

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, October 21, 1993

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Reverend Chris Holmes, Community United Methodist Church, Crofton, MD, offered the following prayer:

One Everlasting God, wide in mercy, broad in justice, we begin in prayer this morning not really to invoke Your presence—for we know that You are already here.

Long before anyone of us arose today, You were awake guiding the night into daylight, just waiting for us to join in with what You had already begun in this day.

So we begin this session of Congress acknowledging that we are in Your presence, and that this is therefore holy ground.

We ask that You guide these Members of Congress in their decisions, the Speaker in his leadership, and even the pages and congressional staffs as they go about their duties.

May all the work of this day glorify You, our one God of many traditions we pray. 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 New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] please come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. ZIMMER 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.

### WELCOMING THE REVEREND CHRIS HOLMES OF CROFTON, MD

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of all our colleagues, I am delighted to welcome to the House of Representatives our guest chaplain for the day, the Reverend Chris Holmes, who is the pastor of the Community United Methodist Church in Crofton, MD, located in my district.

Reverend Holmes is the pastor of one of the strong and vibrant congregations in my district.

It is interesting that his church is called the Community United Methodist Church, for indeed Pastor Holmes and the people of the church are community builders in our area doing the good works that bring people of all backgrounds together in faith and in trust.

Mr. Holmes was graduated from Western Maryland College and from Drew Theological Seminary and is married to Margaret Fry Holmes, who is with us today.

They are the parents of Lindsey, Jenny, and Taylor.

I am delighted to join my colleagues in welcoming the Reverend Holmes to the Chamber today and thank him for his inspiring prayer, which as all of us heard, included, uniquely in some regards, a prayer for our pages, for he, too, was once a page.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE], who appointed Reverend Holmes a page in 1974.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank our leader for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to add my voice to the chorus of praise for the Reverend Chris Holmes who opened this session with a word to the Almighty.

In 1974, I was pleased to appoint a strapping young go-getter as a page. The young Chris Holmes is the son of the venerable Dr. William Holmes, who was back then, the pastor of the University United Methodist Church in the shadow of the tower of the University of Texas at Austin, and is now the senior minister at the National United Methodist Church here in the Nation's Capital. I am happy to see that the acorn didn't fall far from the tree.

Of course, young Chris was a fine, hard-working page and a good student, but some of us remember him as a star on the Page School basketball team. Indeed he once scored 54 points in a single game, and I believe that record still stands. Who knows, if not for his higher calling into the ministry, he might have been the Michael Jordan of the 1970's.

I am honored and proud that the young man I appointed to serve this honorable body some two decades ago has gone on to become the outstanding young pastor he is today.

### ONE IN EIGHT, WE CAN'T WAIT

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

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, thousands of Americans marched on Washington to deliver to President Clinton a petition signed by 2.6 million people drawing attention to a most important cause—the prevention and treatment of and finding a cure for breast cancer. One of those activists was my constituent, Tina Rohrer.

Ms. Rohrer is an artist who has contributed to the breast cancer arts project "Healing Legacies: A collection of art and writing by women with breast cancer." This collection provides breast cancer survivors and families of those who have not survived an opportunity to raise public awareness about the impact breast cancer has on our lives. It will be displayed in our Cannon rotunda through October 29.

Mr. Speaker, breast cancer is an epidemic in which 182,000 new cases are reported in the United States each year and which causes more than 46,000 deaths annually. Some researchers now believe it may be striking one woman in eight during her life. I echo the chant of the marchers on Monday—"one in eight, we can't wait." We need a national strategy to tackle this disease, one that adequately funds research, prevention, and treatment.

### DISEASE PREVENTION IS KEY ELEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION'S HEALTH REFORM PLAN

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

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, the President's health reform plan would make prevention a real priority in our health care system for the first time. Let me cite one example where the priority will benefit millions of our people.

This week the National Academy of Sciences released a report that makes clear why disease prevention is so important. The academy reviewed the impact that lead poisoning is having on our Nation's children.

The study found that even low levels of lead can hurt the neurological development of our children, increasing their likelihood of having a reading or behavioral disorder and increasing the likelihood that they will not graduate from high school.

Over 3 million young children in the United States have unsafe levels of lead in their blood. While treatments are available, we know that many of the effects of lead poisoning are irreversible.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, the only cure for lead poisoning is prevention. One reason to support the Clinton health reform initiative is the priority it places on prevention.

#### THE SUPER SIX

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I was listening to the radio the other day, and I heard a political advertisement that must make opponents of NAFTA very comfortable.

Lyndon Larouche, the erstwhile candidate for President and convicted felon, announced his strong opposition to NAFTA.

He opposes this agreement because it will undermine both the Mexican and American currency systems. Frankly, his arguments sound as plausible as some of the others against NAFTA.

That makes it six marginal Presidential candidates who oppose NAFTA: Larouche, Ross Perot, Jerry Brown, Pat Buchanan, Jesse Jackson, and Ralph Nader.

Mr. Speaker, there's a reason these failed Presidential candidates failed in the efforts to become President. They lacked credibility. Their arguments against NAFTA are just as credible. Jobs will be created, not lost, because of NAFTA. The environment will be helped, not harmed, if the Congress passes this agreement.

When it comes to the Super Six and their arguments against NAFTA, I urge my colleagues to think twice about their credibility.

#### PREVENTIVE CARE IS CORNERSTONE OF CLINTON'S HEALTH PLAN

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, I paid a visit to a mobile mammography van run by the Yale University Comprehensive Cancer Center. This van travels across my district providing critical preventive health services to underserved women.

I visited this program in recognition of this month's designation as Breast Cancer Awareness Month. Also, I wanted to applaud the program's efforts in leading the way in health care reform by focusing on preventive care. But, preventive care does not have to come in the form of a traveling examining room—it can be something as simple as a basic flu shot or a blood pressure test.

Preventive care is the cornerstone of President Clinton's Health Security Act. This plan focuses on keeping people well rather than treating them

when they get sick—a common sense approach that reduces both human suffering and reduces our overall health care bill.

The bottom line is this: Preventive medicine makes good health care policy and good fiscal policy. It is one more reason for us to support the Health Security Act.

□ 1010

#### CLINTON'S TAX-HIKE PROPENSITY EXTENDS TO NAFTA

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

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, it seems that the Clinton administration views every national issue as an opportunity to raise taxes. What a shame and how out of touch with what Americans want.

Already this year President Clinton and the Democratic Congress has passed the largest tax increase in American history. All Americans are paying higher taxes under that plan, especially senior citizens and small businesses.

We all know that the health care plan being proposed by the Clinton administration will require massive new taxes on the middle class. Yesterday it was reported that the administration will propose an increase in the cigarette tax of 75 cents, and that will be just the start. That cigarette tax will only raise a tiny fraction of what the Clinton plan will need.

As if these tax increases were not enough, now the President is trying to raise transportation taxes in the NAFTA instead of cutting a modest \$2½ billion spread over 5 years.

Does every initiative of this administration require a tax increase? Let us not kill NAFTA by making it a tax bill. If the President cannot cut \$2.5 billion over 5 years, how are we ever going to balance the budget? Let us reject Clinton tax propensity and start trimming instead.

#### NAFTA: A BAD DEAL FOR AMERICA

(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, experts say without NAFTA our borders will literally be flooded with illegal immigrants. Can you believe that? It is already so bad there were two Federal judges appointed to be U.S. Attorney General, and they had to disqualify themselves because they hired illegal immigrants.

Let us tell it like it is: if this were about illegal immigrants, there would not be \$90 million going for retraining

American workers that are going to be losing their jobs because of NAFTA. It would be going to the border patrol.

There are two points that need to be made here today: if NAFTA is so good, why does not Japan do it? And, Mr. Iacocca, if I owned all that stock, like you do, in Chrysler, I would be making TV ads for NAFTA, too.

Congress, you better take a good look at NAFTA, because we have all the welders, mechanics, and carpenters we need.

#### TAXPAYERS' MONEY WASTED, AGAIN

(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, not only is the President spending thousands of dollars flying around the country to convince the American people that a Government-run, Government-controlled health care system is for the good of the entire country, he is also spending taxpayer dollars to send political messages to Congress on his health care plan.

Yesterday I received a fax in my office from the White House's health care "delivery room." It is a blatant, petty, partisan attack on the Republican National Committee, and Republicans in general, for speaking out against the President's health care plan. Mr. Speaker, there are many groups speaking out against the Clinton plan, not just the Republicans.

I think this is an outrageous use of taxpayer's dollars to set up an office in the White House whose specific purpose is to engage in purely political activity via the fax machine. How many taxpayer dollars were used to set up this office, hire the staff, and buy the equipment to engage in this partisan warfare?

Mr. Speaker, the President has not even sent his health care legislation to Congress yet, much less told us how it is paid for. But judging from his careless use of taxpayer dollars in the White House, I'm sure he'll have no problem really sticking it to the American people when it comes to his health care plan.

#### NAFTA IS DEAD

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

Mr. APPLGATE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California, Mr. Pannetta said several months ago that NAFTA was dead. Mr. Speaker, NAFTA is dead. And let me say this: it is an issue today in the Canadian elections, and it is going to help oust Prime Minister Kim Campbell before it is all over. Her opponents want to renegotiate NAFTA. Why? Because of the

same reasons that it is bad for the United States.

Second, we are going to need \$2.5 billion to offset the loss of tariffs, which means that your taxes are going to have to be increased.

Mr. Speaker, who in this Congress of the United States is going to vote to raise taxes to fund a trade treaty that denigrates the U.S. industrial base and denigrates American jobs? They say they will retrain workers. Retrain workers? To do what? To sell pants and shirts in a mall?

Give me a break, folks. This is not going to work. I say, let Mexico prove itself. Let them bring themselves up to our standards. But, by god, let us not bring the American standards down to the Mexican standards.

#### JOINT COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS CHANGING COURSE

(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, first let me say, NAFTA ain't dead.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that there is a very disturbing development which has taken place just this week here in the House. Several senior Democrats have chosen to resort to sabotage when it comes to our Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. Just 2 months before we are scheduled to complete our work and go out of existence, several of these Democrats want to change the rules.

The rules of the resolution that put our committee in place basically say that Members of the House deal with issues that affect the House, and Members of the Senate deal with issues that affect the Senate. The Senate filibuster is their priority item. We do not have responsibility to deal with that.

Mr. Speaker, their goal is simply sabotage. They want to prevent us bringing about meaningful reform of this institution.

All Republicans and many Democrats want to do what the American people want. They want to bring about accountability and deliberative democracy for this institution. Let us not let these Members block our responsible efforts to change this place.

#### REFORM HEALTH CARE SYSTEM

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, as our parents told us, an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. Unfortunately, our health care system foolishly squanders this sage advice.

Instead of a few pennies for childhood immunization, we spend a great many

dollars combating preventable disease. Instead of focusing on the prevention of heart disease, we rely on bypass operations. Instead of concentrating on prenatal care, we are left with sick infants in intensive care.

This results in the United States having a higher infant mortality rate than 20 other nations. We rank just 20th in combating fatal heart disease.

President Clinton's reform plan will return common sense to our health care system. Beginning with prenatal care, and including everything from breast cancer to heart disease, the President's plan will work to help keep all Americans healthy.

Mr. Speaker, we must all work together with President Clinton to reform our health care system so that the strongest Nation on Earth can also be the healthiest Nation on Earth.

#### UNDUE INFLUENCE OF SPECIAL INTEREST LOBBYISTS

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I want to spend 1 minute talking about the undue influence of special interest lobbyists—15 years ago I was elected to the Michigan Legislature. At that time it was not uncommon for the special interest lobbyists, especially the multiclient lobbyists, to come before legislators right before a key vote and hand them a bundle of checks and say how important this vote was to their special clients.

We have a chance to change campaign finance reform. We have a chance to diminish the amount of influence that these special interests are having as they write words in legislation, as they write numbers in appropriation bills.

Mr. Speaker, they are not dumb. They spent over \$100 million last election. The problem is that too often they are getting their money's worth.

Mr. Speaker, I hope Members will join me in urging that we have the opportunity to have real campaign finance reform in the next couple of weeks.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about the undue influence of special interest lobbyists and their PAC's. Last November the voters expressed unprecedented hostility to the status quo in Congress. They demanded change. But we've done little if anything.

Soon, Mr. Speaker, this body will have the opportunity to serve the voters, and stand up to the special interests. This week, the Republican Task Force on Campaign Reform announced its bill which would ban PAC contributions entirely, and would cut many other forms of special interest lobbying.

These special interests are standing in the way of the change the voters want. In the last congressional election, PAC's gave more than \$97 million to incumbents, and just \$12 million

to challengers. This 8-to-1 support for incumbents prevents reform, and has led to the scandals, and loss of prestige in Congress in the last few years.

Congress cannot regain the public trust until the power of the special interests is broken. That's why we must enact strong campaign finance reform.

Fifteen years ago I was elected to the Michigan Legislature. At that time, it was not common for the multiclient lobbyist to bring you contributions. Lobbyists of today are much more subtle. I decided in that first year to not accept PAC money from lobbyists.

#### HAITIAN PRESIDENT ARISTIDE HELD IN HIGH REGARD, DESERVES SUPPORT

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

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for Haitian President Jean Bertrand Aristide and the return of democracy to the troubled nation of Haiti.

Yesterday, I was outraged when I heard a Member of the other body refer to President Aristide as a psychopath. This same Senator went on to say that President Aristide was responsible for widespread human rights abuses when he was in office.

These charges are absurd.

I have met with President Aristide many times. He is a man of unbounding intelligence, compassion, perseverance, and high moral character.

I am proud of this friendship.

I am not the only one who holds President Aristide in high regard. Sixty-seven percent of the Haitian people overwhelmingly elected him President over 2 years ago. The people of Haiti have spoken. It is imperative that the United States in concert with the international community continue to do everything possible to honor the will of the Haitian people and bring President Aristide back to his rightful place as President of that Republic.

□ 1020

#### THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS

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

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, which is the congressional reform committee on which I serve, has worked hard all year to develop bold recommendations that I believe will fundamentally change this Congress. We have compiled the most extensive hearing record of its kind in history.

We have sought the advice of outside experts, and we have received hundreds of letters from the public around this country.

More important, we have worked together in a bicameral and a bipartisan fashion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, at the 11th hour, with adjournment of this body looming and the sunset of the reform committee by the end of this year, a handful of House Democrats have decided to embark on a course that can only prevent the joint committee from ever completing our work. Demanding the abolition of the Senate filibuster before even beginning to deal with the rules and the problems of the House is little more than a smokescreen, Mr. Speaker, nothing more than an arrogant ruse to prevent the rest of us who want to reform this body from getting it.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that Democrats and Republicans who care about reform cannot be deterred by this smokescreen. We have got to take advantage of this opportunity and give the American people the deliberative system in this Congress they have asked for.

#### WELFARE SYSTEM REFORM NEEDED

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

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I attended a meeting with some of our colleagues on a very important topic: The critical need to reform the welfare system.

There are two victims of the current welfare system: The needy people it is supposed to help and the working people, especially the working poor, who pay for it. The current system makes one group dependent on Government and costs the second group—taxpayers—roughly \$290 billion a year.

No one better understands how defective our welfare system is than those who live under it and the working poor who do not qualify for assistance, but have to pay for it anyway. Many middle-class and lower middle class workers, who would rather stay at home with their children, are struggling to make ends meet. And their taxes go to help pay for people on welfare, who get to stay home with their children. I do not think it is fair for a hardworking person, who limits the size of their family because they cannot afford to have more children, to pay for those on welfare indefinitely.

We need to end long-term dependency through time-limited assistance. For many, welfare is not the system of transition it should be. Fully one-quarter of those on welfare remain there for more than 10 years. Welfare should be only a way station on the road to work, not a final destination.

#### THE SENATE FILIBUSTER RULE

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, this morning's press reports efforts by a few—and I emphasize few—House Democrats efforts to torpedo meaningful congressional reform if their clique does not get to mandate the rules of the Senate. This is clearly a tactic to divert attention from doable reform.

Yesterday, they issued a threat to the committee to derail all reform efforts unless the other body's filibuster rule is changed to their satisfaction. There is, indeed, what I would call the designated-hitter for antireform efforts. The majority of the committee has worked in a collegial, bipartisan manner to attempt to achieve meaningful reform. The House chairman and vice chairman, our respected colleagues HAMILTON and DREIER, have admirably led a majority of the House contingent in a true statesmanlike manner.

Yesterday's self-serving, staged event should be seen for exactly what it is—an attempt to sabotage congressional reform. It is regrettable that a few, antireform Members on the Democrat side are willing to torpedo the genuine, and genuinely bipartisan reform efforts of the joint committee.

I could count the number of Members in this Chamber who do not want to see reform happen—but that is not necessary, Yesterday's actions are transparent.

#### THREAT TO LABOR STANDARDS BRINGS OPPOSITION TO NAFTA

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

Mr. HAMBURG. Mr. Speaker, Mexico currently imports 3.8 billion dollars worth of products into the United States duty free. This is possible because Mexico is a beneficiary of the generalized system of preferences [GSP].

One of the conditions for beneficiary status is the guarantee of internationally recognized labor standards, such as the right to organize and collectively bargain, guarantees of decent minimum wages, and prohibitions against child labor.

Under GSP law, independent parties can petition to have a country removed from the GSP for failure to enforce these standards. Such a petition was filed in June by the International Labor Rights Fund.

The United States Trade Representative first delayed consideration, and then rejected the petition based on the assumption that the NAFTA will improve labor standards in Mexico.

NAFTA does nothing of the kind. As drafted, the labor supplemental is weaker than the GSP. Where the GSP conditions duty-free access to our mar-

kets on the recognition of labor rights, the NAFTA does not. There is no independent petition procedure, the review process is more arduous, and the penalties are weaker.

The GSP represents the correct direction for our trade policy. The NAFTA represents a step backward.

#### THE NEED FOR CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

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

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, first you proclaim in the House that October is reform month. Then you proclaim the last week of October as reform week. And now, you indicate that the Joint Committee on Reorganization of Congress should be extended into next year.

This is the irony of all ironies. A committee to eliminate committees, is extended further beyond its expiration date.

Mr. Speaker, a couple of democratic members of the Committee on the Reorganization of Congress now want to use the Senate filibuster rule as a condition for reform action, while they fully realize it will mean deadlock.

Here Congress goes again. Trying to proclaim action, when in reality nothing is going to happen.

#### CONGRESSIONALLY IMPOSED STAFFING LIMITS FOR THE OFFICE OF HOUSING ENTERPRISE OVERSIGHT

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

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to call the attention of my colleagues to recent developments in the continuing struggle to protect the public against the financial risks associated with the activities of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, the two largest Government-sponsored enterprises.

Last year, in an effort to ensure the financial safety and soundness of these two housing industry giants, Congress created the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight [OFHEO], and required this new office to develop comprehensive risk-based capital standards by the end of 1994.

The establishment and enforcement of meaningful capital standards for these two federally chartered corporations is critically important because, while they pose no immediate risk to taxpayers, they remain two of the most thinly capitalized financial institutions in the country. Their current level of capitalization is well below that required of all other federally chartered banks and thrifts.

At the time the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight was established I expressed my concern that

the regulator lacked the independence and stature necessary to properly monitor and regulate the financial operations of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. I still have these concerns, and while I hope they prove misplaced, the recent congressional actions to cap the staffing of OFHEO to only 45 employees should be troubling to any objective observer of this situation.

Clearly, it is impossible for 45 employees to effectively oversee Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, whose combined assets exceed \$1 trillion. By comparison, the Office of Thrift Supervision has over 2,500 employees to oversee financial institutions with an asset base of \$800 billion and the Comptroller of the Currency has over 3,600 employees supervising institutions with a \$2 trillion asset base.

Aida Alvarez, the newly appointed Director of OFHEO, has already expressed her concern that this congressionally limited level of staffing will be insufficient. Having short-changed this new agency, Members should not be surprised when we later learn of delays in developing and implementing the required risk-based capital standards.

Let me also observe that this is exactly the kind of micromanagement about which the Reagan, Bush, and Clinton administrations have complained, and which Vice President GORE highlighted in the administration's recently released "National Performance Review." Even more troubling, this is exactly the kind of regulatory interference that undermined the ability of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation to regulate the thrift industry.

Mr. Speaker, it may not be politically expedient to irritate Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac by subjecting them to aggressive financial scrutiny, and assessing them for the cost of such oversight. It also may not be politically expedient to support the hiring of more Federal employees at a time when there is such a hue and cry from all quarters to cut the size of Government. But, Mr. Speaker, let me remind all my colleagues that, if either of these two corporations ever gets into financial trouble and requires special assistance, as has happened in the past, it certainly won't be politically expedient to vote for the bailout that will inevitably occur. At that time I doubt the public will be impressed with this unfortunate instance of congressional meddling.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would note that as troubling as this action is, it has probably not yet done serious damage. OFHEO is just getting started, and currently has only a handful of employees. However, at such time as OFHEO becomes fully operational and Director Alvarez determines that additional staff is needed, I hope that we will fully support her request. To do less could seriously undermine the in-

tended purpose of the legislation creating OFHEO as an independent regulator and will ultimately threaten the integrity of our entire system of housing finance.

Somebody, somewhere ought to "ride herd" on Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, good agencies but agencies which must have proper capital reserve standards.

#### HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, for the 182 million Americans presently covered by private health insurance, health care reform need not involve a reduction of services, more bureaucracy, higher taxes, or diminished freedom of choice. In fact, there is a simple, easy-to-implement proposal that gives individual Americans more power over their personal health care than they have had in 30 years.

The solution, Mr. Speaker, is Medisave. Medisave is a common-sense idea that protects families from catastrophic medical expense. It provides them with a powerful new incentive to manage their own health needs responsibly. It keeps doctors working for patients, not for bureaucrats. And it restores badly needed competition to the health care market.

Ultimately, the question that each one of us must ask is how much power over our individual lives do we want to assign to big government. Personally, my confidence is in the individual, the family, private institutions. And I, frankly, find it ironic that a President who correctly recognizes that our Government is broken and needs to be reinvented would trust that same broken Government to fix the Nation's health care industry.

□ 1030

#### TIME FOR A NATIONAL DEBATE ON AMERICA'S FOREIGN POLICY

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

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, the individual crises in Somalia, Haiti, and Bosnia are indeed symptoms of a larger national problem. In the post-cold-war period, this Nation is largely without a vision of what it is we want to achieve in the world, how we will do it, and what prices we are prepared to pay.

In the cold war, it was contain communism. In the Persian Gulf war, it was to assure that naked aggression was not rewarded. Now it is time for President Clinton, with all the clarity that he brought to the health care debate and the certainty of deficit reduction, to come before this Congress and begin a new debate. What is it we want to achieve in the world? To protect hu-

manity? To assure the protection of democracy? What relationships will we have with international organizations, and what prices are we prepared to bear?

Until and unless this Nation has that vision, we indeed may stumble from international crisis to international crisis, with parents unsure of why they are losing children, taxpayers unsure of why they are spending dollars. It is time for that debate nationally to begin.

#### HEALTH CARE: GOOD INTENTIONS ARE NOT ENOUGH

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, weeks ago, the administration began its campaign to reform the Nation's health care system.

We cannot let a Washington public relations blitz take us too far from what we already know about health care. We must acknowledge that problems exist, and that these must be addressed.

However, we must also remember that America's health care system has many more strong points than weaknesses.

Republicans have introduced health care reform legislation in both this Congress and in the last one. Our plan focuses on our health care system's strengths.

Our plan endeavors to raise the parts of the American health care system that fall short of these strengths, not cap its strengths in hopes of removing its weaknesses.

Bringing good intentions to this debate is not enough. We have to get it right.

To do that, we must first keep it right for the vast majority of Americans for whom health care is working well.

#### HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, by the time I finish this brief speech, 46 Americans will have lost their health care insurance. That is a national embarrassment. Another embarrassment is the fact that the United States has a higher rate of infant mortality than 20 other nations, including Japan and Canada. If we want to lower our infant mortality rate we must focus on preventive care. We must work with young women so they understand the importance of prenatal care.

I am pleased to say that President Clinton is doing this in his health security plan. This reform initiative will

include a schedule of preventive screenings, tests, and checkups covered in only a few of today's health insurance policies. The plan will also encourage new research initiatives in the child health care area, including birth defects, prenatal care, and adolescent health.

Mr. Speaker, we must move ahead. We must reform our health care system, if not for us, then for the future of our country—our children.

#### AMERICA SHOULD LEARN FROM NEW JERSEY'S DISASTROUS TAX EXPERIMENT

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

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Speaker, if the States are indeed the laboratories of democracy, then New Jersey is one laboratory that blew up because of an experiment that was attempted by our Governor, former Congressman Jim Florio.

In 1990, Governor Florio increased taxes in New Jersey by \$2.8 billion. At the time, this was the largest tax hike in any State in history. New Jersey government truly demonstrated Ronald Reagan's observation that government is like a baby with an endless appetite at one end and no sense of responsibility at the other.

At the time when the Nation has created 3.2 million new jobs, New Jersey has lost 277,000 jobs. That is failure created by destructive taxation.

Two hundred seventy-seven thousand jobs killed. New Jersey and the Nation should learn from the Garden State's disastrous tax experiment.

#### INTRODUCTION OF THE FRONTLINE MEDICAL EDUCATION ACT

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

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to introduce legislation that allows community health centers more opportunity to serve as medical training sites for new primary care doctors.

This proposal allows centers with approved residency programs to receive medical education funds directly.

It is time we broaden the sites available for new doctors to gain experience. Right now, only 20 percent of new physicians are entering the primary care field. We need greater emphasis on education and training in community-based sites to change that.

Developing community-based centers with greater emphasis on teaching will help move the extra burden of primary care out of the hospital and let hospitals focus on what they were meant to do: save lives and provide treatment for serious illness.

The Frontline Medical Education Act lays the groundwork for this shift by providing reimbursements to community health centers.

Mr. Speaker, primary care training should take place where it will most often be practiced. This bill lets that happen.

#### SHORT-TERM CONTINUING RESOLUTION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1994

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, Congress again has failed in its most basic duty under our Constitution—to provide comprehensive spending measures for the Federal Government. Today, we will consider yet another stop-gap spending measure, because we have failed to act on time. This time, we are over three weeks late.

In an effort to help curb this sort of irresponsibility, I have introduced H.R. 1922, the Congressional Pay for Performance Act. My bill would require Congress to pass the other 12 general appropriation bills before the appropriation for the legislative branch.

The intent of my bill is simple. I think it is outrageous for Congress to approve money for its own operations or our own salaries while we consistently delay, avoid, and fail to approve many regular appropriation bills by the end of the fiscal year.

We almost yearly bring the Government to a halt and create anxiety among the beneficiaries of Federal programs—while we approve our own budget months ahead of the October 1 deadline. My bill would not cure all institutional flaws, but it would represent a change in thinking and attitude. I think people would prefer to see Congress step to the back of the line for a change.

#### MOVE TO MEXICO OR GO OUT OF BUSINESS

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

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, North Jersey was the center of a great apparel and textile manufacturing industry. Much of that remains in small companies which provide jobs to thousands of workers.

Recently, I was approached by a constituent who urged me to oppose NAFTA. He was not a labor leader or a factory worker. He was a small businessman, one of many apparel manufacturers in my area. He employs 250 people. He showed me this letter sent to him by a Mexican trade group urging him to move his plant to Mexico.

This letter says, "Today in Mexico, one dollar buys \* \* \*." It continues by

encouraging my constituent to relocate his business to Mexico in order to find, and here I quote, a "low cost workforce for less than a dollar an hour that is not 6,000 miles away."

My constituent said, "Herb, if you pass NAFTA, I have only two choices—move my plant to Mexico or go out of business."

Dozens of other small companies in North Jersey are in exactly the same boat. Either way, we lose thousands of jobs—jobs we cannot afford to lose.

Mr. Speaker, this NAFTA is a bad deal for American workers.

#### URGING PASSAGE OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 238, TO FULLY INVESTIGATE SCANDALS IN THE HOUSE

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

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that some Members of this Congress are finally waking up, and I hope that everyone else soon will, to the House Post Office scandal and the stories of embezzlement by Members of this House. Yesterday a bipartisan panel of our Committee on House Administration finally called for the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to get involved on one part of this scandal, missing payroll records. That is a good start, but it is not enough. Let us not mistake the big picture. Let us not ignore the embezzlement charges, charges that Members of this House stole tens of thousands of dollars through the House Post Office.

Since August, I have called for the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to fully investigate this issue. Now the news this week is that it is going to be a long, long time before the Justice Department can be expected to act, but their probe is getting bigger. Meanwhile, a cloud remains over this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, the longer we bury our heads in the sand, the dirtier it makes us look. We have the duty to look into all the charges and to have the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct do so. Let us pass House Resolution 238 and get to the bottom of the full scandal.

□ 1040

#### CONGRATULATIONS TO BPW/USA ON 75TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate BPW/USA as it begins its 75th anniversary year. I am a member at large of this organization, and I want to tell you and my colleagues a little about its esteemed history.

Founded in 1919—a year before women had the right to vote—BPW/USA's long history of advocacy on behalf of women's equality started when women in similar clubs across the country banded together to form a federation.

BPW/USA was one of the original supporters of child labor laws and the first women's organization to endorse Alice Paul's equal rights amendment in 1937. BPW/USA took part in the battle for the establishment of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission in 1972, the Equal Credit Opportunity Act of 1974 and the Women's Educational Equity Act of 1974.

BPW/USA has additionally led the fight in passing much of the Nation's landmark civil and women's rights legislation including: the Women's Business Ownership Act; the Child Care Act of 1991; the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and 1991; the Equal Pay Act; and the Equal Credit Opportunity Act.

This organization represents approximately 80,000 members in 2,800 clubs nationwide. There are BPW/USA members in every congressional district, Mr. Speaker. I hope you and my colleagues will join me in saluting this fine organization.

**THE NEED FOR A BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT**

(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, yesterday's Washington Post sought to defend the indefensible—rallying around the status quo budget policies in Congress. The Post says "a balanced budget amendment would destroy political accountability." What political accountability? As far as I can see there is no discernible accountability for our budget crisis. For 40 years the Democrat leadership has controlled Congress, and our national debt has skyrocketed. Where is the accountability? What about the \$4-plus-trillion-and-rising debt we face? How about the hundreds of billions of dollars of Government waste each year? What about the ease with which legislated ceilings are lifted to accommodate still more spending? Our current system just does not work. We are doing our third CR today. Congress is woefully incapable of balancing the Federal budget on its own. The Post calls the balanced budget a simplistic and dangerous idea. Perhaps it is the Post that is simplistic and dangerous.

**AMTRAK STATION CLOSINGS**

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

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly come before the House again

today to bring to my colleagues attention a problem that has arisen at Amtrak. It seems as though Amtrak has unilaterally taken steps to close some 15 stations across the country in anticipation of what they foresee as a shortfall in funding provided by Congress.

Sure, we all agree that cutbacks have to be made in many different areas to get our fiscal house in order. Amtrak should have to participate in that downsizing as well. However, I encourage you to ask Amtrak how many officials are being eliminated in its corporate hierarchy. Would you believe none? While none of the highly paid executives and lawyers at Amtrak's headquarters will be affected, our front line station managers and employees are getting the ax. If a station is losing money, I have no argument with closing it. But if it is making money, it is absurd to close it.

The very last thing a business would do when trying to get its financial house in order would be to close the doors where the money comes in. However, Amtrak has made that choice. That is no way to run a railroad.

I encourage you to sign a letter that I will be sending to Amtrak today to demand that they change this stupid decision.

**RESTRICTIONS ON FEE FOR SERVICE IN THE CLINTON HEALTH CARE PLAN: CAN YOU CHOOSE YOUR PERSONAL PHYSICIAN?**

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

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, Americans believe that the freedom to choose their own physician is of primary importance in evaluating the various health reform proposals. When an individual is facing a life-threatening moment of decision. That person wants to know that they, and not some faceless Government bureaucrat, can choose their personal physician. The administration knows this and has stated over and over that the fee-for-service option must be offered to all. But when you work through the fine print of the September 7 draft, the fee-for-service option appears to shrink and then disappear, just like our doctor friend on the chart. For in the Clinton plan, the proposed fee-for-service actually eliminates many of the elements of fee-for-service. Let's walk with our fee-for-service [FFS] doctor through these stop signs, or, as Ira Magaziner would say, "toll gates," and see if we can still find our FFS doctor after this long and tortuous journey.

First there are a number of ways that States can waive a fee-for-service [FFS] option. These include, first, the FFS plan is not viable—page 62, September 7, 1993 draft; second there is in-

sufficient provider or beneficiary interest—page 62; or third, the State elects a single-payer system—page 54.

If FFS makes it past the State waivers, it then faces a number of alliance restrictions. First, even if many FFS plans want to contract with an alliance, the alliance can limit FFS plans to three—page 61. Second, an alliance may refuse to contract with plans that exceed the average premium by 20 percent—page 60. This will almost exclusively affect higher cost FFS plans. Finally, the alliance may exclude any plan that might cause an alliance to go over budget—page 61. Again, this would primarily affect higher price FFS plans.

Now there are two more alliance restrictions on fee-for-service plans. First, there must be a mandatory fee schedule, and second, no-balance billing is allowed.

But we are not finished. The State has the following additional authorities. First, States have the authority to impose prospective budgeting on the FFS plan—page 62; second, it can establish spending targets—page 63; and third, it can periodically review utilization and reduce payments to physicians for services to comply with its budget—page 63. I think it is safe to say that no physician or insurer has ever seen or participated in a FFS plan with these types of restrictions.

At this point in our journey there is literally very little fee-for-service option left. After passing through these four stop signs, FFS has been whittled away to nothing. It is like telling the American public you can choose a FFS plan as long as it "walks and talks" like an HMO. Interestingly, the Washington Post October 12 poll shows that the American people have not been fooled. The lack of freedom of choice is identified as the public's No. 1 complaint with the Clinton plan. I am sure we will come to the same conclusion—that is, fee-for-service under the Clinton plan is an illusion rather than reality.

**RESTRICTIONS ON FEE-FOR-SERVICE: CAN YOU REALLY CHOOSE YOUR DOCTOR?**

**STATE WAIVERS**

1. FFS not financially viable.
2. Insufficient Provider or Beneficiary interest.
3. State elects for a single-payer system.

**STATE AUTHORITY**

1. Prospective budgeting on FFS.
2. Spending targets.
3. Provider review of utilization and fee reduction.

**ALLIANCE RESTRICTIONS**

1. Alliance may limit to 3 FFS plans.
2. Alliance may refuse any plan that exceeds average premium by 20%.
3. May exclude any plan that might cause alliance to go over budget.

**FEE-FOR-SERVICE UNDER ALLIANCE**

1. Mandatory Fee Schedule.
2. No Balance Billing.

#### NAFTA: FEWER JOBS FOR AFRICAN-AMERICANS

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

Miss COLLINS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, as the pro-NAFTA forces turn up the heat to pass the trade treaty, with promises of renewed vitality in the American economy, I want to remind my colleagues that NAFTA will not mean economic vitality for many of my constituents.

Indeed, for many African-Americans and other minorities, NAFTA will mean job loss, not job gain. This is because even without NAFTA, the U.S. labor market is moving away from its blue-collar, manufacturing jobs base and into a more white-collar, service-industry economy.

NAFTA will liberalize access to Mexico manufacturing. This, in my view, will cause the number of jobs traditionally held by blue-collar workers in this country to evaporate. Because minorities are concentrated disproportionately in these jobs, we will see unemployment among minorities shoot up.

At 14.6 percent, unemployment among African-Americans is already more than double that of other Americans. NAFTA will not be a job producer for my constituents. It will be a job loser.

I call on my colleagues to reject NAFTA. It will close the door to a good job at a good wage.

#### DEMOCRAT CONGRESSIONAL REFORM PLAN PITIFUL AND PATHETIC

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, why would several senior Democrats set out now to torpedo congressional reform?

First, time is running out. The committee ceases to exist at the end of the year. Sabotaging it now assures that nothing gets done; congressional reform dies.

Second, the Democrats' plan to reform the Congress is so weak that it will not pass the laugh test. Republican members of the joint committee had our first look at the proposed bill yesterday. Only two words come to mind to describe their plan: pitiful and pathetic.

So some Democrats evidently have decided that the best politics is to sabotage the whole process.

Congressional reform is about to die. It is going to die a slow, agonizing death. How sad, but how typical of 40 years of Democrat mismanagement of the Congress.

#### JAPAN'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE ARAB-ISRAELI PEACE PROCESS

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

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, when Yitzak Rabin and Yassir Arafat shook hands on the White House lawn, we were gratified that a new era of peaceful resolution of conflict was now possible.

We know that the process of making that peace in the Middle East must involve nations outside the region.

Besides the United States, one nation with a role to play undoubtedly will be Japan. The question is: How, exactly, will Japan's impact be felt?

As one possible answer, I cite the work of Prof. Yasumasa Kuroda of the University of Hawaii Political Science Department. Professor Kuroda has prepared a study entitled "Japan in a New World Order: Contributing to the Arab-Israeli Peace Process."

I will submit a summary of this work as an extension of my remarks. It is well worth studying and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues and policymakers everywhere.

#### WHO'S ON FIRST AND WHAT IS ON SECOND?

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

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, with the World Series going on, I am one Member that would like to know who is on first and what is on second.

A couple of weeks ago our new Commissioner of INS was quoted in the Washington Post. Let me read:

Over the past year she has repeatedly argued that even if NAFTA meets its goals of promoting economic development in Mexico, it could actually increase the flow of illegal immigration for up to 20 years.

This morning in the Washington Post the President of the United States, the gentleman who appointed her Commissioner on INS, was quoted as saying if NAFTA is rejected it "would result in a flood of illegal immigrants."

Further, if rejected, "The trade agreement would encourage more Mexicans to enter the United States illegally in search of better jobs."

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time that we ask the administration who is on first and what is on second.

□ 1050

#### NAFTA: THE LARGEST THREAT TO THE U.S. ECONOMY AND AMERICAN WORKERS

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address an issue that serves to be the single largest threat to the U.S. economy and the American worker—the present NAFTA agreement.

NAFTA supporters argue this agreement will benefit the United States by creating thousands of jobs. What these people admittedly fail to recognize is that NAFTA will send hundreds of thousands of needed American jobs to Mexico. NAFTA is a job loser for the United States and a bust for the American worker. The United States cannot afford to lose one single additional job to our foreign competitors, much less make it easier for United States jobs to be pulled out from underneath American workers and sent to Mexico.

For my constituents a lost job is a lost job. It is hard for me to justify to these individuals who have lost their jobs because of increased imports or their company has moved out of the United States, that NAFTA by reducing tariffs and encouraging more imports will have a positive impact on them.

Mr. Speaker, millions of American workers have lost their jobs to cheap foreign labor and increased imports. NAFTA through reduced tariffs and encouraged imports will only expedite the mass exodus of needed American jobs. For me, the choice to oppose NAFTA is plain and simple. The United States must have fair trade. We in the Congress have the opportunity and the power to halt further assaults on American workers by opposing this NAFTA.

#### CLINTON PUSHES TO WEAKEN CHILD PORN LAW

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the Clinton Justice Department has quietly, and—I would submit—shamefully, turned its back on children by seeking to reinterpret, loosen, and weaken existing Federal child pornography law.

In brief, the Justice Department has petitioned the U.S. Supreme Court in *Knox versus United States* to remand the case of a man convicted under Federal child pornography law back to a lower court for review. The Clinton brief argues that a weak, ineffective standard be applied in this precedent setting case than that which was affirmed by the Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit. If Mr. Clinton prevails in defending a convicted pedophile efforts to curb this hideous form of child abuse will be seriously undermined.

The Clinton policy seriously weakens law enforcement efforts to crack down on child porn in this country by inventing a new two-part test of what constitutes a crime. Under Clinton,

both criteria must be met for a successful prosecution. The Clinton administration's policy would transfer the burden from the pornographer's intent in arousing a pedophile to the actions of the exploited child. This clearly undermines the meaning of the law as supported by the 1989 case *United States versus Villard* which stated that lasciviousness depends on the intention of the photographer of the material to elicit a sexual response from the viewer. For example, sexually explicit photographs of sleeping children or videos of unclothed children innocently playing on a beach who are secretly filmed by a pedophile could not be said to depict minors "engaged in conduct of lasciviously exhibiting their genitals or pubic areas."

The brief also argues that nudity or visibility of the child's genitalia or pubic area is required. This reinterpretation of the Nation's child pornography statute by Mr. Clinton would shield from prosecution a sizable element within the child pornography industry. This immunity, however, would be conferred to the purveyors and users of kiddie smut at the direct expense of vulnerable children. The court of appeals correctly summed up congressional intent on this point in stating:

The harm Congress attempted to eradicate by enacting the child pornography laws is present when a photographer unnaturally focuses on a minor child's clothed genital area with the obvious intent to produce an image sexually arousing to pedophiles. \* \* \* Our interpretation simply declines to create an absolute immunity for pornographers who pander to pedophiles by using as their subjects children whose genital areas are barely covered.

It is outrageous to me that the Clinton Justice Department seeks to have our current standard, designed to protect children from exploitation, declared "null and void."

Patrick Trueman, head of the Child Exploitation and Obscenity Office at the Bush Justice Department, notes that the Clinton brief "writes a recipe for 'legal' child pornography, i.e., child pornography that the Reno Justice Department will no longer prosecute. \* \* \* With its new interpretation of the Federal child pornography law, the Department gives to pedophiles what they could never get from Congress."

The pornographic tapes which were the basis of the Knox case and which would likely receive immunity under the Clinton Justice Department, were described by the Third Circuit Court of Appeals as containing:

\* \* \* various vignettes of teenage and preteen females, between the ages of 10 and 17, striking provocative poses for the camera. The children were obviously being directed by someone off-camera. All of the children wore bikini bathing suits, leotards, underwear or other abbreviated attire while they were being filmed. . . . The photographer would zoom in on the children's pubic and genital area and display a close-up for an extended period of time.

This week 130 Members from both sides of the aisle—have sent a letter to Attorney General Janet Reno urging her to abandon this morally indefensible position. The Clinton Justice Department has devised a thoroughly flawed legal reinterpretation of congressional intent, has radically reversed the Bush prosecution strategy as it relates to child pornography, and as a consequence has concocted a formula for creating a new protected category of child pornography which will open the floodgates to the exploitation of children.

#### HAITIAN EMIGRATION BEFORE AND AFTER THE COUP D'ETAT

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

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, several years ago the people of Haiti had their first democratically held election and elected President Aristide by 67 percent of the vote. During that period of time, 38 people left that country by boats over the course of his tenure. Lieutenant Cedras and Lieutenant Colonel Francois overthrew the Government, and since that time 40,000 Haitians left there to come to the United States until our embargo was placed there in January.

I commend the President's resolve to return President Aristide, but actually deplore the role the CIA is playing at the present time in discrediting President Aristide.

I call on President Clinton to use the week of October 24, the 48th anniversary of the United Nations, to speak to the American people about the new world order, the multinational approach to world problems and our support for the United Nations.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The Chair would caution Members they cannot refer to the gallery during their remarks.

#### FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS ON REFORMING THE CONGRESS

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, for the last half hour a number of Republican Members of the House have been hyperventilating because I and two other Democrats yesterday held a press conference demanding that the first order of business under reform be the elimination of the filibuster and the practice of holds in the other body.

I want to read the language of the resolution which we submitted to the caucus yesterday:

Because the first obligation of any legislative body is to do its work, the Democratic caucus hereby recommends to the members of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress that reforms be fashioned to assure the right of the majority to obtain a vote on key legislation by substantial modification of the Senate filibuster and that it provide recommendations for the elimination of the anonymous system of Senate holds before it produces recommendations to substantially enhance minority powers.

Mr. Speaker, I make no apology for that recommendation; I insist on it. I insist on it.

I think that we have an absolute right to expect that a majority in either body in this Congress can obtain a vote on crucial national matters. If that is not a legitimate matter that ought to be at the forefront of reform efforts, I do not know what is.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would caution Members not to refer to the procedures of the other body.

#### "NO" ON NAFTA

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

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, as I was driving to the Capitol, I listened to two news items on National Public Radio—the first on Staten Island's efforts to secede from New York City and the second on companies' urging their employees to pressure Washington on NAFTA.

I wondered if there was a connection between the stories.

During my 9 years here, many measures have come to the floor that have severe negative consequences for the United States economy.

However, there have been few occasions that companies have asked their employees to lobby us.

We have seen destructive tax increases, bills that regulate, that render property useless by regulation, and still no serious lobbying efforts from U.S. business.

But on NAFTA there are.

Congress should take note of these trends, and try to understand why our businesses are trying to improve business conditions outside of U.S. borders.

Are the NPR stories related? With higher taxes, overly restrictive environmental mandates, and unbelievable endless regulations, it appears American companies believe they can no longer do business here and are trying to secede from the United States to go where they are welcome.

### SEGREGATING OUT UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICES FROM THE UNIFIED BUDGET

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

Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Representative JILL LONG and I will be introducing a bill next week to segregate unemployment compensation and employment services from the unified budget. As all the Members know, employers are currently financing these programs through a payroll tax in order to insure that there is quality employment services provided to the people of this country. What they find is that their investment is being used to offset the deficit and these programs are being micromanaged by Congress. This is something that always troubled me as a State legislator. We know that in order to have a vibrant economy, employees need to be aware of job opportunities and employers need to be able to readily find qualified employees. That is why I ask Members on both sides of the aisle to join Representative JILL LONG and me in this effort.

### FOREIGN POLICY PERFORMANCE OF CLINTON ADMINISTRATION

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

Mr. LAZIO. Mr. Speaker, my constituents and I are increasingly concerned with the foreign policy performance of the Clinton administration.

It is apparent that we now have a President who believes foreign policy can be delegated. This wrong headed notion is only made worse when foreign policy is delegated to subordinates who lack vision.

Mr. Speaker, it is possible to sail a boat into the wind, but only if the vessel has a keel, a captain, and a capable crew. Without any of these attributes, the boat will only drift aimlessly with the winds and the currents.

Leading the world is much the same. It requires a leader who is both engaged and knows where he wants to go. And it requires a competent team.

That we know all this from past experience is a blessing. That we know this from recent experience is a tragedy.

□ 1100

### REINVENTING GOVERNMENT: GAO AUDIT SAYS NO EFFECT

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, when you hear the White House talk about

reinventing Government, please ask President Clinton and Vice President GORE just what it is they hope to create. If they tell you its a leaner and cleaner Federal bureaucracy, please tell them they have more work to do—lots more.

The General Accounting Office recently concluded that the President's executive order in February to improve efficiency and productivity in the Federal bureaucracy will do neither.

The GAO report says, and I quote:

The order's required reductions as envisioned probably will not effect significantly the federal budget deficit or improve the efficiency and effectiveness of government programs.

It looks to me like the administration's path to reinventing government is paved with reinvented history. Mr. Speaker, measuring by bills sponsored and by votes cast, Vice President GORE was the Senate's biggest spender during his tenure there. And, Mr. Speaker, President Clinton will not reinvent Government by simply telling the Federal bureaucracy to be more productive.

The GAO report illustrates that, rather than really take on the Federal bureaucracy, the White House has merely asked the bureaucrats to change the way they shuffle their paperwork.

### WESTHILL HIGH, AN OUTSTANDING BLUE RIBBON SCHOOL

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor educators in my district who have achieved a great honor. Westhill High School has been named an outstanding blue ribbon school, one of 260 across the Nation to be so honored, and I am very proud.

I am proud because our two oldest children go to Westhill High School. And I am proud because I, as a parent, have played a role in establishing Westhill as an excellent learning institution. That does not mean I am taking credit. Quite the contrary. The credit is due to the administration and the teachers, the support staff and others who actually encourage parents to join in the project of teaching our children. Parents are part of the team. Parents are welcome and parents have access to the team of teachers dedicated to the kids they teach.

The educators on faculty are deeply aware that academic motivation comes from home and the classroom. They are ready to refer students to personnel counselors or career counselors. They are aware that higher motivation creates demands and higher expectations of their services. They welcome this challenge. They attribute much of the success, represented in numbers of

graduates, college attendance and other statistics, to the participation of students in extracurricular clubs and activities. All in all, Westhill creates a community environment of caring and stimulation.

The district boasts a strong program for drug and alcohol abuse prevention provided through our own programs and those of various community agencies.

I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting the principal, Mr. Richard J. Cavallaro, and the entire faculty and staff at Westhill. We recognize their achievement and we encourage them and all other schools to strive for excellence every day.

### SELLING NAFTA

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

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, I am selling NAFTA. I have noticed in my business career and my legal career that when someone is coming to sell me something, if they had enough confidence in the particular project that they wanted to sell that they would say, "Look, you can get out of it anytime you want."

That impressed me then. It impresses me now.

What I want to emphasize today is that fact that this NAFTA agreement allows for a 6-month termination notice. In other words, if we get into this thing with Mexico and Canada and we do not see that combining the largest economic bloc in the world is beneficial to us, we can get out of it.

I would like for the opposition to understand that is how much confidence we have in this particular program. That is what we have built into it and anytime that they want to get out of it, they can, if in fact they get the support of this body. That is confidence. That is a compelling reason to support NAFTA and that is one of the reasons, one of the many reasons why I am supporting it and I hope my colleagues do the same.

### CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2750, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Mr. CARR. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2750) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 18, 1993, at page H8066.)

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CARR].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CARR of Michigan. 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 the conference report on the bill, H.R. 2750, and the amendments in disagreement thereto now being considered.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Transportation of the Committee on Appropriations brings to the House today the conference report on the 1994 Transportation appropriations bill. I believe this is a package that virtually all Members will be able to support. As the membership knows, this bill has not been without controversy this year. This conference agreement represents a good faith effort to accommodate all the competing pressures that the subcommittee faced in putting together the final version of this legislation.

Before getting into a few specifics, I want to acknowledge the tremendous contribution made to our final product by the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia, FRANK WOLF. His advice and counsel not only during the conference, but throughout the many months we have worked on this legislation has been invaluable, not only to the committee but to this Member personally, and I want to thank the gentleman.

Let me also salute the other members of the subcommittee, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SABO, Mr. PRICE, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. DELAY, and Mr. REGULA, for their valuable contributions. Also, I want to commend the chairman and ranking minority member of the Senate appropriations subcommittee for their efforts. Their cooperation and understanding made the task of resolving 187 issues in disagreement much easier than might otherwise have been the case.

I think most importantly, Mr. Speaker, I want to commend our fine and very valuable professional staff. We get a lot of the credit for doing what happens in the legislation, but it is the staff who spends the hours making preparation for hearings, making sure that the hearings have adequate and accurate transcripts, working on the myriad requests that come from Members and other staff, not to mention

the great Nation of taxpaying people interested in the welfare of their transportation systems. Our staff is of high quality, of high caliber, and high professional standards on both sides of the aisle, and without their help this bill simply would not have occurred.

Mr. Speaker, the conference agreement appropriates \$13.38 billion in new discretionary budget authority and assumes outlays of \$34.9 billion, virtually identical to the subcommittee's section 602(b) allocation. The total obligational authority provided in the bill, including limitations on obligations and exempt obligations in the highway program, is \$38.6 billion.

I want first to address the issue of high-speed rail. I know full well that this program is a very high priority within the administration. I know that some Members are disappointed that the conference agreement provides no funds for this new initiative. I am aware of comments that I am reported to be adamantly opposed to high-speed rail. That is not true. Let me repeat that. I am not opposed to high-speed rail. I am in favor of an incremental approach to high-speed rail. This conference agreement supports such an approach. It includes \$225 million for the Northeast Corridor Improvement Program and an additional \$195 million for Amtrak capital. The Northeast Corridor is the only high-speed corridor in the Nation. I believe the incremental approach should demonstrate the feasibility and economics of high-speed rail systems in a densely populated corridor before we finance routes around the country.

The principal reason we have not included funds for the high-speed rail initiative, though, is that the effort is not authorized. Let the committees of legislative jurisdiction complete their work and enact an authorization, and we on the Appropriations Committee will reconsider the issue. The potentially difficult matters such as freight railroad company liability and any requirements for prevailing wage rates should be resolved in the authorization process before money is provided for the program.

I would like briefly to address some of the major provisions in the bill.

It provides \$17.6 billion for the Federal-aid highway program, an increase of \$2.26 billion above the 1993 level, and that surely should be a welcome improvement to our infrastructure and to the creation of jobs.

It provides \$2.4 billion for transit formula grants, an increase of \$700 million above last year.

It provides \$1.785 billion for transit discretionary grants, as follows: \$357 million for buses and bus facilities, \$760 million for rail modernization, and \$668 million for section 3 new fixed guideway systems.

It provides fewer earmarks for special projects and allows greater discre-

tion for the Department of Transportation.

We have included \$100 million in unallocated funds for buses and bus facilities and \$45 million in unallocated funds for section 3 new starts.

We have appropriated less than half as much for specially earmarked highway projects as was done in 1993. We have provided no funding for unauthorized, airway science projects which direct funds to specific colleges and universities.

This has been a reform effort. This is a reform bill, and we will continue that effort next year as we approach our task in the further development and utilization of economically based criteria for the use of the taxpayers hard-earned dollars.

In line with the recommendation in Vice President GORE's Reinventing Government effort, the bill prohibits essential air service in communities less than 70 miles from a large or medium hub airport and with subsidy costs more than \$200 per passenger, with certain exceptions.

The bill provides \$1.69 billion for the FAA's Airport Improvement Program and it provides for the use of the airport priority status list for the last time.

We have included \$4.58 billion for the operation of the Federal Aviation Administration including \$15 million to continue the pay demonstration program through June 1994.

We have provided \$2.57 billion for operations of the Coast Guard, reflecting 98.5 percent of the amount requested.

Mr. Speaker, additional details of the bill are addressed in the conference report and joint explanatory statement of the managers.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I should mention one item agreed upon by the conferees that was inadvertently omitted from the conference agreement. It concerns the right-of-way revolving fund within the Federal Highway Administration. The statement of the managers should have indicated that the conferees agree upon the distribution of funds contained in the House report. Specifically, it is agreed that \$2.5 million is to be used for the Neuse River bridge in North Carolina and \$4 million for the Yuba City bridge in California.

Mr. Speaker, this agreement is a balanced compromise that protects the major provisions and interests of the House-passed bill. It has been developed in a bipartisan fashion with full participation by our conferees from the other side of the aisle. There have been certain major compromises and tough decisions to get us to this point. I believe the conference report deserves the Members' support and I strongly urge its adoption.

□ 1110

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 2750.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CARR], for his leadership and also, I might say, his persistence in bringing this conference report to the floor today after a number of challenges to the bill.

I think it is important that I say, if the gentleman does not want to say it himself, that I think history will demonstrate that what the chairman has done has made a difference and has made this committee better for it, as well as the entire Congress, and that is to develop criteria that we can look at for evaluating a project. We never had that, and now that this battle has taken place between the authorizing committee and the appropriation committee, it is my understanding that the authorizing committee will now have it, and this is positive. So whether it is in their bill or in our bill, I think the credit should be given to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CARR].

Second, it will do a number of other things, such as rescissions and things like that that for years never were talked about here. That precedent has now been established.

So I think the Congress ought to thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CARR] not only for this bill but also for really developing a whole new path, if you will, that hopefully other authorizing committees and appropriation committees will develop.

Without dwelling on the past, it need to be noted for the record that many transportation initiatives included in the original committee legislation fell victim to procedural disputes.

One example that comes quickly to mind is the request brought to us by the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER] concerning assistance in repairing a large crater on an interstate bridge in Jacksonville. This was an urgent safety problem, and I wish the committee could have assisted her. I think it is important that her constituents in Jacksonville know that no one worked harder than the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER] on this issue, and I am hopeful, after talking to the ranking member of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER], who is a fine Member, that the Committee on Public Works and Transportation will deal with Mrs. FOWLER's problem, because it is a serious problem, and I appreciate their willingness to look at it and help her.

There are numerous other examples of requests for assistance with critical transportation problems which will go unmet for this fiscal year. Obviously we regret that, and I want to express my hope that next year we can put

aside individual prerogatives of both the authorizers and the appropriators and instead perhaps deal with some of these critical problems.

Despite the setbacks, there is much to talk about that is good with regard to this bill. The conference report provides for \$34.9 billion to fund needed improvements in our Nation's transportation infrastructure. This includes all modes of transportation: highways, transit, railroads, and aviation. I believe that H.R. 2750 represents a good balance among the transportation modes. This balance is especially critical to the urban areas of our Nation that have difficult times with traffic and gridlock.

In allocating limited resources to provide for the Nation's mobility, the committee has tried to achieve the highest use of taxpayers' dollars.

In addition to helping the Nation move people and goods as efficiently as possible, the bill also seeks to do it as safely and as humanely as possible. The bill provides for the search-and-rescue efforts of the U.S. Coast Guard. It provides for the finest air traffic control system in the world, and for so many other things that are important to the country.

The bill also includes measures to hopefully prevent oil spills that often not only destroy fragile wildlife ecosystems, but people habitats as well.

There is another measure in the bill that I feel an obligation to tell our colleagues about and let them know that it is in this legislation. I am speaking of the provision which will provide \$150,000 to pay the legal expenses of the five White House Travel Office employees who were placed on administrative leave in the so-called Travelgate affair. In this matter—and I might say one of these individuals involved is a constituent of mine—Federal employees were accused of a crime, fired from their jobs without just cause, and publicly criticized for political gain. This then left these five career employees unemployed and saddled with thousands of dollars in legal fees. They have since been unfired and promised comparable jobs, but there is no current mechanism for ensuring them help with their legal bills.

I will also say that I will be introducing legislation to deal with this dilemma should it take place in the future. I plan to propose rectifying this problem with an amendment to the Back Pay Act, which currently only permits an employee to recover attorney fees if he or she has suffered a monetary loss. Since the five Travel Office employees were quickly reinstated once the White House got caught up in the media glare of this embarrassing goof, these employees have not suffered pay loss and are, therefore, ineligible to recover legal fees. Never mind that they have been

substantially harmed in reputation and standing in the community through all the adverse publicity. And I might say that all of them have legal fees in the range of \$30,000.

I have one last thing, and I want to be very careful as I say this, because I feel an obligation to the body and particularly to a constituent and to all Federal employees that could get caught up in this: I think someone from outside should look at this issue. The reason is that I just have an innate sense that some in the White House are looking to bring about a charge, perhaps a criminal charge, with regard to these individuals in order to say, "See, the reason we did this is because of this."

But I think the chairman of the subcommittee for being willing to help these Federal career employees with regard to this matter.

I would be remiss if I did not recognize in closing, Mr. Speaker, the long hours and yeoman work that have been provided by our staffs. I want to thank Del Davis, Rich Efford, Cheryl Smith, and Linda Muir of the majority staff, and Jan Powell and John Blazey of the minority staff for their work in bringing this bill to final passage.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to again let our colleagues know that the work that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CARR] has done will, I think, live on long after this bill and will be helpful in other appropriation bills, but particularly and perhaps even more importantly, in other authorization bills.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TALENT].

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the distinguished gentleman from Virginia yielding time to me, and I would like to engage him in a colloquy.

As the gentleman knows, last December the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration issued regulations requiring red and white reflective devices on the sides and backs of trailers with an overall width of 80 inches or more and a gross vehicle weight of more than 10,000 pounds. I understand the rule is effective on December 1, 1993.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, let me state that that is my understanding.

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Speaker, these regulations were promulgated in response to section 15 of the Motor Carriers Safety Act of 1990. That section directs the Secretary of Transportation to initiate a rulemaking that would make trucks more visible to motorists. The section did not mandate specific reflective materials or colors but was intended to permit flexibility for the owners and operators of the trailers.

Nevertheless, the Department mandated that all truck owners be required to place red and white stickers on their trucks.

Earlier this year, several organizations representing the trucking industry petitioned the Department to delay

implementation of this regulation for 6 months so that they could propose alternative colors to red and white.

□ 1120

These alternative colors would accomplish the same goal as the red and white stickers; in fact, there is some evidence that these colors would be easier for motorists to see.

Would the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] support this request to work with the department to gain a reprieve in implementation of these regulations so that a compromise can be reached?

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I am not a safety expert, but I think the gentleman makes a valid point. And I am interested in this issue. As the gentleman may know, I am working with the Federal Highway Administration on a truck safety initiative on the Capital Beltway because we have had so many accidents with regard to trucks and also death. I do not know the answer to this dilemma. But since we do not have an appointed NHTSA Administrator, I would urge Secretary Pena to sit down with the trucking industry before this regulation takes effect. I would hope this matter could be worked out in a way that does not compromise highway safety, but in fact enhances highway safety.

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Speaker, I know of the gentleman's fine work in that area. I look forward to working with the gentleman, and thank him for yielding.

Mr. CARR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PRICE], a veteran member of the subcommittee.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2750, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for fiscal year 1994.

I want to begin by commending our chairman, BOB CARR, and the new ranking minority member on this subcommittee, FRANK WOLF, for their work this year. Mr. CARR and Mr. WOLF have continued the bipartisan tradition of this subcommittee, and the conference agreement reflects this spirit of cooperation and comity. I also want to thank the fine professional staff of this subcommittee, Del Davis, Rich Efford, Linda Muir, and Cheryl Smith for their critical contributions to this bill.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today increases the efficiency and effectiveness of the Federal investment in transportation. These investments are critical to economic growth in our country; without them, our roads would be more congested and less safe, our airways more dangerous, and our public transportation less efficient.

I am particularly grateful for the recognition of North Carolina priorities in

this bill. Under the bill, highway planning and construction, public transportation, and railroad travel in North Carolina will be improved. North Carolina is trying to meet the challenges posed by its diverse economy and geography, and I am glad the committee has been supportive of their transportation goals and needs.

The bill also responds to our Nation's pressing need to reduce the Federal deficit. The bill is almost \$1.5 billion below the administration's request for transportation spending. This has made it necessary for the committee to make some tough decisions and set some real priorities.

In setting these priorities, the subcommittee took a number of other steps critical to improve transportation decisionmaking in this country. The Coast Guard, which has had difficulty measuring the impact of their work, is directed to develop better methods of evaluating their performance. The research and development budget of the Coast Guard is particularly inadequate in this regard, and the subcommittee has devoted particular attention to developing performance measures in this area.

The subcommittee also made the decision not to fund the airway sciences program. I have been concerned to improve education and training programs in technology fields in this country, but I feel that this particular program has lost its sense of purpose. It has been used by some to fund projects that do not deserve to be in a transportation, or for that matter an education, bill. Until this program can regain its integrity, it does not deserve funding.

In closing, I urge my colleagues to support this conference report. It is a good bill and one which will make key transportation investments in a cost-effective manner.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and the chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CARR], have worked long and hard on this bill. I would just point out from the standpoint of an authorizer and somebody who watches this that there are a couple of problems I do have.

Mr. Speaker, we are \$2.3 billion in increase over current spending, which is a 6 percent increase, which gives some of us some pause. Also there are a couple of areas that I think give me a little bit of concern.

We are above the House-passed level on the mag lev. You have got \$20 million in here out of the general fund for the magnetic levitation system, when the House-passed had zero in it.

For the intelligent vehicle highway system research, you are funded at

\$90.3 million, which is \$56.3 million over the available authorization and \$4 million over the House-passed version. In that particular instance, I am particularly concerned that we are pretty far over where the authorization level is.

Then when I looked down through there and found \$57 million of unauthorized, or I should not say unauthorized, of unrequested highway project earmarked money for the Appalachian corridor improvement project, that also gave me a little bit of concern, because I know the chairman has been very concerned about the whole business of earmarks. Here we are allowing the Senate then to come back and throw an earmark into this bill. That, I think, is really a matter of concern.

Then, finally, I am concerned about the \$908.7 million for Amtrak and the related subsidies to that, which is \$210.7 million over the House-passed version of the bill and \$71.6 million over the request.

I say that as someone who in the last week or two has been faced with an Amtrak decision to close down rail service in my area that is not getting a Federal subsidy. Because what has become apparent to me in the course of dealing with them is this is a railroad being run for the subsidies, not as a business. When we start increasing the levels of these subsidies, what you are doing is just making Amtrak even more dependent upon the subsidy system.

Mr. Speaker, let me give you something that came out of a meeting that I had with them just a couple of days ago that really gives me cause for concern. They suggested in that meeting that they would rather carry 1 passenger 3,000 miles than 3,000 passengers 1 mile; that from the standpoint of their railroad, they think that they can make more money with a system carrying 1 passenger for 3,000 miles.

Well, that may be true, if what you are doing is running a railroad designed to pick up subsidies as you run out across the country. It certainly has no relationship to how rail service is going to have to be run in the country to be an integral part of a real transportation system. Because I will tell you, as the chairman well knows and other Members who have looked at transportation, the only way you make money in transportation is with business travelers, and you do not have business travelers getting up in the morning in my district in Lancaster or Westminster, PA, saying to themselves, "I have business in Chicago; I think I will take the train." They may get up and say, "I have business in New York City; I think I will take the train," or "I have business in Harrisburg; I think I will take the train," or "I have business in Boston; I think I will take the train," or "I have business in Washington; I think I will take the train."

Mr. Speaker, that is where the money can be made, with the business travelers. That is what we should be helping, and that is what we are not helping when we subsidize in the way we are doing here and encourage Amtrak to believe they are better off carrying 1 passenger 3,000 miles than 3,000 passengers 1 mile. This is not a railroad being run to make money, if that is the case.

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

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

Mr. CARR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. The gentleman has put his finger on a problem our committee has faced. We have a way to go. But our committee has had discussions and hearings on these issues. I think we have turned the corner. That is a reference to the kind remarks made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], and I thank him.

For too long we have looked at transportation funding not so much as funding transportation, but as a jobs program or as an economic development program or for some other good cause. Our committee this year has sought to rein in that type of thinking. We have a lot of work to do, because turning that ship will take several miles. It will not happen on a dime.

But I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] for his recognition that we have started that effort. To the best extent that we know how we are requiring project sponsors who come before us to provide data on criteria that will determine the economic rate of return of the project involved to the economy. We will be providing less subsidy, or, if there is a subsidy, to make sure that it is more precisely targeted.

One of the challenges we have in our democratic society is that everybody seems to want a little piece of the action, regardless of whether or not they can put together an economically viable, operable segment of anything. So everybody wants a little Amtrak route; everybody wants a little highway; everybody wants a little high speed rail route; everybody, but maybe those in Nebraska, want a port.

□ 1130

Mr. WALKER. Let me say to the chairman, though, that the concern that I have in this particular instance on Amtrak is that the stations that we are talking about them running between where they are going to reduce the service, one of them is the 20th busiest station in the country; the other is the 4th busiest station in the country. What they are suggesting is they cannot make money on those lines. And when we take a look at their fare structure, one of the reasons why they are not making any money on the railroad is because their fare structure

does not reflect realities and is, in fact, designed in a way that only increases their ability to get subsidies.

I would suggest to Members that most businessmen would probably figure out a way to take some of the busiest stations in terms of passenger travel in the country and make money off that line. Amtrak does not seem to be capable of doing that and, instead, would rather come to the Congress, come to State legislatures or come to State departments of transportation and say to them, "Give me subsidy money instead of asking me to run a real business."

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

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I am very aware of the line the gentleman is talking about, having been raised in the Philadelphia area, coming out of Harrisburg, going through Lancaster and going down the mainline. And that should be one of the most profitable routes. I think the gentleman makes a valid point. I will be glad to work with him, with Amtrak, whatever way we possibly can, but those lines clearly should be very profitable, should not be lines that should be canceled.

I think some of the more long distance lines, where airlines can serve them, and there are not that many riders, so to cancel routes from Harrisburg to Philadelphia 30th Street Station is just not really appropriate.

If we can help, I will be glad to.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY].

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this Transportation appropriations conference report.

I might respond to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, his concerns are very valid, but I also have got to say, because of the actions of this House, our subcommittee was put at a very distinct disadvantage in negotiating with the Senate, that the Senate actually got to write the bill. And then we had to negotiate down from what the Senate bill was.

I think Members really have to take note and evaluate what happened in the House with this bill and be very careful in the future, because I know my chairman and my ranking member are going to be very careful, as they always have been, in presenting this bill next year and understand that unless the Committee on Public Works and Transportation passes a bill that takes care of some of these authorizing type problems that we had earlier with this bill, we are going to visit this again where we are put, as a House, at a disadvantage with the Senate.

I might say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I do not want any money for maglev. I do not think we ought to be involved in maglev, but the Senate has \$107 million in their bill for maglev and through the great negotiating techniques of our chairman, he brought it down to 20 million. In essence, I guess with our kind of doing numbers in this place, we saved \$87 million by negotiations by our chairman and ranking member.

Developing this bill over the last 9 months has been interesting, to say the least. There have been all these battles won and lost both in committee and here on the House floor.

Regardless of this legislation's colorful and memorable past, the conference report this committee brings before the House today is, I think, a good one, a conference report that funds mobility projects nationwide and strengthens our Nation's transportation infrastructure.

I would like to take a brief moment to say that it has been a pleasure working with my chairman, BOB CARR and my ranking member, Mr. WOLF. Both of these gentlemen, new to their positions, have done yeoman's work crafting this legislation, and I certainly appreciate their efforts.

I also appreciate the efforts of the staff who have had to do incredible work, the staff on both sides, in order to bring this bill to the floor. Our conference proceeded smoothly compared to years past and I attribute that efficiency to the hard work of the Chairman and Ranking Member and the staff.

With that said, I would like to talk about several projects and programs that are of interest to me and my district.

Houston is the leader in mass transportation and intelligent vehicle highway systems. These systems serve as a model for the rest of the Nation. Houston's regional bus plan, which is funded in this bill, boasts one of the lowest cost per new rider index figure in the Nation. This project is the backbone of the city's intermodal infrastructure. Intelligent vehicles, roads and transit vehicles will very much be a part of our Nation's transportation future. It is only fitting that Houston also has the most technologically advanced traffic management program in America. Further, the city is well known for having one of the most efficient and cost effective enhanced street maintenance programs, neighborhood infrastructure systems such as hike and bike trails and street and sidewalk improvements in America.

As you can tell from that list of transportation programs, unlike many other cities in this Nation, Houston addresses its transportation efforts in a complete and comprehensive manner. They don't just look at one problem area and try to fix it by pouring money

into a black hole. Each project and program is carefully thought out and fit together. It is this comprehensive philosophy that has enabled Houston to provide the best service for the lowest cost. I recommend their efforts.

Mr. Speaker, Houston is in the process of constructing the most state of the art transportation plan in the Nation and probably the world. For that I am proud of the convictions the people of Houston have shown by supporting this program and I am proud to represent the transportation interests for the Houston area and the rest of the Nation. I sincerely hope to have the distinct opportunity to assist Houston in the future with their transportation goals and objectives.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BONILLA].

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to commend Chairman CARR and Mr. WOLF for their hard work and leadership in laying the groundwork in developing a specific, investment-based criteria for evaluating requests for transportation related projects. I believe that the Federal Government should only fund those projects that contribute to economic growth and avoid those that are not sound investments.

I believe the recent action by Chairman RAHALL in asking 18 specific questions before authorizing any future transportation projects can be directly attributed to Mr. CARR's subcommittee's efforts. I applaud Mr. RAHALL's action and look forward to working with him on projects in Texas that meet those standards.

This bill is a good bill. This bill appropriates a reasonable amount of dollars to help build our Nation's infrastructure. Let me provide an example of how this bill creates jobs and fosters economic growth.

The Laredo intermodal transit center is part of a two-part project, consisting of a bus maintenance facility and an intermodal transfer facility. The downtown intermodal transit center will serve to only the city of Laredo bus system, El Metro, but also the Webb County rural transportation program, El Aquila; also private interstate carriers such as Greyhound; and Mexican carriers such as Transportes del Norte. It is a true hub project for the region, as well as a national and international facility.

The proposed facility will also include a much needed downtown park and ride station that will accommodate 500 vehicles, and when completed will serve almost 20,000 passengers daily. It will create over 250 jobs and will help revitalize the historic downtown central business district in Laredo.

The total project has been fully planned and designed. All local, State and Federal environmental clearances have been obtained, all other permits

and clearances, including section 13-C certification from the U.S. Department of Labor, have been secured, and the proper notices and other procedures have been taken to acquire the privately owned land needed for the project.

The total cost of the transit center is \$12 million. Of that amount, \$4 million will come from local funds, \$1 million has already been allocated by the State of Texas, and the remaining \$7 million will come from Federal sources.

In April 1992, the city received a grant from the Federal Transit Administration discretionary funds of \$3 million for the bus maintenance facility portion of the project but no Federal funds for the transit center. Instead, DOT issued, in May 1992, a letter of no prejudice for the \$7 million Federal share of the transit center.

The city of Laredo has already received voter approval for a dedicated sales tax increase to pay for its share, the bonds have already been sold, and the city is fast approaching the deadline to begin spending these funds. This project can go forward and create jobs once we pass this year's appropriations bill.

I would offer this project as a model for the future of transportation projects. It met a series of goals and economic conditions that finds support at the local, State, and now Federal level. I hope all future transportation dollars have to meet a few criteria in order to ensure that the American taxpayers get the most cost-effective bang for their transportation buck.

□ 1140

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

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

Mr. Speaker, in a few minutes we will be voting on the conference report. I urge all Members to give it their support. To those who looked at our handiwork and found that we came up short, I would only make the following observation. As human beings, we are intimately involved with our own physical movement. Whether it is crawling, walking, or running, it represents our individuality, it represents our freedom. Through the ingenuity of mankind, we have managed to leap some barriers in terms of speed and altitude and comfort. Indeed, transportation has assumed a passionate place in the hearts of Americans and people throughout the world.

We even talk about it in those terms. We have the romance of the rails, and we write songs about the trains, "The City of New Orleans" and "The Wabash Cannonball." We are consumed by the challenge of the skies and space, and we write songs about the wild blue yonder.

We have a love affair with motor vehicles. In my own hometown, we build Oldsmobiles which have been immortalized in "Merry Oldsmobile", the old song. We have fantasies about life and adventure on the seas. We dream, and we dream visions about transportation and the horizons and the barriers that we are going to break.

Every once in a while those visions get ahead of the resources and the dreams get ahead of economic reality. While this committee dreams and has visions, too, about what might be in America and in transportation, it falls to us to be the committee of economic reality. The country and the Congress give us a certain amount of resources to divvy up in any particular year. This committee has done it with a great deal of dedication and a great deal of forethought, taking care of today's needs while pointing us in a direction for the future.

Even for those who wished we could have done better, and even to those who thought we did not crash enough barriers to the future, we would kindly ask for their support.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report on H.R. 2750, appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies. I have long been an avid supporter of investment in our Nation's infrastructure, and believe that this bill will help us move in the right direction. Chairman CARR and all the members of the subcommittee deserve credit for the long hours they worked in preparation for today. I also want to pay a special thanks to the dean of our delegation, Representative WYDEN, who was so helpful to me in support of Westside Light Rail here in the House. I can't thank him enough for his leadership and guidance.

While there are many accomplishments in this bill worthy of note, I want to speak for a moment about a project that is so important to my region of the country: Westside Light Rail. The bill before us today contains \$83.5 million in section 3 funds, and contains a provision which allows funds previously appropriated, but not spent, for another rail project in the Portland area to be used for Westside Light Rail in Portland. In total, the bill before us will provide \$97 million for Westside Light Rail in fiscal year 1994, one of its most critical funding years. While this amount is \$7 million below the level designated by the Federal Transit Administration as a sufficient sum, I am extremely pleased that the conference committee went the extra mile to maximize funding—even in these difficult budget times. It is also my understanding that we will be eligible to compete for the Secretary of Transportation's discretionary account to make up the difference.

Since I came to Washington in January, making sure that funding for Westside Light Rail stays on track has been one of my top priorities. In its final form, Westside Light Rail will stretch 18 miles from downtown Portland to Hillsboro. In terms of pure numbers, it is estimated the project will create 1,700 family-wage jobs during construction with an economic impact to the State's economy of over

\$2.1 billion through the year 2000. Builders and propertyowners also benefit from this project, as propertyowners near the rail line report higher occupancy rates and faster leasing rates than owners not on the line. Two large-scale development projects in our area built in conjunction with the existing light rail line, the Oregon Convention Center, and the new Trailblazer Arena, will bring over \$1 billion in new investment to Portland. These figures, in and of themselves, are compelling.

More importantly, in my view, is how important Westside Light Rail is to the future of the Portland area and our quality of life. In Oregon, we are fortunate to have some of the best land-use planners in the Nation. We desperately need their expertise as our region prepares for an expected influx of 500,000 new residents over the next 20 years. Westside Light Rail is a vital part of that important plan, and will help maintain our quality of life by reducing congestion and improving air quality. Having spent a good portion of time in traffic along the Sunset Highway—Highway 26—myself, along with communications from my constituents about their similar experiences with congestion in that area, Westside Light Rail will help provide some relief. As a matter of fact, the topography of the region makes Westside Light Rail virtually the only option. Specifically, the project is designed to eliminate bottlenecks on Highway 26 between the Metro Washington Park Zoo and Cedar Hills Boulevard, and on Highway 217 between Highway 26 and Canyon road.

My predecessor, Les AuCoin, worked very closely with now-Chairman MINETA of the House Public Works and Transportation Committee to authorize Westside Light Rail in the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act [ISTEA] in 1991, and then with his colleagues on the Appropriations Committee to ensure that the necessary funds were available to ensure timely construction. Before I was elected to Congress last fall, I learned that Westside Light Rail funding was not set in stone and depended on an annual appropriation from Congress. At any point in the process, Congress could either reduce or eliminate funding and put the money somewhere else. With the Nation's budget strings getting tighter and tighter, and Mr. AuCoin no longer in this body—no one from Oregon on the Appropriations Committee at all—I knew it would take an extra level of effort to keep Westside Light Rail on track. I also knew that this year's appropriation was particularly important because virtually every major element of Westside Light Rail construction will be under contract at some point during 1994. With so much on the line for a project that is so important to the people who elected me, I decided I would advocate the cause of Westside Light Rail at every opportunity within the House of Representatives.

Less than a month after I was sworn in as a Member of Congress, I personally contacted President Clinton about the Westside project's importance to our community. In February, I testified before the Public Works and Transportation Subcommittee on Economic Development to ensure that Congress was aware of the importance of Westside Light Rail to our economy in Oregon, and what a vital role it has in planning for our region's future. In

March, I held a briefing with Representative WYDEN for the entire delegation to learn about the future of Oregon's largest public works project from the people who work on its advancement on a daily basis. Throughout March and April, I personally sat down with every majority member of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee and explained in detail where Westside Light Rail was at in terms of budget and construction, and tried to get across to them the importance of this year's appropriation.

During the first week of May, I invited former Hillsboro, OR, Mayor Shirley Huffman and Tom Walsh, general manager of Tri-Met, to come and testify with me and Representative WYDEN in front of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation. They all did a great job, and I followed up their testimony by meeting with Chairman CARR later in the month. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that Chairman CARR and I had a very lively discussion concerning transportation policy in general and Westside Light Rail in particular. I followed up our meeting with a letter to ensure that he was fully aware of our position on a few concerns he had raised. I also worked with Tri-Met officials to ensure that Westside Light Rail's response to the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee investment criteria was timely and well-received. They deserve credit for their efforts, and it is my understanding that their work was one of the top responses in the country by a transit district.

The hard work by everyone paid off in June, when the House passed Westside Light Rail at its highest level ever, despite the fact the section 3 account was cut by over 18 percent. The figure was even higher than the total amount passed for fiscal year 1993; next to Los Angeles, Portland received the highest amount of light rail funds. Obviously, the subcommittee heard the message I was trying to get across for a number of months: Westside Light Rail is the single most important public works project in the first district of Oregon, and a vital community development undertaking with important ramifications for the entire State.

With Westside Light Rail in the hands of the Senate, I worked to solidify the Oregon delegation's support of the project. Senator HATFIELD worked diligently, as he always has on Westside Light Rail, to champion this cause on the Senate side. I must pause a moment to commend Senator HATFIELD's commitment to this project. The Senator and I have talked often—and often at great length—about the importance of this project to my community. I am so grateful to him for all of his efforts, and want it stated for the record how personally grateful I am for his efforts. With Senator HATFIELD's work paying dividends in the Senate, I organized a delegation letter to the conference committee to urge that Westside Light Rail be funded as close as possible to the amount specified by the Federal Transit Administration. I was so pleased when the entire delegation supported my efforts. Just yesterday, I was at the House Public Works and Transportation Subcommittee on Investigation and Oversight to testify on how the Westside Light Rail has been a model of ISTEA implementation, letting more and more decisionmakers know about the good work going on in Oregon.

The end result of all this, Mr. Chairman, is that the \$97 million for Westside Light Rail in Portland, OR, contained in the conference report is proof that relentless advocacy can bring results. I have long believed that much can be achieved through hard work and determination. I am fortunate to have so many good people working with me in this cause in Oregon at all levels: Good people at Tri-Met working on Westside Light Rail everyday, good people at the State level making sure Westside fits into our statewide plan, and good people at our local metropolitan planning organization advancing the cause regionally. Faced with an array of problems in Oregon, well designed and executed planning is so critical to our collective future. I thank all of them for their hard work.

I thank Chairman CARR for his leadership on transportation issues, and the time he took with me personally as a new Member of Congress. I look forward to working with him on issues in the future. In addition, I also want all members of the subcommittee who were quite gracious as I badgered them endlessly about Westside Light Rail; I thank them even more for listening and action on our discussions. Today marks a good day for Westside Light Rail and the future of the first district, and I urge my colleagues to support the conference report on H.R. 2750, 1994 Transportation appropriations.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Department of Transportation fiscal year 1994 appropriations conference report. It contains \$200 million in funding for the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, which will allow WMATA to continue its fast track construction plan for Metrorail. I testified before the Transportation Subcommittee in May, 1993, that the fast-track program will generate over 1,000 new jobs in heavy construction in this area alone. Metro is working to bring the full 103-mile system into revenue-generating operation by the year 2001, 5 years ahead of schedule. My congressional district will see the completion of the red line to Glenmont by mid-1998.

The Clean Air Act requires the Washington region to meet Federal ozone standards by 1999. Vehicle emissions account for approximately two-thirds of the area's hydrocarbons and a little less than 40 percent of the nitrogen oxides, principal ingredients of ozone. A completed Metrorail system will assist with getting cars off the road and meeting the clean air mandate, as well as conserving energy.

I thank the conferees for their consideration of the needs of Montgomery County, MD. This conference report includes \$1 million to assist the county with expanding the Intelligent Vehicle Highway System [IVHS] and in designing the Silver Spring Intermodal Facility, which will eventually link the Maryland Commuter Rail [MARC] with Metrorail. MARC, the State's most rapidly growing transit service, has also received \$23.5 million for its continuing improvement program. In addition, the Maglev Program will be funded at \$20 million for research and development.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the increase in section 402 State and community highway safety grants. This year's total \$123 million includes \$8 million to be targeted to reduce underage drunk driving. This \$8 million

will supplement, but not supplant, the States' current level of funding in this area. In March 1993, the National Transportation Safety Board recommended that measures be taken by the States to deal with the young high-risk driver. This additional funding will assist States in implementing such measures as provisional licensing for minors, promoting increased seat-belt use, and initiating staff penalties for selling alcohol to minors. This is a welcome increase in the safety grant programs, but it is appropriations for 1 year only. Legislation introduced by our colleague, FRANK WOLF, would authorize programs for the high-risk driver. I am a cosponsor of the bill, H.R. 1719, and urge my colleagues to consider cosponsoring it. This increase for fiscal year 1994 will save lives and H.R. 1719 would continue the work begun this year. I thank the appropriators for their hard work to complete the fiscal year 1994 Transportation appropriations.

Ms. VELASQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Transportation and related agencies conference report, H.R. 2750. This bill will help our Nation's infrastructure and provides for the future development of roads and highways so important for our cities. However, I want to express my dissatisfaction with a provision in the bill, inserted in the Senate that will have a devastating impact on my constituents and the city of New York.

Mr. Speaker, section 324 of the fiscal year 1985 Department of Transportation Appropriations Act required that tolls collected on the Verrazano Narrows Bridge, connecting Brooklyn and Staten Island in New York City, be collected only from cars leaving the bridge on the Staten Island side of the bridge. The oneway toll, established in 1986 as an experimental and temporary program was reimposed in the fiscal year 1993 Transportation appropriation bill and will be extended in this year's legislation.

This ill-conceived experiment has been responsible for a tremendous rise of air pollution on the already overpolluted communities in Brooklyn and lower Manhattan, and has caused the traffic to become gridlocked and impossible to cope with. Furthermore, the commercial and residential areas of lower Manhattan have been severely depressed causing economic hardship for thousands of hard-working families in my district. This disastrous policy is accountable for losses of up to \$70 million in toll revenues. In times of economic hardship and budgetary cuts, these funds are badly needed to keep and develop our transportation infrastructure.

The State of New York is having trouble complying with the provisions of the Clean Air Act, trouble caused in part by the hot spots created by increasingly heavy traffic due to the oneway toll. Extending this policy will make future compliance with the Clean Air Act almost impossible. If the city of New York fails to meet the goals of the Clean Air Act, we will lose billions of dollars in Federal aid in transportation and will continue to place our constituents' health in jeopardy.

Mr. Speaker, this is an environmentally and economically disastrous policy for the city of New York. We should work to end this Federal mandate and return jurisdiction over the tolls to the local authorities.

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to discuss the use of recycled rubber materials,

also known as crumb rubber modifiers, in asphalt pavements, in light of section 330 of H.R. 2750. Section 330 prevents the U.S. Department of Transportation from using any funds appropriated for 1994 to implement, administer, or enforce section 1038(d) of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (Public Law 102-240), known as ISTEA. Section 1038(d) of ISTEA mandated that State departments of transportation, beginning in 1994, use minimum amounts of recycled materials in asphalt pavements, and increasing amounts of crumb rubber from scrap tires in future years.

Mr. Speaker, while section 330 was not at issue in the conference on this bill, I think it is important to understand that section 330 of this Transportation appropriations bill only affects the enforcement mechanisms of ISTEA's minimum use requirement. Section 330 does not alter the goal of section 1038; our policy still will encourage States to use crumb rubber products in highway projects.

This point is important because the benefits of using recycled rubber in asphalt pavements are numerous and well-documented. My State of Arizona has found that asphalt rubber, properly applied, makes longer-lasting roads in nearly every climactic and road condition throughout our State.

We face a growing environmental crisis. We discard millions of used tires annually in this country, and we have no established procedure for dealing with this huge volume of waste. Disposing of tires legally is expensive and often difficult to arrange. Citizens often find it easier to dump old tires than to arrange for legal disposal.

Improving access to legal tire disposal represents only a stop-gap solution, however. Fires can occur at storage facilities and may increase unless we develop and encourage other alternatives to dumping, such as recycling. As an aside, the environmental concerns presented when a small mountain of tires burn uncontrolled for days far exceed any effects claimed for use of crumb rubber in asphalt.

I am no great fan of Federal mandates on the States. However, the existing contracting system, fueled in great measure by Federal trust fund receipts, has failed to accept the environmental and road-quality benefits of crumb rubber technology. Section 1038 of ISTEA was designed to counteract foot-dragging; unfortunately, section 330 may only encourage it.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to continue to ignore this technology. According to the House Public Works Committee, 235,000 miles of Federal-aid highways are in poor condition. If we must spend the billions of dollars required to repair our roads, we should demand that those roads be built to last. And if, as the evidence seems to indicate, crumb rubber technology lengthens the life of our highways, on top of offering environmental benefits, we cannot justify continued avoidance of this technology.

Section 1038 of ISTEA may have lost its teeth, but the intent and the need for that provision remain valid. States should seek to incorporate some significant amounts of recycled rubber in their highway projects. States also should not fear that using crumb rubber in a proposal will render their project ineligible for Federal funds. They only need fear what

will happen when their roads do not wear as well as those of States that use crumb rubber technology.

I plan to raise the issue of use of crumb rubber modifiers when the Committee on Public Works and Transportation begins work on authorizing the National Highway System early next year. I believe we can reach a compromise that will encourage States to use recycled rubber not only in asphalt pavement but also in other creative highway applications. I look forward to working on this issue with the distinguished chairman of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee, as well as other interested Members, as that legislation moves forward.

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, this has been a long year for the Transportation appropriations bill. And while there obviously have been difficulties along the way, I think the result is a positive one.

We began with serious issues about inequitable distribution of resources, about unauthorized projects, about the rules of the House, about lack of cooperation and communication. But these problems have basically been resolved along the way. I wish they had been more easily resolved. I wish they had been resolved with less conflict and with less divisiveness. But they have basically been resolved. This conference report represents a great improvement in the equitable distribution of these limited transportation dollars. With respect to unauthorized projects, this conference report is without a doubt the cleanest Transportation appropriations conference report in years.

I think we have shown that working together, we can improve the way we do business around here. We have significantly cleaned up the process. And I hope we will continue to make improvement in the way we handle these very important decisions regarding investment in desperately needed transportation infrastructure.

I certainly pledge my continued efforts to achieve these improvements. I commend my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CARR], for the substantial progress made in this conference report. I know that we will work together in a cooperative and open way in the future to try to continue to improve the process by which we make transportation investment decisions.

I support the conference report, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I support the conference report on H.R. 2750 which will fund our Nation's transportation programs for fiscal year 1994 but with our huge needs for infrastructure investment, this bill does not go far enough.

Infrastructure investment, whether it is highways, transit systems or airports, is not simply another Government spending program. It is an investment in our Nation's economic future but in a shortsighted, pennywise pound foolish approach, we continue to place artificial restrictions on our transportation investment.

In fact, all of our major transportation investment programs—highways, transit, and airports—are being funded at levels below that requested by the administration. The highway and transit programs have been increased but

remain below the authorized levels. The Airport Improvement Program has even been cut \$110 million below last year's funding level.

What makes this situation even worse is that these programs are, for the most part, funded through user fee supported trust fund programs. Reducing the level of spending from these trust funds doesn't aid in reducing the budget deficit. It merely builds up the surplus in the trust funds.

This past week we held hearings in the Investigations and Oversight Subcommittee on the Public Works and Transportation Committee in which we heard about the significant backlog in funding our highway and transit needs. We heard that funding below the authorized levels has, in many cases, made the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 an empty promise.

We heard that the surplus in the highway account of the highway trust fund is \$8.9 billion and the surplus in the transit account is an astounding \$10 billion, enough to fund the transit program at its current level for more than 2 years.

At the same time, we heard about the unmet needs of our Nation's transportation system. All levels of Government spent \$36 billion for highways and bridges in 1991, \$15 billion less than was needed to maintain current conditions. That means not only less economic activity from construction but less productivity and a limit on our ability to move people and goods.

Meanwhile, the transit industry estimates that its capital investment needs are more than \$15 billion annually or three times our total Federal funding of the transit program.

I have no doubt that the Members of the appropriations did the best they could within the framework of existing budget process which treats all spending, for whatever purpose, exactly alike.

I am concerned, however, that this approach will continue to produce larger and larger balances in the trust funds while failing to meet our Nation's capital investment needs. I believe it is time for Congress and the administration to step back and look at the big picture of the level of capital investment needed to support a growing economy in the coming years.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend Chairman CARR and the conferees of the House and the Senate for their efforts in making appropriations which will provide for a dynamic and progressive surface transportation program. This program will strengthen our transportation infrastructure and enable the United States to put in place a modern national system which will enhance the safety and mobility of every American in the future.

I especially commend the conferees in appropriating funds for the automated highway system [AHS] and the maglev prototype.

The AHS is a pure research and development effort which calls for the combined expertise of engineers of many disciplines. It's a long-term effort that has been endorsed by the Ford Motor Co. and General Motors. It is futuristic in nature and will not be ready for deployment until the year 2002. But this program will not be successful unless it is carefully managed under the Department of Transportation

and properly supported by the Congress as originally intended in the ISTEA authorization bill, Public Law 102-240.

Unfortunately, the report language contained in the Senate report to accompany H.R. 2750, broadens the intent of the AHS Program as authorized. The Senate report language calls for research and development to be performed by multiple consortia. I appreciate the apparent frustration of the Senate in noting the AHS has not proceeded expeditiously, but we should recognize the change in the administration and maintain confidence in those who now oversee this effort. I also believe the Congress should leave the organization of the AHS to the Department of Transportation while holding them accountable for the success of the program.

The Senate report language also calls for the integration of all current intelligent-vehicle highway system [IVHS] technologies. However, no current IVHS system is applicable to the AHS. The AHS established under Public Law 102-240 requires the development, the invention, of new sensing and control systems.

At this point, I do not feel it necessary to go beyond the current program objectives, as authorized. They are:

First, develop a prototype system by 1997 to demonstrate AHS technical and systems performance and thereby determine necessary additional requirements;

Second, prove that the AHS system can enhance highway safety. This prototype would be the basis for continuing development to the commercial level around the year 2002;

Third, establish the cost and economics of the system after hardware has been made and tested so that the estimated cost can be realistic and not just paper guesswork and;

Fourth, perform human factors engineering to confirm the effectiveness of man-machine relationships.

I ask the conferees to proceed with the development of the AHS as provided for by the authorizing legislation in ISTEA, Public Law 102-240.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I want to voice my opposition to amendment 172 which will mandate the continuance of one-way westbound toll collection at the Verrazano Narrows Bridge which connects the boroughs of Brooklyn and Staten Island. This provision will continue the already serious environmental problems, in my congressional district, which were first created by an appropriations rider in 1986.

The environmental impacts caused by the one-way toll are indeed significant. Brooklyn, a borough, with much greater population and traffic density than Staten Island, has been forced to absorb additional traffic due to the toll's diversionary effects. The lion's share of this diversion has resulted in heavy trucks using the Gowanus and Brooklyn-Queens Expressways. This diversion has hastened the deterioration of roadway infrastructure, caused damage to private property, increased air pollution and noise, with the result that these communities have borne societal and economic costs of between \$100 and \$200 million a year for the last 6 years. The addition of these diverted vehicles has added pollution hot spots where the concentration of carbon monoxide exceeds the National Ambient Air

Quality Standards. Moreover, the Gowanus and Brooklyn-Queens Expressways will have to be reconstructed over the next 10 to 15 years at a cost of \$500 million. This reconstruction will also cause further hardship to residents in the adjacent neighborhoods of Boerum Hill, Brooklyn Heights, Carroll Gardens, Cobble Hill and Red Hook.

Moreover, this restriction has resulted in a loss of revenue for the Metropolitan Transportation Authority [MTA]. The Verrazano Bridge, operated by the Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority [TBTA], collected tolls in both directions from 1964 until 1986. The MTA has lost \$12 million in annual revenues since the imposition of this one-way toll in 1986.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure you will agree the Federal Government should not be used to prohibit current negotiations, which are underway at the State level, to resolve this longstanding issue. I would hope that this bill will not continue to be used to block a New York State resolution on this toll dispute. This is clearly an issue which should be resolved without congressional interference.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the conference report before us today on the Transportation appropriations bill, H.R. 2750, contains a number of worthwhile provisions. Most important to my constituents in Illinois is the funding in the bill for the Wisconsin Central Commuter Rail Line that would establish commuter rail service with numerous stops between Antioch and Franklin Park, IL. Indeed, the Wisconsin Central Commuter Rail Line serves as a model for other proposals of this type. Its development represents a joint endeavor by State government, local communities, and METRA, who have each pledged their financial support to its completion and have continuously worked to pare down its cost. I was pleased to work with my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee this year in fully funding the Wisconsin Central Commuter Rail Line in the Transportation appropriations bill. Although this funding level was lowered in conference through the adoption of the \$8 million appropriation in the Senate version of the bill, I believe that this amount represents a significant Federal commitment toward the establishment of commuter rail service in north-eastern Illinois. For this reason, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the members of the conference committee for their work in this area.

Mr. CARR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, 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. MONTGOMERY). The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Monday, October 18, 1993, the amendments in disagreement and motions printed in the joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference to dispose of amendments in disagreement are considered as having been read.

The Clerk will designate the first amendment in disagreement.

Mr. CARR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 12, 13, 14, 21, 23, 26, 56, 122, 149, 154, 155, and 172 be considered en bloc and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The texts of the various Senate amendments referred to in the unanimous consent request are as follows:

Senate amendment No. 1: Page 2, after line 2, insert:

IMMEDIATE OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

For necessary expenses of the Immediate Office of the Secretary, \$1,173,000.

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

IMMEDIATE OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY SECRETARY

For necessary expenses of the Immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary, \$481,000.

Senate amendment No. 3: Page 2, after line 2, insert:

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

For necessary expenses of the Office of the General Counsel, \$7,667,000.

Senate amendment No. 4: Page 2, after line 2, insert:

For the necessary legal expenses of the 5 former employees of the White House Travel Office who were placed on paid administrative leave during calendar year 1993, \$150,000 to be made available to the Office of the General Counsel: *Provided*, That such funds shall be deposited in a Fund established by the General Counsel: *Provided further*, That the General Counsel shall disburse a portion of such funds to any such employee—

(1) after submission of a valid claim for reimbursement of necessary legal expenses incurred as a result of an investigation of the operations of the White House Travel Office during calendar year 1993; and

(2) upon notification or finding by the department of Justice that such employee is not a subject of such investigation.

Senate amendment No. 5: Page 2, after line 2, insert:

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR TRANSPORTATION POLICY

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Transportation Policy, \$2,410,000.

Senate amendment No. 6: Page 2, after line 2, insert:

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR AVIATION AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Aviation and International Affairs, \$8,000,000.

Senate amendment No. 7: Page 2, after line 2, insert:

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR BUDGET AND PROGRAMS

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs, \$2,826,000, including not to exceed \$60,000 for allocation within the Department for official reception and representation expenses as the Secretary may determine.

Senate amendment No. 12: Page 2, after line 2, insert:

CONTRACT APPEALS BOARD

For necessary expenses of the Contract Appeals Board, \$602,000.

Senate amendment No. 13: Page 2, after line 2, insert:

OFFICE OF CIVIL RIGHTS

For necessary expenses of the Office of Civil Rights, \$1,430,000.

Senate amendment No. 14: Page 2, after line 2, insert:

OFFICE OF SMALL AND DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS UTILIZATION

For necessary expenses of the Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization, \$934,000: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds available for the purposes of the Minority Business Resource Center in this or any other Act may be used for business opportunities related to any mode of transportation.

Senate amendment No. 21: Page 3, line 7, after "provision" insert "*Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for service to communities in the forty-eight contiguous States that are located fewer than seventy highway miles from the nearest large or medium hub airport, or that require a rate of subsidy per passenger in excess of \$200, unless such point is greater than two hundred and ten miles from the nearest large or medium hub airport".

Senate amendment No. 23: Page 3, line 25, after "*Provided*," insert "That of this amount, \$120,000 shall be derived from unobligated balances of the Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization: *Provided further*,".

Senate amendment No. 26: Page 4, line 6, after "\$220,000" insert "*Provided further*, That of this amount \$180,000 shall be derived from unobligated balances of the Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization".

Senate amendment No. 56: Page 15, line 8, after "100-457" insert "and Public Law 101-516".

Senate amendment No. 122: Page 30, after line 8, insert "\$6,700,000 for the Hawthorne-Warwick Commuter Rail Project".

Senate amendment No. 149: Page 35, line 13, after "Transportation" insert "and the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences".

Senate amendment No. 154: Page 41, line 4, after "Center" insert "*Provided*, That the Secretary may plan for further development of the Volpe National Transportation Systems Center and for other compatible uses of the Center's real property".

Senate amendment No. 155: Page 41, line 4, after "Center" insert "*Provided further*, That any such planning does not alter the Federal status of the Center's research and development operation".

Senate amendment No. 172: Page 51, after line 14, insert:

SEC. 335. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, tolls collected for motor vehicles on any bridge connecting the boroughs of Brooklyn, New York, and Staten Island, New York, shall continue to be collected for only those vehicles exiting from such bridge in Staten Island.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CARR OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CARR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CARR of Michigan moves that the house recede from its disagreements to the amendments of the senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 12, 13, 14, 21, 23, 26, 56, 122, 149, 154, 155, 172, and concur therein.

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

the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CARR].

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. 8: Page 2, after line 2, insert:

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs, \$2,225,000.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CARR OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CARR of Michigan. 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. CARR of Michigan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment, insert "\$2,100,000".

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

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. 9: Page 2, after line 2, insert:

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration, \$33,794,000, of which \$6,417,000 shall remain available until expended.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CARR OF MICHIGAN

The CARR of Michigan. 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. CARR of Michigan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert:

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration, \$27,066,000.

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

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 2, after line 2, insert:

OFFICE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS

For necessary expenses of the Office of Public Affairs, \$1,388,000.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CARR OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CARR of Michigan. 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. CARR of Michigan 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 sum proposed in said amendment, insert "\$1,355,000".

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

The motion was agreed to.

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 11: Page 2, after line 2, insert:

EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT

For necessary expenses of the Executive Secretariat, \$901,000.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CARR OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CARR of Michigan. 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. CARR of Michigan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment, insert "\$900,000".

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

The motion was agreed to.

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 15: Page 2, after line 2, insert:

OFFICE OF INTELLIGENCE AND SECURITY

For necessary expenses of the Office of Intelligence and Security, \$1,214,000.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CARR OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CARR of Michigan. 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. CARR of Michigan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment, insert "\$1,000,000".

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

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. 16: Page 2, after line 2, insert:

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING, RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses for conducting transportation planning, research, and development activities, including the collection of national transportation statistics, to remain available until expended, \$2,815,000.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CARR OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CARR of Michigan. 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. CARR of Michigan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment, insert "\$9,232,000".

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

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. 17: Page 2, after line 2, insert:

OFFICE OF COMMERCIAL SPACE

TRANSPORTATION OPERATIONS AND RESEARCH

For necessary expenses for operations and research activities related to commercial space transportation, \$4,990,000, of which \$1,500,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, there may be credited to this account up to \$200,000 received from user fees established for regulatory services.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CARR OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CARR of Michigan. 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. CARR of Michigan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the first sum named in said amendment, insert "\$4,700,000".

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

The motion was agreed to.

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 29: Page 5, line 4, strike out all after "*further*," down to and including "*shipyards*" in line 9 and insert "That the Commandant shall reduce both military and civilian employment levels for the purpose of complying with Executive Order No. 12839".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CARR OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CARR of Michigan. 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. CARR of Michigan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "That of the funds provided under this head, not less than \$6,000,000 in work currently scheduled to be conducted at the Coast Guard Yard is to be awarded based upon a competitive solicitation of both public and private shipyards: *Provided further*, That the Commandant shall reduce both military and civilian employment levels for the purpose of complying with Executive Order No. 12839".

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

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. 33: Page 5, line 21, strike out "\$47,700,000" and insert "\$50,200,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CARR OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CARR of Michigan. 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. CARR of Michigan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$44,500,000".

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

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. 35: Page 5, line 25, strike out "\$37,500,000" and insert "\$40,615,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CARR OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CARR of Michigan. 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. CARR of Michigan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$41,615,000".

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

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. 36: Page 6, line 2, after "1994" insert "*Provided*, That funds received from the sale of the VC-11A and VC-

4 aircraft shall be credited to this appropriation for the purpose of acquiring new aircraft and increasing aviation capacity".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CARR OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CARR of Michigan. 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. CARR of Michigan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert "Provided, That funds received from the sale of the VC-11A aircraft shall be credited to this appropriation for the purpose of acquiring new aircraft and increasing aviation capacity".

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

The motion was agreed to.

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 45: Page 9, line 3, after "aircraft" insert "Provided further, That none of the funds provided shall be made available for pay raises or bonuses in fiscal year 1994 for Federal Aviation Administration employees whose responsibilities include noise abatement policy function, managing aircraft route design or changes, and responsibility for preparing, managing, and overseeing the environmental impact statement mandated by section 9199 of Public Law 91-508, until the final report on such impact statement is issued".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CARR OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CARR of Michigan. 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. CARR of Michigan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of "section 9199 of Public Law 91-508" named in said amendment, insert "section 9119 of Public Law 101-508".

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

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. 46: Page 9, line 23, strike out "\$2,142,000,000" and insert "\$2,162,578,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CARR OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CARR of Michigan. 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. CARR of Michigan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46 and

concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$2,120,104,000".

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

The motion was agreed to.

□ 1150

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 47: Page 9, line 23, strike out "\$1,945,500,000" and insert "\$1,988,488,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CARR OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CARR of Michigan. 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. CARR of Michigan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$1,922,104,000".

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

The motion was agreed to.

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 53: Page 14, strike out lines 7 to 11.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CARR OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CARR of Michigan. 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. CARR of Michigan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended as follows: In lieu of the sum named, insert "\$30,262,000".

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

The motion was agreed to.

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 54: Page 14, line 17, strike out "\$17,482,663,000" and insert "\$18,020,000,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CARR OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CARR of Michigan. 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. CARR of Michigan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the

amendment of the Senate numbered 54 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$17,590,000,000".

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

The motion was agreed to.

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 60: Page 17, strike out lines 11 to 17.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CARR OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CARR of Michigan. 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. CARR of Michigan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

OPERATIONS AND RESEARCH

For expenses necessary to discharge the functions of the Secretary with respect to traffic and highway safety under the Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Act (Public Law 92-513, as amended) and the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act, \$75,909,000, to remain available until September 30, 1996.

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

The motion was agreed to.

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 70: Page 21, line 11, strike out "\$20,166,000" and insert "\$17,113,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CARR OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CARR of Michigan. 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. CARR of Michigan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$37,613,000".

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

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 22, line 6, strike out "\$331,000,000" and insert "\$351,000,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CARR OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CARR of Michigan. 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. CARR of Michigan 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 sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$351,700,000".

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

The motion was agreed to.

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 74: Page 22, line 8, strike out "\$100,000,000" and insert "\$208,580,000, not to become available until July 1, 1994."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CARR OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CARR of Michigan. 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. CARR of Michigan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "\$195,000,000, not to become available until July 1, 1994."

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

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. 88: Page 26, line 14, strike out "\$2,404,867,000" and insert "\$2,336,000,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CARR OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CARR of Michigan. 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. CARR of Michigan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$2,414,867,000" and, on page 26, line 13 of the House engrossed bill, H.R. 2750, delete "\$1,324,916,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,284,916,000".

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

The motion was agreed to.

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 92: Page 27, line 15, strike out "\$1,140,000,000" and insert "\$1,076,133,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CARR OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CARR of Michigan. 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. CARR of Michigan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$1,195,000,000".

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

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 27, line 21, strike out "\$1,079,951,000" and insert "\$1,011,084,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CARR OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CARR of Michigan. 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. CARR of Michigan 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 sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$1,129,951,000".

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 106: Page 29, strike out lines 11 and 12 and insert "\$500,000 for the South Jersey alternatives analysis."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CARR OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CARR of Michigan. 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. CARR of Michigan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 106 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "\$1,000,000 for the Northeast Ohio Commuter Rail Project; \$500,000 for the South Jersey alternatives analysis."

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

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. 124: Page 30, after line 8, insert "\$1,850,000 for alternatives analysis for Cincinnati, Ohio Commuter Rail; and".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CARR OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CARR of Michigan. 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. CARR of Michigan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 124 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert "\$1,350,000 for alternatives analysis for Cincinnati, Ohio Commuter Rail; and".

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

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. 125: Page 30, after line 8, insert "\$600,000 for Memphis, Tennessee Regional Rail Plan".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CARR OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CARR of Michigan. 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. CARR of Michigan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 125 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert "\$500,000 for Memphis, Tennessee Regional Rail Plan".

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

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. 127: Page 30, line 16, strike out all after "proviso," down to and including "\$50,000,000" in line 18 and insert "\$4,000,000 shall be for the Milwaukee, Wisconsin East-West Corridor Project and \$3,200,000 shall be for the RAILTRAN Corridor project of Dallas, Texas and Fort Worth, Texas, and \$69,300,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CARR OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CARR of Michigan. 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. CARR of Michigan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 127 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "\$10,000,000 shall be for the South Boston Piers Transitway, \$8,500,000 shall be for the Chicago Central Area Circulator Project, \$4,000,000 shall be for the Dallas South Oak Cliff LRT Project, \$1,000,000 shall be for the Houston Regional Bus Plan Program of Projects, \$5,000,000 shall be for the Pittsburgh Busway Projects, \$3,000,000 shall be for the Milwaukee, Wisconsin East-West Corridor Project, and \$45,000,000".

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

the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CARR].

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. 128: Page 31, after line 2 insert:

INTERSTATE TRANSFER GRANT—TRANSIT

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of 23 U.S.C. 103(e)(4) related to transit projects, \$45,000,000, to remain available until expended.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CARR OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CARR of Michigan. 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. CARR of Michigan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 128 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

INTERSTATE TRANSFER GRANTS—TRANSIT

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of 23 U.S.C. 103(e)(4) related to transit projects, \$45,000,000, to remain available until expended.

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

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 32, after line 12, insert:

PITTSBURGH BUSWAY

For 80 percent of the expenses necessary for the Pittsburgh Busway, as authorized by section 1069(e) of Public Law 102-240, \$28,000,000.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CARR OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CARR of Michigan. 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. CARR of Michigan 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 matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

LOCK AND DAM NO. 4 BRIDGE

For 80 percent of the expenses necessary for the Lock and Dam No. 4 bridge in Pine Bluff, Arkansas, \$4,000,000.

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

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. 134: Page 32, after line 12, insert:

MINEOLA GRADE CROSSING

For 80 percent of the expenses necessary for the Mineola, New York grade crossing, as authorized by Public Law 99-591, \$7,800,000.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CARR OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CARR of Michigan. 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. CARR of Michigan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 134 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

MINEOLA GRADE CROSSING  
(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

For 80 percent of the expenses necessary for the Mineola, New York grade crossing project, as authorized by Public Law 99-591, \$7,800,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund and to remain available until expended.

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

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 32, after line 14, insert:

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS SAFETY

For expenses necessary to discharge the functions of Hazardous Materials Safety and for expenses for conducting research and development, \$12,721,000, of which \$1,334,000 shall remain available until expended; *Provided*, That up to \$1,000,000 in fees collected under section 106(c)(11) of the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act (49 U.S.C. App. 1805(c)(11)) shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury as offsetting receipts; *Provided further*, That there may be credited to this appropriation funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources for expenses incurred for training, and for reports publication and dissemination.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CARR OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CARR of Michigan. 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. CARR of Michigan 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 first sum named in said amendment, insert "\$12,600,000" and, in lieu of the second sum named in said amendment, insert "\$1,364,000".

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

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 33, line 9, strike out "\$915,000" and insert "\$884,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CARR OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CARR of Michigan. 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. CARR of Michigan 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 "\$842,000".

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

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. 143: Page 33, line 17, strike out "\$1,863,000" and insert "\$1,781,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CARR OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CARR of Michigan. 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. CARR of Michigan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 143 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$1,766,000".

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

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 35, after line 13, insert:

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Inspector General to carry out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$36,595,000; *Provided*, That not more than \$1,000,000 of the funds made available under this head shall be available for implementation of Public Law 101-576.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CARR OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CARR of Michigan. 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. CARR of Michigan 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 first sum named in said amendment, insert "\$39,000,000".

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

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. 158: Page 43, line 5, after "240" insert: "and \$458,629 for the National Commission on Intermodal Transportation authorized by section 5005 of Public Law 102-240, and \$15,000,000 for administrative costs and allocation to States under section 1302(d) of the Symms National Recreational Trails Act of 1991 and \$5,000,000 for Lock and Dam No. 4 located at Pine Bluff, Arkansas. Amounts for section 5002 and section 5005 of Public Law 102-240 and amounts for section 1302(d) of the Symms National Recreational Trails Act of 1991 shall be deemed necessary for administration under section 104(a) of title 23, United States Code; and

"(4) Notwithstanding subsection (a) or any other provision of law, the Secretary shall withhold from initial distribution the fiscal year 1994 Federal-aid highways obligation limitation set aside for Interstate Construction Discretionary projects: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall distribute only after August 1, 1994, such obligation limitation withheld in accordance with this section to those States receiving Interstate Discretionary allocations".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CARR OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CARR of Michigan. 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. CARR of Michigan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 158 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

and \$458,629 for the National Commission on Intermodal Transportation authorized by section 5005 of Public Law 102-240. Amounts for section 5002 and section 5005 of Public Law 102-240 shall be deemed necessary for administration under section 104(a) of title 23, United States Code; and

(4) Notwithstanding subsection (a), the Secretary shall withhold from initial distribution the fiscal year 1994 Federal-aid highways obligation limitation set aside for Interstate Construction Discretionary projects: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall distribute only after August 1, 1994, such obligation limitation withheld in accordance with this section to those States receiving Interstate Discretionary allocations

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

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 43, strike out lines 6 to 20, and insert:

(d)(1) During the period October 1 through December 31, 1993, the aggregate amount of

obligations under section 157 of title 23, United States Code for projects covered under section 147 of the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1978, section 9 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1981, sections 131(b), 131(j), and 404 of Public Law 97-424, sections 1061, 1103 through 1109, 4008, and 6023(b)(8) and 6023(b)(10) of Public Law 102-240, and for projects authorized by Public Law 99-500 and Public Law 100-17, shall not exceed \$302,551,350.

"(2) The limitation on obligations for Federal-aid highways for fiscal year 1994 shall apply, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to obligations for priority corridor feasibility studies under section 1105(h) of Public Law 102-240; obligations for the Priority Corridor Revolving Loan Fund under section 1105(i) of Public Law 102-240; and obligations for the Applied Research and Technology Program under section 307(e) of title 23, United States Code.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CARR OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CARR of Michigan. 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. CARR of Michigan 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 stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert:

(d) During the period October 1 through December 31, 1993, the aggregate amount of obligations under section 157 of title 23, United States Code for projects covered under section 147 of the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1978, section 9 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1981, sections 131(b), 131(j), and 404 of Public Law 97-424, sections 1061, 1103 through 1109, 4008, and 6023(b)(8) and 6023(b)(10) of Public Law 102-240, and for projects authorized by Public Law 99-500 and Public Law 100-17, shall not exceed \$302,551,350.

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

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. 163: Page 47, after line 25, insert:

SEC. 324. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and except for fixed guideway modernization projects, funds made available by this Act or previous Acts under "Federal Transit Administration, Discretionary Grants" for projects specified in this Act or previous Acts or identified in reports accompanying this Act or previous Acts not obligated by September 30, 1996, shall be made available for other projects under section 3 of the Federal Transit Act, as amended.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CARR OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CARR of Michigan. 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. CARR of Michigan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the

amendment of the Senate numbered 163 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the section number "324", insert "326".

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

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. 175: Page 51, after line 14, insert:

SEC. 338. None of the funds provided in this or any other Act shall be used to remote radar coverage from the Roswell, New Mexico, airport prior to the Federal Aviation Administration obtaining congressional approval based upon a cost study applying (1) actual personnel staffing levels used at comparable facilities such as Moses Lake, Washington, and Waterloo, Iowa, and (2) the actual equipment costs based on integration with existing systems rather than acquisition of wholly redundant systems. The Federal Aviation Administration will report back to the committee with an appropriate study not later than December 31, 1993.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CARR OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CARR of Michigan. 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. CARR of Michigan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 175 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert:

SEC. 336. None of the funds provided in this Act shall be used to remote radar coverage from the Roswell, New Mexico, airport unless that Federal Aviation Administration shows a significant cost savings by remote radar coverage based upon a cost study applying (1) actual personnel staffing levels used at comparable facilities, and (2) the actual equipment costs based on integration with existing systems rather than acquisition of wholly redundant systems. The Federal Aviation Administration will report back to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations with an appropriate study not later than December 31, 1993.

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

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. 176: Page 51, after line 14, insert:

SEC. 339. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, monies previously appropriated for the Chattanooga fixed rail project out of the section 3 "New Construction" account shall be made available for the Chattanooga electric vehicle project through the "Bus and Bus Facilities" account.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CARR OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CARR of Michigan. 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. CARR of Michigan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 176 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

SEC. 337. Monies previously appropriated for the Chattanooga fixed rail project out of the section 3 "New Construction" account shall be made available for the Chattanooga electric vehicle project through the "Bus and Bus Facilities" account.

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

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. 177: Page 51, after line 14, insert:

SEC. 340. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds previously appropriated for Project Breakeven in Portland, Oregon, may, upon application by Tri-Met to the Federal Transit Administration, be expended on other eligible transit projects in the Portland metropolitan region.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CARR OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CARR of Michigan. 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. CARR of Michigan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 177 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

SEC. 338. Funds previously appropriated for Project Breakeven in Portland, Oregon, may, upon application by Tri-Met to the Federal Transit Administration, be expended on the Westside Light Rail Project in the Portland metropolitan region.

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

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. 180: Page 51, after line 14, insert:

SEC. 343. NEXRAD Installation.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), pursuant to the FAA's participation in the National Implementation Plan for the Modernization and Associated Restructuring of the National Weather Service, shall install nine standard FAA redundant configuration NEXRAD radar, to provide coverage to each of the following areas in Alaska, by the date indicated: Anchorage by June 1995; Sitka by July 1995; King Salmon by July 1995; Middleton Island by August

1995; Fairbanks by September 1995; Nome by October 1995; Bethel by October 1995; McGrath by September 1996; and the Bering Sea near Cold Bay or Sand Point by September 1996.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CARR OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CARR of Michigan. 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. CARR of Michigan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 180 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

SEC. 339. The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, pursuant to the Federal Aviation Administration's participation in the National Implementation Plan for the Modernization and Associated Restructuring of the National Weather Service, shall install seven standard Federal Aviation Administration redundant configuration NEXRAD radar systems, to provide coverage to each of the following areas in Alaska: Anchorage; Sitka; King Salmon; Middleton Island; Fairbanks; Nome; and Bethel. *Provided*, That the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall submit a study to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations on the adequacy and effect on aviation safety of installing fewer than nine NEXRAD systems in Alaska.

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

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. 182: Page 51, after line 14, insert:

SEC. 345. TRANSFER OF APPORTIONED TITLE 23 FUNDING.—The Secretary of Transportation shall permit the obligation of not to exceed \$4,000,000, apportioned under title 23, United States Code, section 104(b)(5)(B) for the State of Florida for operating expenses of the Tri-county Commuter Rail project in the area of Dade, Broward, and Palm Beach Counties, Florida, during each year that Interstate 95 is under reconstruction in such area.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CARR OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CARR of Michigan. I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. MONTGOMERY]. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Mr. CARR of Michigan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 182 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert:

SEC. 340. (a) The Secretary of Transportation shall permit the obligation of not to exceed \$4,000,000, apportioned under title 23, United States Code, section 104(b)(5)(B) for the State of Florida for operating expenses of the Tri-County Commuter Rail project in

the area of Dade, Broward, and Palm Beach Counties, Florida, during each year that Interstate 95 is under reconstruction in such area.

(b) The Secretary of Transportation shall permit the obligation of not to exceed \$9,000,000, apportioned under title 23, United States Code, section 104(b)(1) for the State of North Carolina for capital improvements for their Rail Impact project in the Interstate 40/85 corridor from Raleigh to Charlotte during reconstruction of Interstate 40/85.

Mr. CARR of Michigan (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

□ 1200

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 185: Page 51, after line 14, insert:

SEC. 348. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available for use for closing or otherwise reducing the services of any flight service station in the State of Alaska in operation on the date of the enactment of this Act, until after the expiration of the 90-day period following the date that the Secretary of Transportation has reported to Congress regarding the effects on safety of the flight service station closing and reduction in services plan being carried out by the Federal Aviation Administration in the State of Alaska on the date immediately preceding the date of the enactment of this Act. Such report shall be submitted no later than 90 days after enactment of this Act.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CARR OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CARR of Michigan. 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. CARR of Michigan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 185 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the section number "348", insert "341".

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

The motion was agreed to.

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 186: Page 51, after line 14, insert:

SEC. 349. If any State or local interest, within one year following the date of the enactment of this Act, can demonstrate to the satisfaction of the National Railroad Passenger Corporation that such State or local

interest can cover any potential operating losses including the cost of equipment depreciation, or that the National Railroad Passenger Corporation will not incur or absorb any part of operational losses including the cost of equipment depreciation due to the initiation of new State-supported service, the Corporation shall initiate such new service: *Provided*, That the corporation determines equipment is available to initiate such service.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CARR OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CARR of Michigan. 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. CARR of Michigan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 186 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the section number "349", insert "342".

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

The motion was agreed to.

REQUEST TO VACATE DISPOSITION OF SENATE AMENDMENT NUMBERED 172 AND RECONSIDER SENATE AMENDMENT NUMBERED 172

Mr. CARR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the earlier disposition of Senate amendment No. 172 and to reconsider that amendment at this point.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is there a way that we could put that off for a minute or two? I have called the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI], who represents that area.

Mr. CARR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my unanimous consent request at this time.

REQUEST TO VACATE DISPOSITION OF SENATE AMENDMENT NUMBERED 172 AND TO RECONSIDER SENATE AMENDMENT NUMBERED 172

Mr. CARR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the earlier disposition of the Senate amendment numbered 172 and to consider that amendment at this point. This is a restatement of my earlier unanimous consent request.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will talk for just a minute on this objection I have.

Mr. Speaker, I yield at this point to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY].

Mr. DELAY. I thank the gentleman for yielding under his reservation.

Mr. Speaker, could we ask the Chair what is this amendment and what is the effect of this amendment?

Mr. CARR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, may we ask the Clerk to read the amendment?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report Senate amendment numbered 172.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 172: Page 51, after line 14, insert:

SEC. 335. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, tolls collected for motor vehicles on any bridge connecting the boroughs of Brooklyn, New York, and Staten Island, New York, shall continue to be collected for only those vehicles exiting from such bridge in Staten Island.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation of objection, and I think I will object, but I yield to the gentleman from New York to talk about this issue for a minute or two, but because of my protection of Ms. MOLINARI, I will object. But I will yield to the gentleman if he would like to comment.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gesture of the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion offered by the distinguished chairman.

Let me be clear on what this provision would do. It would dictate to the city of New York how we should collect tolls on one local bridge. It is an outrageous and unjustified intervention in a purely local matter.

We hear a great deal of talk these days about reforming the way Congress does its business—that we should respect the rights of local communities, we should avoid Federal micromanagement of municipal affairs, and we should put an end to congressional stunts that cost local taxpayers millions of dollars.

If we agree to the language placed in this bill by the other body, Congress would mandate that New York continue collecting tolls on the Verrazano-Narrows Bridge in the westbound direction only. This method of toll collection, originally put in place by a Congressionally imposed mandate, has been an unmitigated disaster for the people of the city I represent.

Make no mistake, if you support imposing this measure, you will be doing so against the will of the people of our city—the very people who will have to live with the consequences.

The mayor of New York City, the Governor of New York State, and all but one member of our city's delegation oppose this measure.

What have been the consequences of this congressional mandate for one-way tolls on this one bridge? I urge my colleagues to study the findings of the draft environmental impact statement on this subject: The one-way tolls have increased congestion in the Holland Tunnel because heavy trucks traveling through New York City can avoid tolls by entering the city through the Verrazano Bridge, avoiding its congressionally mandated westbound toll collection and exiting through the Holland Tunnel, avoiding its eastbound toll collection. The one-way tolls have in-

creased air pollution. According to the draft environmental impact statement, vehicles diverted into lower Manhattan, my district, entirely to avoid tolls, have increased air pollution and created several pollution hotspots where the 8-hour concentration of carbon monoxide greatly exceeds the national air quality standards.

We cannot afford stunts like this which increase air pollution in New York. We are already a nonattainment area, and will soon be faced with penalties imposed by—that is, right, you guessed it—the U.S. Congress unless we clean up our air. But the same Congress that would penalize us if we do not clean up our air tells us not to take a purely local action to reduce congestion and clean up our pollution problems.

The one-way tolls have increased traffic on the Gowanus Expressway and the Brooklyn/Queens Expressway by diverting traffic onto them as they are the route between the Verrazano Bridge and the Holland Tunnel. This is a serious matter. It is more than a cause of increased pollution, it is more than an inconvenience for local residents. This is choking off the Red Hook and South Brooklyn marine terminals in Brooklyn as well as numerous small commercial and light manufacturing businesses on the Brooklyn waterfront and in industrial Sunset Park. It is causing major job loss, and it will get worse. The Gowanus Expressway, scheduled for a 10-year reconstruction job. Soon all this car and truck traffic will be diverted onto the local streets of Sunset Park and Red Hook.

One-way tolls have cost our city locally generated transportation dollars. Drivers taking advantage on one-way tolls, successfully evade toll collection. This has cost our transportation agencies between \$7 and \$8.2 million annually.

Since we're discussing transportation appropriations, let me turn my attention for a moment from this legislative issue to one of actual transportation funding. Does anyone here feel so strongly that they have to tell New York how to run our local roads that they would be willing to make up these lost dollars out of their State's appropriations? We're not talking about money paid by your constituents, we're talking about money New Yorkers pay to our own local transportation agencies for our local transportation system. Why should Congress tell New York City how to raise money locally?

I have been told by many of my colleagues that they would prefer not to get involved in a local dispute. I strongly agree. Unfortunately, Congress has been involved in a local dispute for nearly a decade. This congressional meddling has cost us over \$70 million of local funds so far, has clogged our streets, killed local businesses, destroyed the quality of life in

some of our communities, and, unless we send this provision back to the other body, Congress will do it to us for another year.

Why do this now? The only reason this amendment is in this bill today is because its sponsors know that left alone, New Yorkers will do what is in our own best interest and get rid of the one-way tolls. A small minority in our city wants to use the power of the Federal Government to circumvent the popular will of the majority in our city. Don't help them do it. I urge the defeat of the motion.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I am going to yield to the gentlewoman from New York in a moment. I will just tell the gentleman that the committee looked at this and felt that Ms. MOLINARI had made a compelling case. And because, if you have people back and forth, you back up on both sides, and one-way collection has been the trend on Route 95 and has been the trend and is the case in the Holland Tunnel. So the committee felt that was important.

Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation of objection, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. MOLINARI. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take just a few moments to explain why this is a national issue.

No. 1, it is a national issue because the interstate to which my colleague from New York refers and the bridge that connects it is not a local road, it is a road that is a part of the Federal Interstate Highway System. And the Verrazano Narrows Bridge connects those two. It is also the subject of a Federal Navigable Waters Bridge Act and Verrazano Narrows Bridge was implicitly constructed under Federal statute. So therefore the tolls on that bridge can in fact be regulated by Congress.

The last point is that if this was in fact a local issue that pitted one district against another, this would not have only been an issue handled by Senator D'AMATO in the Senate.

□ 1210

It was in fact an issue that despite the please of the mayor of the city of New York received the support and the assurances of Senator FRANK LAUTENBERG from New Jersey, as it did with the majority of the Members of this body relative to both Democrats and Republicans from New Jersey who believe that this is a Federal interstate and therefore a very important venue of travel for residents of New Jersey also into New York City and out. So this is a lot more encompassing than just one borough against another.

Mr. Speaker, let me make just one more point. When we talk about revenues, please understand, and to those of you who are not from New York

City, this may be a subject that is absolutely inconceivable to you, but please understand, I represent a borough from the city of New York. My colleague represents a borough from the city of New York. My borough, Staten Island, is the only borough that does not have a free access road to another borough in the very same city.

The people that I represent have to pay in order to get home from work every day a \$6 toll; \$5 out of that \$6 leaves Staten Island and the majority of it goes into another borough, called Manhattan, where it subsidizes mass transportation on the subway systems. It subsidizes the Long Island Railroad and train routes in New Haven, CT.

So Mr. Speaker, this is an issue for the Federal Government to get involved in because it is an issue that discusses transportation fairness. It discusses the ability of Staten Islanders to receive some relief while we continue to support the subsidies of other boroughs, and also, lastly, it is an issue that affects two States, New York and New Jersey.

For that reason, I understand when the issue did come up in the other body the support of Senator LAUTENBERG helped to persuade this institution and the other institutions that in fact this was an appropriate venue for the Federal Government in which to get involved.

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

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to make a couple very brief comments.

No. 1, this issue does not affect New Jersey. The only way conceivably it could affect New Jersey would be if you assume a better than 7-mile backup into New Jersey, and that is inconceivable.

Second of all, there are plenty of highways and roads and bridges paid for partially or almost entirely with Federal funds, but the local way in which they operate is generally considered a local issue. This is properly a local issue.

There are ramifications here. We could debate this for hours. The ramifications are a lot more complex than we can do justice to in 2 or 3 minutes. I am not going to go into them now, but the ramifications are much more complex and they are of local concern, local import, and the local governments concerned ought to decide that. That is why I think this amendment is an imposition on New York and not a good idea.

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. MOLINARI. I would only conclude, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps after this election day in November I may in

fact agree with the gentleman that this should be a situation that the local governments should decide.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CARR]?

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. We have concluded the consideration of amendments in disagreement.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 281, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1994

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 282 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 282

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 281) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1994, and for other purposes. Debate on the joint resolution shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], pending which I yield myself such time as I may use. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 282 allows this body to consider House Joint Resolution 281, making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1994, in the House—any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding. The hour of debate time will be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee. The rule provides one motion to recommit.

House Joint Resolution 281 is a one-sentence joint resolution, simply changing the end date for the continuing resolution from October 21 to October 28.

Mr. Speaker, the situation is not hard to understand. Tonight, the short-term continuing resolution will run out. The Appropriations Committee struggled mightily to finish all their bills before the deadline. Serious and

important issues delayed us. No one should object to the committee, the House, or the Congress taking the time to debate and vote on these serious matters.

Realistically, we are still on track, with some hard work, to complete the regular appropriations bills by the end of next week.

Mr. Speaker, the joint resolution before us is a simple, clean extension through October 28 of the most restrictive form of a continuing resolution: providing the lowest amount among last year's level, the House-passed or the Senate-passed amount for each account. The only question is whether to continue the operations of the Government for 1 more week until we complete the regular appropriations process. The rule gives the House an up-or-down vote on that question.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 282 is a fair rule and I urge its adoption.

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

Mr. Speaker, by now just about all observers of Congress know that advanced planning and careful forethought are not generally considered to be among the strong suits of this House and the majority leadership as we go about our business here, and so it probably does not come as much of a surprise that we are here today, on October 21, 16 days after the targeted adjournment date, once again extending the ominous continuing resolution or CR so commonplace just referred to as a CR. As it is called that is so commonplace around here now that it has its own acronym. Many Americans remember it as that great document that President Reagan dropped upon the podium, and caught national attention with, to keep the Government funded while we scramble to complete our appropriations business. After all, we missed the statutory deadline for finishing all spending measures for the coming fiscal year. That milestone came and went on October 2, so we adopted a 3-week CR that expires today. Then a host of thorny problems jostled the schedule—certainly we have had skirmishing, if not open warfare between the authorizers and the appropriators on a number of issues, and despite the best intentions of the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] who has labored mightily to hit all the deadlines, regrettably all 13 spending bills are still not ready for the President's signature. In fact, I understand only two or so have been signed. As late as 3 p.m. yesterday, Chairman NATCHER was expressing his supreme reluctance to further extend this CR—and I commend him for his commitment to getting our appropriations work done as expeditiously as possible and on schedule. The chairman, this Member, and I believe all Members of this body are all

uncomfortable with having to fall back on short-term, stopgap funding resolutions like the one before us today. Even though this CR is basically a very clean bill coming out of this House, regrettably it offers a temptation to the other body, and that is always a danger that we have to undergo with CR's. It is only a 1-week extension, but in my view it further erodes the credibility of this Congress. We just cannot seem to get our work done well and timely. When we fail to meet important deadlines and targets in the budget process, what signal are we sending to the people we represent? And why should they have confidence in our ability to meet the next deadline we are setting, considering the first two have already come and gone? Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope that next week at this time we will have met our responsibilities and completed our work.

Mr. Speaker, I think everybody knows that we have a budget that does not balance. I think everybody knows that we have taken action this year that has raised our taxes in the neighborhood of \$250 billion, and I think that everybody still knows we are waiting for promised spending cuts to materialize from the White House and be considered by this body. All those things are important business that ought to be taken up, and instead we are absorbed with the routine business which we are not completing on time. I think that is a shame, and I hope we can do better.

□ 1220

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

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on consideration of House Joint Resolution 281, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

#### FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1994

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 282, the rule just adopted, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 281) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal

year 1994, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 281

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 106(c) of Public Law 103-88 is amended by striking out "October 21, 1993" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 28, 1993".*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 282, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. Speaker, today we bring to the House a 1-week extension of the continuing resolution.

The House has been considering, as the Members know, conference reports on appropriations bills all week. The House has acted on 12 of our regular 13 appropriations conference reports, but further action by the House on the District of Columbia and energy and water development conference reports is necessary and is scheduled for tomorrow. The Senate is still considering the Defense appropriations bill.

Conference reports that are pending on the Senate side are Treasury-Postal Service, Veterans Affairs-HUD, Commerce-Justice-State-Judiciary, Interior, and now Transportation, Agriculture, military construction, and Labor-Health and Human Services-Education are at the White House awaiting signature. While two bills are enacted, legislative and foreign operations, it is apparent that action on all the rest of the appropriations bills will not be completed by midnight tonight, the expiration date of the present continuing resolution.

To provide time for the Senate to complete action and for the President to review the bills, and for conference action to proceed on the Defense appropriations bill, this 1-week extension of the continuing resolution is absolutely necessary. The resolution before the House simply extends the present continuing resolution until midnight Thursday, October 28. No extraneous provisions are included. It is clean.

The House has worked hard all week trying to get our conference reports on our appropriations bills adopted. I want all Members to know I appreciate their cooperation. This applies to every Member of the House, Mr. Speaker. They have all helped us, and as we said when we started out we are going to do it right. We have almost completed our

task. We have worked long hours, and I appreciate it.

This extension is supported by the President, the Speaker, Senator BYRD, and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget. I urge its adoption.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I must disagree—and this is one of those rare times when I do so—with my dear friend, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who does such an able job in leading the committee.

I do so, Mr. Speaker, because I strongly hold to the belief that this joint resolution in its current form will not do the job, that in fact we will be back here looking at continuing resolution No. 3, that the defense bill will never be ready in time to fit within the parameters of this resolution.

I agree with the chairman of the committee completely when he says that the other 12 bills can and should and hopefully will be done even before the week is out, but I see little evidence that the Senate, still having an appropriation bill on the Senate floor and probably going to have it there again tomorrow, is likely to complete its work.

Therefore, I oppose this joint resolution in its current form, Mr. Speaker, and at the appropriate time I will offer a motion to recommit it.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, today, Congress will take up the second continuing resolution of this fiscal year. The passing of continuing resolutions because we cannot get our budgets done on time has become an annual shame for this institution.

We waste too much time either out of session or working on trivial matters, while many of the most important issues of the day are never even discussed on the floor of this House.

The constant use of continuing resolutions in this House keeps us from having the most important tool necessary to any negotiating process—a firm deadline. Without it, Congress limps along for weeks, even months, at a time, without the budget that it is our first task to produce and approve.

This leaves the American public with the impression that the House cannot take care of its most basic tasks. It undermines faith in the process and forces us to spend too much time away from our home districts and constituents.

Members in this House may have differing ideas of what should be emphasized in a congressional reform package. I hope, though, that we can all

agree that the annual budget charade has to end and that this continuing resolution should be the last continuing resolution.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, pity the poor soul who misses a deadline for paying Federal taxes. No matter how small the amount owed, if payment arrives late the barrage of IRS dunning letters, interest charges and penalties will be merciless.

Don't expect such Prussian punctuality from the people who authorize spending our tax dollars. Just this year, Congress already has ignored at least 25 deadlines required by the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. By June 10, the House Appropriations Committee was required to have reported all 13 of the regular appropriations bills for fiscal year 1994; it only reported two bills by the deadline. Only 9 of the 13 bills cleared the House floor by the budget law's June 30 deadline.

By October 1, the beginning of the new fiscal year and the date on which President Clinton's \$1½ trillion budget was to have taken effect, only two of the 13 spending bills for operations of the Federal Government had been passed by both Houses of Congress and signed by the President. Almost routinely, on the eve of the new fiscal year, the congressional leadership pushed through a continuing resolution to provide stopgap spending authority for 3 weeks.

Now that the stopgap extension is expiring, still only two regular appropriations bills have been passed and signed by the President. This week, because it cannot even meet its own extended deadlines, Congress passed still another stopgap spending bill. For 12 of the last 13 years now, Congress has exhibited this inability to abide by the budget law.

Will any of the responsible parties pay a penalty for violating the budget law? Perish the thought. The law that created the current budget process has no effective enforcement mechanisms—and that's just the way congressional big spenders like it.

If we are ever to get Federal spending under control, we must overhaul the budget process and make it work. Democrats and Republicans alike should be able to agree upon a better system for developing and enforcing the annual budget—so that tax and spending decisions are made in an organized, timely and rational fashion, and then backed up by budget discipline.

To this end, Representative CHARLES STENHOLM and I have introduced H.R. 2929, the Budget Process Reform Act. More than 160 other reform-minded House members have joined as cosponsors, including House Republican budget leader JOHN KASICH, JANE HARMAN, and KEN CALVERT, cochairmen of the bipartisan Freshman Class Task Force on Re-inventing Government. Senators TRENT LOTT and RICHARD SHELBY soon will introduce this bipartisan reform bill in the Senate.

The hallmarks of our reform plan are clarity, evenhandedness regarding the role of the President and Congress, and discipline.

In place of the unenforceable concurrent resolution now in use, Congress would have to pass a budget in the form of a legally binding joint resolution, signed by the President. Until the budget is signed into law, no authorization or appropriations bill would be allowed

to come to the floor of either the Senate or the House, nor to any committee. This will encourage Congress and the President to cooperate and come to agreement early in the process.

Our bill would ban baseline budgeting. Instead of calling a scaled-back increase a cut, the budget will use real dollars to compare last year's actual spending to next year's proposed spending.

We'll halt the commonplace abuse of waivers. On more than half of all the spending bills enacted last year, Congress declared the budget law's restraints and deadlines not to be in force. This year already, Congress has waived the budget law more than 20 times. These waivers now pass almost routinely by simple-majority vote. The Budget Process Reform Act will make it far more difficult to bend the budget law, requiring a two-thirds majority in both the House and the Senate to approve a waiver.

Congress will have to stop its blank-check spending binge. Our bill abolishes open-ended appropriations for such sums as may be necessary. Fixed-dollar appropriations will be required for all accounts except Social Security and interest on the debt.

Finally, our bill would automatically authorize the previous year's funding level for any program or activity if Congress fails to complete its budget work on time. This would banish the threat of Government shutdowns caused by congressional inaction and delay and give Congress a powerful incentive to finish its business by the start of the fiscal year.

We shouldn't let another year go by without overhaul of the Federal budget system. We need a tough, enforceable budget law to replace the laughable procedures Congress now uses to circumvent fiscal discipline. The Budget Process Reform Act makes solid bipartisan sense. It merits support from every responsible Member of Congress who believes Congress should stop breaking the budget law's deadlines. Taxpayers who work hard to meet the April 15 congressional deadline for paying the IRS deserve no less.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this continuing resolution. It is unnecessary, unwise, and will assist the forces opposed to the change called for by our President.

Mr. Speaker, the argument for another continuing resolution at this time is extremely weak. And the argument for no continuing resolution—or at least a continuing resolution only covering the Defense Department—is extremely strong.

If you are opposed to further funding for the super collider, you should be opposed to this continuing resolution. This continuing resolution will give the Senate a week to figure out some way to save this expensive project, and undermine the strong desire of this body that the program be ended.

If you are in favor of grazing fee reform, you should be opposed to this continuing resolution. The continuing resolution will give the Senators a week to filibuster the Interior Appropriations conference report and force changes to the fee reforms achieved in conference and adopted overwhelmingly by this body.

Mr. Speaker, if the other body wants to neglect its duty to act expeditiously on appropriations conference reports it should pay a political price for doing so. Seven conference reports are now stacked up in that body, like airplanes circling a fogged-in airport. This failure to act should have consequences. The fog in the other body is not a result of natural causes, and those who are promoting gridlock should be made to explain why their individual interest justifies shutting down the Government. Such an explanation is extremely hard to make in a convincing manner.

Mr. Speaker, in endorsing this continuing resolution you have forgotten the lesson that physics teaches—a body at rest tends to remain at rest in the absence of the application of force. This continuing resolution removes the pressure and dissipates the force. It endorses our institutional incompetence, it reinforces in the minds of many Americans the contempt in which they hold us, and it gives the upper hand to the status quo.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that you, and the majority leader of the Senate, and the President all understand that we should not be in this situation—that continuing resolutions are not a necessary evil but rather that they are absolutely avoidable through the exercise of strong leadership.

This leadership must come from the President, and it must begin in January—at the commencement of the annual budget cycle. The President must submit his budget proposal on time. The President must ask for its expeditious consideration. And the President must indicate that he expects the Congress to complete its work on time and within budget.

Delay in submission of a complete budget on time sets the process off on the wrong foot. Further delays come as a consequence of initial delay and the result is seen 10 months later when an embarrassed institution must temporarily extend the agencies of Government in a manner reminiscent of a fledgling Government, not the world's greatest democracy.

The President needs to understand that when he signed the first continuing resolution a few weeks ago, he endorsed a governmental process that is inimical to the good government, reform and change he seeks.

Indeed, the President should understand that delay in the budget process undermines his entire Presidential agenda and hurts him.

Consider the case of health care reform. Delay in the budget process drew attention away from this top Presidential priority. His people were diverted from addressing the details of health reform, and the timetable for introducing a health bill was pushed back. As a result, the President still hasn't given us a health reform bill, administration witnesses can't answer basic questions about the plan, and Halloween, Thanksgiving, and congressional adjournment are around the corner. The prospects for congressional action this year are zero, and the prospects for action in this Congress are somewhat diminished.

In sum, Mr. Speaker, delay on the budget damages the President and it is in his own self interest to put an end to it.

When we passed the first continuing resolution a few weeks ago, I acknowledged that a new President needs time to get his feet un-

derneath him. But, Mr. Speaker, no such problem will exist next year or the year after or the year after that. And the President needs to take command of the budget timetable. He needs to submit his budget—with full detail and numbers that add up—on time.

Then, he needs to demand that the Congress do the same—he must hold our feet to the fire and ensure that on his watch there will be no more continuing resolutions. This is, quite simply, the essence of good government.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time on this side.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests on this side, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 282, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. MCDADE

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. MCDADE. In its current form, I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MCDADE moves to recommit the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 281) to the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

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

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### WE HAVE CULTURAL WAR IN THIS COUNTRY

(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, we are not just in a cultural war, we are in a cultural meltdown. And the lead attack on Mosaic law, Judaeo-Christian ethics and the traditional values of our country is now being led by the White House itself.

Here is a story from today's Washington Times.

On the lawn of the White House yesterday, a Ms. Gebbie, the President's

newly appointed AIDS czar told the Nation that we have to dump our repressed Victorian society and that we have to stop denying homosexual sexuality, particularly in teens. According to Ms. Gebbie, to deny their sexual appetite would leave people abandoned with no place to go.

One of the people responding to Gebbie's comments was an AIDS activist by the name of Luke Sissyfag—this is no joke, Mr. Speaker. It is an indication of the moral sickness of our society. This Luke Sissyfag says, "Kristine, put your money where your mouth is." If she puts her mouth where his has been, she would probably die of AIDS.

President Clinton's administration is in a meltdown and they are contaminating the rest of us. It is going to be 3 long, painful years to November 5, 1996, when we get rid of this moral sickness.

Mr. Speaker, please include a copy of the article following my remarks.

[From the Washington Times, Oct. 21, 1993]  
AIDS CZAR TELLS AMERICANS TO SEEK THEIR PLEASURE IN SEX  
(By Joyce Price)

President Clinton's AIDS czar says talking about sex "in terms of don't and disease" is not working, and Americans must start viewing sex as an "essentially important and pleasurable thing."

Until they do so, "we will continue to be a repressed Victorian society that misrepresents information, denies sexuality early, denies homosexual sexuality—particularly in teens—and leaves people abandoned with no place to go," Kristine Gebbie told a conference on teen-age pregnancy yesterday.

"I can help just a little bit in my job, standing on the White House lawn talking about sex with no lightning bolts falling on my head," said Miss Gebbie, a former nursing educator and Washington state health official.

Miss Gebbie is the first person to be put in charge of coordinating the government's effort to fight AIDS.

She delivered her remarks at a conference sponsored by the Association of Reproductive Health Professionals, the American Social Health Association and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Miss Gebbie's comments were immediately attacked by leaders of conservative pro-family groups.

"Her statements are utterly stupid, totally irresponsible and unfounded" said the Rev. Donald Wildmon, president of the American Family Association, based in Tupelo, Miss.

"What porn company does she work for?" he asked. "It sounds like 'Clinton and Co.' What she's saying sounds like something that came out of the Gay and Lesbian Task Force."

Phyllis Schlafly, president of the Eagle Forum, said: "The people who believe what she's saying are the ones getting the diseases. . . . People who have Victorian morality aren't."

"The ones with AIDS are the ones who had sexual freedom," Mr. Wildmon said.

Ben Merrill, special assistant to Miss Gebbie, said her message at the teen pregnancy conference has been a "common theme" of hers and is "something that needs to be said."

"It came up at the Gay and Lesbian Journalists Convention last month," he said. "And it's been well received."

He said Miss Gebbie wants "to change the way the nation looks at AIDS."

To accomplish that, she believes the "nation's puritanical roots need to be examined," a federal source said.

"When we approach AIDS, we approach it as a sexual disease, not a plague," Mr. Merrill said.

Luke Sissyfag, an AIDS activist who has criticized Miss Gebbie, said of her comments yesterday: "Kristine, put your money where your mouth is. She says the right things, like Bill Clinton, but doesn't do anything."

Mr. Sissyfag wants Miss Gebbie to follow the 30 recommendations of the National Commission on AIDS—proposals he says Mr. Clinton promised to implement during his campaign.

"If you are concerned about teen pregnancy and about transmission of HIV [the virus that causes AIDS] in adolescents, you should be implementing a coordinated federal AIDS education in high schools which includes a distribution of condoms," he said.

"That was one of the recommendations of the National Commission on AIDS, but all those recommendations are just sitting on the shelf gathering dust."

#### IN OPPOSITION TO H.R. 2520, FISCAL YEAR 1994 INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I voted against the rule on H.R. 2520, the fiscal year 1994 Interior appropriations bill and opposed the legislation itself because it is the only means I had to express my grave concern about recent actions by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

While I could cite many examples of Fish and Wildlife officials overstepping their legal authority, I particularly call attention to the efforts of one employee to effectively close the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway by insisting that the so-called Alabama sturgeon be declared endangered.

Public hearings were recently held on the subject. More than 600 people attended the October 4 hearing in Mobile and only one person spoke in support of listing the fish as endangered. In contrast, members of the Alabama congressional delegation, the U.S. Corps of Engineers, the U.S. Coast Guard, and the Southeast Power Administration pointed out that there is no scientific justification for this proposal. A biology professor from Samford University testified that the Alabama sturgeon is most likely the same species as the Mississippi shovelnose sturgeon, which is a common fish throughout the Mississippi River watershed. The Alabama sturgeon has been proposed as a separate species three times before, and each time, it was eventually recognized not to be different than others already identified.

Testimony was also heard about the tremendously adverse economic consequences this listing would cause if it forced curtailment or even closure of the Tenn-Tom Waterway. This action is not justified and it is my hope

that my vote and the attention directed to this issue will send a strong and clear message to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to use a little common sense in its regulatory activities. Its decisions should be based on the scientific evidence and in this case, when that evidence is examined, I think it is clear that the Alabama sturgeon should not be placed on the endangered list.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1435

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. WATERS) at 2 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.

#### REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO FILE FURTHER CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2445, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight, October 21, 1993, to file a further 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 SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Madam Speaker, reserving the right to object, could I engage in a colloquy or dialog with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Madam Speaker, could the chairman inform me as to the reason the gentleman would want to file this particular conference report this evening, as opposed to during the normal regular order next week?

Mr. NATCHER. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman will yield to me, we know on this side and on both sides of the gentleman's interest in the particular matter. It has been cleared through the leadership on the gentleman's side. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] is present with us on the floor at this time. It has been cleared.

In the conference that is now being held on the Senate side, it is being held in S-128. Senator JOHNSTON and his conferees are there. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] and his conferees are there. They are holding a conference on this particular matter

that the gentleman is concerned about at this particular time in that room. It would be of advantage and it would be of assistance to our committee if the gentleman would permit us to file it. That is all we want to do.

Knowing the gentleman's interest, the gentleman is entitled to attend the conference right now. Any Member of the House is entitled to attend it.

The gentleman is a good Member of the House. I know of his interest in this particular project.

I think the gentleman with this information ought to go over and attend the conference, but I believe he ought to let us file.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Madam Speaker, if I could ask another question of the distinguished chairman, if I were to object, would the gentleman not file next Tuesday? Would that not be possible?

Mr. NATCHER. Yes, I guess I would. No question about that. We would file as soon as we were permitted to file. If that would be Tuesday, that would be the day, but this only prints the matter. That is all it does.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. If it were to be filed next Tuesday, would the gentleman still not be able to bring the bill to the floor next week while the continuing resolution is still in effect?

Mr. NATCHER. We would have to have the assistance of the Rules Committee at that particular time.

The gentleman knows as far as I as the chairman of the committee is concerned, I was here a long time before I found out where the Rules Committee met.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Well, Madam Speaker, I have nothing but great admiration for the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee; but due to the sensitivity and the nature of this, and I have been attending the conference—

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

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I would like to just assert what the timing might end up being. If the conference report were filed by midnight tonight, would that anticipate then that we would have the bill on the floor on Tuesday?

Mr. NATCHER. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I would say to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the leadership would have to pass upon that. That will be a matter for the leadership to pass upon.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I am just trying to ascertain what this means in terms of the schedule. There are a number of people who are concerned about what will be in the conference report. The gentleman from Kentucky is absolutely right. All he is doing is asking permission for it to be filed so it can be printed.

On the other hand, what is being printed becomes fairly important to a lot of members, including the gentleman from Texas, and their ability to examine this and decide whether or not the conference report does in fact meet what they thought it was going to do.

□ 1440

If it is taken up on Tuesday, that would be a limited ability for Members to have a chance to examine the conference report before they might have to vote. If, in fact, though it were filed on Tuesday, and therefore, did not come to the floor until Wednesday, it would give Members somewhat more time to understand what took place in the conference.

Madam Speaker, I am just trying to figure out what the schedule might be so that the Members—

Mr. NATCHER. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman would yield further, I could help him as to that matter.

This would have to go to the Committee on Rules. It would have to go, it would have to go to the Committee on Rules on Tuesday. It could not be brought up sooner than on Wednesday of next week. It would have to go to the Committee on Rules, and, since that is the situation, it would help us if the gentleman would not object.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Well, Madam Speaker, I would do any personal favor for the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] because he is such a distinguished Member of this body, but, due to the sensitivity of it, and I have been attending the conference committee, and I am not sure there will be a resolution this afternoon, again, with great respect, I am going to object.

So, Madam Speaker, I do object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. WATERS). Objection is heard.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. MICHEL. Madam Speaker, I ask for this time for the purpose of inquiring of the distinguished majority leader the program for next week and possibly beyond.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. Madam Speaker, I am happy to yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

Mr. GEPHARDT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] for yielding to me.

Madam Speaker, there will not be further votes today. There will be a pro forma session tomorrow, but no votes.

On Monday, October 25, the House will not be in session.

On Tuesday, October 26, and the balance of the week, the House will meet at noon on Tuesday and 10 a.m. on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday.

On Tuesday, Madam Speaker, we have the possibility of these options:

H.R. 3116, motion to go to conference on defense appropriations; H.R. 2445, the energy and water development appropriations conference report which we just had some discussion about, and H.R. 1845, the Nation Biological Survey Act of 1993, to complete consideration.

Further, Madam Speaker, during the week we have the District of Columbia appropriation conference report, H.R. 1036 to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, subject to a rule, and H.R. 3116, defense appropriations conference report, subject to a rule, and H.R. 2151, Maritime Security and Competitiveness Act of 1993, subject to a rule.

As the gentleman knows, the continuing appropriation, we believe, will pass through the other body later today, but it goes until the 28th, which is Thursday, so, if we cannot get all these appropriations finished, and we hope we can, then we would have to think about another continuing, but we obviously hope that does not happen.

Now, to give the gentleman and the Members a sense of the coming month, Madam Speaker, I would like to talk for a moment about November.

We are now anticipating the following days for votes, and on other days there will not be votes. We are planning no votes on the 1st or the 2d of November. As the gentleman knows, there is an election in many States on the 2d. But there will be votes on the 3d, 4th, and 5th of November. There would be votes on Monday, the 8th; Tuesday, the 9th; and Wednesday, the 10th, but no votes on Veterans Day, the 11th, Thursday, the 11th, or Friday, the 12th. There then would be votes on the 15th, Monday; the 16th, Tuesday; the 17th, Wednesday; the 18th, Thursday; the 19th, Friday, and possibly votes on the weekend of the 20th and the 21st, even Saturday and Sunday, and votes on the 22d, Monday, with the target adjournment day for this year on November 22, 1993.

Mr. MICHEL. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] for that information because I know the Members have all been inquiring about it, and it also indicates that, if we can keep up to our schedule, then that cherished adjournment date could very well be then a couple days before Thanksgiving, and I appreciate the gentleman informing the Members of such.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, OCTOBER 22, 1993, TO TUESDAY, OCTOBER 26, 1993

Mr. GEPHARDT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Friday, October 22, 1993, it adjourn to meet at noon on Tuesday, October 26, 1993.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. GEPHARDT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

#### 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:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, October 21, 1993.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in clause 5 of rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on Thursday October 21, 1993 at 1:05 p.m.: that the Senate passed without amendment: H.R. 328; and agreed to the Conference Report and amendments in disagreement to H.R. 2519.

With great respect, I am

Sincerely yours,

DONALD K. ANDERSON,  
Clerk.

#### GIVE THESE BLUE RIBBON SCHOOLS AN "A"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EMERSON. Madam Speaker, I proudly take to the floor today to celebrate the achievements of three schools in my district: Farmington High School, Rolla Senior High School, and Rolla Middle School. These three schools from southern Missouri have been chosen as outstanding Blue Ribbon Schools.

So often, Mr. Speaker, Congress debates and considers what is wrong and broken with our Nation. The public education system has not missed out on this discussion and has been the target of a great deal of criticism. As often happens in the Nation, we forget to remember that there are hundreds of education success stories—millions of students who are learning and excelling. It is my honor and pleasure to join in the Department of Education's celebration of what is good in our public education system.

Let me tell you a little about the schools from the Eighth District of Missouri that are being honored this week. Farmington High School serves a rural community 75 miles south of St. Louis. The school district, along

with the community, is rapidly growing and the city of Farmington's theme for the school district is tradition and progress.

Farmington High School has achieved success by having the flexibility to adapt its programs to meet the specific needs of the student population. Besides being flexible, Farmington High School is both innovative and prudent. Even though the money spent by Farmington High School is moderate by national standards, the performance of their students is above both National and State averages. This is a statement worthy of repeating. Even through Farmington's spending per pupil is average, the students at Farmington High School perform far above the national and State averages.

The second school receiving a Blue Ribbon Award is Rolla Senior High School. Rolla High School has a great tradition of academic excellence and proven success in educating students from highly diverse backgrounds. In the last 5 years, Rolla High School has had 58 students who were commended, semifinalists, and finalists in the National Merit Scholarship Program. Eighty-five students qualified for the Missouri Higher Education Academic Scholarship Program by achieving a national score in the top 3 percent on the ACT or SAT exams. Additionally, the Presidential Academic Fitness Award was earned by 257 students.

Finally, Madam Speaker, I want to congratulate the third school from the Eighth District of Missouri to receive the Blue Ribbon School Award, Rolla Middle School. One of the most remarkable features about Rolla Middle School is its strong commitment to parental and community involvement in education. Rolla Middle School boasts an 85 percent participation rate in biannual parent-student-teacher conferences. Rolla students flourish in this environment. Students have been recognized for excellence at both State and National levels and school attendance exceeds 93 percent. Rolla Middle School is most certainly on the right track.

Once again, I want to applaud Farmington High School, Rolla High School, and Rolla Middle School for their selection as recipients of the prestigious Blue Ribbon Schools Award. They are clearly among the most distinguished schools in the Nation with a tireless commitment to excellence in education.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RUSH (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of official business.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. STEARNS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GOSS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TALENT, for 60 minutes, on November 9.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. SABO) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MONTGOMERY, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WALKER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. EMERSON, 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. STEARNS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HASTERT.

Mr. ALLARD.

Mr. ZIMMER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SABO) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. COPPERSMITH.

Mr. STARK in two instances.

Mr. MORAN.

Mr. BONIOR.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WALKER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. OXLEY.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

Mr. BILIRAKIS.

Mr. PACKARD.

Ms. FURSE.

Mr. COOPER.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin.

Mr. WOLF.

Mrs. LOWEY.

Mr. SKELTON.

#### BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROSE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following date present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On October 20, 1993:

H.J. Res. 111. Joint resolution designating October 21, 1993, as "National Biomedical Research Day."

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.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, October 22, 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:

2051. A letter from the General Counsel of the Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the transfer of 25 naval vessels to certain foreign countries; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2052. A letter from the Executive Officer, National Science Board, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2053. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification of the deployment of U.S. Naval Forces to participate in the implementation of the petroleum and arms embargo of Haiti (H. Doc. No. 103-153); to the Committee on Ways and Means and 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. ABERCROMBIE (for himself, Mr. OBERSTAR and Mr. BACCHUS of Florida):

H.R. 3327. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect domestic and foreign tourists and other travelers in interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. BYRNE:

H.R. 3328. A bill to prohibit the U.S. Postal Service from expending any further funds in connection with instituting a new logo until such time as its operations are no longer being conducted at an annual loss; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 3329. A bill to assure due process and equal protection of the law by permitting the use of statistical and other evidence to challenge the death penalty on the grounds of disproportionate patterns of imposition with respect to racial groups, to prohibit such patterns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3330. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to civil rights related crimes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3331. A bill to protect civil rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3332. A bill to strengthen the Federal response to police misconduct; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOKE:

H.R. 3333. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals a deduction for contributions to a Medisave account; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE (for himself, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. KYL, Mr.

HUNTER, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. EWING, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. STUMP, Mr. INHOPE, and Mr. FIELDS of Texas):

H.R. 3334. A bill to impose limitations on the placing of U.S. Armed Forces under the operational control of a foreign national acting on behalf of the United Nations; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Armed Services.

By Ms. FURSE:

H.R. 3335. A bill to amend the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to administer a Federal demonstration program to coordinate response and strategy within many sectors of local communities for intervention and prevention of domestic violence; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON:

H.R. 3336. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide mandatory life imprisonment for persons convicted of a third violent felony and to provide for the conversion of three military installations to be closed under the base closure laws into Federal prison facilities capable of incarcerating these persons; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Armed Services.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 3337. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to strengthen Federal standards for licensing firearms dealers and heighten reporting requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY:

H.R. 3338. A bill to amend title 38, United States code, to repeal a requirement that the Under Secretary for Health in the Department of Veterans Affairs be a doctor of medicine; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, and Mrs. MALONEY):

H.R. 3339. A bill to provide that tolls may not be collected solely from vehicles exiting into Richmond County, NY, from a bridge connecting Kings and Richmond Counties, NY; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. SLATTERY (for himself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MONTGOMERY, and Mr.

STUMP, Mr. APPELGATE, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. EVANS, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. KING, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. TEJEDA, and Mr. SPENCE):

H.R. 3340. A bill to amend title 38, United States code, to provide a cost-of-living adjustment in the rates of disability compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for survivors of such veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SLATTERY (for himself, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. STUMP, Mr. APPELGATE, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. EVANS, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. KING, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, and Mr. TEJEDA):

H.R. 3341. A bill to amend title 38, United States code, to increase the rate of special pension payable to persons who have received the Congressional Medal of Honor; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H.R. 3342. A bill to establish a toll free number in the Department of Commerce to assist consumers in determining if products are American made; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 3343. A bill to prohibit the expenditure of Federal funds on metric system highway signing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

##### Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Ms. BYRNE introduced a bill (H.R. 3344) for the relief of Lloyd B. Gamble; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 323: Mr. HERGER, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. GILCREST, Mr. COMBEST, Mr.

ROTH, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. CRANE, Mr. GOSS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON.

H.R. 441: Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin.

H.R. 466: Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY.

H.R. 830: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. POMBO, and Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin.

H.R. 1360: Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 1504: Mr. KASICH and Mr. HOKE.

H.R. 1645: Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. FARR, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.

H.R. 1671: Mr. SYNAR, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.

H.R. 1753: Ms. BYRNE.

H.R. 2091: Mr. BACHUS of Alabama.

H.R. 2444: Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 2735: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 2835: Mr. BROWDER, Mr. COPPERSMITH, Ms. BYRNE, and Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin.

H.R. 2918: Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. FARR, Mr. PAXON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. WYNN, Mr. BISHOP, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. GINGRICH, and Ms. FURSE.

H.R. 2962: Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 3014: Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin.

H.R. 3023: Mr. GILMAN, Mr. BLILEY, Ms. FURSE, Mr. FISH, Mr. KING, Mr. WOLF, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. SPENCE, and Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma.

H.R. 3173: Mr. LINDER and Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 3182: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 3203: Mr. BLUTE, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, and Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 3315: Mrs. MEEK, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.J. Res. 274: Mr. MANTON and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H. Res. 148: Mr. POMEROY.

H. Res. 165: Mr. CARR, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. HAMBURG, Mr. MINETA, Mr. FARR, Mr. CONDIT, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin, Mr. CHAPMAN, Ms. WATERS, Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. SENBRENNER, Mr. MCCURDY, and Mr. ANDREWS of Texas.

H. Res. 271: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mr. BAKER of Louisiana.