jonathan Howe. My understanding of the situation is from two tours in Vietnam in Special Forces and combat units and over here as an instructor on counterguerrilla operations at the United States Army Infantry School, Fort Benning, GA. I was a professional Army officer until retirement in 1971," and he is the president of a Cleveland company that is into heavy wall steel casings, rail joints, track work, steel fabrications. So, he is in his second or third career in his life.

"In Somalia there are several key indicators of a heightened risk and even impending disaster. At this point there were only four killed in action, MP's on that Humvee accident August 8." Now we are at 26, and the four are from before, two under Bush and then five noncombat deaths. We are up to 35, and, when he is talking, only four since the four way back in the winter.

He says, "Popular support is on the side of Aideed. The Pakistanis have particularly earned the enmity of the populace, and the polyglot U.N. forces are regarded as foreigners. The average Somali has to side with his countrymen if he expects to be alive the day after the U.N. forces depart," and now we have got a U.S. date certain, March 31.

"Two, the gangs have sanctuaries that the U.N. forces do not have the power to control. There are entire sections of Mogadishu that are still under gang dominance.

"Three, the gangs have freedom of movement to attack U.N. forces at will because of the characteristics of the city," and I have seen that bird's eye view and help from the populace.

□ 2250

Additionally, practically every street is an ambush site, resulting from the narrowness of most streets and walls next to the streets.

What I have not seen, DUNCAN, were machinegun nests of the enemy forces with our sandbags on the roof of every third building. I never picked that up in looking at satellite imagery. And I sent three rolls of film in today with a 70-millimeter zoom from a few hundred feet up, and I will have clearer stuff than any intelligence people have shown me around here in 2 years.

He says every street is an ambush site. Conventional forces are exceedingly vulnerable in these circumstances, even if they are armed. My son and four of his soldiers luckily survived an ambush on June 5.

That is the same day they killed 24 Pakistanis.

Mr. HUNTER. If the gentleman will yield, that is why we needed to have some armor over there. You cannot work cities without having armor.

Mr. DORNAN. He wrote this the day after the armor was rejected the first time in the Pentagon by civilians without him knowing it.

Mr. HUNTER. The interesting thing here, too, is that we did not ask the Secretary of Defense to make his own analysis or to understand by his own background that you needed armor. All we needed him to do was to honor the request of his field commander.

Mr. DORNAN. Exactly. I do not know if you have seen this yet, but here is Clinton's report, the October 15 report that we asked for. And in it it has the armor, here it is right here, report to the Congress on United States policy in Somalia, October 13, 2 days early. A big long letter from Bill, signed in the White House.

When you turn to the disposition of all of our troops, and, by gosh, we have got a lot of stuff there, support stuff, when it comes to the quick reaction force comprised of 1,358 personnel, here is how they list it. This is already in print from the White House.

A brigade level headquarters of the 10th Mountain Division, a helicopter force of 48 aircraft, a battalion of the 10th Mountain Division with an engineering platoon, military police platoon, psychological operations team, civil affairs team, a truck section, a bulldozer team, and a special forces team. Then he says 46 forward support battalion with a platoon of MP's, a mechanized infantry team of 14 Bradley fighting vehicles and four tanks, and then he goes on the Rangers.

In other words, it is all in print, like there is nothing wrong with having four tanks and Bradleys here.

And when our pal Les Aspin says we didn't want to look offensive, there is not a media person with the skill to question this and not accept the answer, oh, we always have a few tanks, organic, to any U.S. division or battalion thereof.

No one would have noticed, particularly not with the Indians, with a whole potful of Russian T-72's, and I saw other countries with every type of German built, tired and tracked vehicle, all over the city.

Mr. HUNTER. If the gentleman would yield, even if they did know this, who cares?

Mr. DORNAN. Exactly.

Mr. HUNTER. We had American forces over there that were military forces, and we made it a point that they were military forces. And what is more important, protecting those forces, or appearing to not be cosmetically offensive to some undefined international audience?

Mr. DORNAN. Who would have noticed?

Mr. HUNTER. Who are we catering to? That is the genesis or that is the exact description of what we did during Vietnam, where Washington, DC made political decisions and deferred requests by commanders in the field, because they did not want to irritate politicans. And as a result of that, we lost many, many lives, because we did not honor the requests of field commanders.

All of you have to do when you have the best team in the world, when you have got Babe Ruth and Lou Gehrig in the lineup, all you have to do is be sober enough to get to the ball field. And our Pentagon apparently could not get to the ball field. At least they could not bring themselves to send the armor.

Mr. DORNAN. Well, here was another excuse. That some unnamed journalist or reporter was going to demand to know why four tanks and a handful of Bradleys were becoming organic to the 10th Mountain Division Quick Reaction Force. And then they said the people in Congress would find it offensive.

Who? JACK MURTHA, who went over there last week, a week before me, is the reason I guess I got to go, because a Democrat had gone. JACK is a former Marine, ran the press briefing center in Da Nang at the height of the Vietnam War. He is going to tell his colleagues, hey, we got a tough situation there. Alley ways, guys being sniped at, umpteen soldiers dead throughout the U.N. command. They need a few armor vehicles.

Well, let me finish this dad's letter, and then we will read some of these names, because this sets it up.

He mentions the 4 soldiers, 4, now 30, but the 4 that were wounded June 5. He says wounded, they were actually killed.

He says we are very lucky that the casualty numbers are not significantly greater. All the U.S. casualties are support.

Well, that is true. There were only MP's up until then.

Four, the gangs are better armed. They are using rocket-propelled grenades with impunity to attack the U.S. compounds, even held a U.S. tanker in the harbor on Saturday. They are also improving their military skills, such as marksmanship, tactics, and coordination.

The day after this father wrote this letter, the first chopper went down on the night of September 25.

The situation is rapidly developing into urban guerrilla warfare against the U.N. forces. U.S. forces in this situation are increasingly vulnerable.

He goes on to talk about the thin-skinned vehicles of the combat support and service units. That 15 percent of the troops are female. One trucking company commander is female.

I met the company commander—captain, female, of one of signal units going in from Cairo West.

He points out the bulldozers, the loaders, the scrapers and the like, only the operators are U.S. Army soldiers, and all they carry are M-16's. They

have no heavy weapons. This is his son's unit. No mortars, no 50-caliber machine guns, no night vision devices, no TOW missiles, and, of course, no combat engineer vehicles, CEV's. For the combat engineer missions which they now perform exclusively in any engagement with the gangs, our men are outgunned at the outset.

United States security is unreliable. One unit was on a large search mission in support of the Pakistanis. In the afternoon, the Pakistanis disappeared, leaving our engineers naked without security. This is not a confidence builder. Army doctrine and practice until now have proscribed operations combining multilingual units below battalion level because of operating difficulties.

We learned this 50 years ago this month with the Brazilians in Italy. Good fighters, but they had to answer only to themselves.

There are increasing rocket and sniper attacks on our compounds. The RPG's are very effective antipersonnel weapons and they act like mortars in this application.

I learned all this on the site yesterday.

Our units are especially vulnerable to this type of attack. Car bombs and ground assaults will follow. The U.S. combat unit in the area is a brigade from the 10th Mountain, part of the quick reaction force, not used to secure any missions by the engineers or the transportation units. Please note it is light infantry.

And he points out there are no tanks with him at this point or APC's.

He closes—it is clear that the current forces on the ground are increasingly losing control. It is an obvious lack of combat power defined by quality of forces, communications, mobility, and firepower. A combat ratio of 3 to 1 is usually required for a conventional force to defeat another conventional force. A combat power ratio of at least 10 to 1 is needed for a conventional force to defeat a guerrilla force.

That is, if the politicians stay out of it, as did not happen in Vietnam.

The threat of another Beirut, a real disaster. We must decide to control the situation by reinserting significant numbers of U.S. forces. It took 19 months to accomplish that.

In order to maintain control, these forces may be required to stay there for years. Overwhelming force was a key success in Desert Storm. The other alternative is to leave. We must decide to do one or the other. We should not leave any of our forces out on a limb with inadequate security. Casualties will continue to mount. Not one single American soldier's life should be wasted on a situation that has no real mission or any linkage to our national interest.

Congressman HOKE, I look forward to your response. Very truly yours, William H. Willoughby, president. And the father predicted it all. And here comes the names of the young men who paid because people like this decorated special forces officer from Vietnam were not being listened to.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Let me just read, BOB, the names of the people who were killed in action. Lawrence L. Freeman, age 51, Fayetteville, NC. He was a U.S. Government civilian. He was killed when his truck hit a land mine near Bardera.

Mr. DORNAN. Former enlisted man doing intelligence work. Top-notch guy, one 51 years of age, our oldest fatality.

Mr. HUNTER. Pfc. Domingo Arroyo, U.S. Marine Corps, age 21, Elizabeth, NJ, 3d Battalion, 11th Marine Regiment, based in Twentynine Palms, CA.

Lance Cpl. Anthony D. Botello, U.S. Marine Corps, age 21, Wilberton, OK, C Company, 1st Battalion, 7th Marine Regiment, Twentynine Palms, CA.

□ 2300

Mr. DORNAN. Give the date he was killed.

Mr. HUNTER. 27 January 1993.

Mr. DORNAN. Sniper.

Mr. HUNTER. Sfc. Robert H. Deeks, U.S. Army, age 40, Littleton, CO, Company A, Second Battalion, 5th Special Forces Group, Fort Campbell, KY, killed 3 March 1993.

Mr. DORNAN. Land mine.

Mr. HUNTER. Sp. Mark E. Gutting, U.S. Army, 25 years old, Grand Rapids, MI, 977th MP Company, Fort Riley, KS.

Mr. DORNAN. He and the next three are the August 8 Humvee and the broken charred vehicle still lying there on the street.

Mr. HUNTER. That was destroyed by a command-detonated land mine.

Mr. DORNAN. By the way, the young gunner on the helicopter I was on turned around to me and hit the mike button and said to me, "Congressman, we were the first air on the ground. I landed where those four big trucks are parked, and I ran over to the vehicle. We were the first ones there." And he said, "It was a sad thing to see our guys dead and dying like that." It still sits there.

Mr. HUNTER. Sgt. Christopher K. Hilgert, U.S. Army, 27, Bloomington, IN, 977th MP Company, Fort Riley, KS, 8 August 1993, same incident. Sp. Keith D. Pierson, U.S. Army, 25 years old, Tavares, FL, same company, 977th MP Company, Fort Riley, KS. And Sgt. Ronald N. Richerson, 24, Portage, IN, 300th MP Company, Fort Leonard Wood, MO. All those killed on that same detonation.

Pfc. Matthew K. Anderson, 21, Lucas, IA, Company B, 9th Battalion of the 101st Aviation Regiment, Fort Campbell. Sgt. Eugene Williams, 26 years old, Chicago, IL, Company B, 9th Battalion of the 101st Aviation Regiment, Fort Campbell.

Mr. DORNAN. The black sergeant, the pride of his family in Chicago. We are now up to the September 25 incident that happened the day after this letter was written by this experienced father. No remains whatever went back. That family just had a memorial ceremony.

Mr. HUNTER. Sgt. Ferdinand C. Richardson, 27, Summermead, CA, Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 2nd Attack Battalion, 25th Aviation Regiment.

Mr. DORNAN. He was bumming a ride in the helicopter as an extra gunner for the two guys from Fort Campbell. We did get his remains back, Sgt. Richardson, but 21-year-old Matt Anderson Williams, those are the first two Americans with no remains going all through Desert Storm and Desert Shield, all through Grenada, all through Panama. We have to go way back to Vietnam before we have no remains recovered whatsoever, except pilots lost at sea.

Mr. HUNTER. CWO Donovan L. Briley, 33, North Little Rock, AR, Company D, 1st Battalion, 160th Special Operations Aviation Regiment, Fort Campbell, KY.

Mr. DORNAN. Let me say something about this handsome guy, Donovan Briley, 33, Little Rock, AR. Five or six men may have died just protecting his dead body in the cockpit. The commander of the Rangers, your old unit, the 75th, the 3d Battalion, Danny McKnight, was wounded on the scene and he called back and said, we are not leaving this dead pilot. We want his remains. We are going to stay here. You know why? Because they were worried about the incident on the 25th of September, having the crowd get the body, tear it apart and not have any remains. So to even protect a dead warrant officer pilot of the first chopper that went down, men gave their lives. And I had Admiral Jeremiah, our Deputy Chief of Staff, take exception to the questioning of one of our freshman Democrats that these men were not well armored. And he starts talking about this great Kevlar equipment. There was nobody that died that day of a body shot. That Kevlar armor is great. But they died of face shots, neck shots. And one man was hit with a rocket grenade of some kind that went up through his body, inside the armor, and his Kevlar stayed intact but his body was destroyed. So we were not talking about bulletproof vests of the highest state of the art. A fire fight is a fire fight, and they were fighting for their lives. Starting off to defend WO Donovan Briley.

Mr. HUNTER. Let me say something about the Rangers, too, I had the privilege of serving when the 173d Airborne came back from Vietnam in June or July 1971. I went to the Rangers for the remaining 4 months of my tour, Charlie Company Rangers, C Company Rangers in the highlands, in Nkai. But

I was compared to the people who were in these Ranger companies, which all of whom, the personnel are all Ranger-qualified, all jump-qualified. I was jump-qualified, but I did not go to Ranger School. Those people are highly trained, much more highly trained than the average Ranger who served in Vietnam. They are absolutely the cream of the crop. They have tremendous equipment, very sophisticated communication capability, and project American power more effectively and efficiently than any land forces have every projected power. So they are a very, very elite unit.

Cpl. James M. Cavaco, 26, Forestdale, MA, Company B, 3d Battalion, 75th Ranger Regiment, Fort Benning, GA. Sp. Dominick M. Pilla, 21, Vineland, NJ, Company B, 3d Battalion, 75th Ranger Regiment, Fort Benning, GA.

Sgt. Lorenzo M. Ruiz, 27, El Paso, TX, Company B, 3d Battalion, 75th Ranger Regiment, Fort Benning, GA. Sp. James E. Smith, 21, Long Valley, NJ, Company B, 3d Battalion, 75th Ranger Regiment, Fort Benning, GA.

As you go through these names and you look at the hometowns of these people, you realize that this is one of the few things that this country does all together. That is, defends the Nation's interests.

FURTHER DISCUSSION OF EVENTS IN SOMALIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BROWN of Ohio). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HUNTER. I will try to give a little convenience to our wonderful staff folks who are here tonight. I will not speak for 60 minutes, but let me continue with the list of casualties.

Americans, if you look at the places that these Americans come from, many times when a young person joins the armed services, it is the first time he has moved from his hometown, whether it is Vineland, NJ, or Forestdale, MA, or El Paso, TX. And he finds out a little bit about the rest of the country. It is one of the best geography lessons that you can have in this country is to join the military and meet all these people and live with all these people from various parts of the United States.

Sp. James E. Smith, I think I mentioned him, 21 years old, Long Valley, NJ, Company B, 3d Battalion, 75th Ranger Regiment, Fort Benning. M. Sgt. Timothy L. Martin, 38, Aurora Dearborn, U.S. Army Special Forces Command, Fort Bragg, NC.

Mr. DORNAN. This master sergeant, 38 years of age. Timothy Martin, and the next two are more trained, if it is humanly possible, than the four Rangers that you read before them. These are the top secret, most highly qualified people. if you ever get hijacked on an airliner, it is a Sgt. Tim Martin that is coming to get you released and save your life.

Mr. HUNTER. You can tell that the young people that serve on our line units, for example, if you take the average Marine unit, the young people that serve in those units, the average age of the young person who serves on a U.S. aircraft carrier in the Navy is about 19 or 20 years old. When you see somebody who is a master sergeant, 38 years old, that truly in the military, although that would be young for us, in the military that is a real oldtimer. It is somebody who has a lot of experience and a lot of capability that hopefully will help him keep his unit, keep the personnel in his unit safe and secure in situations that are very dangerous.

SFC Earl R. Fillmore, Jr., 28, Blairsville, PA, U.S. Army Special Forces Command, Fort Bragg, NC. Staff Sgt. Daniel D. Busch, 25 years old, Portage, WI, U.S. Army Special Forces Command, Fort Bragg, NC. Sgt. James C. Joyce, 24, Denton, TX, 75th Ranger Regiment, Fort Benning, GA. and I believe I saw his father discussing the situation, if it was Colonel Joyce, I believe, a couple of nights ago on national television, and understanding what it means to put your military people in harms's way and understanding foreign policy in a way that many people who are presently leading the civilian sector of our military leadership do not understand.

□ 2310

If we took Colonel Joyce, I think, I believe he was a retired colonel, and took some of the top leaders in the Clinton administration out of their positions and put him in, the country would probably be better for it. He showed great common sense and understanding of military missions.

Pfc Richard W. Kowalewski, Jr., 20 years old, Crucible, PA, 75th Ranger Regiment, Fort Benning, GA.

Mr. DORNAN. Time magazine printed a series of excerpts from this proud young Ranger in last week's issue, and you could see him change in his letters just over a period of a couple of weeks, and anxiety developing over the type of operations they were going into and Aideed's use of woman and children as shields.

The open segment from his letter, let me just read it here, because they are beautiful words. This is Private Kowalewski.

He writes: "August 11. I love my country and everything it stands for. I am in a position that I may have to give my life for my country. I must also say a few words for the 3rd Ranger Battalion. As you well know, I love this. Despite how we all fight and mess with one another, there is a bond here. You have to be part of it to understand. I am very confident in the leadership of the 3d Ranger Battalion."

They put excerpts in from about seven more letters, really beautiful. On September 22d, that would be 11 days before he gives his life for his fellow soldiers, and for that downed helicopter crew, he says, "Men are said to have women and children holding hands walking in front of the gunmen as they shoot, sort of human shields. Don't get me wrong, but I am scared, real damn scared."

Two days later he says, "I am starting to get real homesick. The best news is, those last stories turned out to be a hoax."

His last entry says: "Yesterday was probably the coldest, darkest, saddest day of my life. I stood at attention as three American soldiers were rolled by in caskets draped with American flags." What he did not know was, two of those caskets were empty. That was Williams and Richardson, from the September 25th helicopter crash.

"War is very sad and kills everyone in some way. I cannot help but think, what if it had been me in one of those caskets."

The next day, September 27: "I am being as careful as I can. I carry a loaded weapon with me everywhere I go. I don't hesitate one bit showing it to the faces of these Somalis that are always around us." He was the youngest by far of the six Rangers who were killed and the five Special Ops guys from Fort Bragg.

Mr. HUNTER. PFC James H. Martin, Jr., 23, Collinsville, IL, 10th Mountain Division, Fort Drum, NY. He comes from Fort Drum, where our great friend, David O.B. Martin, our friend on the Committee on Armed Services, and now the gentleman from New York, JOHN MCHUGH, represents, and always did.

I remember both those Representatives always paid special attention to Fort Drum and the military construction projects there. They were very proud of their Mountain Division.

Mr. DORNAN. Here is a letter from his dad, cousin, to Clinton. He sent it to another one of our colleagues from Georgia. JOHN LINDER.

He says: "Unlike you, Mr. Clinton, the Martin family has paid for their American citizenship in service and blood. Eight uncles fought in World War II. Uncle Woody died in his chute with the 82nd Airborne over Arnhem. My wife's father and uncle, Roy and William Gilbert, were POWs. I thank God they were liberated, because you are now killing our remaining live POWs. . . ."

Then he takes a shot at Secretary of Commerce Ron Brown. "Uncle Sherman got the Purple Heart with the 5th Marines in the Chosin Reservoir in Korea. Seven of my cousins and I served in Vietnam. Mike lost his right arm. Cousin Sandy served in Desert Storm, and is now in Somalia.

"Defining patriotism to you is like explaining Judaism to Hitler. From the abortion of young children to euthanasia of the elderly to your health care plan, life is secondary to your thirst for power."

He goes on to get real serious after that, so there are families, like you talked about, at the kitchen tables of America, that find this extra painful and difficult because of the Commander in Chief having dodged the draft three times in 1969.

Mr. HUNTER. I think we should go on and talk about those who were killed, but I think the gentleman makes a point, in that President Clinton spent a good part of this year, against the wishes of these young people, who over and over again, in surveys and in statements, and in thousands of letters, said, "Don't force us to live in close contact with homosexuals," not in a mean way, but because "It is not good for us, it is not comfortable for us. Please don't do it to us, Commander in Chief."

He spent three-quarters of this year shoving homosexuals down the throats of these young Americans in uniform, but he could not send them four tanks when they asked for it.

Mr. DORNAN. That came up at almost every stop along the route I raveled over the weekend.

Mr. HUNTER. CWO Clifton P. Wolcott, 36, Cuba, NY, 160th Special Operations Aviation Regiment, Fort Campbell, KY.

Mr. DORNAN. He was the other pilot at the first crash site.

Mr. HUNTER. Sgt. Cornell L. Houston, 31, Compton, CA, Company C, 41st Engineer Battalion, Fort Drum, NY.

Sfc. Matthew L. Rierson, 33, Nevada, IA, Headquarters and Headquarters Company, U.S. Army Special Forces Command, Fort Bragg, NC.

Sergeant Thomas——

Mr. DORNAN. He was standing right in front of the Ranger headquarters, they called it Golden BB. The most unlucky shot by one of Aideed's men landed right in front of 13 guys having a conversation. Twelve were wounded. They are all back in the country.

What is amazing, another mortar round, RPG, landed near that, and it did not go off. That one the Ranger asked if he could have, and the superiors cut it in half, took out all the explosive parts, and he went home on a plane with that, because his time was up. He has that mortar shell, and believe me, that will be on his mantel and passed down to his grandkids; landed about 3 feet away from him.

Mr. HUNTER. Sgt. Thomas J. Field, 25, of Lisbon, ME, Company D, 1st Battalion, 160th Special Operations Aviation Regiment, Fort Campbell, KY.

MSgt. Gary I. Gordon, 33, of Lincoln, ME, Headquarters and Headquarters Company, U.S. Army Special Forces Command, Fort Bragg, NC.

Mr. DORNAN. Gary Gordon died trying to rescue Tom Field, the name you read off before. Field is one of the door gunners of Durant's Black Hawk.

Mr. HUNTER. I think it is appropriate to also list the non-battle deaths, because these young people went over to Somalia in battlefield conditions. Very often a large number of the people who are killed are killed driving trucks and otherwise engaged in hazardous duty; that while it is not directly related to combat, it is part of the operation. They are deserving, I think, of our recognition.

Specialist Edward J. Nicholson, 21, of Houston, TX, Company H, 159th Aviation Regiment, died as a result of injuries sustained in an accident in Mogadishu.

Mr. DORNAN. It is okay to say how he died, because his parents know. This speaks so well of our medical forces.

He had lost both of his legs in a shark attack. He was on a work assignment, working hard. I mentioned earlier, it looks like Laguna, the water is so inviting, and he and a friend went in. His friend got him up on the beach.

They not only stopped the bleeding and got him to a vehicle and to the hospital, but unfortunately, he had lost so much blood that he had oxygen starvation to his brain. However, they got him on an airplane and got him home and up here at Walter Reed. They flew his family to join him, and they were at his side when he died on October 6, in his beloved United States.

Mr. HUNTER. Private David J. Conner, U.S.A., age 19, Huntington Beach, CA, 57th Transportation Company, 10th Mountain Division, Fort Drum. He died in an automobile accident.

Mr. DORNAN. He was one of our Orange County, California guys driving a big five-ton truck with water, taking it out to the people, and the other engineer swerved to avoid a pothole and the whole load shifted. The truck overturned, and you are right, these guys, non-battle deaths, also die serving, trying to feed these starving people.

Mr. HUNTER. Private Don D. Robertson, U.S. Army, age 28, Tustin, CA, 157th Field Service Company, Fort Hood, TX. He died also in an automobile accident, driving a five-ton truck.

Mr. DORNAN. He swerved to avoid a pedestrian. Don was in the back and got thrown out of the truck, way out in the countryside in Baidoa, again trying to feed people.

This is what Christ talked about with the beatitudes: Blessed are the peacekeepers, for they shall know God. So he is part of that effort that started out so wonderfully over there.

Mr. HUNTER. Lance Corporal William A. Rose, U.S. Marine Corps, age 20, San Joaquin, CA, Company B, 1st Battalion, 7th Marine Regiment, Twentynine Palms, CA.

□ 2320

Private Daniel L. Harris, U.S. Army, age 21, Newsoms, VA, Headquarters Company, 13th Corps Support Command, Fort Hood, TX.

So that is the casualty list for the KIA, killed in action and non-battle death list. The country owes them all a debt of gratitude, and I think what we have to do her is to reassess. Americans make a lot of mistakes, and I think one of our greatest national assets is our capability to come back from mistakes, learn from them, and do the right thing.

I think that this Secretary of Defense, and I called for his resignation today even though he is a friend, and I think Les Aspin did some very valuable things at times as the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, and he made some good political decisions. Unfortunately, in this decision not to send tanks when his field commander requested them, he made a political decision when it should not have been a political decision. It should have been a troop decision, and he should have sent the tanks, and in the words of my old platoon sergeant in Charlie Rangers, whom I just talked to a few moments ago, Pop Carter, the Secretary of Defense broke the contract.

Mr. DORNAN. DUNCAN, you know at the press conference this morning, I did not join you. And I know you will not mind my saying some good things about Les. He did support the Contra freedom fighters in Nicaragua. He did stand with Reagan to save the peacekeeper missiles that helped bring about the end of the cold war. He spoke effectively and stood shoulder to shoulder against the entire leadership of his party across the way, 177 votes, only three Republicans on this side, but not to drive Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait, 180 votes Les was with you, with me, with the prevailing majority against the 180.

The two reasons I gave, and I do not want to damn with faint praise, but I really do believe Les will never ever ever deny command forces in the field what they want to protect the young men and women who serve under them, and as Sir Arthur Wellesley said, you learn by your mistakes, and this is what I mean by damning with faint praise, I hope Les will not take this as an insult, but he was the best one on the list Clinton had. SAM NUNN was on the list for a while, both good guys on defense during that period. I am terrified if Les Aspin leaves that position that Clinton truly will find a person who was giving aid and comfort to the enemy during the Vietnam war, like Strobe Talbot, one of his Rhodes Scholar friends in England, who has now the most important ambassadorial job in the world for America. He is the Ambassador to Kazakhstan, Tadzhikistan, Uzbekistan, Ukraine, Byelorussia, Moldava, Georgia, Azerbaijan. This

guy, Strobe Talbot, who lied for Clinton as a senior editor of Time Magazine is the Ambassador Plenipotentiary to all of the states of the former evil empire. That is who he would put in Les Aspin's position if Les, like a British Politician, resigned over this bad call.

Mr. HUNTER. If the gentleman will yield, although I have called for his resignation, and I wish I had had a chance to talk to Secretary Aspin today. I was in the room and my time was coming, and the hearing was concluded before I got a chance to look him in the eye and tell him this, so I sent a letter to him, and I hope to talk to him tomorrow. But nonetheless, I think the fact that I have called for his resignation, and several other Republicans have done that, it probably will not lead to his resignation. And I think I also agree with you that he has taken to heart the burden of what occurred the other day, because he did not give his field commander what he needed because of political considerations. And I hope that he never again fails, as Pop Carter said, to carry out the contract.

Mr. DORNAN. I do not think it will happen. And I saw it in his face, because he accompanied one of those civilians that gave him the bad advice, and our great Chief of Staff of the Army, Gordon Sullivan, to the first funeral at Arlington Cemetery of one of the names that you read, a beautiful Irish name, James Joyce, retired colonel, and Les was standing at the funeral, and I looked at the picture in Time magazine, and I could see the pain in his face.

Let us close on this. Tomorrow I will take another special order to discuss what Adm. Jonathan Howe told me and Maj. Gen. William Garrison told me, commander of all of the Rangers and other special ops.guys, and the 160th Tigers out of Black Hawk squadrons and the other exotic helicopters up at Fort Campbell, and what I learned from just men in the field and talking to the Rangers, and some more conversations about the guys that were in the firefight from hell. One thing I want to get on the RECORD tonight, General Garrison walked me out to the C–5 as we were leaving, and we had jammed for four hours on the ground, and I had answered every question that I asked. He took me by the arm and he said, "Congressman, may I tell you something." This guy is a terrific-looking specimen of a general officer. He said, "That was a good mission. We accomplished our mission on October 3. We captured 20 of these people that had been killing U.N. troops, their leadership. Four died in the firefight from their own fire mostly. We got them out of there, and we tried to defend our men that were trapped in that helicopter." And you will appreciate this being a paratrooper. He said, "Congressman, we just simply got ourselves in a hell of a firefight, and we won that too." About 400 Somali learned that Americans know how to defend themselves, even when they are trapped, pinned down, and you are sniping them. And I said I understand that, General.

The attitude of the younger Rangers was let us get Aideed.

Now Clinton showed his lack of experience again this morning at the press conference when he jerks out the Rangers, and then he says well, the Marines are trained to do that. Again, I repeat, young, brandnew Marines are good, and they will be marksmen, sharpshooters, and the handful of experts in there. But they are not of the caliber of these people who were learning the alleyways of this small Horn of Africa site.

Mr. HUNTER. I think the Rangers had some experience in becoming street smart.

Mr. DORNAN. Exactly. Again, I say if he wanted to pull them out, why would he tell Aideed. Aideed has been bragging all day long that he has driven out the best fighting force in the world, our U.S. Rangers, out of that fight.

When I was in the U.N. compound, and I will close on this, a guy taps one of my military aides, getting a little dramatic here, and he says, "The Congressman dropped this letter." And he said, "I think it's important to him."

Well, the colonel could see that I did not drop the letter, and he picked it up, and we get on the C–5, and we are climbing out of Ethiopia, heading back to Cairo West. And he said, Congressman, come here, and showed it to the highest-ranking officer on board. By the way, all of the aircrews on the C–5's are lieutenants and captains, unbelievable, flying this gigantic apartment building through the skies. And he showed me the letter. And it ties in to the special order I had last week.

It is dated September 14, again, a week before the person that this letter is addressed to was captured. Now, I go back through all of the computer files and I find out that this key, No. 1 lieutenant, aide and financier of Aideed, the killer, was captured April 14, and we let him go. He was captured again September 21, and I guess this letter was on his person. And some of the people there did not want to hand it to me for fear that they would be picking a battle with the media. So they pretended that it was dropped on the ground, and I had dropped it.

It says, Dear Osman, and you see his name in the April 14 story as Osman Otto, O-t-t-o. But I have learned through intelligence that it is Atto, A-t-t-o, Osman, Aideed's key guy. This is the week before he has been captured, signed by four British journalists, or three Brits and one Canadian.

Mr. HUNTER. Let's set this up. These are journalists who want to get some good footage.

Mr. DORNAN. Good footage. I do not know if that was their only motivation, but you be the judge. If that was their only motivation, it would have been all right.

Mr. HUNTER. But the bottom line was they wanted a story. That is the point. They were not concerned necessarily about the morality of the situation or whether it was good or bad.

Mr. DORNAN. Or our fighting men or any of the other forces.

Mr. HUNTER. They simply wanted a story, so go ahead and read it. I think it will be interesting.

Mr. DORNAN. These are from respectable papers, such as the Times in London. Let me jump ahead. One of these people, Mark Hubayan, was allowed into interview Durant when Durant gave his first interview and asked for the pizza, and started to cry when he talked about all of the men on his crew, and the two Rangers that came to save him were great, great Americans he said, and he started to cry. And you could tell he was in a lot of pain, and had been turning down pain medication. It says, "Dear Osman, once again we would like to seek your help in getting an interview with General Aideed. UNOSOM is under great political pressure to change its policy in Mogadishu."

I have to remind you again this is September 14, 11 days before the first chopper went down at night, 2 weeks before the October 3d firefight where we lost 18.

The humanitarian section at the U.N. is calling for a political solution, and Animal Howe has been called to New York to discuss this.

Now, the officers and I on the C–5 looked at the handwritten note that this is typed from, and it is terribly spelled, and there is no "d." We decided it might have been Admiral Howe, just all of the letters reversed around, but it sure looked like "Animal Howe."

□ 2330

I want to give these reporters the benefit of the doubt on that. Now, underlined is the time for the general to speak to us and to make his point to the media. We can bring a camera to videotape the interviews for the television stations. Above all, please recognize that the timing for now is perfect. It would allow General Aideed to take the political initiative. He already has the military initiative. With best wishes, Sam Kiley of the Times, Mark Huband, Guardian; Scott Peterson, Telegraph," three of them signed it. The last one is Paul Watson, the Star.

That must mean Paul Watson of the Toronto Star, the guy that my daughter Robin called me about last week when I was on the floor because she had just seen him with Bernie Shaw on CNN saying that we were a little too obsessed with all these American casualties, bodies being dragged through

the streets, desecrated and beaten. He said, "I have seen the Somalia children in the hospitals." Yes, the one that Aideed uses as human shields.

My daughter said—now I did not use Bernie's name last week, but I am going to call him now that I have this letter. Bernie said, "You mean we are too interested in the Americans and not the Somali casualties?" I hope Bernie was not really thinking that through when he asked this, and get this——

Mr. HUNTER. If the gentleman will allow me, let us make this clear. What the gentleman has there is something that I think is the darker side of international journalism. The point is that American kids are being killed by this man, and yet the journalists, these international journalists are writing this killer and acting like his public relations agent. They are saying, "Now is the chance for you and General Aideed to tell your side of the story and win some brownie points in the public relations game, and we will help you if you will just give us a little time on camera. It is good for us. It is good for you." That is the dark side of journalism.

Mr. DORNAN. Well, it almost smacks—I hope I am wrong—it almost smacks of the bias of media in Vietnam glorifying Ho Chi Minh, another Aideed-type person; no regard for human life. his own young teenagers, subteens, women or fighting men, no regard, because he can always replenish them from his clan out in the boondocks.

Mr. HUNTER. If the gentleman will allow, there was a tinge of that in the Desert Storm operation. I remember when General Schwarzkopf began to have his great successes against Saddam Hussein, was not just playing "rope-a-dope" as if he was Muhammad Ali, going to come back, the wiley fighter, and he was going to end up killing a lot of Americans. As if this was a game and he was the underdog and they were rooting for him. Actually, the lives of hundreds of thousands of young Americans depended on him not being able to come back, not being able to beat the American forces. It was a little bit—you know what is interesting: I walked in and my family were watching television one night and I did not realize that it was Saturday Night Live. Even Saturday Night Live, this comedy show, caught this fact and they had a press conference—obviously a mock press conference, but I had just walked in and did not realize that—you had the American general briefing the press, saying, "We can't give out any secrets here and we don't want to say anything that would be bad for morale, so please understand that and limit your questions." And the first question was, "What do you think would be the most demoralizing thing for the American troops?" And he said, "No, please, we can't do that." Somebody else raises their hand and they say, "What are the passwords up at the front?" And he said, "We can't do that." Finally, though, you have a guy in an Arab headdress who said, "Where are your men? Can I count them?" And then they said, "It is Saturday Night Live."

Mr. DORNAN. Also, where will they be landing? Where will the war start, and when will you attack, at what point?

Mr. HUNTER. I realized at that point that even a television show which could never be characterized as a conservative show——

Mr. DORNAN. Never.

Mr. HUNTER. Was picking up the fact that there was a certain antagonism by the press, including some of our press, toward the prospect of a military victory by the American military. There was a certain amount of antagonism in Desert Storm toward our military. They did not rail, they were not pleased with the fact that we had low casualties if they did not get to cover certain beats and if they did not get to be allowed to go to certain areas. The most important thing for them was not American success, it was what kind of footage they got. In those terms, if you are the cameraman who gets the footage of the American being stripped naked and being dragged through the streets and mutilated, perhaps the war had been more successful for you than if you were simply an American journalist who gets briefed on an American victory, as they did in Desert Storm.

Mr. DORNAN. Without knowing it, the gentleman has led me to my point. In those three magazines last week that all had Durant on the cover, which I held up—and here is where my former broadcasting days get to me with these cameras because I would like to call for a closeup. This is a U.S. News & World Report. Here is a full two-page spread picture of the trousers of probably Jimmy Martin, Jr. because that is not a Ranger outfit, that is the khakis of the 10th Mountain Division. You can tell by the 5-ton truck exploded in the background that this was at the front of the column of the rescue unit trying to come up from Circle K-4 from the southwest to get to the Ranger positions up on top of this hill by the Olympic Hotel. I look at this picture and looked up at the corner, and it says "AFP," Agencie France Presse. When I went through Time magazine on the airplane coming home, 3,300 angels above the Atlantic somewhere, I picked this article up and here is the same picture with a different Somali, a two-page picture of Jim's trousers, and I look at this picture and I look at the trousers, and I look to see who took this one. I could not believe my eyes. Read what it says on the side of this picture. Here it is at the beginning of this Time magazine with the same person in U.S. News holding up a bloody teeshirt, a white jockey shorts covered with blood, one of our 10th Mountain Troopers. Read whose name is on the side, whose picture that is, this tiny, miniscule print, the photo credit. You have to turn it sideways.

Mr. HUNTER. Paul Watson, Toronto Star.

Mr. DORNAN. Now, unless Paul Watson is a man of color, that means this Canadian Caucasian journalist is in these angry streets with these people who have torn apart—killed POW's, torn apart their bodies, and he is allowed to move around and take these photographs of this mayhem?

Today in the Washington Post is the story of another father who is the president and CEO of a computer company in Nairobi, one of our American businessmen overseas. He says, "My son is a photojournalist who was beaten to death by a mob on July 12," and he is indicating that one of these helicopters was overhead and was calling back to the base. He has gotten some records. They could have landed and helped his son. But then the pilots might have been overrun and killed.

He said, "My son was asked by Aideed with three other journalists to come in and photograph the results of the U.N. operation where Aideed said his people were hurt." These four journalists were beaten to death July 12. I did not even know about this story. In an incident like that, why can Paul Watson move through these streets and photograph the desecration of the remains of our murdered Americans, many of whom were prisoners and alive, and then come on with Bernie Shaw, my friend at CNN, and say that we are too interested in the American casualties, we ought to know more about the Somali casualties in their hospitals. Very interesting. I look forward—I asked for Paul Watson when I was there, but I did not get to find him because he is out in the city, I guess, in Mogadishu.

Final thought, small area, real small; looks like an Army graphic demonstration of a city with guerilla warfare out at the National Training Center in Barstow. I could not believe that we had not gotten the proper equipment in there to back up and defend these men who were trying to arrest the man you properly called this morning a war criminal. Tomorrow I will be back and talk more about the diplomatic ramifications of the U.N. and how we can extricate ourselves from this and how it has probably saved American lives that would have died in Haiti or Bosnia were it not for the loss of our 18 heroes on October 3 and October 4, the three chopper crewmen on the 25th of September, and the one senior sergeant who died of a mortar round right behind the sandbags at the very entrance of the Ranger and Special Forces living

area there at the International Airport.

□ 2340

Mr. HUNTER. I want to thank the gentleman for all the time he has taken and for that 40-hour plane trip.

Mr. DORNAN. I loved it.

Clinton appointed Jane Fonda as a representative to the United Nations, Hanoi Jane.

One of the soldiers asked me about this. I had heard of her speaking out there, but I did not know why. One of the Catholic kids over there was talking to me about Rush Limbaugh and he said, "Did you know about her speech at the U.N. attacking the Catholic Church?"

You know what I told this sergeant? "You must be wrong. She would not have done that. Clinton went to Georgetown, a Jesuit University. He would not have sent her up to do that."

I am on the airplane and just to get a break from all this military reading, I pick up a conservative Catholic paper, the Wanderer, and my eye goes to a story on Solzhenitsyn. I read all about the honors he received in Luxembourgh. I read an article on encyclical morals to be presented October 5, which I have not had the delightful honor of reading in our society as it morally decays, and Jane Fonda's name catches my eye in the corner. Here is an article by Henry King. Listen to what Clinton did to these military people with Hanoi Jane, who sat in the gun pit, and Ted Turner was with her on this trip to the U.N., and we will close on this:

New York. Jane Fonda, left-wing political activist and physical fitness queen, became the first outfront Catholic basher since Dr. Jocelyn Elders won U.S. confirmation for Surgeon General by a wide margin.

Dr. Elders had been described as an anti-Catholic bigot, although 14 out of 15 Catholic Democrats in the Senate voted for her. Fonda in her role as President Clinton's special goodwill ambassador to the United Nations International Conference on Population and Development hammered the Catholic Church before a crowded United Nations assembly on September 20, stating that—

And I am quoting Fonda with Ted Turner in the wings—

Powerful vested interests, including the Catholic Church want us to ignore contraception as a necessary part of family planning.

The 56-year old Fonda, nicknamed Hanoi Jane after she visited enemy North Vietnam leaders in Hanoi as a friend of the court at the height of the Vietnam War also hit the church which she described as 'the church's reluctance to face reality.'

Then she goes on to ridicule the church about Galileo and it says:

Fonda continues an assertion that a population explosion is producing more people than the earth can feed.

And this writer feels that this type of latent Catholic bashing which we would never tolerate, hitting Jewish Americans, was made easy and politically correct by Dr. Elder's easy 65 to 34 Senate confirmation only two weeks earlier.

And the response to Fonda, who was accompanied by her millionaire media executive husband, was answered by Monsignor John K. Woolsey, who is a friend of mine, Director of New York Archdiocese Family Life Office, and here is a good shot across her bow:

Now we have the gospel according to Jane Fonda. She has come a long way since Barbarella. I was wondering how long it would take Hanoi Jane to come up with another politically correct cause. Before she attacks the Roman Catholic Church, may I suggest that she take the time to learn and understand the rich and beautiful teaching of the church regarding the sacredness and dignity of human sexuality.

Thank you, my good friend and highly trained theologian, Monsignor John Woolsey.

I say to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], the beat goes on. Clinton sends Jane Fonda to the U.N. and pulls the U.S. Rangers out of Mogadishu before they can avenge the death of all their comrades and put brand new young Marines, 3,600 of them under what—what does Montgomery say in the same press release on the wires today where Clinton is making these ignorant statements? He said:

Well, nobody has put the Marines under my command yet.

He answers to a Turkish three-star general, Lieutenant General Cevik Bir who I had lunch with, a good man, but uncomfortable about our troops under him. He could not get the backup, either, and General Tom Montgomery says:

I guess some of these Marines will be coming ashore.

Clinton's disastrous followup foreign policy, and what you and I warned about, standing there and here in September and October has come home in spades. The man is incapable of understanding the military culture or making decisions that respect what our men and women are doing in the field, offering their lives not only for their country, but for humanitarian peacekeeping missions.

Mr. HUNTER. Nonetheless, my friend, as we close this special order, we have one Commander in Chief, and that is Bill Clinton, and we have one Secretary of Defense. I do not think he is going to be resigning at my call, and that is Les Aspin. Let us hope for the sake of our country and the safety of our young people that they have learned some lessons here and that they discover competency in foreign policy.

Mr. DORNAN. If they have not, it is going to be a long, long 3 years.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following notes on my trip to Somalia:

WHAT BOB HOPES TO ACCOMPLISH ON HIS TRIP TO SOMALIA

(1) Personally view "air bridge" options by U.S. Air Force to resupply forces in Somalia. Find out crew stress on these long flights and need for C-17 type aircraft on Third World airfields.

(2) Ground commander report on situation in Somalia including:

a. Specific military objectives.

b. Threat identification/rules of engagement.

c. Command and control relationships with both Washington, D.C. and U.N. forces.

d. Precise security arrangements for U.S. forces both on patrol and within the rear area of operations.

(3) Gain first hand knowledge of the morale of U.S. troops and living conditions of these troops.

(4) Gain knowledge of Somali support/opposition to U.S. presence.

(5) Show active public/Congressional support for U.S. troops.

(6) Determine need for additional forces including specific type of forces (armor, attack helicopters, engineer vehicles, etc.)

(7) Determine proper conditions for withdrawal of forces.

(8) Determine why requests for additional armor forces were denied and what can be done to prevent the problem in the future.

(9) Ask troops if they understand why they are in Somalia.

(10) Determine what else can be done to better support troops.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ENGEL (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of personal business.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week 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. EWING) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BOEHNER, for 60 minutes, on November 3 and 4.

Mr. BOEHLERT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GOSS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KINGSTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WELDON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DORNAN, for 60 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SKELTON, for 5 minutes, on October 19 and 20.

Mr. EDWARDS of California, for 5 minutes, on October 25.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, on October 19, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, and 29.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RICHARDSON, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. EWING) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MOORHEAD.
Mr. SOLOMON in two instances.
Mr. MYERS of Indiana.
Mr. LEWIS of California.
Mr. KNOLLENBERG.
Mr. CLINGER.
Mr. EMERSON.
Mr. RIDGE.
Mr. DICKEY.
Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
Mr. PORTMAN.
Mr. GILMAN in two instances.
Mr. CLAY.
Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WYNN.
Ms. BYRNE.
Mr. BROWN of California.
Mr. REED.
Mr. TORRES.
Mr. SARPALIUS.
Mr. PASTOR.
Mr. CLAY.
Mr. STUDDS.
Mr. DURBIN.
Ms. ESHOO.
Mr. SYNAR.
Mr. MINETA.
Mr. MEEHAN.
Mr. LEHMAN.
Mr. NADLER.
Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DORNAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GILLMOR.
Mr. WASHINGTON.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROSE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

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

H.R. 2518. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

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

H.J. Res. 111. Joint resolution designating October 21, 1993, as "National Biomedical Research Day."

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1487. An act entitled the "Middle East Peace Facilitation Act of 1993."

S. 1548. An act to amend the National Wool Act of 1954 to reduce the subsidies that wool and mohair producers receive for the 1994 and 1995 marketing years and to eliminate the wool and mohair programs for the 1996 and subsequent marketing years, and for other purposes.

S.J. Res. 21. Joint resolution designating the week beginning September 19, 1994 as "National Historically Black Colleges and Universities Week."

S.J. Res. 78. Joint resolution designating the beach at 53 degrees 53'51"N, 166 degrees 34'15"W to 53 degrees 53'48"N, 166 degrees 34'21"W on Hog Island, which lies in the Northeast Bay of Unalaska, Alaska as "Arkansas Beach" in commemoration of the 206th regiment of the National Guard, who served during the Japanese attack on Dutch Harbor, Unalaska on June 3 and 4, 1942.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROSE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On October 15, 1993:

H.R. 2517. An act to enable the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to demonstrate innovative strategies for assisting homeless individuals, to develop the capacity of community development corporations and community housing development organizations to undertake community development and affordable housing projects and programs, to encourage pension fund investin affordable housing, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 265. Joint resolution to designate October 19, 1993, as "National Mammography Day."

H.J. Res. 218. Joint resolution designating October 16, 1993, and October 16, 1994, each as "World Food Day."

H.R. 2399. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of land claims of the Catawba Tribe of Indians in the State of South Carolina and the restoration of the Federal trust relationship with the tribe, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2493. Joint resolution making appropriations for Agriculture, rural development, Food and Drug Administration, and related agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 20, 1993, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2026. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize a retroactive waiver of the survivability testing procedures that apply to the F-22 program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2027. A letter from the Board of Directors, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report involving United States exports to the Republic of the Philippines, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

2028. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 10-121, "Real Property Tax Rates for Tax Year 1994 and Real Property Tax Classification Amendment Act of 1993," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2029. A letter from the Secretary, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of the surveyor's plat to accompany Council Resolution 10-91, "Transfer of jurisdiction over Children's Island, S.O. 92-252, Resolution of 1993"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2030. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Education, transmitting Notice of Final Funding Priority—Program for Children and Youth with Serious Emotional Disturbance, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2031. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistant Agency, transmitting notice of the Department of the Air Force's proposed lease of defense articles to the Coordination Council for North American Affairs (Transmittal No. 03-94), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2032. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notice of the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization's proposed lease of defense articles to the Coordination Council for North American Affairs (Transmittal No. 02-94), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2033. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting President Clinton's determination that the Board of the International Fund is, as a whole, broadly representative of the interests of the communities in Ireland and Northern Ireland, and that disbursements from the International Fund are distributed in accordance with the principle of equality of opportunity and nondiscrimination in employment, without regard to religious affiliation, and will address the needs of both communities in Northern Ireland, pursuant to Public Law 99-415, section 5(c) (100 Stat. 948); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2034. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the price and availability report for the quarter ending 30 September 1993, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2768; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2035. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the report of political contributions by Nichlas Andrew Rey, of New York, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Poland, and members of his family, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2036. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting OMB estimate of the amount of change in outlays or receipts, as the case may be, in each fiscal year through fiscal year 1998 resulting from

passage of H.R. 38, pursuant to Public Law 101-508, section 13101(a) (104 Stat. 1388-582); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2037. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Compliance, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report on proposed refunds in excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2038. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary (Civil Works), Department of the Army, transmitting the 2d priority project list report prepared by the Louisiana Coastal Wetlands Conservation and Restoration Task Force, pursuant to Public Law 101-646, section 303(a)(3) (104 Stat. 4779); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2039. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the Department's report on "Buoy Chain Procurement Practices"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2040. A letter from the Chairman, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting the Board's report, entitled "Whistleblowing in the Federal Government: An Update," pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 1205(a)(3); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

2041. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "U.S. Colonias Water Pollution Control Act"; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

2042. A letter from the Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting notification that DOD intends to sign agreements with a value up to $70 million to assist the Republic of Kazakhstan in activities related to the elimination of strategic offensive arms, pursuant to Public Law 102-396, section 9110(a) (106 Stat. 1928); jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Affairs.

2043. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting a report on the transfer of property to the Republic of Panama under the Panama Canal Treaty of 1977 and related agreements, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3784(b); jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2044. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of Presidential Determination No. 93-45: POW/MIA Military Drawdown for Laos; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations.

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. GORDON: Committee on Rules.

House Resolution 279. Resolution relating to the consideration of amendments reported from conference in disagreement on the bill (H.R. 2520) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-301). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTED BILLS SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

Mr. GONZALEZ: Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 1257. A bill to reconstitute the Federal Insurance Administration as an independent agency within the executive branch, provide for minimum standards applicable to foreign insurers and reinsurers providing insurance in the United States, make liquidity assistance available to well-capitalized insurance companies, and provide for public access to information regarding the availability of insurance, and for other purposes; with an amendment; referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce for a period ending not later than November 19, 1993, for consideration of such provisions of the bill and amendment as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee pursuant to clause 1(h), rule X (Rept. 103-302, 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. STUDDS (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 3300. A bill to amend the act popularly known as the Sikes Act to enhance fish and wildlife conservation and natural resources management programs on military installations; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TORRICELLI (for himself, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Ms. LOWEY, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. MORAN):

H.R. 3301. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prevent persons who have committed domestic abuse from obtaining a firearm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILMAN (for himself, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. HYDE, and Mr. SOLOMON):

H.R. 3302. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to modify the penalties for certain passport and visa related offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey:

H.R. 3303. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to prohibit the Department of the Navy from contracting for long-term scheduled ship maintenance work to be performed outside the United States unless a certification is made to Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COX (for himself, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. GOSS, Mr. RAVENEL, and Mr. ZIMMER).

H.R. 3304. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to allow State disapproval of Federal offshore leasing decisions; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. YATES, and Ms. PELOSI):

H.R. 3305. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to establish a Board of Visa Appeals within the Department of State to review decisions of consular officers concerning visa applications, revocations, and cancellations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ (for himself and Mr. SCHUMER):

H.R. 3306. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to regulate the retail sale of nondeposit investment products by insured depository institutions to prevent customer confusion about the uninsured nature of the products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. GUTIERREZ:

H.R. 3307. A bill to prohibit any entity that receives Federal assistance from delaying or denying the placement of a child into foster care or for adoption based on any difference between the race, color, or national origin of the child and that of the prospective foster or adoptive parent or parents if a prospective parent of the same race, color, or national origin is not available; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MALONEY:

H.R. 3308. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide housing benefits for the purchase of residential cooperative apartment units; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MINETA (for himself and Ms. DANNER):

H.R. 3309. A bill to terminate the effectiveness of certain amendments to the foreign repair station rules of the Federal Aviation Administration; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 3310. A bill to establish the Barbara McClintock Project to Cure AIDS; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 3311. A bill to establish the Professional Boxing Corporation, and for other purposes; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Education and Labor.

By Mr. PICKETT:

H.R. 3312. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to revise a map relating to the Coastal Barrier Resources System; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROWLAND (for himself, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. STUMP, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. BUYER, and Mr. LINDER):

H.R. 3313. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve health care services of the Department of Veterans Affairs relating to women veterans, to extend and expand authority for the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide priority health care to veterans who were exposed to ionizing radiation or to Agent Orange, to expand the scope of services that may be provided to veterans through Vet Centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself, Mrs. UNSOELD, and Ms. FURSE):

H.R. 3314. A bill to provide for a review of all Federal programs that assess or mitigate the risks to women's health from environmental exposures, and for a study of the research needs of the Federal Government relating to such risks; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. WASHINGTON (for himself, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. WATT, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. MFUME, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Ms. NORTON, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. RUSH, Ms. WATERS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. WYNN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. STARK, Mr. REYNOLDS, and Mr. THOMPSON):

H.R. 3315. A bill to prevent crime and to reform the criminal justice system to make it more fair; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Ways and Means.

By Mr. DICKEY:

H.R. 3316. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit contributions by nonparty multicandidate political committees; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROGERS:

H.R. 3317. A bill to prohibit the U.S. representative to the United Nations from voting to approve, expand, or extend any U.N. peacekeeping, peacemaking, or peace-enforcing operation unless the President notifies the Congress before that vote; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MINETA (for himself, Mr. NATCHER, and Mr. MCDADE):

H.J. Res. 279. Joint resolution providing for the appointment of Manuel Luis Ibáñez as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MINETA (for himself, Mr. NATCHER, and Mr. MCDADE):

H.J. Res. 280. Joint resolution providing for the appointment of Frank Anderson Shrontz as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. NADLER:

H. Con. Res. 167. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that any comprehensive health care reform legislation that is enacted should ensure that women receive appropriate breast and cervical cancer screenings and general gynecological care consistent with current medical standards; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER:

H. Con. Res. 168. Concurrent resolution relating to the Republic of China on Taiwan's rejoining the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROEMER (for himself, Ms. DUNN, Ms. SHEPHERD, Mr. ALLARD, and Mr. FINGERHUT):

H. Res. 280. Resolution expressing the sense of the House that a schedule should be adopted to require three consecutive 5-day workweeks per month; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

250. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to enacting legislation to protect the eligibility of senior citizens in public and assisted housing; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 65: Mr. BAKER of California.

H.R. 302: Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 303: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 349: Mr. REED.

H.R. 439: Mr. MCHALE.

H.R. 466: Mr. JACOBS and Mr. SUNDQUIST.

H.R. 476: Mr. REED.

H.R. 520: Mr. MORAN and Mr. BISHOP.

H.R. 546: Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Ms. FURSE, Mr. KINGSTON, Ms. MOLINARI, and Mr. YATES.

H.R. 760: Mr. KLEIN.

H.R. 784: Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 796: Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. BROWN of California, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 911: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland and Ms. FURSE.

H.R. 962: Mr. WHEAT.

H.R. 1087: Mr. DE LA GARZA.

H.R. 1155: Ms. FURSE.

H.R. 1161: Mr. SCHAEFER.

H.R. 1172: Ms. BYRNE.

H.R. 1205: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H.R. 1383: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H.R. 1392: Mr. ANDREWS of Maine.

H.R. 1504: Mr. VISCLOSKY and Mr. GILLMOR.

H.R. 1552: Ms. SNOWE.

H.R. 1608: Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. COPPERSMITH, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. KIM, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MCHALE, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. ROEMER, and Mr. SUNDQUIST.

H.R. 1627: Mr. QUINN, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. SANTORUM.

H.R. 1683: Mr. PETERSON of Florida.

H.R. 1709: Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. KLUG, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SHAW, and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 1720: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin, and Mrs. MORELLA.

H.R. 1747: Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 1755: Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 1793: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. FARR, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. JACOBS.

H.R. 1945: Ms. DUNN, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. BYRNE, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. MCHALE, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. MCMILLAN, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 2135: Ms. NORTON, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. FAZIO.

H.R. 2147: Ms. NORTON, Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. STUDDS, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, and Mr. KREIDLER.

H.R. 2221: Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 2354: Mr. ARMEY.

H.R. 2523: Mr. DIAZ-BALART and Mr. ARMEY.

H.R. 2543: Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. RAVENEL, Ms. DELAURO, and Ms. LOWEY.

H.R. 2638: Ms. LOWEY and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 2641: Ms. VELAZQUEZ.

H.R. 2735: Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin, Mrs. THURMAN, and Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 2759: Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 2788: Ms. NORTON and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 2790: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WILSON, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 2831: Mr. BAKER of California.

H.R. 2834: Mr. BROWDER and Mr. COPPERSMITH.

H.R. 2846: Mr. KLUG, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. PARKER, Mr. BARRETT, OF WISCONSIN, AND MR. BISHOP.

H.R. 2884: Mr. BISHOP.

H.R. 2939: Mr. WYNN and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 3017: Mr. PARKER.

H.R. 3030: Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 3031: Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina.

H.R. 3041: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas.

H.R. 3077: Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H.R. 3087: Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. KLEIN, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, and Mr. BROWDER.

H.R. 3098: Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. BERMAN, and Ms. VELAZQUEZ.

H.R. 3105: Mr. LEVY and Mr. HUGHES.

H.R. 3128: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. PENNY, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 3129: Mr. LEHMAN.

H.R. 3173: Mr. BLUTE and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 3182: Mr. FAWELL, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. KLECZKA.

H.R. 3192: Mr. STENHOLM.

H.R. 3203: Mr. LEVY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 3283: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BALLENGER, and Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.J. Res. 79: Mr. COBLE, Ms. BYRNE, and Mr. DARDEN.

H.J. Res. 113: Mr. GORDON and Mr. HAYES.

H.J. Res. 159: Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COPPERSMITH, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FARR, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FISH, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. FROST, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KASICH, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. KLEIN, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. LEACH, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCNULTY, Mrs. MEEK, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. NATCHER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REED, Mr. REGULA, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. SKEEN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. STARK, Mr. SYNAR, Mrs. THURMAN, Mrs. UNSOELD, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WATT, Mr. WISE, Mr. WOLF, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. MCDADE.

H.J. Res. 175: Mr. UNDERWOOD.

H.J. Res. 178: Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. MACHTLEY, and Mr. TUCKER.

H.J. Res. 185: Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. FISH, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.J. Res. 212: Mr. FAWELL, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. GIBBONS, Ms. FURSE, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.J. Res. 245: Mr. CRAPO, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. KING, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. HALL of Texas.

H.J. Res. 248: Mr. CANADY.

H.J. Res. 264: Mr. YATES, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. WALSH, Mr. MANTON, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. BATEMAN, and Mrs. VUCANOVICH.

H.J. Res. 274: Mr. WOLF, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. KLECZKA, and Mrs. MEEK.

H. Con. Res. 98: Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H. Con. Res. 122: Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. ROYCE.

H. Con. Res. 159: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. BATEMAN, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. KING, and Mr. KYL.

H. Res. 38: Ms. NORTON, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

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. 2501: Mr. ZIMMER.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

LET'S LISTEN TO TAXPAYERS FOR A CHANGE

HON. JOE KNOLLENBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1993

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I want to call my colleagues' attention to an extraordinary grassroots event that occured on Saturday here in the Nation's Capital. This was the Taxpayer Action Day rally in Washington.

Unlike the many special interest marches and staged events we regularly see in Washington, this event was organized by fed up taxpayers from across America. These Americans are tired of big government, and high taxes.

I am particularly proud because one of the groups that sponsored this event—Speak Out America—is the brainchild of Karen Mazzarella, of Highland, MI, a resident of my congressional district.

I have included for insertion in the RECORD a recent article from the Milford Times which discusses how Karen and her fiance Gary Stewart spearheaded this protaxpayer movement.

Karen is a political novice, but 5 months ago in response to President Clinton's record tax hike she called a Detroit talk radio station and volunteered to organize a march on Washington.

From that point on her phone has been ringing off the hook.

Saturday we didn't hear from the special interests who live off of Washington, instead we heard from ordinary Americans who pay the bills. I think it is time we listened to them.

[From the Milford Times, Sept. 30, 1993]

SPEAKING OUT: HIGHLAND RESIDENT SPARKS WASHINGTON MARCH

(By Frank J. Elchenlaub)

Karen Mazzarella's life changed unexpectedly when her name and phone number were broadcast in May on a Detroit radio station.

Her phone began to ring soon after the broadcast. And it has hardly stopped ever since.

That May night Mazzarella became the organizer of the "Speak Out America" march on Washington, D.C., which will take place Oct. 16 to protest taxes and government waste and spending.

"It was bedlam," Mazzarella said of the night her phone number was given out on the radio. "We estimate that within the first week, we got over 500 phone calls."

The incoming calls were so heavy that Mazzarella and her fiance, Gary Stewart, were forced to set up an additional line and to hire an answering service.

Mazzarella, a Highland resident who describes herself as a political novice, has taken a leave from her job selling insurance to organize the nation-wide event out of her home.

She now logs 16-hour days in the home, which has become scattered with "Speak Out America" posters, pamphlets and T-shirts.

Her group, Speak Out America, has nonprofit status and operates with a core group of about six people who perform most of its duties—from designing T-shirts to speaking on radio talk shows.

"It's quite a logistical nightmare in keeping it all together," said Stewart, who also calls himself a political novice.

While Mazzarella organizes with state directors, Stewart conducts interviews with radio stations and does much of the administrative work.

All of this began inadvertently for Mazzarella when, in mid-May, discussion of President Bill Clinton's deficit reduction plan pushed her over the edge.

She called a conservative talk show one night to discuss her opposition to the plan. Earlier, another caller had suggested citizens march on Washington to protest higher taxes, and Mazzarella told the show's producer that she would organize it.

"I called up and said I just wanted to leave my name and number backstage with the producer," Mazzarella said. "I said I'm one of those people who are better off behind the scenes."

But later that evening, Ronna Romney, who is expected to run for the U.S. Senate in 1994, gave out Mazzarella's name and phone number.

"It was crazy," Mazzarella said. "I couldn't even get a chance to call the station and have my number pulled. That's how fast and furious they were coming in."

"I actually woke up the next day and asked, "Well, how does one do this?" Mazzarella said.

She made several calls to Washington groups and ended up receiving support from Citizens Against Government Waste, which holds yearly rallies called "Taxpayer Action Day" on Oct. 16. Although that group has 170 rallies across the nation, it has never marched on Washington. It will still conduct individual rallies across the nation for those unable to attend the Washington march.

From there, the event "just blossomed," Mazzarella said.

"We started out with one sheet of paper that was copied," Mazzarella said. "It's the most amazing thing to watch. It's like it takes on a life of its own."

Truck drivers circulated "Speak Out America" flyers across the country. People called Mazzarella from as far away as California and New Mexico.

People in more than half the states in the country have set up organizations for the march. And she estimates that 70,000-80,000 Speak Out America brochures have been mailed out.

"I had no idea it would get to the magnitude it has gotten to—I mean from one phone call," Mazzarella said. "What I've found amazing is 80 percent of the people that I talk to across the United States are people just like me. They're people who are not politically active."

The Oct. 16 event begins at 10 a.m. near the Washington Monument. The march gets underway at 11 a.m. and circles in front of the White House.

Marchers will return to the monument area where a long list of speakers will address the crowd, including Ross Perot via satellite.

Speak Out America has arranged bus and air transportation to the march. Those interested can call the local "march line" at 887-4919.

But Mazzarella and Stewart hope their group continues even after the October march on Washington and, once again, President Clinton has provided part of the inspiration.

"The health care issue—we look at it as another tax," Mazzarella said. "A lot of people think that it is just a socialistic agenda."

They narrowed their approaches to either a group to coordinate letter writing campaigns or a Political Action Committee, which would target Congressional "tax and spenders," Stewart said.

DARWIN LELAND STILL GOING STRONG AS 90-YEAR-OLD CEO OF COMPANY BEARING HIS NAME

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1993

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I like to think that the 22d Congressional District of New York has more remarkable people in it than any other district in the country. I'd like to say a few words about one of them today.

His name is Darwin Leland, and today, about 30 years after most of his peers were starting to think about retirement, he is still going strong as chief executive officer of Leland Paper Co. of Glens Falls, NY.

Mr. Leland admits that he has slowed down a step or two. He works only about 40 hours a week these days. But he is still very much involved in the business he founded 42 years ago, taking orders and making sure everything is all right with the company's many accounts.

He purchased an existing company in 1951 and gave it his own name. He started with five employees and one delivery truck. Leland Paper now has 27 employees, four trucks, a station wagon and two cars. The company started in a warehouse. Two relocations later, in 1991, the company celebrated its 40th anniversary in a new 31,500-square foot building. The company supplies paper towels, copy and computer paper, and restaurant and janitorial supplies. Its name is synonymous with quality products and outstanding service.

One of my fondest experiences was getting former President Reagan to autograph a 1956 picture of himself sitting with Leland at the head table at a dinner of the Glens Falls Chamber of Commerce. At that time Leland was president of the chamber, and Ronald Reagan was doing public relations work for General Electric. That picture hangs on a wall containing other memories and accomplishments, including the Charter Day Award he got from the Glens Falls Rotary Club in 1992.

Leland credits his late wife, Marion Coleman Leland, for her supportive role in the business. She was missed at the recent party friends and family held for him at the Glens Falls Country Club. His son Richard, company president since 1988, and daughter Marcia Coleman of Arlington, VA, were both there, as was one of his brothers, Dexter Leland of Scottsdale, AZ. Leland also has three grandchildren and two great-grandchildren.

Richard Leland was quoted in a local newspaper as saying that the source of his father's longevity is hard work.

With that in mind, Mr. Speaker, I would ask you and all Members to join me in a salute to Darwin Leland of Glens Falls, NY, one of the countless reasons America is the great country it is.

HONORING VETERAN FAMILY SERVICE CORP. FOR ITS EXTRAORDINARY ASSISTANCE TO U.S. VETERANS

HON. ESTEBAN EDWARD TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1993

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to give special recognition to an outstanding organization, Veteran Family Service Corp. The Veteran Family Service Corp. provides assistance to active military personnel, veterans or immediate family members of veterans in need.

Founded in March 1992, Veteran Family Service Corp. provides over 7 tons of food per month, clothing, benefits assistance, alcohol and drug treatment, as well as medical and psychological care to veterans who are in need of a helping hand.

For the past year, this private, non-profit organization has helped over 1600 veterans and their families throughout the San Gabriel Valley and greater Los Angeles area. As well as servicing individual veterans and their families, V.F.S.C. supplies over 5,000 pounds of food per month to a burgeoning list of veteran agencies, including the Vet Center, American G.I. Forum, AMVETS, Vietnam Veterans of America, Disabled American Veterans, and Desert Strom Veterans.

Veteran Family Service Corp. has helped veterans who, because of a myriad of circumstances, have lost their jobs, homes, and/or military benefits. Veterans who come to V.F.S.C. for assistance come from varied backgrounds. Some are living in cars, addicted to alcohol or drugs or both, or plain penniless and, unfortunately, some have contemplated suicide.

Regardless of the circumstances surrounding their arrival to V.F.S.C., Vietnam veteran, Chaplain Robert Preciado, founder and president of V.F.S.C., never turns his back of them. On the contrary, Chaplain Preciado helps them get back on their feet with a renewed sense of dignity and a fresh outlook for a better tomorrow. He, along with other dedicated volunteers, feeds their spirits as well as their bodies.

V.F.S.C., through its committed and sensitive volunteers, has instilled hope in many veterans who lost it long ago. At a time when people are struggling twice as hard to make a living and funding resources are limited, organizations like V.F.S.C. play a critical role in meeting the needs of these veterans.

Mr. Speaker, it is with pride that I rise to recognize Veteran Family Service Corp and Chaplain Preciado for the tremendous contributions made to the well-being of veterans and their families. I also ask my colleagues to join me in saluting this exceptional organization for its public service record.

THE NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ON MILITARY LANDS ACT OF 1993

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1993

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to join Mr. YOUNG, my colleague of long-standing on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, in introducing legislation to amend and reauthorize the Sikes Act for an additional 5 years. If enacted into law, this legislation promises to bring about real improvement in the conservation of fish, wildlife, and other natural resources on our Nation's military installations.

When most of us picture a military base, images of wetlands, forests, and wildlife don't usually come to mind. However, many military facilities—particularly those with large tracts of undeveloped land set aside for training activities—are, in fact, hosts to a wealth of plant and animal life. The biological diversity that exists on these lands is arguably one of this Nation's best kept conservation secrets.

Nationwide, the Department of Defense [DOD] manages roughly 900 military installations, comprising 25 million acres—an area equal in size to the State of Kentucky. The Sikes Act was enacted 33 years ago to foster cooperative wildlife management among the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Interior, and State agencies on these facilities.

Unfortunately, DOD's record of compliance with the act is less than exemplary, and Congress has repeatedly used the reauthorization of the Sikes Act to provide clearer mandates for the conservation of natural resources on military installations. Nonetheless, many DOD facilities have continued to ignore their responsibilities due to the lack of departmental leadership or enforcement provisions within the act. The reality is that management plans aren't being developed aren't being implemented, or—where they have been developed—lack coordination with or integration into military activities. The result has been that some DOD lands have been degraded to such an extent that even their usefulness for training exercises is impaired.

No one disputes the fact that DOD installations must be managed first and foremost to meet the needs of the military. The Natural Resources Management on Military Lands Act of 1993 does nothing to interfere with those purposes. The bill simply requires installations with significant natural resources to develop and implement an integrated natural resource management plan and that military activities be conducted in consultation with the military officials responsible for natural resource management. Also, this bill adds a much-needed enforcement process whereby military installations that fail to meet their responsibilities under the Sikes Act will be required to promptly institute remedial actions to correct those violations.

This bill will foster sound management of each installation's natural resources. As a result, we will be helping preserve these lands' biological diversity, their suitability for troop maneuvers and other military exercises, and will reduce the likelihood of costly environmental disasters.

This legislation has the backing of several conservation groups, including the National Wildlife Federation and the National Military Fish and Wildlife Association and its nationwide membership of DOD natural resource managers. But perhaps even more encouraging is the cooperation we have received from DOD itself. It seems that DOD now realizes that it simply cannot afford to continue business as usual—that the time has come for forward-thinking, pro-active natural resource management on military installations. Our legislation exemplifies these principles.

This legislation offers us a valuable opportunity to demonstrate that environmental protection continues to be a high priority of the Congress and is consistent with our military training needs. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

SHRINERS' MINICARS ARE VEHICLES TO GOOD HEALTH

HON. LESLIE L. BYRNE

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1993

Ms. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the outstanding work performed by a special group of people, the Shriners. In particular, I rise to commend one of my constituents, Mr. Del Farmer, for his outstanding and generous efforts on behalf of injured and sick children throughout the United States of America.

Recently, the Washington Post Magazine ran a heart-warming story about Del and the rest of the Shriners' Kena Temple in Fairfax. The story highlighted his mini-car unit which is used in the famous Shriners parade to underscore some of the important work done by the Shriners organization. I would like to share that article with my colleagues today.

Throughout North America the Shriners operate 19 orthopedic hospitals and 3 burn units for children. These hospitals operate completely on the generosity of Shriners across the Nation, and the young patients at these hospitals are treated without any cost to them or to their families. The Shriners accept no payments from the Government or insurance companies.

As the national debate on health care intensifies, the contribution of the Shriners Hospitals to medical care and medical advances merit praise and recognition. Over the years thousands of young people have been treated

at their hospitals and burn units. There is no happiness more cherished than an injured child made well and whole. This concept is embodied in the Shriners efforts on behalf of children who may live happy and productive lives because of the charitable work of this generous organization.

The Washington Post Magazine article is entitle "Good Wheels Toward Men." After reading it and learning about the Shriners Hospitals, you can see why those little cars represent vehicles to good health for thousands of crippled and burned children. The article follows:

[From the Washington Post Magazine]

GOOD WHEELS TOWARD MEN

(By Bill Sautter)

Shriner Del Farmer sometimes uses his firecracker-orange Corvette Stingray for parade duty. But more often, you'll see him zig-zagging down the route in an identically painted mini "Vette barely big enough for a third-grader.

How does this 255-pound retired D.C. cop slip his 6-foot frame into a car that's only 30 inches wide?

"V-e-e-e-ry carefully," the Vienna resident says with a laugh. "I kind of straddle the car, squat down and ease myself onto the seat. My knees stick up in the air. It isn't very comfortable."

As president of his temple, Farmer participates in up to 30 parades a year. "Shriners have always been associated with these little cars," he says. "It's just a fun tradition, I guess. Our Kena Temple in Fairfax is one of two in Virginia that have a mini-car unit. We have 19 cars and about a dozen regular drivers."

The cars, powered by five-horsepower lawnmower engines, were designed for kids. They "seem to last forever, but the bodies get scraped and cracked," Farmer says, running a finger across a dime-sized chip in the sleek fiberglass frame. "I turned this one over on Constitution Avenue during the Cherry Blossom Parade in 1990—ripped my pants. Everybody called me 'Flipper' for a while."

To avoid flips and fender benders, Farmer and his buddies practice figure eights, basket weaves and crossovers in the outer parking lot at Fair Oaks Mall most Sunday afternoons. "That's when we get the collisions and cuss words out of the way."

The whole shtick can be time consuming and expensive; individuals purchase and maintain their own cars.

So what's in it for Farmer?

"There's a serious side to this," he says. "The mini-cars are a good way to get people to learn about the work we do." The Shriners support 19 orthopedic hospitals and three burn centers for children in the United States and Mexico.

"We may look a little silly driving these things, but if it helps get the word out, we don't mind a bit."

INTRODUCTION OF FOREIGN REPAIR STATION BILL

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1993

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill on the regulations that govern the use of foreign repair stations by U.S. airline operators. This bill is similar to bills that I introduced in the 101st and 102d Congresses, and would return the regulations governing the use of foreign repair stations to their pre-1988 status.

In November 1988, the Federal Aviation Administration changed its regulations on the use of foreign repair stations by U.S. operators. Prior to that regulatory change, a U.S. operator had to demonstrate very special needs or an emergency situation to have maintenance conducted on U.S. domestic aircraft outside of the United States. The 1988 changes removed the regulatory barriers thereby enabling airlines to take their aircraft offshore for maintenance if they so chose. My bill would say the changes made in 1988 would no longer be effective, and it would, again, be difficult to obtain overseas maintenance of U.S. domestic aircraft.

Since 1987, when this regulatory change began being discussed, I have had a great deal of concern that this would result in a flight of good paying aircraft mechanic jobs out of the United States. I have also had concerns that the Federal Aviation Administration would not be able to adequately inspect foreign repair stations to ensure the safety of their operations.

Since the 1988 rule change, a number of these concerns have not materialized. However, it is clear that they could in the future if circumstances change.

First, in 1988, the U.S. airline industry was a major proponent of the rule change and appeared anxious to take advantage of the new rules. However, since the rule change, U.S. carriers' interest in using the offshore possibilities created by the rule change appears to have largely evaporated. In a quarterly report to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, the FAA finds that, " * * * There has been no significant change in the way U.S. airlines are having maintenance performed by foreign repair stations * * *" Testimony before the Subcommittee on Aviation and conversations I have had with airline officials indicate that corporate decisions have been made to keep aircraft maintenance in-house and on-shore. Since 1988, the U.S. major carriers have constructed large new maintenance facilities in the United States or are expanding existing ones. While there are certainly threats to the jobs of mechanics in the United States as demonstrated by the decline of jobs in this sector in recent years, foreign repair stations, to date, have not contributed to this decline. The loss of jobs stems from the generally poor financial condition of the aviation industry.

Second, the FAA has taken a very measured approach to the certification of new foreign repair stations. There were concerns that the FAA would be overwhelmed with a flood of new repair stations and would not have the resources necessary to inspect and ensure the safety of new and existing foreign repair stations. FAA has not allowed itself to become overwhelmed, and I commend the agency for carefully gauging its new foreign repair station certifications with its own capabilities.

While I am very pleased with the industry and FAA approach so far, I do not want the FAA, the industry, and its workers to believe that I think this issue is totally behind us. Approaches can change, and my earlier concerns could be revived. So, I am introducing this bill to let it be known that this is an issue the committee will continue to follow closely.

At this time, industry attitudes and the FAA's approach do not indicate a need to move on this legislation beyond introduction. However, should there be significant changes in this regard, I will take the steps necessary to rectify the situation.

BIOGRAPHY OF LUTHER ESKIJIAN

HON. CARLOS J. MOORHEAD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1993

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, Luther Eskijian was born on November 1, 1913, in a small village in the mountains of Syria, the son of Rev. and Mrs. Hovannes Eskijian. Seven years later, he, his brother, John, and mother immigrated to the United States.

Like thousands before him, Luther crossed the ocean on a third-class ticket with refugee status. The family arrived at Ellis Island not knowing the language or culture.

Without funds or resources, the family struggled to survive, but through perseverance and hard work, Luther Eskijian established himself in business and obtained an education as an architect.

But before his own personal plans could progress very far, World War II started and Luther entered the Army. After marrying Anne Hotzakorgian at the base chapel of Camp Monroe, NC, he was shipped overseas and attached to General Eisenhower's headquarters in Paris.

His job was to design hospitals throughout the war front following General Patton's Eighth Army from the Rhine River to Berlin, as cities were liberated and large buildings were evacuated for hospital use.

During his service in Europe, Luther had little personal time, but when he did, he visited cathedrals and unusual buildings, making sketches of scenes of beauty and devastation. He also purchased art objects from antique shops. These collector's items would become the basis for his extensive collection of antiques for the museum he would establish in later life.

Returning to the United States in January 1946, he met his first child who was born while he was serving in France. Luther and Anne resumed their life, a home was established, and two other children were born. He expanded his career as an architect and businessman. He designed and built many smaller institutional buildings, churches, schools, and banks.

Luther Eskijian has been active in civic and religious affairs all his life, serving in many positions in his church, missionary associations, Christian schools, and philanthropic trusts. He has assisted scores of small churches, and simply reached out to people who needed help, freely offering his time, resources, and professional services. He has been a Rotarian for over 43 years, and has served as President of his club with distinction. His field of endeavors has expanded to include specialized

engineering activities, for which he holds a dozen patents.

Now in his retirement years, he has spent most of his time in the planning and construction of an outstanding edifice of ancient Armenian architecture, a sanctuary and museum for the Armenian Community Center and the Mission Hills Ararat Home of Los Angeles. The sanctuary is most unusual in that it uses modern materials but incorporates ancient designs, with beamed ceilings, a central cupola with an ancient gold cross on top, stained glass windows of Biblical scenes, natural split face blocks and marble altar, similar to the construction of ancient Armenian churches going back over 1,000 years.

The lower floor of the sanctuary contains the Ararat Eskijian Museum which will house many historical Armenian artifacts from before the time of Christ, along with European and Middle Eastern artifacts. Additionally, one section of the museum will be devoted to American patriotic artifacts of Presidents Washington and Lincoln. This church and museum will serve the extensive Armenian community in the Los Angeles area.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Eskijian is beloved of his wife, children, and grandchildren, his friends and community. He is a gift and an asset to America and his people.

CONGRATULATIONS TO MERCYHURST PREPARATORY SCHOOL

HON. THOMAS J. RIDGE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1993

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to recognize and congratulate Mercyhurst Preparatory School for being named a 1992–93 blue ribbon school.

In becoming a blue ribbon school, the entire Mercyhurst Prep community has achieved excellence in education. Their hard work and dedication has been recognized not only by the U.S. Department of Education, but by experts in the education community nationwide. They have proven that Mercyhurst Prep possesses strong visionary leadership and a can-do attitude toward meeting today's education challenges.

In earning this honor, the students, parents, and teachers of Mercyhurst Prep have set high educational standards for other Pennsylvania communities. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I am most enthused that everyone in the Mercyhurst Prep community has viewed this accomplishment as a spring board to the future, and not as a place to rest on their laurels.

I am confident that Mercyhurst Prep will remain focused on its student's needs and interests. There is no doubt that this is a school performing at an exemplary level. It is my hope that the ingenuity and creativity that has served their community so well will continue to move Mercyhurst Prep forward in its never-ending search for excellence in education.

Again, Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to congratulate Mercyhurst Prep on their dedication and achievement.

ACCESS EXCELLENCE

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1993

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Genentech, Inc., and its president and chief executive officer, G. Kirk Raab, for their vision in launching Access Excellence, an innovative initiative to improve biology education in America.

Too often our country's best biology teachers do not have access to the information and resources they need to educate their students. That needs to change.

The fact that American high school students ranked dead last in biology among 13 nations included in the Second International Science Study does not bode well for a country which needs an educated work force to compete in a tough global market. It will become increasingly difficult for U.S. biotechnology companies, like Genentech, to beat their foreign competition unless our students receive adequate training today for the jobs of tomorrow.

Access Excellence will tackle this difficult problem through an interactive computer network which will provide the access that our teachers need to the wealth of expert scientific resources that our country has.

The goal of the program is to link as many U.S. biology teachers as possible to the computer network. Each year, the National Science Teachers Association will select 100 of the country's best biology teachers to participate in the program. These teachers will meet at the annual Access Excellence summit in San Francisco.

I applaud Kirk Raab and Genentech's generosity and dedication to our children. This progressive company clearly understands the critical connection between education and our country's future competitiveness.

JOURNALISTIC EXCELLENCE OF SARATOGIAN RECOGNIZED BY PEERS

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1993

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the news media, both print and broadcast, receive a great deal of criticism. It often makes us forget that the overwhelming majority of reporters, editors, and news directors are hard-working, dedicated, and skilled professionals. Our form of Government could not function without them.

I'd like to single out one news-gathering organization today, one that has already been singled out by its peers.

The Saratogian is a daily newspaper in the city where I have my main district office. It's long tradition of journalistic excellence has been recognized by the New York State Associated Press Association, which gave the paper five awards for 1993.

Former staffer Lisa Finnegan was a first-place winner for her in-depth series on the safety hazards of county workers. Also receiving a first-place award was Community News Editor Jim Rogalski for his coverage of the impact of a toxic waste dump.

Editors Rik Stevens and Mike Killian received second place awards for their work on a series about the findings of a State commission studying the horse racing industry in New York. Stevens also received an honorable mention for his reporting on the blizzard of 1993. Another honorable mention went to editorial staffers who worked on the story of alleged sexual misconduct by a local clergyman.

Mr. Speaker, that's an impressive performance by a smaller daily newspaper. I would ask all Members to join me in congratulating the staff and management of the Saratogian for a job well done.

IN HONOR OF STATE COLLEGE AREA HIGH SCHOOL, BLUE RIBBON SCHOOL AWARD RECIPIENT

HON. WILLIAM F. CLINGER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1993

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate State College Area High School in State College, PA, for having been selected by the Department of Education as one of only 260 blue ribbon schools across the United States.

This prestigious award is presented to schools which demonstrate excellence in education and a commitment to the six national education goals. Because of their efforts to realize their potential and to achieve these goals, the students and educators of State College Area High School are an excellent selection for this honor.

As is the case with many of the schools, State College Area High School is an institution in transition. Since 1990, the senior high school and intermediate high school have been working to integrate their programs and personnel to provide quality education efficiently and effectively. In addition to this structural reorganization, the school is also working to implement the latest innovations in education, including a revised mathematics curriculum and a goal-oriented writing assessment program.

The effectiveness of these efforts is evident in the results which the school enjoys. From 1986 to 1991, the percentage of graduates going on to college has increased from 52 percent to 75 percent. And, with a graduation rate of 90 percent, State College Area High School has already achieved one of the six national education goals that was set for the year 2000. Nationally, the school matches up quite well. On a consistent basis, between 8 and 12 percent of its senior class is honored as either national merit commended students or semi-finalists.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of State College Area High School for all of its accomplishments. I look forward to taking part in the congressional reception to be held on Thursday, October 21 in honor of all of the Blue Ribbon Award recipients. These administrators, teachers, and students are representatives of our educational system at its best, and I wish them all continued success.

TRIBUTE TO ALBERT BENINATI

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1993

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday night, there will be a very well-deserved retirement party for Albert Beninati in Bridgewater. Albert Beninati has worked for the people of his town for 38 years in a variety of capacities. In recognition of the extraordinary service this dedicated man gave to the people of Bridgewater, the Board of Selectmen adopted a resolution addressed to him, which will be presented to him on Saturday night. I think it is important that we give due recognition to outstanding public servants who act as models for others and I ask that the text of this resolution of heartfelt thanks from the people of Bridgewater to Albert Beninati be printed here.

[Town of Bridgewater, Office of Selectmen; Bridgewater, MA]

PROCLAMATION OF RECOGNITION

Greetings: In behalf of the citizens of the town of Bridgewater, it is with great pride and respect that we present this proclamation of recognition to Albert Beninati.

In appreciation and recognition of over thirty-eight (38) years of continuous service to the Townspeople of Bridgewater—you were appointed on a Call Firefigher in 1955. In 1962 you began your career with the Highway Department as Equipment Operator. You were then promoted to Lead Man and Surveyor in 1967; advanced to Foreman in 1971 and ultimately appointed Highway Superintendent in 1976, a position you have held with distinction for the past seventeen (17 years. You also served on many Town committees over the years, including the Traffic Study Committee. Ad Hoc Lake Nip Committee, Zoning By-Law Committee, Insurance Advisory Committee and Land Use Development Committee.

During your tenure, the Town's unprecedented growth has seen the building of many new subdivisions greatly increasing the demand for Highway Department services. You have performed your duties well—always striving to keep in touch with the needs of our residents and to deliver the bent possible services with the funds available.

On behalf of the Townspeople of Bridgewater, we wish you a long, healthy and happy retirement with your family and friends and on this happy occasion, we, the Bridgewater Board of Selectmen, do hereby proclaim this 23rd Day of October 1993 as Albert Beninati Day in the town of Bridgewater.

150TH ANNIVERSARY OF B'NAI B'RITH

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1993

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I inform my colleagues of the 150th anniversary of the oldest and largest Jewish organization this month. B'nai B'rith—Children of the Covenant—International, was founded when 12 German Jews, sitting together at Sinsheimer's Cafe in New York City, organized themselves into a group for the purpose of helping their fellow brethren.

Since its modest beginnings in 1943, B'nai B'rith International has grown to 500,000 members in 51 countries. Its educational, antibigotry, and interfaith activities are recognized around the world. B'nai B'rith built the first Jewish community center in the United States and the first Jewish American library. The National Jewish Hospital in Denver was opened in 1899, and the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith was created in 1913.

B'nai B'rith's 150th anniversary is being celebrated with the theme, "Honoring the Past, Building the Future," having built the future, brick by brick, through its innovative programs for young people. The B'nai B'rith Youth Organization and B'nai B'rith Hillel were organized in the early 1920's. In the ensuring decades, thousands of Jewish youth have participated in B'nai B'rith programs and gone on to become leaders of both the Jewish and secular communities. Today, there are over 400 Hillel centers on college campuses worldwide, providing innovative leadership training, community service, as well as social action and religious and cultural programs.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of my own affiliation with B'nai B'rith for so many years, and am extremely pleased that this vibrant organization is now in a position to celebrate its 150th anniversary.

Accordingly, I congratulate all the B'nai B'rith officers and members throughout the country with a hearty "mazal tov," certain that B'nai B'rith International will embark on its next 150 years of service in an equally stellar manner.

TRIBUTE TO AN OUTSTANDING EDUCATOR: GROVER C. JOHNSON

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1993

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mr. Grover C. Johnson, has retired from the St. Louis Public Schools. On October 22, 1993, he will be honored by his colleagues for his outstanding professional career.

For 35 years Mr. Johnson has served the students in St. Louis Public Schools and the community of St. Louis in a variety of roles. As an elementary classroom teacher and as a physical education teacher, Mr. Johnson consistently encouraged students to establish high standards for themselves and helped them achieve their goals. As an administrative assistant at various schools he was respected by students and staff as a firm but fair disciplinarian, and he was always recognized as an advocate for students.

Mr. Johnson has also served St. Louis Public Schools in a variety of summer positions: summer school principal; assistant to the director of Federal programs; and coordinator of summer physical education programs. In addition, Mr. Johnson developed a physical education program for Project Headstart in Metropolitan St. Louis; this program was a model for Headstart programs on a national level. He served as a presenter, spring 1990 in San Antonio, TX, at the Elementary Principals Association Annual Conference. He presented information on the National Model National Endowment for the Humanities St. Louis Principals Institute on Law, Mercy and Justice.

Mr. Johnson was appointed principal of Carver Elementary School in 1976. He had graduated from 8th grade at Carver and served his apprenticeship there as a college student. He subsequently served as principal of Clark Elementary School and Ashland Elementary School, one of the largest elementary schools in the St. Louis system. Throughout his career as principal, Mr. Johnson demonstrated exceptional organizational skills as well as highly developed interpersonal skills, reflected in his relationships with students, parents, staff, and community members. He was acknowledged as a strong disciplinarian who was compassionate and always had the children's interests as his primary focus. He was admired by all for his calm demeanor and his ability to deal with stressful situations in a nonthreatening manner. His appearance was also a role model for students and staff as he was noted for being impeccably attired everyday.

Mr. Johnson demonstrated his dedication to excellence through his own educational activities and affiliations. He received degrees from Stowe Teachers College, St. Louis, bachelor of arts, and St. Louis University, master of arts; he attended special classes at the University of Illinois, Champaign, IL, and Harris-Stowe State College, St. Louis, MO. He is an active member of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development—national, State, and local—International Reading Association—national, State, and local—National Elementary Principals Association, and local 44, AFL/CIO Administrators Association.

Mr. Johnson continues to serve the community as a commissioner on the Civil Service Board of University City, MO. He is a longstanding member of St. Philip Lutheran Church, Omega Psi Phi fraternity, and Promethians, Inc.

Retirement will enable Mr. Johnson to pursue many of his other interests. He will enjoy spending more time with his wife, Geraldine, daughters Jana, Jennel, and Jacqueline, and nurturing his four wonderful grandchildren. An avid golfer and member of the University City Golf Club, he will undoubtedly spend time on many golf courses.

We congratulate Mr. Johnson on his outstanding career as an educator and wish him a retirement that is both challenging and fulfilling. Best wishes for good health and happiness for many years to come.

TRIBUTE TO RICHARD KOHRS

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1993

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise in tribute to an individual who has made an enormous and enduring contribution to the Nation's civil space program. Mr. Richard Kohrs recently retired from

the National Aeronautics and Space Administration after 30 years of distinguished service. Since 1989, Mr. Kohrs had directed the space station *Freedom* program with skill and an unquestioned integrity through a period of extreme budgetary and political uncertainty. He and the rest of the space station *Freedom* team brought discipline to a large, complex technological undertaking and made significant progress in the development of a viable permanent space station.

Mr. Kohrs' accomplishments on the space station program are reflective of a lifetime of achievement and public service. His professional career has spanned the Nation's history of human spaceflight, and he has played an important role in accomplishing many of America's finest achievements in space.

After graduation from Washington University and 7 years in the aerospace industry, Mr. Kohrs joined NASA in 1963 where he worked on the Apollo program. Following Apollo, Mr. Kohrs assumed positions of increasing responsibility in the space shuttle program, ultimately becoming Deputy Director of the Space Transportation System. Mr. Kohrs was a key leader of the return-to-flight effort after the *Challenger* accident and performed that task with distinction.

After being named Director of the space station *Freedom* program, Mr. Kohrs moved quickly to bring stability and progress to the program. He and his team set a high standard of accomplishment, culminating in the successful completion of the space station's critical design review. It is not an overstatement to say that Mr. Kohrs' leadership was instrumental in delivering a viable space station design and program to the Nation. The results of his work will provide the cornerstone of any future space station program, and he can take justifiable pride in a job well done.

Mr. Kohrs' qualifications and accomplishments have been amply recognized by his peers: he has been the recipient of some of NASA's and the aerospace community's most prestigious awards. I can only echo their judgments, and express my gratitude to Mr. Richard Kohrs for a lifetime of singular service to America's space program.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO MELWOOD

HON. ALBERT RUSSELL WYNN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1993

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Melwood. Melwood is a nonprofit agency located in Prince George's and Charles Counties which is celebrating its 30th anniversary this year. For 30 years, Melwood has searched for better ways to find jobs and homes for adults with developmental disabilities.

The founders of Melwood were parents who had raised their sons and daughters at home and had no wish to place them in an institution.

Virgil Dolly and the president of the ARC of Prince George's County, Don Gagnon, knew there had to be an alternative—the ARC was known as the Association for Retarded Children at the time.

They dreamed of a new approach for the training and employment of their adult children. They wished for their kids to be part of the community and be able to learn by working. We know today that they were ahead of their time and that their convictions have proved to be true, even more than they realized.

With 6.5 acres of donated surplus land from the Federal Government, a surplus army tent and an old surplus Navy pickup truck, the dream became a reality; the Melwood Agricultural Training Center was born in 1963. United Way dollars contributed almost 100 percent of the early years' annual budgets of $18,000, growing to $25,000 in a few years. These operating dollars were supplemented by civic groups donating equipment and actually constructing the first Melwood buildings.

The Silver Hill, South Gate and Clinton Lions, the Prince George's Lawyers Wives, the Officers Wives of Andrews Air Force Base, and the Hilltop Garden Club set an early precedent for the dozens of civic groups who followed.

As the years passed and more needs for service in Charles County became evident the Charles County Farm was founded in 1970. Again civic groups came forth, giving time and dollars. The Waldorf Jaycees and the Indian Head Lions Club led the way.

Next came the Melwood-Bowie VSI partnership where the Melwood Greenways program was initiated, serving Bowie residents. Here the first residential endeavor was housed, again thanks to community support. Prince George's County, which I represent, leased a house to Melwood on Route 301 at an annual cost of $1.

By the mid-1970's, the original 5 trainees had seen their ranks grow to over 100 workers and 8 residents. The Melwood community based on-the-job training models were regularly attracting nationwide attention. International organizations such as the International Labor Organization and the Partners of the Americas also were attracted by this unique approach to jobs. Melwood is on the verge of launching an international program which seeks to train professionals and consumers in the social-entrepreneurial model which has worked so well in our country.

Melwood's growth has continued, today serving 300 workers with job support, 61 persons with residential services, and more than 800 vacationers a year in the recreation travel program.

Melwood received a national grant from the Administration for Developmental Disabilities, the Department of Health and Human Resources. The grant has allowed Melwood to again prove to the community that persons with developmental disabilities have abilities and resources we would never conceive. Persons with developmental disabilities are buying and renting their own homes with Melwood's help and ongoing support.

The executive director, Earl Copus, summarizes Melwood's philosophy when he says:

> Look where we have been in 30 years * * * we are challenged to do better at serving our consumers with developmental disabilities. We will transform our agency to respond to their needs and wishes. We will be an agency where the controlling motivation will be consumer satisfaction.

Mr. Speaker, the success of Melwood is capsulated in these words: Congratulations to all of the people who are consumers, volunteers, and staff who make Melwood what it is.

SAY "NO" TO NAFTA

HON. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1993

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share with you a song written by one of my constituents, Mr. Lowell J. Reynertson, that warns us of some of the evils of the North American Free-Trade Agreement. I would like to commend Mr. Reynertson for his efforts and clever lyrics. Mr. Reynertson played this song at a recent town meeting in my district and I want to share it with the rest of the House of Representatives.

SAY NO TO NAFTA

(By Lowell J. Reynertson)

Shout from the rafta, SAY NO TO NAFTA,
for it will send all U.S. workers down the drain.
Why do we hafta, still get the shafta, to pull this off I guess they think we have no brain.
Let's ram this NAFTA, right up their afta,
the mandate vote to change our ills is still our aim.
If we pass NAFTA, we must be dafta, which means the lobbying of beggars still remain.
We're not as stupid as we look, we know when we are being took,
most heard it said I'm not a crook, it's time we played things by the book.
Our nations debt would go away, if living wages we'd OK,
so that in comfort all could stay, and income taxes gladly pay.
There'll be no lafta until here afta, if all these grafta NAFTA draftas get their say.
Let's stand united and not be slighted, and we can send these trouble-makers on their way.
We've gorged the greedy, ignored the needy, which has resulted in our buying power shot.
For change indeedy with mouths to feedy, we must awaken all the powers that we've got.
Let's make the people understand, a living wage all could demand.
If we would unionize this land, then everything would be so grand.
Let's put this country on a roll, and not get deeper in the hole.
There's far too many on the dole, so decent jobs would be our goal.
We'd be productive, and not corruptive, if opportunities existed as before,
But if we hafta, put up with NAFTA, then all the hopes and dreams we made would be no more.
But should this grafta, stick us with NAFTA, then we must tax-exempt all U.S. goods we make.
Restore these taxes, by raising taxes, on those that sold out all good labor by their take.
We know that then we must compete, impossible would be this feat.
Without our way of life deplete, from NAFTA's draftas sly deceit.

So if our servants sell us out, their days are numbered, few will doubt.
We'll rise and shout, you've made your clout, is mainly what this song's about.
SAY NO TO NAFTA—NO, NO, NO!

CHEST PHYSICIANS PLEDGE SMOKING CESSATION EFFORTS

HON. RICHARD J. DURBIN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1993

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, the members of the American College of Chest Physicians deserve the recognition of my colleagues for their longstanding efforts to reduce the number of unnecessary deaths and disease caused by tobacco use.

All physicians recognize that their patients will be healthier if they stop smoking. In recent years, the medical community has called attention to the important role physicians can play if they encourage their patients to stop smoking and provide support to help them end their addiction to tobacco. Many physicians have responded to this challenge and can count the patients whose lives have been extended as a result.

For more than a decade, however, one physician organization has made this goal a central component of its very identity. The American College of Chest Physicians has chosen to highlight the importance of this issue by incorporating a smoking cessation commitment into the traditional pledge taken by each new fellow of the college.

Since 1979, new initiates into the American College of Chest Physicians, as well as longtime members, have had the opportunity to make the following pledge:

As a Fellow of American College of Chest Physicians and a leader in the most important struggle faced by chest physicians, the prevention and control of our major health problems of lung cancer, cardiovascular and chronic pulmonary disease, I shall make a special personal effort to control smoking and to eliminate this hazard from my office, clinic and hospital. I shall ask all of my patients about their smoking habits and I shall assist the cigarette smoker in stopping smoking. I make this pledge to my patients and to society.

Later this month, the college will gather, as it does each year, for its annual convocation. New fellows will be invited to take this pledge and continue the college's leadership in fighting our Nation's No. 1 preventable cause of death and disease—tobacco use.

I salute those physicians who already subscribe to this pledge and those who will commit themselves to implementing it in their medical practices in the future. Their willingness to question their patients regarding tobacco use and help those who decide to quit smoking is a demonstration of their commitment to the well-being of their patients and our society.

Someday—perhaps not in our lifetime, but someday—we will achieve the goal of a smoke-free society. When that day comes, the members of the college will no longer need to make this commitment regarding tobacco use. They will be able to take part of the credit for the improved health and well-being that accompanies a smoke-free lifestyle. Until that day comes, I hope the members of the college will continue to take the lead in the effort to reduce the unfortunate addiction to tobacco that plagues so many of our fellow citizens. I wish them well in their efforts.

TRIBUTE TO ROFEH INTERNATIONAL

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1993

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on a regular basis, I have had the privilege of sharing with my colleagues information about ROFEH International, a very important charitable program run by the New England Chassidic Center under the direction of Grand Rabbi Levi Horowitz. Rabbi Horowitz, known as the Bostoner Rebbe, is a man of great distinction and scholarship, and among the areas where he continues to perform great service for others is in the medical field. Rabbi Horowitz is a leading authority in the field of medical ethics, and he has put his ethical concerns into practice through ROFEH International, which is a referral organization that helps make the excellent medical care in the Boston area available to a wide variety of people who might not otherwise be able to benefit from it. ROFEH does not simply help people learn about the medical care available; through ROFEH, people are able to receive housing and other forms of assistance that make it possible for them to come to Boston for necessary treatments. Rabbi Horowitz and the others who work so hard in ROFEH are entitled to celebrate their accomplishments, as they will on November 7, at the annual dinner of the New England Chassidic Center.

Two men in particular will be honored for the work they have done through ROFEH to benefit others. The Man of the Year is Gerald Elovitz, who has been a staunch supporter of the New England Chassidic Center in his works, and who is the very successful founder and head of the Building 19 retail operation and its related operations. Joining Mr. Elovitz as an honoree is Dr. Frederick Mandell who will receive the coveted Harry Andler Memorial Award. Dr. Mandell is associate clinical professor of pediatrics at Harvard Medical School, and senior associate in medicine at Children's Hospital Medical Center. He has spent a good deal of his time helping young patients from all over the world who come for medical help.

Mr. Elovitz is a longtime supporter and concerned friend of the New England Chassidic Center. He is a member of its Executive Board. Other memberships include: South Shore Chamber of Commerce, past president and now on the board of directors; member of the board of directors for the Hebrew Rehabilitation Center for the Aged; awarded 1987 Master Entrepreneur in Retail by Arthur Young/Ventura magazine; and serving on board of judges since 1988.

Gerry has been married to his wife Elaine for over 40 years. They were high school sweethearts. They have three grown and married children and eight grandchildren. Gerry is a graduate of Trinity College. Elaine graduated from Curry College and taught special need children for a number of years. She too, has been a devoted friend of the causes of the Bostoner Rebbe.

In celebration of 25 years in business, Gerry Elovitz set up a charitable foundation, which funds various small, local charities, local being the towns and cities where there is a Building 19 store. "It's our way of giving back to the communities," he said.

Dr. Mandell is the founder of the Massachusetts Chapter for Sudden Infant Death Syndrome and was the vice-chairman of the National Sudden Infant Death Syndrome Foundation. He is currently the editor of "Pediatric Alert" and chairman of the ROFEH International Medical Steering Committee.

Dr. Mandell's longtime interest in sudden infant death syndrome has brought him to the native American reservations of this country, where he is currently examining, with the American Academy of Pediatrics and the Indian Health Service, the exceptional high rates of Sudden Infant Death Syndrome among native American nations. Dr. Mandell was the recipient of a recent grant which resulted in the publication of the work "An Understanding of Sudden Infant Death Syndrome for Native Americans."

Presently, Dr. Mandell is serving on a medical team with four children's hospitals in the United States to build the first cooperative pediatric medical center in China. The accomplishments of Dr. Mandell extend to those students who have been influenced by his teaching, those children who have been aided in their time of illness, and those families for whom he has been a physician.

THE PASSPORT AND VISA OFFENSES PENALTIES IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1993, H.R. 3302

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1993

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation—the Passport and Visa Offense Penalties Improvement Act of 1993, H.R. 3302—to bring long-needed improvements in our Nation's criminal laws as they relate to the penalties dealing with visa and passport fraud, and other criminal offenses involving the misuse of these vital travel and entry documents.

This Nation received a serious terrorist wake-up call in February of this year. The World Trade Center bombing in New York made it vividly clear that this Nation can be the target of international terrorism, especially on the very streets and in the offices and shops of our cities. Subsequent disclosures of other terrorist plots directed at elected political leaders in the United States, the United Nations complex, and even commuter tunnels in metropolitan New York have served to further shake our very confidence in our own safety from acts of terrorism. The costs of the Trade Tower bombing were enormous—six lives lost, including a constituent of mine, over 1,000 injuries, and an estimated $600 million or more

lost in property and business disruptions. In light of these events we simply cannot afford not to be vigilant and concerned about international terrorism.

An examination of the United States visa processing system at the State Department following the Trade Tower bombing, and the erroneous entry into the United States by radical Sheik Omar Abdul Rahman, disclosed serious flaws and outdated operations and equipment being used in the issuance of U.S. travel visas. The State Department in the 1990's is still, in many places around the globe, using 1950's microfiche technology to maintain a lookout list of possible terrorists and other undesirable elements, ineligible for entry into the United States. We here in the Congress have called for that outmoded system to be changed, and we are working on administrative and legislative solutions to improve the visa processing systems.

A similar review of the criminal penalties currently on the books with regard to visa and passport fraud, and other offenses with regard to these important travel documents, which also can facilitate the entry of illegal aliens capable of committing acts of terrorism against the United States, reveals a need for improvement as well.

Recently, for example, it was reported that agents of the State Department's Bureau of Diplomatic Security arrested a document counterfeiter who had produced numerous forged U.S. travel visas, using a color copier, whose inauthenticity were almost undetectable. This is serious business. These agents need the most effective tools to do a very difficult job, which as this arrest shows, they are doing well, even with the limited tools with which they now have to operate. Currently, it is not unusual for major criminals convicted of passport and visa crimes—most of which are felonies—to receive light sentences, even probation. Now is the time to change that. My legislation does so effectively by making the punishment fit the crime.

The criminal penalties and categories of offenses with which the U.S. criminal justice system is concerned must proportionately reflect the seriousness of visa and passport crimes. My bill increases the maximum imprisonment time for these offenses specified in title 18, United States Code, sections 1541 to 1546. The penalties have not been raised since 1948; 45 years ago. It is time for a change. In addition, I have also added a new maximum 15-year term for offenses committed in the course of drug trafficking, and a 20-year term for offenses to facilitate international terrorism.

Also included in the bill, for the first time, are asset forfeiture penalties that will make the tools of these crimes as well as the fruits subject to civil forfeiture. So, for example, in the case of the printing of forged visas, such items as the printer, vehicles used to transport them, and any illicit gains could all be seized by the Government as a deterrent to these crimes.

I invite my colleagues to join me in sponsoring, and enacting this important legislation as soon as possible. I am pleased that joining me as original co-sponsors are Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. HYDE and Mr. SOLOMON. We need to be prepared to counter terrorism with all of the tools our law enforcement community needs and must have to do the job. I submit the full text of this bill to be printed at this point in the RECORD:

H.R. 3302

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 "Passport and Visa Offenses Penalties Improvement Act of 1993".

SEC. 2. PASSPORT AND VISA OFFENSES PENALTIES IMPROVEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 75 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 1541, by striking "not more than $500 or imprisoned not more than one year" and inserting "under this title or imprisoned not more than 10 years";

(2) in each of sections 1542, 1543, and 1544, by striking "not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than five years" and inserting "under this title or imprisoned not more than 10 years";

(3) in section 1545, by striking "not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than three years" and inserting "under this title or imprisoned not more than 10 years";

(4) in section 1546(a), by striking "five years" and inserting "10 years";

(5) in section 1546(b), by striking "in accordance with this title, or imprisoned not more than two years" and inserting "under this title or imprisoned not more than 10 years"; and

(6) by adding at the end the following:

"§ 1547. Alternative imprisonment maximum for certain offenses

"Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the maximum term of imprisonment that may be imposed for an offense under this chapter (other than an offense under section 1545)—

"(1) if committed to facilitate a drug trafficking crime (as defined in 929(a) of this title) is 15 years; and

"(2) if committed to facilitate an act of international terrorism (as defined in section 2331 of this title) is 20 years.".

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 75 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

"1547. Alternative imprisonment maximum for certain offenses.".

(c) ASSET FORFEITURE.—Section 981(a)(1) of title 18, United States code, is amended by inserting after subparagraph (F) the following:

"(G) Any property used in committing an offense under section 1543 or 1546 of this title or for which the maximum authorized imprisonment is set by section 1547 of this title.".

BOB MICHEL: A LEADER AND A FRIEND

HON. BILL EMERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1993

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, upon the announcement of leader BOB MICHEL'S retirement, I want to take this moment to pay tribute to this tireless fighter. I came to the House in the 97th Congress, the year BOB was elected Republican leader. BOB has toiled in the vineyards of national and House GOP policy and politics for some 38 years. His commitment was always first to the citizens of central Illinois who have continually returned him to represent their needs and interests, always in the perspective it should have been. BOB understood the importance of forwarding a legislative agenda that was positively good for the country, not necessarily good for party or person. BOB'S service and perspective is embodied in that dictum of a statesman of another day, "He serves his party best who serves his country best."

BOB is someone we once junior Members could turn to in our early years of service, for political advice and help in tough early races we invariably seem to face. Notwithstanding the grueling business of the week here, he traveled to my hometown of Cape Girardeau one beautiful fall evening many years ago, to help me prepare for what would become my toughest election. The people in attendance were enlightened by his perspective on politics and the direction of the country, and were also glad to share moments of his lighthearted humor and join him in song to cap a warm, yet spirited evening. In those and so many other efforts, BOB MICHEL proved himself to be a friend, one that will not be forgotten. I count myself among the lucky to have served in this House under the leadership of BOB MICHEL, a classic gentleman, legislator, and friend. I wish him much happiness as he moves into yet a new stage of life and leadership, and want to share with our colleagues some of BOB'S perspective as it appears today on the op-ed page of the Washington Times. It is a statement of vision, philosophy, and leadership that well reflects the manner, love of this institution, and commitment to high ideals that BOB MICHEL has exemplified in his service here.

[From the Washington Times, Oct. 19, 1993]

MY CURIOUSLY BASELESS REPUTATION AS A MODERATE AND COMPROMISER

(By Robert H. Michel)

A funny thing happened to me upon my recent announcement not to seek re-election in 1994. I discovered, as I read press accounts of my decision, that I am a political "moderate" and that "compromise" has been my major legislative tactic.

The fact that neither of these words happens to reflect the reality of my career—or the complexities of legislative life—appears to be beside the point to those who create such labels, and I am certain that when my time comes to meet my Maker, the obituary will tell of "Michel, the Moderate Compromiser." Perhaps it is time to try to set the record straight—or, at least, to examine what those words really mean.

By every accepted means of measuring voting records, liberal or conservative, I am just about as conservative as any Republican member of the leadership in the House today, or in my lifetime. I led the House Republicans in helping to pass all of President Ronald Reagan's economic policies of the early 1980s. Throughout the Cold War, I consistently voted and spoke out for a strong national defense, and, in the House, led the Reagan-Bush legislative efforts on national security.

That I am not what is called a "movement" or activist ideological conservative is, of course, true, and I have had my share of criticism from the Washington-based conservative political activists and journalist

(including, on a regular basis, the editors of The Washington Times). But it has long been my belief that true conservatism is not defined by the dogmatic utterances of self-appointed ideological gurus (real conservatives leave such thought-policing to the liberals). Conservatism—if the word is to mean anything at all—must at the very least mean adherence to political truths rooted in historical experience. Judged by that standard, my voting record over 38 years—on foreign policy, defense, and the economy—is conservative, not "moderate."

As for the "compromising" label, I have always stressed the need to reach reasonable bipartisan legislative solutions whenever possible, a view that is anathema to ideologues of the left and right. My belief is rooted in the conviction that my constituents sent me to Congress not to pose or posture or preach, but to pass good bills, make bad bills more palatable through amendments or to oppose bad bills that are not amendable.

But I also recognize there are times when direct confrontation is necessary. In the 1970s, as ranking member of the House Appropriations Committee, I regularly called for cuts in many programs, including some agricultural programs very popular among farmers in my district. Year after year, I came to the floor with what was termed "the Michel amendment," offering to cut the appropriations bill by a certain percentage. The Democrats who regularly savaged me (and defeated my amendments by 2-to-1 margins) didn't think I was compromising, nor did my fellow Republicans. During the 1980s, I led every single fight for the Reagan administration on Central American policy, one of the most heated and intensely partisan controversies ever to come before Congress. (And one that didn't have any direct political payoff back home for me.) My leadership in the Gulf War certainly did not involve compromise.

So why the labels? I guess it is because throughout my career, and particularly during my term as leader, I have committed the one political sin that ideologues cannot forgive: I do not hate government. I believe legislators are sent to Congress to make government work well. I believe the government of the United States is one of the greatest conservative accomplishments in history, and I am intensely proud that I have been part of it for all these years.

The Founders were conservative, and the Constitution they gave us created a government that is rooted in conservative beliefs about human nature and the absolute necessity to have a government that is at once limited and strong (if the Founders had not been willing to compromise, we would not have a Constitution).

Conservatives, and Republicans of all stripes, must understand government is not the enemy—wasteful government, intrusive government, irresponsible government, corrupt government is the enemy. The people of the United States are not happy with government when it does not work well. But make no mistake about it: Americans from the beginning have realized that the governmental system left to us by the Founders is the best in the world. Just ask the people of the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe whether they think our form of government is an "enemy." They realize all too well what a profound blessing stable, orderly government, based on law and with a true division of powers, can be. In my view, any political party that bases its appeal on Perot-like government-bashing will deserve exactly the failure it gets in 1994 and 1996.

EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS EXTENSION ACT

HON. MIKE SYNAR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1993

Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent last week when the House voted on H.R. 3167, the Emergency Unemployment Benefits Extension Act. I strongly support this bill because it fulfills a promise made to more than 1 million American workers whose unemployment insurance benefits will run out over the next 4 months and who continue to struggle to find productive jobs in a turbulent economy. This 4-month extension is essential for long-term unemployed workers who are trying to keep themselves and their families afloat while they seek work.

We are facing a situation where there are persistent pockets of unemployment throughout many sections of the Nation. This legislation will enable us to provide unemployment benefits for 7 or 13 weeks depending on a State's unemployment rate. While our economy continues to gain momentum, we cannot ignore those who are victims of a labor market that continues to battle a proliferation of low-wage, low-skill jobs. This bill provides crucial benefits to unemployed workers who need our help right now.

Mr. Speaker, there is another promise we need to keep to the American public, and that is the real story behind this piece of legislation. There are still over 8 million Americans who are searching for steady jobs and who will be forced to choose low-wage jobs because they lack high-wage skills.

So, we must reinvent the job training programs designed to prepare our workers for the future. This bill begins to address this issue by identifying displaced workers and referring them to job assistance programs early in their unemployment. This is a good start, but we need to confront the reality of a global economy, create better school-to-work programs and recognize the driving force of technology. These programs must be streamlined and those that are duplicative should be consolidated, so that we better target our fiscal resources to Federal programs that achieve results on a local level. Our ultimate goal is to ensure that these workers have access to effective job training programs and then master a set of marketable, technical skills.

I look forward to working with my colleagues and the President as we continue to carve out a strategy to create high-wage jobs, retrain our workers and grow this economy. H.R. 3167 is a key part of this effort, and I am glad that it received overwhelming support from my colleagues during last week's vote.

THE SPREAD OF TOBACCO USE IN EASTERN EUROPE

HON. MARTIN T. MEEHAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1993

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of my colleagues the spread of tobacco use in Eastern Europe. While the United States attempts to stem the toll of tobacco-caused disease and death and grapples with a proposed cigarette health tax, the people of Eastern Europe have become the primary target of U.S. tobacco companies in their attempt to compensate for their losses here at home. Americans are smoking less and less each year, causing tobacco companies to exercise their trade leverage to force open the doors to developing democratic countries, specifically Eastern Europe, and promote the export of U.S. tobacco products. The results are disease and death.

Mr. Speaker, as we all well know, tobacco use is the most preventable cause of disease and premature death. And in Central and Eastern Europe, tobacco use is responsible for one-third of all deaths. Today, U.S. tobacco companies threaten to contribute to the spread of tobacco addiction among the new generations of these developing countries who need our help now more than ever.

Recently, public health leaders from 13 Central and Eastern European countries declared a mutual defense pact against the marketing aggression of the tobacco industry. On behalf of his colleagues, Prof. Witold Zatonski, head of epidemiology at the Polish Institute of Oncology, wrote to President Clinton requesting that he fulfill the promise and spirit of his tobacco control initiatives as well as his promise for aid by restraining the aggressive overseas marketing by U.S.-based tobacco companies and help implement comprehensive, effective tobacco control programs.

Professor Zatonski writes,

> The transnational tobacco companies [TTC's] exploit our countries' desperate need for immediate economic investment. But, in so doing, they damage our health and ruin our longer term economic well-being. And in their political maneuvering to resist normal and appropriate public health measures, the TTC's also threaten to corrupt our emerging democratic institutions.

He continues,

> As a minimum, Mr. President, we also ask that the United States impose advertising marketing, and labeling restraints on the overseas activities of US-based tobacco companies at least as strong as those imposed upon them for the protection of your own people.

Mr. Speaker, America promised the people of Eastern Europe aid and support for reconstruction, but we have only provided cancer and heart disease. I hope that in a time when our country is focusing on improving the health care of our own citizens, we can also lend a hand to our friends overseas.

H.R. 3288, THE PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS EXCEPTIONS ACT OF 1933

HON. ED PASTOR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1993

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, last week my colleague Representative CRAIG THOMAS and I introduced H.R. 3288, the Public Accommodations Exceptions Act of 1993. I would like to

take this opportunity to explain to my colleagues the need for this legislation.

Under U.S. copyright laws, the hospitality industry, including restaurants, taverns, and other retail alcohol beverage establishments, must pay fees to performing rights societies for the public performance of music, musical records, and tapes. These performing rights societies, such as the American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers [ASCAP], Broadcast Music Industry [BMI], and SESAC, negotiate contracts separately with retailers and, in many cases, all three of these societies could seek payment of fees for the right to play copyrighted materials in an establishment. One exception to the payment of these fees by the hospitality industry is the use of radios and loudspeakers that are commonly used in a private home.

In various U.S. Supreme Court cases and in changes made to the copyright laws, it has been decided that small establishments that merely "augment a home-type receiver" would be exempt from the fees of the performing rights societies. In many cases, these licensing organizations have construed that any television over 36 inches, including big-screen televisions, to be other than "of a kind commonly used in private homes." However, technology has far outpaced the size of the screen, to arbitrarily force our retailers to pay fees for the television that might have a larger screen than that.

Representatives of the retail hospitality establishments in my State of Arizona and others around the country have discussed this issue with me. I believe that it is time for Congress to amend the 1976 Copyright Act to provide for a total exception from licensing fees paid to the performing rights societies for music copyrights relating to the radio and television equipment used in these establishments, provided that no direct charge is made to see or hear the transmissions. Congress needs to explore this issue in public hearings.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation introduced by Representative CRAIG THOMAS.

A TRIBUTE TO THE HIGH DESERT CULTURAL ARTS FOUNDATION

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1993

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention the fine work and outstanding public service of the High Desert Cultural Arts Foundation [HDCAF] in California's artistic high desert. Under the guidance of Dr. Gudelia McMurray, the foundation is once again sponsoring its preeminent fundraising event in November, the 1993 Aurora Ball.

The HDCAF was founded and incorporated 5 years ago, thanks to the ambitious vision and boundless enthusiasm of a small group of local artists and art enthusiasts. Its primary mission is to promote the appreciation and advancement of the arts in the high desert. The HDCAF seeks to encourage and nurture artists by supporting and endorsing numerous art groups, raising funds to provide grants to qualified, nonprofit art organizations, and awarding scholarships to gifted individuals interested in the arts.

The ultimate mission for the HDCAF is the establishment of a cultural arts center including an art gallery, theatre, and facilities for instruction and training of interested individuals and groups in the visual, graphic, and performing arts. Once completed, the arts center will provide a cultural environment and climate unique to California's high desert conducive to the advancement of the arts.

In support of its goals, the HDCAF has sponsored over the past 4 years a very successful 3-day Presidio Arts Festival at the Jess Ranch in Apple Valley. This fantastic event has attracted artists and supporters of the arts from throughout southern California and Arizona. Through this festival, artists have discovered an opportunity to exhibit and sell their works in diverse media—oil paintings, sculptures, water colors, photographs, and others. In June of this year, the festival became a multicultural event. In addition to art exhibitions, this year's festival featured performances by local dance, music, and theatre groups including the Shenanigans Youth Theatre, the Mojave Community Theatre, Creative Energy, Entertainers Plus, and the Gold Diggers Dancers.

Mr. Speaker, as a longtime patron and supporter of the arts, I too, am enthusiastic about the mission of the High Desert Cultural Art Foundation. Recognizing and advancing the arts in our high desert communities will not only promote current artistic talent, but will foster cultural diversity and inspire future generations of artists. Please join me in wishing HDCAF the best success with this year's Aurora Ball and recognizing this wonderful organization for its inspired leadership in the arts.

HONORING MAJ. GEN. DALE TABOR ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT FROM THE U.S. AIR FORCE

HON. BILL SARPALIUS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1993

Mr. SARPALIUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Maj. Gen. Dale C. Tabor on the occasion of his retirement from the U.S. Air Force. General Tabor has served his country for 32 years and has been a shining example of the values and traditions which make America great.

General Tabor was born on August 26, 1938, in Clyde, TX, where he graduated from high school in 1956. He went on to complete a bachelor of science degree at the U.S. Air Force Academy. That degree earned him a commission in the USAF and started his promising career. General Tabor continued his education throughout his Air Force career and received a master's degree through the Air Force Institute of Technology program at UCLA. He also attended the Air Command and Staff College and the National War College.

General Tabor should be honored first as a family man and father. He married Kay York from his hometown of Clyde and they became the proud parents of a son and a daughter, Russell and Jill. Their family has endured with high spirits the sacrifices required of a member of the Armed Forces because they knew the cause was just and honorable. General Tabor and his wife never allowed the rigors of military life to enjoin them from passing on their rich family values to their children. The Tabor children now set a fine example for their peers.

General Tabor's long military service is highlighted by many worthy accomplishments. He is a command pilot with 4,000 hours of flight time including 223 combat missions in Southeast Asia. He served as commander of the 333rd Tactical Fighter Squadron at Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, AZ; wing commander, 81st Tactical Fighter Wing at Royal Air Force Station, Bentwaters, England; and assistant deputy chief of staff for operations, Headquarters U.S. Air Force in Europe.

General Tabor has also made significant contributions to both his country and his service through command of the Lowery Technical Training Center in Colorado and ultimately the 82d Training Wing, Sheppard Air Force Base, TX. It is through command of these training facilities that General Tabor was able to serve this country in his highest capacity, for here he seized the opportunity to mold young minds and ensure the well-being of America for future generations.

Beyond his mission in the USAF, no tribute to Dale Tabor would be complete without a look at how he distinguished himself again and again as one of America's finest. He has been decorated numerous times and is the recipient of honors such as the Legion of Merit—three times—, the Distinguished Flying Cross, the Distinguished Service Medal, and the Bronze Star, to name but a few.

To be sure, Maj. Gen. Dale Tabor has left a legacy that is rich in tradition, service, and values. In both war and peace he found ways to serve above and beyond the call of duty. His retirement represents the culmination of a stunning military career. He will be sorely missed. I trust my colleagues will join me in honoring Maj. Gen. Dale C. Tabor, a man devoted to the United States of America.

ROBERT A. MERCER III BECOMES EAGLE SCOUT

HON. JACK REED

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1993

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute a distinguished young man from Rhode Island who has attained the rank of Eagle Scout in the Boy Scouts of America. He is Robert A. Mercer III of Troop 66 in Garden City and he is honored this week for his noteworthy achievement.

Not every young American who joins the Boy Scouts earns the prestigious Eagle Scout Award. In fact, only 2.5 percent of all Boy Scouts do. To earn the award, a Boy Scout must fulfill requirements in the areas of leadership, service, and outdoor skills. He must earn 21 merit badges, 11 of which are required

from areas such as citizenship in the community, citizenship in the Nation, citizenship in the world, safety, environmental science, and first aid.

As he progresses through the Boy Scout ranks, a Scout must demonstrate participation in increasingly more responsible service projects. He must also demonstrate leadership skills by holding one or more specific youth leadership positions in his patrol and/or troop. These young men have distinguished themselves in accordance with these criteria.

For his Eagle Scout project, Robert supervised the general cleanup of Wildflower Drive playground where debris had been allowed to accumulate over a period of time. Children who live in this section of Cranston are now able to enjoy their neighborhood playground due to Robert's efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in saluting Eagle Scout Robert A. Mercer III. In turn, we must duly recognize the Boy Scouts of America for establishing the Eagle Scout Award and the strenuous criteria its aspirants must meet. This program has through its 80 years honed and enhanced the leadership skills and commitment to public service of many outstanding Americans, two dozen of whom now serve in the House.

It is my sincere belief that Robert A. Mercer III will continue his public service and in so doing will further distinguish himself and consequently better his community. I join friends, colleagues, and family who this week salute him.

TRIBUTE TO LABOR LEADER AL GARRISON

HON. RICHARD H. LEHMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1993

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Al Garrison, the 1993 Labor Leader of the Year for the 14,000-member Fresno-Madera Central Labor Council.

I'm especially proud because I have known Al for a number of years and I can tell you that when asked, Al has always been there for his union and for his community.

Like many who are involved in the labor union movement, Al comes from a family of dedicated union members, a legacy that began with his late father who was a member of the Teamsters for more than 20 years and which continues today with Al's three sons who are in the union sheet metal trade.

Al almost gave up becoming an apprentice, but I'm glad he didn't. He completed his apprenticeship in 1966 and he has been an active union sheet metal worker ever since.

"I liked the possibility of being able to make money while I was being trained, and sheet metal work sounded a lot more interesting than the other jobs I'd been doing," he recalled. Al credits his mother, Elsie, for getting him involved in being more than just a member of Sheet Metal Workers Local Union 252.

Al accepted his first position as an executive board member with local 252 in 1970. In 1973 he was elected president, and went on in 1979 to serve as the union's business manager. After a merger, Al was named the local's business agent, a position he has held ever since.

"To see a poor little country boy like me end up with this much—to be honored like this—well, I'm really humbled by it," Al said of his selection as Labor Leader of the Year.

He is currently the vice president of the Central Labor Council and he serves as a member of the council's executive board. Al is also a trustee for the Sheet Metal Workers Northern California Health Care and Pension Plan, and is secretary of the Sheet Metal Workers Joint Apprenticeship Committee.

Al is a past president of the Clovis Y Men's Club and the Clovis Junior Soccer League, as well as a former coach at both the Clovis Little League and Clovis Junior Soccer.

HONORING OSCAR WASSERMAN ON THE OCCASION OF HIS 100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. PAUL E. GILLMOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1993

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Oscar Wasserman of Fremont, OH, on the occasion of his 100th birthday, October 22, 1993.

Like many of my colleagues, I look forward to spoiling my grandchildren. Oscar has had the chance to indulge not only 10 grandchildren but 20 great-grandchildren, and 7 great-great-grandchildren.

Oscar is lucky enough to have lived his entire life in Fremont, OH. He began working for H & M Bakery at age 19, delivering bread with a horse and wagon. He went on to work for Hench's Pastry, and in 1927, purchased the Pastry from Mr. Hench. He operated the Pastry until his retirement in 1964, when he sold it to his son-in-law, Louis Reinbolt.

Oscar's success in business has mirrored his achievements in public service. He is a member of the Knights of Columbus. In fact, he is the first member of Fremont Council No. 591 to reach 100 years old. In addiiion, Oscar is a charter member of the Lion's Club and a honorary member to Catholic Knights of Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, we have often heard that America works because of the unselfish contributions of her citizens. I know that Ohio is a much better place to live because of the dedication and countless hours of service given over the years by Oscar Wasserman.

I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Oscar Wasserman's record of personal accomplishments and wishing him all the best in the years ahead.

WOMEN'S PREVENTIVE HEALTH CARE INITIATIVE

HON. JERROLD NADLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1993

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a House concurrent resolution which expresses the sense of the Congress that any comprehensive health care reform legislation that is enacted must ensure that women receive appropriate breast and cervical cancer screenings and general gynecological care.

According to the Centers for Disease Control, in 1993, over 50,000 women will die from breast and cervical cancers, many of whom could have been treated, had they had access to screening for these deadly diseases. In the 1990's alone, over half a million American women will lose their lives to breast and cervical cancers, despite available technology offering easy and early diagnosis. Tragically, much of this suffering could be averted through early, frequent, and easily accessible detection and treatment services like mammograms and Pap smears. Experience has proven that these screenings save lives. Ensuring universal access to regular screenings can save even more lives.

Having lost my mother-in-law to breast cancer, I am all too aware of the extraordinarily high incidences of breast cancer, and the devastation that it can bring. It is even more frustrating when a family finds out that an early mammogram may have saved that loved one's life.

The President's health care plan makes a good start by committing this Nation to universal coverage for all women. We must ensure, however, that women are covered for all tests recommended by the best available medical knowledge.

This resolution will express the sense of the Congress that any national comprehensive benefits package should cover annual mammograms for women who are at least 40 years of age and at any earlier age if a woman's medical history indicates a need for more frequent screenings. It also expresses the sense that annual Pap smears and any other gynecological exams or tests be covered as well. It should be noted that this resolution takes into consideration the recommendations of the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists.

It is vital that Congress go on record now in favor of preventive health care for women. With proper gynecological screenings and preventive health measures we can surely save the lives of many women, and prevent suffering endured by many women and their families. It is absolutely necessary that these services be included as a clear and definite component of a woman's health care regimen.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me and cosponsor this important health care resolution.